

Gambling Behaviors Among American College Student-Athletes:

Results from the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Study

Tom Paskus, NCAA

Jeffrey Derevensky, McGill University

Caroline Temcheff, University of Sherbrooke



Why Is the NCAA Concerned about Student-Athlete Gambling?

- Student-athlete well-being
- Contest integrity

Mission

The NCAA opposes all forms of legal and illegal sports wagering, which has the potential to undermine the integrity of sports contests and jeopardizes the welfare of student-athletes and the intercollegiate athletics community.



Sports Wagering Consequences

PERMANENTLY INELIGIBLE

- Engage in activities designed to influence a portion or final outcome of a sports contest (“point shaving” or “spot fixing”).
- Participate in a sports wager of any kind on any team at the student-athlete’s institution.

INELIGIBLE FOR A MINIMUM OF ONE YEAR AND CHARGED A MINIMUM OF ONE SEASON OF ELIGIBILITY

- Participate in a sports wager of any kind via or through:
 - the internet;
 - a bookie; and/or
 - a parlay card.

INELIGIBLE (Length to be determined)

- Participate in a sports wager of any kind by putting something at risk for the opportunity to win something. This would include fantasy leagues, Super Bowl pools and March Madness pools.

Key Questions for the NCAA

1. Are student-athletes engaging in gambling behaviors that violate NCAA bylaws or put their well-being in danger?
2. How have such behaviors been changing over the past decade?
3. What are student-athlete attitudes toward gambling and sports wagering?

Key Questions for the NCAA

4. Are there particular subgroups of student-athletes whose gambling behaviors should concern us?
5. How can the NCAA and member schools best support student-athletes (e.g., educational programming and prevention)?

Current Study

- During spring semester 2012, the NCAA conducted its third national survey of student-athlete gambling behaviors and attitudes (2004, 2008, 2012).
- Approximately 23,000 survey responses were analyzed from the 2012 survey administration and 20,000 each from the 2004 and 2008 administrations.
- This report highlights the findings from 2012 and compares them to results from the previous studies.
- A more detailed set of tables and recommendations is expected to be completed and published later in 2013.

Methods

- All 1000+ NCAA member institutions were approached to participate.
 - Asked to survey one to three squads.
 - Teams selected by the NCAA via a stratified random sampling protocol designed to provide sufficiently large and representative samples within sports/divisions.
 - Faculty athletics representatives (FARs) asked to facilitate survey administration.
 - NCAA assists with campus IRB approval.
- Study protocols were designed to standardize the administration and maximize the anonymity of participating student-athletes and schools.
- As a result, not only do we not know the identities of the student-athlete participants, we do not know which NCAA schools took part in the study.
- Based on the number of surveys received, we estimate that about 65% of schools participated.

Results:

Gambling Behaviors and Sports Wagering

Percentage of Student-Athletes Gambling for Money During the Previous 12 Months

		2008 Study	2012 Study
Males	Overall	66%	57%
	Div. I	58%	50%
	Div. II	67%	56%
	Div. III	73%	65%
Females	Overall	39%	39%
	Div. I	31%	30%
	Div. II	40%	41%
	Div. III	45%	46%

Gambling Severity (DSM-IV Classification)

Males	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Non-gambler	29.3%	33.7%	42.3%
Social gambler	66.7%	62.5%	55.8%
At-risk gambler	2.9%	1.8%	1.2%
Probable pathological gambler	1.1%	2.0%	0.7%

Females	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Non-gambler	51.1%	61.4%	61.3%
Social gambler	48.6%	38.2%	38.6%
At-risk gambler	0.3%	0.2%	< 0.1%
Probable pathological gambler	< 0.1%	0.2%	< 0.1%

Gambling Behaviors among Male Student-Athletes

	2004 Study		2008 Study		2012 Study	
	Past Year	1 x / mo+	Past Year	1 x / mo+	Past Year	1 x / mo+
Played cards for money	46.8%	20.6%	45.9%	14.3%	27.4%	6.1%
Bet horses, dogs	9.8%	2.0%	8.5%	1.4%	6.5%	1.5%
Games personal skill	39.7%	16.3%	33.1%	13.0%	25.4%	9.9%
Dice, craps	13.4%	4.3%	11.7%	3.9%	7.8%	2.5%
Slots	19.8%	3.6%	15.1%	2.0%	11.9%	1.8%
Lottery tickets	36.2%	11.1%	31.4%	9.1%	35.2%	11.1%
Played stock market	10.2%	4.7%	9.2%	4.5%	7.4%	3.6%
Commercial bingo	6.5%	0.9%	6.9%	1.1%	5.3%	1.2%
Gambled in casino	--	--	22.9%	3.8%	18.7%	3.3%
Bet on sports	23.5%	9.6%	29.5%	9.6%	25.7%	8.3%
Casino games on Internet for money	6.8%	2.8%	12.3%	4.7%	7.5%	1.9%

Note: Percentages displayed are cumulative rather than independent. A student-athlete reporting having wagered 'once/month or more' is also included in the 'past year' figure.

Gambling Behaviors among Female Student-Athletes

	2004 Study		2008 Study		2012 Study	
	Past Year	1 x / mo+	Past Year	1 x / mo+	Past Year	1 x / mo+
Played cards for money	19.0%	4.4%	10.7%	1.3%	5.3%	0.6%
Bet horses, dogs	4.8%	0.4%	3.2%	0.1%	2.8%	0.2%
Games personal skill	14.1%	3.2%	7.2%	1.2%	4.0%	0.7%
Dice, craps	3.5%	0.7%	2.2%	0.3%	2.0%	0.3%
Slots	14.3%	1.3%	9.9%	0.5%	8.4%	0.6%
Lottery tickets	29.7%	5.4%	24.0%	3.5%	30.5%	5.1%
Played stock market	3.5%	1.3%	2.1%	0.6%	1.1%	0.4%
Commercial bingo	7.3%	0.8%	6.8%	0.8%	6.2%	0.8%
Gambled in casino	--	--	11.0%	0.6%	9.4%	0.6%
Bet on sports	6.7%	1.5%	6.6%	0.8%	5.2%	0.6%
Casino games on Internet for money	2.1%	0.8%	1.9%	0.2%	1.8%	0.3%

Note: Percentages displayed are cumulative rather than independent. A student-athlete reporting having wagered 'once/month or more' is also included in the 'past year' figure.

Wagering Targets of Student-Athletes who Reported Sports Wagering in Past 12 Months (Sorted by % among Males)

	2012 Study	
	Males	Females
NFL	60.1%	57.7%
M College BB (tourney)	53.1%	37.5%
College Football	37.5%	19.2%
NBA	30.3%	21.2%
M College BB (season)	29.1%	17.9%
Other pro	23.7%	12.3%
MLB	21.1%	12.7%
Other college	10.7%	8.6%
HS or Youth Sports	6.7%	3.0%

“Other pro” examples listed = hockey, boxing, MMA, auto racing, soccer;

“Other college” examples = baseball, women’s basketball

Gambling Behaviors among Men's Golf Student-Athletes

	2012 Study All Males (no golf)			2012 Study Men's Golf		
	Past Year	1 x / mo+	1 x / wk+	Past Year	1 x / mo+	1 x / wk+
Played cards for money	26.7%	5.8%	1.5%	43.0%	12.2%	3.8%
Bet horses, dogs	6.3%	1.5%	0.5%	11.5%	3.2%	0.7%
Games personal skill	24.0%	8.8%	3.1%	56.0%	36.1%	20.8%
Dice, craps	7.7%	2.5%	0.9%	9.9%	2.9%	0.9%
Slots	11.5%	1.7%	0.3%	20.2%	3.8%	0.8%
Lottery tickets	34.7%	10.8%	2.9%	45.7%	19.0%	6.5%
Played stock market	7.1%	3.4%	1.7%	14.2%	7.8%	2.6%
Commercial bingo	5.1%	1.1%	0.4%	10.8%	3.6%	1.2%
Gambled in casino	17.9%	3.1%	0.7%	35.4%	7.5%	2.5%
Bet on sports	24.9%	7.8%	2.5%	44.4%	20.2%	8.5%
Casino games on Internet for money	7.2%	1.8%	0.5%	15.7%	5.4%	1.7%

Note: Percentages displayed are cumulative rather than independent. A student-athlete reporting having wagered 'once/month or more' is also included in the 'past year' figure.

Results:

Genesis and Gambling
Companions

First Gambling Experience among Student-Athletes who have Ever Gambled

2012 Study	Males
Played cards for money	47.8%
Sports Wagering	19.6%
Bet on game of personal skill	12.3%
Lottery/scratch tickets	5.6%
Other	5.2%
Dice/craps	3.4%
Horses, dogs or similar	2.8%
Slots	2.5%
Bingo	0.6%
Internet gambling site	0.1%

2012 Study	Females
Lottery/scratch tickets	25.7%
Played cards for money	23.5%
Slots	15.3%
Sports Wagering	13.0%
Horses, dogs or similar	6.6%
Bet on game of personal skill	5.0%
Bingo	4.8%
Other	4.1%
Dice/craps	1.8%
Internet gambling site	0.2%

Gambling Companions of Student-Athletes who Reported Any Gambling Behavior in Past 12 Months

2012 Study	Males	Females
Teammates, other student-athletes or other students involved in athletics program	33.8%	9.0%
Other friends or co-workers	33.6%	21.3%
Significant other or family	16.7%	60.6%
Other students in residence hall or apartment	8.4%	2.6%
Alone (including online)	4.3%	5.2%
People specific to gambling	1.8%	0.9%
Fraternity/sorority members	1.4%	0.4%

Results:

Money for Gambling

Largest One-Day Gambling Loss among Student-Athletes who
Reported any Gambling Behavior in Past 12 Months

2012 Study	Males	Females
Less than \$10	26.9%	46.7%
\$10 - \$24	22.1%	24.9%
\$25 - \$49	13.0%	12.3%
\$50 - \$99	15.9%	10.8%
\$100 - \$299	13.9%	4.5%
\$300 - \$499	4.5%	0.6%
\$500 - \$999	2.3%	0.2%
\$1,000 +	1.4%	0.0%

Financial Debt (e.g., Student Loans, Personal Loans, Credit Card Debt)
Students Personally Responsible for Paying

2012 Study	Males	Females
None	41.0%	47.4%
< \$500	3.1%	2.8%
\$500 - \$999	2.6%	2.5%
\$1,000 - \$4,999	11.7%	11.5%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	13.9%	12.7%
\$10,000 - \$20,000	16.1%	13.3%
> \$20,000	11.7%	9.8%

Results:

Gambling in the Digital Age

Methods Used for Placing Sports Bets

Among those betting sports at all during year, used that method at all	Males – 2008	Males – 2012
Bet with friends	92.7%	91.5%
Bet with a student bookie	7.8%	8.4%
Bet with an off-campus bookie	7.5%	8.6%
Via Internet or phone/text	26.3%	33.7%
Bet via the Internet	22.3%	20.9%
Bet via phone or text message #	9.4%	20.5%
Bet at casino, sports book, lottery	18.5%	20.9%
Bet through an intermediary *	6.7%	15.0%

Notes:

= option changed from “by cell phone, telephone or PDA” to “by phone or text message”.

* = option phrased as “Through an intermediary who placed the bet with a different source” in 2008; “intermediary” replaced with “friend or acquaintance” in 2012.

Percentage of Student-Athletes Reporting That They Played Simulated Gambling Activities in the Past Year

2012 Study	Males			Females		
	Past Year	1 x / mo+	1 x / wk+	Past Year	1 x / mo+	1 x / wk+
Played a simulated gambling activity via a <u>videogame console</u>	18.2%	5.8%	2.4%	4.8%	0.9%	0.3%
Played a simulated gambling activity via a <u>social media website</u>	12.0%	3.9%	1.3%	4.2%	0.9%	0.2%
Played a simulated gambling activity via an <u>Internet gambling website</u>	10.3%	3.2%	1.0%	2.4%	0.5%	0.2%
Played a simulated gambling activity on your <u>cell phone</u>	14.5%	5.5%	2.3%	5.4%	1.4%	0.6%
Played a free simulated sports betting or <u>bracket game</u> on the Internet	11.7%	3.5%	1.2%	2.2%	0.4%	0.1%

Percentage of Student-Athletes Reporting That They Played Any Simulated Gambling Activity in the Past Year

	2012 Study
Males	28.1%
Females	10.2%

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players Reporting Having Been Contacted by Outside Sources to Share Inside Information

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	1.2%	3.8%	4.6%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	2.0%	3.5%	2.2%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	0.6%	1.4%	1.6%

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players Claiming to Have Provided Inside Information to Outside Sources

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	1.2%	0.9%	0.8%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	2.5%	1.1%	0.3%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%

Results:

Education/Prevention

Have you received information on the NCAA rules concerning gambling?

	2008		2012	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Division I	76.9%	83.4%	71.5%	75.9%
Division II	63.0%	67.6%	59.3%	58.6%
Division III	62.0%	60.6%	56.9%	57.9%

Student-Athlete Self-Report of the Most Effective Ways to Influence Student-Athletes not to Wager on Sports

2012 Study Rank	Males – Wagered on Sports Past Year	Females – Wagered on Sports Past Year
1	Coach (3.63)	Teammates (3.84)
2	Teammates (3.56)	NCAA Penalties (3.81)
3	NCAA Penalties (3.55)	Coach (3.77)
4	Pro Athlete Presentation (3.28)	Pro Athlete Presentation (3.51)
5	Parents (3.17)	Law Enforcement Present (3.39)
6	Athletic Dept Info/Present (3.14)	Athletic Dept Info/Present (3.33)

Notes:

- Number in parentheses represents group average on 0-5 scale (3=somewhat agree, 4=agree).
- Among males who wagered on sports in the past year, rank 7=law enforcement presentation (3.07), 8=NCAA presentation (2.91), 9=NCAA educational materials (2.74), 10=former bookie/gambler presentation (2.66).
- Among females who wagered on sports in the past year, rank 7=NCAA presentation (3.18), 8=parents (3.16), 9=NCAA educational materials (2.98), 10=former bookie/gambler presentation (2.81).

Perceived Belief among Student-Athletes who Wagered on Sports in Past Year that Coaches or Teammates Would Be Aware if a Team Member Was Gambling on Sports

2012 Study	Males	Females
Coaches generally aware	33%	42%
Teammates generally aware	67%	70%

Self-Reported Personal Beliefs of Student-Athletes about Sports Wagering (Across Division – Among SAs who Wagered on Sports in Past Year)

2012 Study	Males	Females
Most athletes in college violate NCAA rules that prohibit sports wagering	59%	48%
Sports wagering is acceptable so long as you wager on a sport other than the one in which you participate	57%	41%
College coaches see sports wagering as acceptable so long as you don't bet on your own games	41%	26%
Student-athletes and coaches take NCAA rules about sports wagering seriously	62%	68%
I think sports wagering is a harmless pastime	68%	58%
People can consistently make a lot of money gambling	59%	49%

Note: Percentage endorsing "Somewhat agree" or higher (top three scale points on six-point scale).

Some Current Enforcement and Educational Initiatives

Point Shaving Scandals Since 1994

1. Arizona State – men's basketball
2. Northwestern University – men's basketball
3. University of Toledo – men's basketball and football
4. University of San Diego – men's basketball



Trends In Sports Wagering Violations

There has been an increase in the number and severity of sports wagering violations since August 2011:

- Allegations of point shaving at two NCAA institutions.
- Six cases involving student-athletes and coaches sports wagering via the Internet, including two student-athletes betting on a team at their own institution.
- Student-athlete who was an on-campus bookie with several other student-athletes as clients.
- Athletics administrator betting with a bookie.
- Increase in fantasy league and sports pools violations.

Educational Initiatives

Continue to develop and refine comprehensive sports wagering and gambling educational program.

- Speaking Engagements.
- Don't Bet On It.org.
- Resource Materials.
- Sports Wagering Conference and On-Campus Conferences.
- Sports Wagering Toolkit.
- Expand educational programming to additional audiences.
- Public Service Announcement.
- Expand Don't Bet On It messaging at championships and on campuses.



Key Results

Key Results

- Gambling is becoming more normalized among American youth, including student-athletes.
- Although many gambling behaviors have decreased in this population over the past few years (perhaps related to the economic downturn), sports wagering remains a popular and frequent activity.
- Betting on sports is highest among males, Division III student-athletes and golfers. However, problem gambling occurs throughout the population.
- Most student-athlete gamblers bet small amounts of money, but some incur significant debt, making them vulnerable to outside influences.

Key Results

- Outside gambling influences increasingly use social media/technology to gain access to student-athletes and others on campus.
- Technology is playing a large role in gambling among college student-athletes.

Questions?

Media Inquiries:

Emily Potter, NCAA

epotter@ncaa.org

Gambling Resources:

Mark Strothkamp, NCAA

mstrothkamp@ncaa.org

Research Study:

Tom Paskus, NCAA

tpaskus@ncaa.org

Summary / slides available at www.ncaa.org/research

Follow us on Twitter -- [@NCAAResearch](https://twitter.com/NCAAResearch)