2018 Iowa Gambling Treatment Outcomes System:

C. Six-Month Follow-Up Report

Prepared for

Iowa Department of Public Health

Division of Behavioral Health

Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention

Prepared by

Ki H. Park
Mary E. Losch
Rodney Muilenburg
Abigail Cobb
Cade Olmstead
Erin Heiden

May 2018

For further information, contact:

Eric M. Preuss, MA, IAADC, CCS, Program Manager
Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention
Iowa Department of Public Health, Div. of Behavioral Health,
Lucas State Office Building, Sixth Floor
321 East 12th Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0075
(515) 281-8802; eric.preuss@idph.iowa.gov

Ki Park, PhD, Senior Research Scientist
Center for Social and Behavioral Research
University of Northern Iowa, 2304 College St., Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0402
(319) 273-2105; Ki.Park@uni.edu

or

Mary E. Losch, PhD, Professor and Director,
Center for Social and Behavioral Research
University of Northern Iowa, 2304 College St., Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0402
(319) 273-2105; Mary.Losch@uni.edu

The views and conclusions expressed in this report are the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Iowa Department of Public Health, Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention, or the University of Northern Iowa. This project was conducted under a contract between the University of Northern Iowa and the Iowa Department of Public Health.

This study was conducted by the Center for Social and Behavioral Research at the University of Northern Iowa under contract with and funding from the Iowa Department of Public Health, Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention.

Citation: Park, K.H., Losch, M.E., Muilenburg, R., Cobb, A., Olmstead C., & Heiden, E. (2018). *2018 Iowa Gambling Treatment Outcomes System: C. Six-Months Follow-Up.* Cedar Falls, IA: Center for Social and Behavioral Research, University of Northern Iowa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Eric M. Preuss, Mary Crawford, and Katrina Bee from the Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention at the Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH), Div. of Behavioral Health for their innumerable insights of the state treatment program and guidance of this work and a special note for Mary who provided ongoing data support from the I-SMART Problem Gambling Domain.

Also, special thanks to our staff, Sharon Cory, and student research assistants at CSBR who supported the writing and editing of this report. Similarity, many thanks to telephone interviewers from CSBR's CATI lab who collected the 6-month follow-up questionnaire data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 3

Executive Summary C: Six-Month Follow-Up 5

Demographic Characteristics 5

Treatment Rating 5

Disordered Gambling and Psychosocial Indicators 5

Multivariate Analysis: Gambling Disorder 5

SECTION C1. INTRODUCTION 6

Six-Month Follow-Up 6

SECTION C2. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS 7

Comparing Patients' Demographics, Discharge Status and Length of Service 7

SECTION C3. OUTCOMES AT 6-MONTH FOLLOW-UP 8

Satisfaction with Treatment 8

Gambling Disorder 10

Psychosocial Indicators in the Past 30 Days between Admission and 6-Month Follow-up 12

Multivariate Analysis: Treatment Outcomes 6 Months after Discharge 12

Satisfaction of Treatment Received 13

Disordered Gambling Diagnosis 14

SECTION C4. Patients' Own Words 16

Appendix: Six-Month Follow-up Frequency Tables 19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY C: SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP

Prepared May 2018 for the Iowa Department of Public Health, the Iowa Gambling Treatment Program
Prepared by the Center for Social and Behavioral Research, University of Northern Iowa

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

- The demographics characteristics of patients who participated in the six-month follow-up questionnaire were like those who were admitted to the treatment program with the exception of age and marital status. Patients at the six-month follow-up were more likely to be married and older than the patients at admission.
- About half of patients who participated in the six-month follow-up did not receive a discharge reason of treatment completion.

TREATMENT RATING

- Four of 10 patients, regardless of discharge reason, said that the treatment received was "excellent."
- The ratings of treatment received were not different by demographic characteristics or discharge status.

DISORDERED GAMBLING AND PSYCHOSOCIAL INDICATORS

- Among those who participated in the six-month follow-up, 82 percent of patients met the criteria for a Gambling Disorder (GD) at the time of admission, 6 percent at discharge, and 25 percent at the time of six-month follow-up.
- The level of psychosocial indicators at the time of the six-month follow-up were like the level of distress at the time of discharge.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS: GAMBLING DISORDER

- Receiving four or more services within 30 days was the only protective factor that reduced the likelihood of meeting criteria of a Gambling Disorder at the time of six-month follow-up.

SECTION C1. INTRODUCTION

The 2018 Iowa Gambling Treatment Outcomes (IGTO) Monitoring System report presents findings based on treatment and recovery support services data from the Problem Gambling Domain in the Iowa Service Management and Reporting Tool (I-SMART).

The purpose of the IGTO Monitoring System is to assess the patient outcomes of problem gambling treatment services funded via the Office of Problem Gambling Treatment and Prevention. The IGTO Monitoring System project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UNI to ensure compliance with human participant research protections.

SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP

At the placement screening assessment, patients are asked if they would agree to complete follow-up questionnaires six months after discharge from treatment. This follow-up questionnaire contains several measures that are like the Placement Screening, Admission, 30-Day Follow-up and Discharge assessments from the problem gambling domain in I-SMART, and includes completion of the Gambler Screening. The Six-Month Follow-up also contains questions regarding perceptions of treatment.

Figure C.1. Process and number of patients in 2015 and 2017

One distinctive aspect of the discharge data set is that I-SMART does not require collection of all discharge data elements when a patient receives a discharge reason of "Client Left," "Death" or "Incarcerated." Overall, 639 patients were discharged between January 1, 2015, to December 31, 2017. Of these, 570 consented to be part of the follow-up study and were contacted six months after discharge (regardless of the Discharge Reason). Of these, 130 patients completed the six-month follow-up questionnaires during the report period (see Figure C.1).

SECTION C2. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

COMPARING PATIENTS' DEMOGRAPHICS, DISCHARGE STATUS AND LENGTH OF SERVICE

Demographic characteristics reported on the I-SMART Admission assessment and the six-month follow-up samples were similar. However, patients who participated in the six-month follow-up were more likely to be married and older compared to demographic profiles of admitted patients. Table C.1 shows these comparisons.

TABLE C.1. Demographics of patients in I-SMART and 6-month follow-up samples

	Admission ***n*** **= 635**	**6-month follow-up** ***n*** **= 130**
Gender		
Male	59%	55%
Female	41%	45%
Ethnicity		
No Hispanic/Latino	97%	96%
Race		
Caucasian	89%	93%
African American	9%	2%
Other	3%	5%
Relationship*		
Single	44%	30%
Married or cohabitating	32%	42%
Divorced, separated, or widowed	24%	28%
Education		
High school or GED or less	57%	55%
Some college or more	43%	45%
Employment status		
Full/part time	48%	52%
Unemployed or unable to work	52%	48%
Age group*		
18-30 years	25%	12%
31-50 years	43%	42%
51 or more	32%	47%

*$p < .05$

The proportion of those patients given a discharge reason of either "Completed Treatment" or "Substantially Treated" was 25 percent in the I-SMART sample compared to 42 percent in the six-month follow-up sample. This difference was statistically different (see Table C.2). In other words, more than half of the six-month follow-up respondents were among those who did not receive a discharge reason of "Completed Treatment" or "Substantially Treated."

The average numbers of service hours between these two groups were not significantly different (average length of service for all follow-up sample was 14 hours).

TABLE C.2. Proportions of discharge status by sample

	Patients in treatment and 6-months follow-up	
Discharge status	I-SMART n = 509	6-month FU n =130
Incomplete	75%	59%
Complete	25%	42%
Average service hours received	13.3	14.2

SECTION C3. OUTCOMES AT 6-MONTH FOLLOW-UP

SATISFACTION WITH TREATMENT

Demographics

When asked "Overall, how would you rate the gambling treatment you received?" there were no differences in ratings by any demographic characteristics (see Table C.3).

TABLE C.3. Demographics of follow-up sample by satisfaction

	Rating of services		
	Fair, poor	Good	Excellent
Gender			
Male	25%	31%	44%
Female	28%	35%	38%
Ethnicity			
No Hispanic/Latino	26%	32%	41%
Race[1]			
Caucasian	28%	33%	40%
Relationship			
Single	23%	36%	41%
Married or cohabitating	32%	28%	41%
Divorced, separated, or widowed	22%	36%	42%
Education			
High school or GED or less	18%	35%	47%
Some college or more	36%	29%	35%
Employment status			
Full/part time	30%	34%	37%
Unemployed or unable to work	22%	31%	47%
Age group			
18-30 years	20%	33%	47%
31-50 years	25%	26%	49%
51 or more	30%	38%	33%

[1] All other races did not have enough cases to be represented in this table.

However, less than one-third of participants who did not receive a discharge reason of Completed Treatment of Substantially Treated (28 percent) rated the program as "excellent" compared to half of participants who did complete the treatment (60 percent), (see Table C.4).

TABLE C.4. Discharge status by rating of treatment

	Completion of treatment	
Rating of treatment received	Incomplete n=76	Complete n=53
Excellent	28%	60%
Good, fair, poor	72%	40%

*p = .000

Treatment rating as "excellent" was associated with significantly higher service hours and the number of services received (see Table C.5).

TABLE C.5. LOS by rating of treatment

	Aggregated services while in treatment	
Rating of treatment received	Average number of hours	Average number of services
Excellent (n = 53)	19	20
Good-fair-poor (n = 76)	11	11

*p = .015

About half of participants who received four or more services within 30 days (51 percent), rated the program as "excellent" compared to one-fourth of participants who received fewer than four services within 30 days (25 percent) (see Table C.6).

TABLE C.6. Discharge status by rating of treatment

	Services within 30 days	
Rating of treatment received	Less than 4 encounters n=48	4 or more encounters n=81
Excellent	25%	51%
Good, fair, poor	75%	49%

*p = .000

Treatment rating as "excellent" was associated with receiving e-therapy and support from RSS[2] (see Table C.7).

TABLE C.7. Rating of treatment by number of e-therapy services and RSS received

	E-therapy*		RSS	
Rating of treatment received	No e-therapy n =80	1 or more e-therapy n =49	No RSS n = 88	1 or more RSS n = 41
Excellent	30%	59%	36%	51%
Good-fair-poor	70%	41%	64%	49%

*p = .001

Another way to look at the data was to compare patients grouped by wait time and treatment ratings. There was no difference in the ratings by wait time (see Table C.8).

TABLE C.8. Rating of treatment by number of wait days

	Wait time to Admission	
Rating of treatment received	0-7 days n = 85	8 or more days n = 44
Excellent	40%	43%
Good, fair, poor	60%	57%

GAMBLING DISORDER[3]

Patients who reported disordered gambling criteria varied significantly depending on the assessment. Six months after discharge, 25 percent of participants reported four or more criteria (see Table C.9).

TABLE C.9. Disordered gambling diagnoses by assessment

	Assessments		
DSM-5 Disordered Gambling	Admission n =130	Discharge n =54	6-months follow-up n = 130
Yes	82%	6%	25%
No	18%	94%	75%

[2] There were no participants who received e-therapy in the follow-up sample.

[3] A patient needed to report 4 or more DSM-5 Disordered Gambler criteria to be classified as patient meeting criteria for a Gambling Disorder.

In the follow-up assessment, the DSM-5 classification was statistically different between those who received a discharge reason Completed Treatment of Substantially Treated than those that did not. Those who did not (33 percent) were more likely than those who did (13 percent) to meet the criteria of a Gambling Disorder (see Table C.10).

TABLE C.10. Gambling Disorder by discharge status

	Discharge Reason	
DSM-5 Disordered Gambling	Incomplete n = 76	Complete n =54
Yes	33%	13%
No	67%	87%

The DSM-5 classification did not differ by demographics. (see Table C.11).

TABLE C.11. Demographic proportions of sample by gambling disorder diagnosis

	DSM-5 Disordered Gambling	
	No *n* = 98	Yes *n* = 32
Gender		
Male	57%	47%
Female	43%	53%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	5%	0%
Race		
Caucasian	92%	97%
African American	2%	3%
Other	6%	0%
Relationship		
Single	30%	31%
Married or cohabitating	42%	44%
Divorced, separated or widowed	29%	25%
Education		
High school or GED or less	54%	59%
Some college or more	46%	41%
Employment status		
Full/part time	54%	69%
Unemployed or unable to work	46%	31%
Age group		
18-30 years	10%	16%
31-50 years	42%	41%
51 or more	48%	44%

Psychosocial Indicators in the Past 30 Days between Admission and 6-Month Follow-up

There were up to 54 patients who completed assessments at admission (n =54), 30-day follow-up (n = 45), discharge (n = 49) and six-month follow-up (n = 53). The nine psychosocial indicators across assessments is shown below (see Figure C.2). Although the number of patients that could be assessed across the time is not robust, the frequency of the indicators show consistency with measures shown in the previous part of the report. There is consistent decline from admission to discharge and these indicators tend to stay at similar levels six months after discharge.

Figure C.2. Psychosocial indicators at admission to six months follow-up.

Multivariate Analysis: Treatment Outcomes 6 Months after Discharge

Bivariate findings above were further examined using multivariate analytic procedures. The purpose of these analyses was to determine the strongest predictors of retention and outcome of treatment services when *all the potential predictors are considered simultaneously*. Outcomes being predicted by the analysis (i.e., dependent variables) in this section were:

1) Satisfaction: Satisfaction of treatment received (ST)
2) DSM-5: Disordered gambler (DG)

Predictors included in the model were respondent demographics, substance abuse and readiness for change in gambling behavior. In addition, type of treatment services were also included in the overall model.

The procedures used in IBM SPSS Statistics (V24.0) were Logistic Regressions (ST & DG) to estimate the odds ratios and their confidence intervals (CI). Satisfaction (ST) was a binary outcome with those patients who rated the treatment received (1= Excellent, 2 = Good, fair, or poor). The DSM-5 Disordered Gambling diagnosis (DG) was a binary outcome (1 = Disordered gambling, 0 =

No disordered gambling). Respondents with missing values for any variable in the model were excluded from the analysis. Each of the independent variables used in the modeling was also categorical; thus, some numerical variables, such as age, were recoded.

The independent variables were:

A) Demographics and individual characteristics
B) Service data
C) Substance abuse & mental health in the past 30 days
D) Context: Agencies

Satisfaction of Treatment Received

The logistic regression focused on those who had discharge information and were discharged between January 2015 and December 2017. The dependent variable (treatment satisfaction) was coded as 1 = "Excellent" and 0 = "Good, fair, or poor." The final number of patients in the analysis was 129. This model is shown below.

Regression analyses revealed that receiving four or more services within 30 days and any e-therapy services had a positive impact on the "excellent" rating in the services. However, these associations were only marginally significant.

- Four or more services within 30 days from admission: odd ratio for those patients who received four or more services within 30 days compared to those who received three or fewer was: 2.33 [0.89, 6.07]
- The odd ratio for those who received any e-therapy compared to those who did not was: 2.19 [0.93, 5.15]

Figure C.3. Factors related to satisfaction of treatment received at 6-month after discharge

Disordered Gambling Diagnosis

The logistic regression focused on those who had discharge information between January 2015 and December 2017. The dependent variable (DSM-5 diagnosis) was coded as 1 = "Disordered gambling" and 0 = "No disordered gambling." The final number of patients in the analysis was 141. This model is shown next.

Those who received four or more services within 30 days were significantly less likely to meet criteria for Disordered Gambling six months after discharge. Also, those who were ready for change compared to those already changed at the time of the admission assessment, females compared to males, and receiving one or more RSS compared to those who did not were marginally significant in the model.

- Four or more services within 30 days from admission: odd ratio for those patients who received four or more services within 30 days compared to those who received three or fewer was: 0.24 [0.08, 0.77]. Therefore, those who received four or more services were 75 percent less likely than those who received three or fewer services to meet criteria for Disordered Gambling six months after discharge.

Figure C.4. Factors related to meeting criteria of Disordered Gambling at 6-month after completion of the discharge assessment.

SECTION C4. PATIENTS' OWN WORDS

The six-month follow-up questionnaire included three open-ended questions prompting respondents to provide insight into their perceptions of and recommendations for gambling treatment services. These short-answer questions asked what was most helpful, what was least helpful, and how the treatment services could be improved. Findings are summarized below.

An interactive approach (Maxwell, 2013)[4] to qualitative coding was used to examine 256 responses collected between January 2013 and December 2017. First, a preliminary codebook of organizational categories was developed to sort the data into broad topic areas. Two research assistants independently coded the short-answer responses adding new codes as they emerged. The two codebooks were compared to reach agreement on a final set of organizational categories, and the research assistants coded the responses a second time using the revised codebook. The inter-rater reliability Cohen's Kappa was .74. The organizational categories were then used analyze the data into substantive themes (Maxwell, 2013). Substantive themes describe the responses in a broad sense and develop inductively as themes emerge across the open-ended responses.

Figure C.5. Word cloud and reflective quotes on the most helpful and least helpful aspects of and suggestions for treatment services

[4] Maxwell, J.E. (2013). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Three main topic areas emerged among comments related to "most helpful" treatment services. Responses highlighted the positive impacts of "individual counseling," "feeling supported, heard and understood," and "realizations about [harmful] behaviors and consequences." Responses commonly reflected that the connection between patients and counselors is an essential element of treatment services, as these connections increase awareness to help reduce harmful behaviors.

Responses reflecting the importance of the patient-counselor relationship persisted among responses to "least helpful" treatment services, but the focus shifted. Two of the most common comments were "incompatibility with counselor" and "counterproductive, unnecessary or repetitive info from the counselor." Here, the importance of these connections becomes clearer – the perceived impact of counseling is influenced by the quality of these patient-counselor sessions. For many respondents, a reoccurring challenge was a perceived inexperience due to counselors' relatively younger age or counselors' apparent lack of empathy.

Additionally, comments made about "group therapy" or "GA" were generally negative. Several patients described group therapy as being one of the least helpful treatment approaches for reasons such as triggering impulses, discomfort speaking in front of groups, low attendance or inconvenient meeting locations. In contrast, for other respondents, group therapy was a source of comfort knowing others who are facing similar struggles due to the same disorder. In fact, one in four commonly suggested adding "more group therapy sessions and information."

When asked how gambling treatment services could be improved, respondents provided comments related to "increase availability of counselors," "increase training and number of counselors," and "extend/expand treatment [options]." One of the most salient comments about expanding treatment was related to therapy options beyond in-person counseling such as tele-therapy or internet group chats. These suggestions are consistent with respondents' request for increased counselor availability. Responses suggesting treatment extension were generally about the duration of services. More specifically, several respondents expressed wanting to attend additional counseling sessions beyond the treatment period without having to re-enroll. This is consistent with the favorability and perceived helpfulness of counseling sessions.

The variety of feedback reveals that patients' needs and preferences are diverse and specific to the individual. Because of this, it is an important reminder that treatment plans are to be crafted to patient needs to improve effectiveness. Additionally, while on the surface some of the variety appears to be contradictory, four general themes emerged:

1. Individual counseling was one of the most helpful program services, but some cited incompatibility or difficulty relating with their counselor.
2. Lack of scheduling availability was a barrier for both group therapy and individual counseling sessions.
3. Some participants desired a way to extend follow-up beyond the treatment period without having to re-enroll.
4. Individuals suggested the need for therapy options beyond in-person counseling.

Taken together, these themes indicate that counselor compatibility is important to respondents. Prioritizing the delivery of counseling might include measures such as investing in professional development to address patient perceptions of inexperience or lack of empathy, creating additional counseling opportunities through tele-therapy or chat rooms, and creating a policy for continued care for participants who request services beyond the standard treatment timeline.

APPENDIX: SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP FREQUENCY TABLES

Overall, how would you rate the gambling treatment you received?

	n	Valid %
Excellent	53	41.1%
Good	42	32.6%
Fair	24	18.6%
Poor	10	7.8%
Total	129	100.0%

Would you recommend the gambling treatment program you received to a friend or relative?

	n	Valid %
Definitely Yes	79	61.2%
Maybe	26	20.2%
Probably Not	19	14.7%
Definitely Not	5	3.9%
Total	129	100.0%

How was the length of your gambling treatment?

	n	Valid %
Too short	37	29.8%
About right	82	66.1%
Too long	5	4.0%
Total	124	100.0%

My life is much better now than it was when I entered treatment- How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	45	34.6%
Agree	60	46.2%
Disagree	22	16.9%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.3%
Total	130	100.0%

My life is much better now than it was 6 months ago-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	44	34.1%
Agree	57	44.2%
Disagree	25	19.4%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.3%
Total	129	100.0%

My gambling activity is much less now than it was then I entered treatment-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	64	49.2%
Agree	48	36.9%
Disagree	14	10.8%
Strongly Disagree	4	3.1%
Total	130	100.0%

My gambling activity is much less now that it was 6 months ago-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	63	48.8%
Agree	45	34.9%
Disagree	17	13.2%
Strongly Disagree	4	3.1%
Total	129	100.0%

Individual counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	71	57.3%
Moderately Beneficial	17	13.7%
Slightly Beneficial	18	14.5%
Not at All Beneficial	12	9.7%
Did not receive the service at that time	6	4.8%
Total	124	100.0%

Group counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	25	20.3%
Moderately Beneficial	8	6.5%
Slightly Beneficial	10	8.1%
Not at All Beneficial	9	7.3%
Did not receive the service at that time	71	57.7%
Total	123	100.0%

Family counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	22	17.9%
Moderately Beneficial	9	7.3%
Slightly Beneficial	4	3.3%
Not at All Beneficial	7	5.7%
Did not receive the service at that time	81	65.9%
Total	123	100.0%

Education classes about gambling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	32	25.8%
Moderately Beneficial	8	6.5%
Slightly Beneficial	8	6.5%
Not at All Beneficial	5	4.0%
Did not receive the service at that time	71	57.3%
Total	124	100.0%

Financial counseling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	38	31.1%
Moderately Beneficial	10	8.2%
Slightly Beneficial	9	7.4%
Not at All Beneficial	3	2.5%
Did not receive the service at that time	62	50.8%
Total	122	100.0%

Substance abuse counseling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	27	22.1%
Moderately Beneficial	6	4.9%
Slightly Beneficial	3	2.5%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.6%
Did not receive the service at that time	84	68.9%
Total	122	100.0%

Sexual addiction counseling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	5	4.1%
Moderately Beneficial	3	2.5%
Slightly Beneficial	1	0.8%
Not at All Beneficial	3	2.5%
Did not receive the service at that time	109	90.1%
Total	121	100.0%

Domestic abuse counseling -How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	6	5.0%
Moderately Beneficial	4	3.4%
Slightly Beneficial	2	1.7%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.7%
Did not receive the service at that time	105	88.2%
Total	119	100.0%

Mental health counseling -How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	31	25.4%
Moderately Beneficial	8	6.6%
Slightly Beneficial	5	4.1%
Not at All Beneficial	5	4.1%
Did not receive the service at that time	73	59.8%
Total	122	100.0%

Gamblers Anonymous meetings-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	25	20.5%
Moderately Beneficial	11	9.0%
Slightly Beneficial	8	6.6%
Not at All Beneficial	3	2.5%
Did not receive the service at that time	75	61.5%
Total	122	100.0%

Alcoholics Anonymous meetings-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	18	14.9%
Moderately Beneficial	8	6.6%
Slightly Beneficial	5	4.1%
Not at All Beneficial	4	3.3%
Did not receive the service at that time	86	71.1%
Total	121	100.0%

Other type of counseling-How beneficial was this service?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	9	9.2%
Moderately Beneficial	2	2.0%
Not at All Beneficial	2	2.0%
Did not receive the service at that time	85	86.7%
Total	98	100.0%

Program staff members were helpful in getting me enrolled-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	77	63.6%
Agree	37	30.6%
Disagree	3	2.5%
Strongly Disagree	4	3.3%
Total	121	100.0%

Program staff members were concerned about me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	74	59.7%
Agree	37	29.8%
Disagree	7	5.6%
Strongly Disagree	6	4.8%
Total	124	100.0%

Program staff members were concerned about my family-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	62	50.8%
Agree	34	27.9%
Disagree	21	17.2%
Strongly Disagree	5	4.1%
Total	122	100.0%

The rooms and offices were appropriate for receiving services-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	64	51.2%
Agree	56	44.8%
Disagree	4	3.2%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.8%
Total	125	100.0%

The treatment offered was appropriate for me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	66	53.7%
Agree	35	28.5%
Disagree	18	14.6%
Strongly Disagree	4	3.3%
Total	123	100.0%

Counselors had very little time for me.-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	7	5.6%
Agree	14	11.3%
Disagree	51	41.1%
Strongly Disagree	52	41.9%
Total	124	100.0%

Counselors did not explain the treatment to me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	7	5.6%
Agree	14	11.1%
Disagree	47	37.3%
Strongly Disagree	58	46.0%
Total	126	100.0%

I feel prepared to have a new, healthier lifestyle-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	61	48.8%
Agree	42	33.6%
Disagree	16	12.8%
Strongly Disagree	6	4.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Staff members were sincerely interested in me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	60	47.6%
Agree	51	40.5%
Disagree	13	10.3%
Strongly Disagree	2	1.6%
Total	126	100.0%

I clearly understood program expectations for me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	62	50.0%
Agree	49	39.5%
Disagree	8	6.5%
Strongly Disagree	5	4.0%
Total	124	100.0%

The program was disorganized-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	7	5.7%
Agree	14	11.4%
Disagree	47	38.2%
Strongly Disagree	55	44.7%
Total	123	100.0%

Staff told me when I was making progress-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	50	42.4%
Agree	46	39.0%
Disagree	20	16.9%
Strongly Disagree	2	1.7%
Total	118	100.0%

I felt I had the right to disagree with staff-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	42	34.1%
Agree	70	56.9%
Disagree	8	6.5%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.4%
Total	123	100.0%

I rarely became upset about the treatment process-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	48	40.3%
Agree	51	42.9%
Disagree	11	9.2%
Strongly Disagree	9	7.6%
Total	119	100.0%

My family and friends were as involved as they wanted to be in my treatment-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	32	27.1%
Agree	46	39.0%
Disagree	22	18.6%
Strongly Disagree	18	15.3%
Total	118	100.0%

Counselors were skilled at working with me-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	56	45.9%
Agree	47	38.5%
Disagree	13	10.7%
Strongly Disagree	6	4.9%
Total	122	100.0%

The treatment methods were well thought out-How much do you agree/disagree?

	n	Valid %
Strongly Agree	49	40.2%
Agree	49	40.2%
Disagree	18	14.8%
Strongly Disagree	6	4.9%
Total	122	100.0%

Individual counseling about gambling-Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	44	36.4%
Same	73	60.3%
Less	4	3.3%
Total	121	100.0%

Group counseling about gambling -Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	46	41.1%
Same	49	43.8%
Less	17	15.2%
Total	112	100.0%

Family counseling about gambling-Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	31	28.4%
Same	66	60.6%
Less	12	11.0%
Total	109	100.0%

Education classes about gambling-Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	42	36.8%
Same	65	57.0%
Less	7	6.1%
Total	114	100.0%

Financial counseling-Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	49	43.0%
Same	61	53.5%
Less	4	3.5%
Total	114	100.0%

Other service -Do you think you should have received more, the same, or less?

	n	Valid %
More	10	16.7%
Same	44	73.3%
Less	6	10.0%
Total	60	100.0%

Did you complete all the treatment services recommended before leaving?

	n	Valid %
Yes, before leaving I completed all services recommended	58	49.2%
No, I left before completing all services	60	50.8%
Total	118	100.0%

Services were not helpful-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	47	79.7%
Checked	12	20.3%
Total	59	100.0%

Made enough progress already-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	47	79.7%
Checked	12	20.3%
Total	59	100.0%

Asked to leave-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	58	98.3%
Checked	1	1.7%
Total	59	100.0%

Scheduling conflict-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	43	72.9%
Checked	16	27.1%
Total	59	100.0%

Moved/relocated-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	55	93.2%
Checked	4	6.8%
Total	59	100.0%

Some other reason-Reason for not completing services before leaving

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	28	47.5%
Checked with comment	31	52.5%
Total	59	100.0%

Overall, how beneficial was the gambling treatment program?

	n	Valid %
Very beneficial	59	47.2%
Beneficial	46	36.8%
Not Beneficial	20	16.0%
Total	125	100.0%

What is your gender?

	n	Valid %
Male	68	54.0%
Female	58	46.0%
Total	126	100.0%

How old are you?

	n	Valid %
22	1	0.8%
23	1	0.8%
24	1	0.8%

How old are you? (continued)

	n	Valid %
25	3	2.4%
27	2	1.6%
28	1	0.8%
29	1	0.8%
30	3	2.4%
31	2	1.6%
32	5	4.0%
34	1	0.8%
35	1	0.8%
36	3	2.4%
37	2	1.6%
38	4	3.2%
39	4	3.2%
40	1	0.8%
41	3	2.4%
42	2	1.6%
43	3	2.4%
44	3	2.4%
45	4	3.2%
47	3	2.4%
48	1	0.8%
49	3	2.4%
50	6	4.8%
52	4	3.2%
53	5	4.0%
55	3	2.4%
56	4	3.2%
57	2	1.6%
58	1	0.8%
59	5	4.0%
60	5	4.0%
61	3	2.4%
62	3	2.4%
63	2	1.6%
64	4	3.2%
65	3	2.4%

How old are you? (continued)

	n	Valid %
66	6	4.8%
68	1	0.8%
69	2	1.6%
70	1	0.8%
72	1	0.8%
73	2	1.6%
74	1	0.8%
76	1	0.8%
78	1	0.8%
79	1	0.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Marital Status

	n	Valid %
Single	26	20.8%
Married	45	36.0%
Cohabitating	8	6.4%
Divorced	37	29.6%
Widowed	7	5.6%
Checked other with comment	2	1.6%
Total	125	100.0%

In the past 6 months, were you arrested for a gambling-related reason?

	n	Valid %
No	124	98.4%
Yes	2	1.6%
Total	126	100.0%

Number of arrests gambling related [6 months]

	n	Valid %
1	1	50.0%
7	1	50.0%
Total	2	100.0%

In the past 6 months, were you arrested for any other reason?

	n	Valid %
No	124	98.4%
Yes	2	1.6%
Total	126	100.0%

Number of arrests not gambling related [6 months]

	n	Valid %
1	1	100.0%
Total	1	100.0%

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

	n	Valid %
Less than high school	8	6.5%
High school or GED	58	46.8%
Vocational or technical training	10	8.1%
2-Year college degree	23	18.5%
4-Year college degree	13	10.5%
Graduate or professional degree	12	9.7%
Total	124	100.0%

Employment Status

	n	Valid %
Employed full time	67	58.3%
Employed part time	24	20.9%
Unemployed and looking for work	5	4.3%
Not looking for work and not employed	19	16.5%
Total	115	100.0%

Disabled-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	19	55.9%
Checked	15	44.1%
Total	34	100.0%

Homemaker-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	32	94.1%
Checked	2	5.9%
Total	34	100.0%

Incarcerated-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	34	100.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Retired-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	17	50.0%
Checked	17	50.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Student-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	33	97.1%
Checked	1	2.9%
Total	34	100.0%

Unemployed (not looking)-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	33	97.1%
Checked	1	2.9%
Total	34	100.0%

Other-Reason not in the labor force

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	34	100.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Individual monthly income

	n	Valid %
0	2	1.8%
194	1	0.9%
250	1	0.9%
350	1	0.9%
400	1	0.9%
600	2	1.8%
665	1	0.9%
735	1	0.9%
739	1	0.9%

Individual monthly income (continued)

	n	Valid %
767	1	0.9%
776	1	0.9%
800	5	4.4%
850	1	0.9%
894	1	0.9%
900	2	1.8%
930	1	0.9%
935	1	0.9%
987	1	0.9%
997	1	0.9%
1000	2	1.8%
1100	2	1.8%
1122	1	0.9%
1200	1	0.9%
1300	1	0.9%
1400	3	2.6%
1500	5	4.4%
1600	1	0.9%
1700	1	0.9%
1788	1	0.9%
1800	1	0.9%
1900	2	1.8%
1906	1	0.9%
1912	1	0.9%
2000	9	7.9%
2087	1	0.9%
2100	3	2.6%
2200	2	1.8%
2291	1	0.9%
2400	2	1.8%
2500	4	3.5%
2624	1	0.9%
2800	2	1.8%
3000	7	6.1%
3200	1	0.9%
3500	5	4.4%
3600	3	2.6%
4000	2	1.8%
4500	3	2.6%

Individual monthly income (continued)

	n	Valid %
4700	1	0.9%
5000	6	5.3%
5200	1	0.9%
5500	1	0.9%
6000	2	1.8%
6822	1	0.9%
7000	1	0.9%
8000	1	0.9%
10000	1	0.9%
15000	1	0.9%
18000	1	0.9%
45000	1	0.9%
48000	1	0.9%
Total	114	100.0%

Household monthly income

	n	Valid %
0	1	1.2%
194	1	1.2%
350	1	1.2%
500	1	1.2%
600	1	1.2%
735	1	1.2%
776	1	1.2%
800	1	1.2%
894	1	1.2%
900	1	1.2%
997	1	1.2%
1100	1	1.2%
1200	1	1.2%
1300	1	1.2%
1400	1	1.2%
1440	1	1.2%
1500	3	3.5%
1600	1	1.2%
1750	1	1.2%
1788	1	1.2%
2000	6	7.1%

Household monthly income (continued)

	n	Valid %
2100	1	1.2%
2200	1	1.2%
3000	4	4.7%
3100	1	1.2%
3200	2	2.4%
3245	1	1.2%
3300	1	1.2%
3500	3	3.5%
3700	1	1.2%
3800	2	2.4%
4000	6	7.1%
4500	2	2.4%
5000	8	9.4%
5100	1	1.2%
5200	1	1.2%
6000	2	2.4%
6300	1	1.2%
6500	1	1.2%
6600	1	1.2%
7000	5	5.9%
7700	1	1.2%
8000	2	2.4%
8900	1	1.2%
9000	1	1.2%
10000	1	1.2%
13000	1	1.2%
15000	3	3.5%
48000	1	1.2%
50000	1	1.2%
Total	85	100.0%

Total amount currently owe on all credit cards, IOUs, bills, etc.? (Do not include mortgages)

	n	Valid %
0	19	17.8%
352	1	0.9%
500	1	0.9%

Total amount currently owe on all credit cards, IOUs, bills, etc.? (Do not include mortgages) (Continued)

	n	Valid %
550	1	0.9%
650	1	0.9%
800	1	0.9%
1000	4	3.7%
1050	1	0.9%
1300	1	0.9%
1317	1	0.9%
1500	2	1.9%
1700	1	0.9%
1800	3	2.8%
2000	2	1.9%
2200	1	0.9%
2850	1	0.9%
3000	1	0.9%
4000	1	0.9%
4200	1	0.9%
4500	1	0.9%
5000	1	0.9%
6000	6	5.6%
6400	1	0.9%
7000	2	1.9%
7280	1	0.9%
7500	1	0.9%
8700	1	0.9%
10000	8	7.5%
12000	2	1.9%
12500	1	0.9%
13300	1	0.9%
13400	1	0.9%
15000	4	3.7%
18000	1	0.9%
20000	1	0.9%
24000	1	0.9%
25000	2	1.9%
26000	3	2.8%
30000	2	1.9%

Total amount currently owe on all credit cards, IOUs, bills, etc.? (Do not include mortgages)

	n	Valid %
32000	1	0.9%
35000	2	1.9%
39000	1	0.9%
40000	2	1.9%
45000	2	1.9%
47000	1	0.9%
50000	1	0.9%
60000	3	2.8%
80000	2	1.9%
85000	1	0.9%
99999	1	0.9%
150000	2	1.9%
180000	1	0.9%
300000	1	0.9%
330000	1	0.9%
Total	107	100.0%

Amount currently owed due to gambling

	n	Valid %
0	46	43.4%
100	1	0.9%
150	1	0.9%
300	1	0.9%
350	1	0.9%
352	1	0.9%
500	1	0.9%
600	1	0.9%
700	2	1.9%
800	1	0.9%
1000	3	2.8%
1300	1	0.9%
1700	2	1.9%
2000	3	2.8%
3500	2	1.9%
4000	2	1.9%
5000	4	3.8%

Amount currently owed due to gambling (continued)

	n	Valid %
5400	1	0.9%
6000	4	3.8%
6500	1	0.9%
7000	2	1.9%
10000	4	3.8%
13060	1	0.9%
16000	1	0.9%
17000	1	0.9%
19500	1	0.9%
20000	2	1.9%
23000	1	0.9%
24000	1	0.9%
25000	2	1.9%
40000	2	1.9%
45000	1	0.9%
47000	1	0.9%
120000	1	0.9%
150000	1	0.9%
160000	1	0.9%
180000	1	0.9%
191000	1	0.9%
300000	1	0.9%
330000	1	0.9%
Total	106	100.0%

How much did you owe due to gambling one month ago?

	n	Valid %
0	46	43.4%
50	1	0.9%
60	1	0.9%
175	1	0.9%
280	1	0.9%
300	3	2.8%
500	1	0.9%
550	1	0.9%
700	2	1.9%
820	1	0.9%
1000	3	2.8%

How much did you owe due to gambling one month ago? (continued)

	n	Valid %
1317	1	0.9%
1700	1	0.9%
2000	4	3.8%
2300	1	0.9%
2400	1	0.9%
3000	1	0.9%
3500	1	0.9%
4000	3	2.8%
4500	1	0.9%
5000	2	1.9%
5500	1	0.9%
6000	3	2.8%
6200	2	1.9%
7000	3	2.8%
10000	3	2.8%
12000	1	0.9%
13060	1	0.9%
17000	1	0.9%
19000	1	0.9%
20000	2	1.9%
23000	1	0.9%
24000	1	0.9%
25000	2	1.9%
40000	2	1.9%
45000	1	0.9%
50000	1	0.9%
150000	1	0.9%
300000	1	0.9%
330000	1	0.9%
Total	106	100.0%

Is your current gambling debt now more, the same or less than it was when you left treatment?

	n	Valid %
More now	8	6.7%
About the same	35	29.2%
Less now	77	64.2%
Total	120	100.0%

How much did you owe due to gambling when you left treatment 6 months ago?

	n	Valid %
0	34	33.3%
200	2	2.0%
300	1	1.0%
500	1	1.0%
700	2	2.0%
1000	4	3.9%
1275	1	1.0%
1500	1	1.0%
2000	3	2.9%
2500	1	1.0%
3000	1	1.0%
4000	3	2.9%
4500	1	1.0%
5000	4	3.9%
6000	4	3.9%
7000	3	2.9%
8000	2	2.0%
9000	1	1.0%
10000	4	3.9%
11000	1	1.0%
12000	2	2.0%
13000	1	1.0%
13060	1	1.0%
15000	1	1.0%
18000	1	1.0%
19500	1	1.0%
20000	4	3.9%
24000	2	2.0%
25000	2	2.0%
28000	1	1.0%
40000	2	2.0%
45000	1	1.0%
50000	1	1.0%
60000	1	1.0%
150000	1	1.0%
180000	1	1.0%
200000	1	1.0%

How much did you owe due to gambling when you left treatment 6 months ago? (continued)

	n	Valid %
300950	1	1.0%
310000	1	1.0%
330500	1	1.0%
399999	1	1.0%
Total	102	100.0%

How much did you owe due to gambling when you entered treatment?

	n	Valid %
0	26	25.0%
500	1	1.0%
700	1	1.0%
925	1	1.0%
1000	2	1.9%
1200	1	1.0%
1300	1	1.0%
1500	2	1.9%
2000	4	3.8%
2500	4	3.8%
3000	1	1.0%
4000	5	4.8%
4500	1	1.0%
5000	4	3.8%
7000	3	2.9%
8000	5	4.8%
9000	1	1.0%
9500	1	1.0%
10000	3	2.9%
12000	3	2.9%
13000	1	1.0%
15000	2	1.9%
17000	1	1.0%
18000	1	1.0%
19500	1	1.0%
20000	5	4.8%
24000	2	1.9%
25000	3	2.9%

How much did you owe due to gambling when you entered treatment? (continued)

	n	Valid %
26000	1	1.0%
30000	1	1.0%
35000	2	1.9%
40000	2	1.9%
45000	1	1.0%
50000	2	1.9%
60000	2	1.9%
120000	1	1.0%
150000	1	1.0%
180000	1	1.0%
191000	1	1.0%
200000	1	1.0%
320000	1	1.0%
330000	1	1.0%
Total	104	100.0%

How has your overall financial situation change since you entered treatment?

	n	Valid %
Better now	78	61.9%
About the same	37	29.4%
Worse now	11	8.7%
Total	126	100.0%

Is your current overall financial situation better, the same or worse now than 6 months ago?

	n	Valid %
Better now	77	60.2%
About the same	39	30.5%
Worse now	12	9.4%
Total	128	100.0%

In the past 6 months, have you declared bankruptcy?

	n	Valid %
Yes	9	6.9%
No	121	93.1%
Total	130	100.0%

When if ever was the last time someone told you they would not help you financially until you got your gambling under control?

	n	Valid %
No one has ever helped me financially	35	27.6%
No one who has ever helped me has ever told me this	35	27.6%
I was most recently told this within the past 3 months	13	10.2%
I was most recently told this between 3 and 6 months ago	3	2.4%
I was most recently told this between 6 and 12 months ago	14	11.0%
I was most recently told this more than 1 year ago	27	21.3%
Total	127	100.0%

Casino table game-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	98	86.0%
1	6	5.3%
2	3	2.6%
3	2	1.8%
4	1	0.9%
5	4	3.5%
Total	114	100.0%

Video: Poker/keno/blackjack-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	104	92.9%
2	1	0.9%
3	2	1.8%
4	1	0.9%
5	1	0.9%
7	1	0.9%
8	1	0.9%
15	1	0.9%
Total	112	100.0%

Slots-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	86	72.9%
1	6	5.1%
2	6	5.1%
3	1	0.8%
4	2	1.7%
5	3	2.5%
6	1	0.8%
7	1	0.8%
8	1	0.8%
10	2	1.7%
12	2	1.7%
14	1	0.8%
15	2	1.7%
17	1	0.8%
20	1	0.8%
25	1	0.8%
30	1	0.8%
Total	118	100.0%

Live keno-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	110	98.2%
4	2	1.8%
Total	112	100.0%

Touch Play machines-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	107	95.5%
1	2	1.8%
3	1	0.9%
7	1	0.9%
15	1	0.9%
Total	112	100.0%

Cards not in a casino-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	108	97.3%
2	1	0.9%
8	1	0.9%
14	1	0.9%
Total	111	100.0%

Bingo-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	109	98.2%
1	1	0.9%
14	1	0.9%
Total	111	100.0%

Scratch tickets and Pull tabs-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	80	70.8%
1	7	6.2%
2	3	2.7%
3	4	3.5%
4	1	0.9%
5	4	3.5%
7	1	0.9%
10	3	2.7%
15	3	2.7%
20	3	2.7%
21	1	0.9%
25	1	0.9%
30	2	1.8%
Total	113	100.0%

Lotteries-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	90	79.6%
1	7	6.2%
2	2	1.8%
4	2	1.8%
5	6	5.3%
6	1	0.9%
7	1	0.9%
8	2	1.8%
10	1	0.9%
15	1	0.9%
Total	113	100.0%

Racetrack-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	110	98.2%
1	2	1.8%
Total	112	100.0%

Sports-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	107	95.5%
1	1	0.9%
3	1	0.9%
5	1	0.9%
15	1	0.9%
22	1	0.9%
Total	112	100.0%

High risk trading-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	110	99.1%
5	1	0.9%
Total	111	100.0%

Internet-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	111	99.1%
2	1	0.9%
Total	112	100.0%

Other type of gambling-How many days did you do this gambling activity?

	n	Valid %
0	103	98.1%
1	1	1.0%
20	1	1.0%
Total	105	100.0%

How much money did you lose in the last 30 days due to gambling?

	n	Valid %
0	54	46.6%
1	1	0.9%
2	2	1.7%
5	1	0.9%
6	1	0.9%
10	4	3.4%
11	1	0.9%
12	1	0.9%
15	2	1.7%
20	2	1.7%
40	2	1.7%
50	1	0.9%
60	2	1.7%
65	1	0.9%
75	2	1.7%
85	1	0.9%
100	2	1.7%
130	1	0.9%
200	2	1.7%
300	2	1.7%
350	1	0.9%
400	2	1.7%
500	2	1.7%

How much money did you lose in the last 30 days due to gambling? (continued)

	n	Valid %
700	2	1.7%
750	1	0.9%
800	3	2.6%
900	1	0.9%
1000	4	3.4%
1008	1	0.9%
1200	2	1.7%
1500	1	0.9%
1850	1	0.9%
2000	4	3.4%
2500	1	0.9%
5000	3	2.6%
8000	1	0.9%
10000	1	0.9%
Total	116	100.0%

Won more than lost

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	116	94.3%
Checked	7	5.7%
Total	123	100.0%

In total, on how many of the past 30 days did you do any type of gambling?

	n	Valid %
0	53	42.1%
1	14	11.1%
2	10	7.9%
3	3	2.4%
4	6	4.8%
5	7	5.6%
6	2	1.6%
7	3	2.4%
10	5	4.0%
12	2	1.6%
13	1	0.8%
14	2	1.6%
15	8	6.3%

In total, on how many of the past 30 days did you do any type of gambling? (continued)

	n	Valid %
17	1	0.8%
20	2	1.6%
22	1	0.8%
23	1	0.8%
25	1	0.8%
30	4	3.2%
Total	126	100.0%

When you gambled in the past 30 days, did you usually gamble alone?

	n	Valid %
Yes	52	42.3%
No	20	16.3%
Did not gamble	51	41.5%
Total	123	100.0%

Casino-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	87	68.5%
Checked	40	31.5%
Total	127	100.0%

Race track-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	125	98.4%
Checked	2	1.6%
Total	127	100.0%

Sporting event-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	124	97.6%
Checked	3	2.4%
Total	127	100.0%

Bar or restaurant-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	119	93.7%
Checked	8	6.3%
Total	127	100.0%

On the Internet-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	125	98.4%
Checked	2	1.6%
Total	127	100.0%

School-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	127	100.0%
Total	127	100.0%

Work-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	126	99.2%
Checked	1	0.8%
Total	127	100.0%

Home or a friend's home-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	120	94.5%
Checked	7	5.5%
Total	127	100.0%

Convenience store-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	88	69.3%
Checked	39	30.7%
Total	127	100.0%

Some other place-Places gambled in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Unchecked	123	96.9%
Checked with comment	4	3.1%
Total	127	100.0%

Miss work or school because of gambling-related problems-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	114	95.0%
1	4	3.3%
3	1	0.8%
5	1	0.8%
Total	120	100.0%

Feel depressed or hopeless-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	91	74.6%
1	3	2.5%
2	3	2.5%
3	3	2.5%
5	3	2.5%
7	2	1.6%
10	4	3.3%
15	2	1.6%
18	1	0.8%
20	2	1.6%
25	1	0.8%
28	1	0.8%
30	6	4.9%
Total	122	100.0%

Think about suicide-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	111	92.5%
1	5	4.2%
2	1	0.8%
4	1	0.8%
10	1	0.8%
20	1	0.8%
Total	120	100.0%

Drink alcohol-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	85	70.2%
1	7	5.8%
2	3	2.5%
4	4	3.3%
5	7	5.8%
6	3	2.5%
7	2	1.7%
10	1	0.8%
15	2	1.7%
17	1	0.8%
20	2	1.7%
25	1	0.8%
27	1	0.8%
30	2	1.7%
Total	121	100.0%

Use illegal drugs-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	115	95.0%
5	1	0.8%
7	1	0.8%
17	1	0.8%
18	1	0.8%
20	1	0.8%
25	1	0.8%
Total	121	100.0%

Starve yourself, binge, or purge-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	114	95.8%
3	2	1.7%
5	1	0.8%
12	1	0.8%
30	1	0.8%
Total	119	100.0%

Use tobacco-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	63	51.6%
2	2	1.6%
3	2	1.6%
4	1	0.8%
5	1	0.8%
6	1	0.8%
7	1	0.8%
10	1	0.8%
28	1	0.8%
29	1	0.8%
30	48	39.3%
Total	122	100.0%

Misuse prescription drugs-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	118	99.2%
3	1	0.8%
Total	119	100.0%

Starve yourself, binge, or purge-Number of days in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
0	114	95.8%
3	2	1.7%
5	1	0.8%
12	1	0.8%
30	1	0.8%
Total	119	100.0%

Been late paying the bills-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	34	27.4%
No	90	72.6%
Total	124	100.0%

Declared bankruptcy-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	1	0.8%
No	124	99.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Lost a job due to a gambling problem-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	1	0.8%
No	124	99.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Lost a job for some other reason-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	6	4.8%
No	119	95.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Committed illegal acts to get money to gamble with-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	4	3.2%
No	121	96.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Been arrested related to gambling-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
No	124	100.0%
Total	124	100.0%

Been arrested for some other reason-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	1	0.8%
No	124	99.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Given up or greatly reduced important activities to gamble-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	13	10.4%
No	112	89.6%
Total	125	100.0%

Had difficulty managing your responsibilities at work or school-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	13	10.4%
No	112	89.6%
Total	125	100.0%

Had difficulty managing your responsibilities at home-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	22	17.6%
No	103	82.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Had difficulties with family and/or friends-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	26	20.8%
No	99	79.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Recognized and expressed your feelings inappropriately-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	24	19.2%
No	101	80.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Felt generally dissatisfied with your life-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	38	30.6%
No	86	69.4%
Total	124	100.0%

Lacked self-confidence or felt bad about yourself-Done in the last 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	45	36.0%
No	80	64.0%
Total	125	100.0%

Find yourself thinking about gambling-past experiences or future plans in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	45	36.0%
No	80	64.0%
Total	125	100.0%

Need to gamble with larger amounts or bets to get the same feeling of excitement in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	21	16.8%
No	104	83.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Repeatedly try to cut down or stop your gambling, but have been unsuccessful in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	32	25.6%
No	93	74.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Feel restless or irritable when you tried to cut down or stop gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	30	24.0%
No	95	76.0%
Total	125	100.0%

Gamble to run away from problems or relief from feelings in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	28	22.6%
No	96	77.4%
Total	124	100.0%

After losing money gambling, often return to win it back in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	27	21.6%
No	98	78.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Lie to family members and friends to hide your gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	34	27.4%
No	90	72.6%
Total	124	100.0%

Commit any illegal acts to finance your gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	2	1.6%
No	123	98.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Lost or almost lost a significant relationship, job or opportunity due to gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	8	6.4%
No	117	93.6%
Total	125	100.0%

Rely on others to relieve financial situations caused by gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	16	12.8%
No	109	87.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Received individual counseling about gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	14	11.0%
No	113	89.0%
Total	127	100.0%

Received group counseling about gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	2	1.6%
No	125	98.4%
Total	127	100.0%

Received family counseling about gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	4	3.1%
No	123	96.9%
Total	127	100.0%

Received education classes about gambling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	4	3.1%
No	123	96.9%
Total	127	100.0%

Received financial counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	5	3.9%
No	122	96.1%
Total	127	100.0%

Received substance abuse counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	7	5.5%
No	120	94.5%
Total	127	100.0%

Received sexual addiction counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
No	127	100.0%
Total	127	100.0%

Received domestic abuse counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	1	0.8%
No	126	99.2%
Total	127	100.0%

Received mental health counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	20	16.0%
No	105	84.0%
Total	125	100.0%

Attended a Gamblers Anonymous meeting in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	12	9.5%
No	114	90.5%
Total	126	100.0%

Attended an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes	14	11.1%
No	112	88.9%
Total	126	100.0%

Received some other type of counseling in the past 30 days

	n	Valid %
Yes w/ comment	4	3.3%
No	115	94.3%
Yes, not comment	3	2.5%
Total	122	100.0%

Have you been admitted or re-admitted to any gambling treatment program in the past 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Yes	6	4.8%
No	118	95.2%
Total	124	100.0%

Number of times admitted or re-admitted to any gambling treatment programs in the past 6 months

	n	Valid %
1	4	100.0%
Total	4	100.0%

Individual counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	24	19.2%
Moderately Beneficial	10	8.0%
Slightly Beneficial	5	4.0%
Not at All Beneficial	3	2.4%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	83	66.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Group counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	9	7.3%
Moderately Beneficial	4	3.2%
Slightly Beneficial	2	1.6%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.6%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	107	86.3%
Total	124	100.0%

Family counseling about gambling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	8	6.5%
Moderately Beneficial	3	2.4%
Slightly Beneficial	1	0.8%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.6%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	109	88.6%
Total	123	100.0%

Education classes about gambling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	8	6.5%
Moderately Beneficial	4	3.2%
Slightly Beneficial	4	3.2%
Not at All Beneficial	1	0.8%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	107	86.3%
Total	124	100.0%

Financial counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	8	6.4%
Moderately Beneficial	5	4.0%
Slightly Beneficial	2	1.6%
Not at All Beneficial	1	0.8%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	109	87.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Substance abuse counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	9	7.2%
Moderately Beneficial	3	2.4%
Slightly Beneficial	3	2.4%
Not at All Beneficial	1	0.8%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	109	87.2%
Total	125	100.0%

Sexual addiction counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	3	2.4%
Moderately Beneficial	2	1.6%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.6%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	118	94.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Domestic abuse counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	3	2.4%
Moderately Beneficial	2	1.6%
Not at All Beneficial	2	1.6%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	118	94.4%
Total	125	100.0%

Mental health counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	19	15.2%
Moderately Beneficial	7	5.6%
Slightly Beneficial	5	4.0%
Not at All Beneficial	3	2.4%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	91	72.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Gamblers Anonymous meetings-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	12	9.6%
Moderately Beneficial	2	1.6%
Slightly Beneficial	5	4.0%
Not at All Beneficial	4	3.2%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	102	81.6%
Total	125	100.0%

Alcoholics Anonymous meetings-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	16	12.8%
Moderately Beneficial	2	1.6%
Slightly Beneficial	2	1.6%
Not at All Beneficial	4	3.2%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	101	80.8%
Total	125	100.0%

Other type of counseling-How beneficial was this service in the last 6 months?

	n	Valid %
Very Beneficial	9	8.0%
Moderately Beneficial	1	0.9%
Not at All Beneficial	1	0.9%
Did not receive the service in past 6 months	101	90.2%
Total	112	100.0%