

**REPORT ON SIX CASINO PATRON SURVEYS
IN FIVE ONTARIO COMMUNITIES**

Prepared for:
Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre

August 13, 2006

Prepared by:
Joan Nuffield and Robert Hann
Robert Hann & Associates Limited

Disclaimer: Opinions expressed in this final report are those of the investigator(s), and do not necessarily represent the views of the Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre (OPGRC).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre not only for funding the preparation of this Report, but also for funding the original surveys in Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Sarnia, Point Edward and Gananoque. Thanks are due also to Barbara Carmichael and her survey team from Sir Wilfrid Laurier University, who conducted the surveys in those cities

We would also like to thank Dave Sheridan, of Shercon Associates Inc., Oakville, for graciously sharing the original data from his five surveys in Brantford. The helpful comments of an anonymous and independent peer reviewer on an earlier draft were also very much appreciated.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
The significance of patron surveys	6
Methodology	7
The surveys in 2002-2004	7
Response rates	8
Study limitations	9
Community Context of the Surveys	9
The charity casino communities	9
<i>Sault Ste. Marie</i>	9
<i>Brantford</i>	9
<i>Point Edward and Sarnia</i>	10
<i>Thunder Bay</i>	10
<i>Gananoque</i>	10
Survey Results	10
The survey respondents	10
<i>The home community of survey respondents</i>	11
<i>Gender of patrons</i>	12
<i>Age of patrons</i>	13
<i>First trip to the gaming venue</i>	13
Attracting Outside Visitors to the Community	13
<i>Purpose of visit to the community</i>	14
<i>Returning to the host city to gamble</i>	15
<i>Organized tours</i>	15
<i>Coming alone or with others</i>	15
Visitors' Contributions to Other Revenues in the Host City	16
<i>Staying overnight</i>	16
<i>Staying in commercial accommodations</i>	16
<i>Eating at area restaurants</i>	17
<i>Shopping</i>	17
<i>Other area attractions</i>	18
<i>Total tourism spending among outside visitors</i>	18
Gaming Patterns among Patrons	19
<i>First visit to the charity casino or Horse Park</i>	19
<i>Frequency of visiting the charity casino or Horse Park</i>	20
<i>Correlates of more frequent gaming</i>	23
<i>Engaging less often in other forms of gaming</i>	24
<i>Setting a limit on wagering or time in the gaming venue</i>	26
<i>Monies wagered</i>	28
<i>Differential contributions to amounts wagered</i>	31
<i>Concluding comments</i>	33
References	34
Appendix A. Brantford Charity Casino Patron Survey	35
Appendix B. Patron Survey Instrument for 2002-2004 Surveys	38
Appendix C. Supporting Community/Venue Specific Statistical Tables	43

Executive Summary

Communities that agree to host public gambling facilities in their midst do so based on certain understandings or assumptions about the impacts these facilities will have on the local area. These assumptions include factors such as: how much of the population will gamble, how often, and to what levels of wagering; how many tourists will be attracted to the area by the gaming venue; and what secondary benefits there will be to the local community from gambling tourism. Patron surveys were conducted at gambling sites (four Charity Casinos and one Horse Park) in five Ontario communities from 2002 to 2004 to explore these questions.

A total of 7,226 patrons were involved in all surveys combined, which took place in Brantford, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Point Edward, Sarnia, and Gananoque. These cities vary significantly in their proximity to other large urban centres and other gaming venues. Participation in the survey was entirely voluntary, but response rates were high -- from 79% to 84%. Women accounted for 54% of patrons surveyed, and men 46%. People age 35 or over accounted for 87% of the patrons interviewed, and people age 65 and older 26%.

Home Community of Patrons

Do charity casinos mostly attract patrons from the local area?

Overall, 58% of patrons interviewed indicated that they lived in the community hosting the charity casino, and another 11% came from the surrounding county. The pattern in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay was much different, with 87% and 90% of patrons, respectively, coming from the host city.

The proportions of American patrons found at the various sites ranged from 3% or less in Brantford, Thunder Bay, and Sault Ste. Marie, to 12% at Gananoque, 19% at Hiawatha Horse Park in Sarnia, and a high of 41% at Point Edward.

Effects on Commercial Revenues from “visitor patrons”

Do charity casinos attract outside visitors to the community?

Overall, 70% of “visitor patrons” (i.e., persons not residing in the host community) who were interviewed indicated that the main purpose of their trip to the city was to visit the charity casino or Horse Park. However, this proportion was much lower in Sault Ste. Marie (20%) and Thunder Bay (11%).

Effects on other local hospitality and tourism or recreation businesses were measured. Other than in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, 90% of visitor patrons said they were not staying overnight. Half the visitor patrons in Sault Ste. Marie and 80% in Thunder Bay said they were spending at least one night in the city. The proportion of all visitor patrons staying in commercial accommodation varied across the individual sites, from a low of 2% to a high of 42%.

Do charity casino patrons who come from outside the local area spend money at local area businesses while they are in town?

At most sites, 7 out of 10 visitor patrons said they had not spent, and did not expect to spend, any money in the city (outside of the charity casino or Horse Park). At most sites, a minority (one in five) of visitor patrons also indicated that they expected to eat in a local restaurant outside the charity casino or Horse Park, and 1 in 10 said they were planning to visit other area attractions or do some shopping while in the city. In Sault Ste. Marie, 83% of visitor patrons said they would be spending some money outside of the charity casino while in the city, and the modal level of expected spending was from \$101 to \$200. In Thunder Bay, 97% of visitor patrons said they would be spending some money outside of the charity casino while in the city, and the modal level of expected spending was from \$201 to \$500.

Frequency of Attendance at the Gaming Venue

How often do charity casino patrons -- especially those from the local area -- go to the casino?

Among the patrons from the host city, three out of five surveyed said they visited the gaming venue once a week or more. Among the visitor patrons, half said they had visited the gaming venue once a week or more. Most patrons had visited the charity casino before: only 4% to 8% of patrons said they had not been to the gaming venue before.

Gaming Patterns among Patrons

How much do patrons wager in a single visit to a charity casino?

Overall, 7 out of 10 patrons set a limit on how much they would wager before entering the gaming venue. One in four city patrons and 1 in 10 visitor patrons set a limit of \$25 or less on their wagering. Six out of ten city patrons and 3 out of 10 visitor patrons set a limit of \$50 or less on their wagering. Actual wagering on the current visit conformed closely to the limits set. Almost half (44%) of the city patrons wagered less than \$50, and the rest wagered more. Just under a quarter (23%) of visitor patrons wagered less than \$50, and the rest wagered more. Younger patrons (under age 25) and women were more likely to report wagering less money overall on the current visit.

Playing Other Games Less Often

Have other forms of charitable gaming suffered as a result of the advent of the new charity casino?

One out of five patrons indicated there were other games, such as bingo, that they “played less often now because of this or another charity casino”. However, 1 out of 10 patrons said they now played other games *more* often.

Differential Contribution to Gross Wagering by Different Groups

Is there a group of patrons who account for a differentially high proportion of the revenues earned by the charity casinos?

The patrons who said they gamble “daily” or “most days” make up 4% and 8%, respectively, of the total number of patrons surveyed, but their wagering accounts for 53% of the gross monies wagered over a year. When the patrons who reported visiting the charity casino or Horse Park “twice a week” are added, these three groups of most-frequent gamblers make up 30% of the patrons surveyed, and, based on certain reasonable assumptions, accounted for 77% of the gross monies wagered over a year.

Patrons who said they visited the gambling venue “daily” or “most days” are more likely than patrons as a whole to be from the local host community (86%), older, male, coming to the venue alone, and not setting a dollar limit on how much they will wager.

Introduction

The significance of patron surveys

In 2001/02, the (then) Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation (OLGC) reported 22 million patron visits at its charity casinos and racetrack slot machines, and gross gaming revenues of \$1,664 million. By the end of 2003/04, the OLGC was reporting 24.6 million patron visits and \$2,001 million in gross gaming revenues at these facilities. Statistics Canada (2003) has found that three-quarters of Canadians report having gambled at least once in the previous year, and 38% report having gambled weekly. Gaming revenues provided over \$11 billion in revenues to various governments in Canada in 2002.

Debate about the costs and benefits to host communities -- as opposed to governments which collect revenues -- from gaming venues is vigorous. Some studies (e.g., Gerstein et al., 1999) appear to show some economic benefits to communities, such as declines by about one-seventh in unemployment rates, welfare outlays, and unemployment insurance. Other studies (e.g., Gazel & Thompson, 1995; Grinols, 2004) suggest the extent to which a host community for a gaming facility will realize a net benefit is strongly tied to the facility's capacity to attract patrons from outside the host city and state or province. Social ills, including an increase in problem and pathological gamblers in the population closest to a gaming venue, are cited (Gerstein et al., 1999; Welte, Wieczorek, Barnes, Tidwell, & Hoffman, 2003; Volberg, 2004) in some studies.

Specifically, when communities consider whether they should become or remain the site of a large gaming venue, they would benefit from information that sheds light on these potential costs and benefits, including:

- does the gaming venue attract tourist-gamblers from outside the local community, or do most of the patrons come from the community hosting the facility?
- what proportion of patrons come from the immediate municipality, surrounding area, other areas within Ontario, and outside Ontario or Canada?
- do visitor patrons come to the host community principally or exclusively to gamble, or is the gambling venue a diversion during a trip taken principally for other reasons?
- do visitor patrons generate economic benefit for the host community by spending money at local area hotels, restaurants, retail businesses, or tourist attractions?
- how many local patrons visit the gambling venue on a frequent basis -- frequent enough to spend a significant amount of money there?
- how many local patrons wager large sums -- large enough to be significant or potentially troubling?
- does the arrival of a casino-style gaming venue draw money away from other gaming activities, such as local bingos, that benefit local charitable organizations and causes?
- what is known about the relative costs and benefits to the local economy from the arrival of a large gaming venue?

As part of a much larger study (Hann & Nuffield, 2005) of the impact of the first four "charity casinos" in Ontario (Brantford, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, and Point Edward), Robert Hann & Associates stationed interviewers in the lobby at the Brantford Charity Casino from July 7 to 14, 2000 to conduct an "exit survey" of patrons leaving the charity casino (see Nuffield, 2001 for initial patrons survey). The original survey questions, developed in cooperation with members of the Brantford community, are reproduced in Appendix A. The patron survey, which was also used as the basis for the other patron surveys analyzed in this report, allows the researchers to pose questions of the exiting patrons that queried a number of areas relevant to addressing these issues:

- the home residence of patrons;
- for visitors who came from outside the immediate municipality, how many had, as the principal reason for their visit, gambled at the charity casino, and how many had other purposes;
- how many visitors also spent money at other area establishments and attractions (and which types), and how many spent money only at the charity casino;
- the total amount of money visitors had spent or were planning to spend at other area establishments, including hotels, restaurants, and tourist attractions;
- the frequency with which patrons visited the charity casino;
- whether patrons were less engaged in other types of gambling, as a result of the advent of the charity casino;
- whether patrons set limits on the amounts they wagered before arriving at the charity casino;
- how much patrons wagered on the casino visit in question;
- the age of patrons; and
- the gender of patrons.

These are key questions of interest to governments and communities, and answers to them will allow a greater understanding of how, and to what extent, the creation of a new gambling venue in a local area will affect the economy and the residents of that area. The patron exit survey allows researchers to go beyond the information collected and provided by gambling venues, information that tends to be considered proprietary, and is limited by methodologies that track only those people who are in “Winner’s Circle” or other frequent patron registries.

The exit survey also allows researchers to obtain information on large numbers of people who visit gambling venues, as opposed to telephone or other population-based surveys, which have lower response rates, and contain large numbers of respondents who do not gamble or visit gambling venues at all.

Associations of gambling enterprises rightly criticize the use of patron surveys as a means to measure gambling behaviour in the population as a whole -- akin to “looking for alcoholics in a bar”. Indeed, it appears the prevalence of problem and pathological gamblers among patrons interviewed at gaming venues exceeds that in the general population by a factor of perhaps 10 (Gerstein et al., 1999). However, some patron surveys have advantages over telephone or other surveys of the general population.

The patron exit survey allows researchers to enrich our understanding of, for example:

- how many of the patrons at gambling venues are from the immediate area;
- how much of the monies wagered at gambling venues come from people who live in the municipality hosting the gambling venue;
- how much of the monies come in from other communities, provinces, and from outside Canada;
- whether gambling venues also have spin-off economic benefits to other local establishments;
- how often various segments of the patron population gamble at such venues, and how much they wager. In particular, selective and poor memory mars the accuracy of retrospective surveys of gamblers (e.g., McCusker & Gettings, 1997), but gathering responses that are relatively fresh may improve validity.

Methodology

The surveys in 2002 - 2004

In the years following the original Charity Casino project (Brantford patron survey), the same survey questions were used in four more surveys (from 2002 to 2004) in Brantford, by Shercon Associates Inc. (2004), and again in the early summer of 2004 by researchers from Wilfrid Laurier University, at the charity casinos in Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Point Edward, and Gananoque, as well as at the Hiawatha Horse

Park in Sarnia. As with the original Brantford Survey, interviewers were stationed in the lobbies of the charity casinos and Horse Park to conduct the “exit survey” of patrons leaving these venues.

The survey questions, which differed in certain relatively minor respects from the original 2000 survey in Brantford, are reproduced in Appendix B. The precise dates during which the surveys were conducted are as follows:

- Sault Ste. Marie: April 20 – 25, 2004
- Thunder Bay: April 27 - May 2, 2004
- Point Edward: April 27 – May 2, 2004
- Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park): April 27 – May 2, 2004
- Gananoque: May 3 – May 9, 2004
- Brantford:
 - July 7 - 14, 2000
 - August 27 – 31, 2002
 - January 21 – 24, 2003
 - August 26 – 30, 2003
 - January 19 – 23, 2004.

This Report summarizes the findings from a total of the 10 surveys in 5 Ontario communities from 2000 to 2004. In the interest of concentrating on surveys conducted in more recent years, however, only the nine surveys conducted in 2002 and later are included in the report’s tables. Where the findings from the original 2000 survey in Brantford differ from the later Brantford results, the differences are noted in the text.

Response rates

Two different selection methods were used; one in Brantford and the other in the remainder of the communities. In Brantford, interviewers were instructed to obtain a cross-section of patrons of all ages and genders, and were given a quota of interviews for each shift (i.e., time of day when the patron was exiting the venue). Therefore, the Brantford patrons surveyed are fairly evenly distributed across all the days and time periods for the period under study, and do not fully reflect the peaks and valleys in actual attendance at the charity casino for certain times of day or days of the week. In the other surveys, interviewers were instructed to include every *n*th patron (*n* being a random number from 1 to 10).

The following response rates (the number of completed interviews expressed as a percentage of persons approached) were found for the various surveys:

- Sault Ste. Marie - 83.1%;
- Thunder Bay - 83.9%;
- Point Edward - 78.9%;
- Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park) - 78.6%;
- Gananoque - 83.5%;
- Brantford - not available.

These response rates are considerably higher than those typically found in telephone surveys. For example, a recent telephone survey of Ontario adults (Wiebe, Single, & Falkowski-Ham, 2001), using the Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI), had a completed participation rate of 37% (the CPGI is a much lengthier instrument than the current survey instrument, which exacerbates problems with response rates). Table 1 shows the number of completed patron interviews at each of the survey sites.

Table 1. Number of Completed Patron Interviews by Site

Gananoque	1,069
Hiawatha Horse Park (Sarnia)	1,085
Point Edward	1,036
Sault Ste. Marie	1,362
Thunder Bay	1,291
Brantford	1,383
Total	7,226

Study Limitations

Although attempts were made to obtain a reasonably representative sample of respondents -- as discussed above -- these surveys do not draw on a pure random sample of charity casino and Horse Park patrons. In particular, participation in the survey was entirely voluntary. Thus, patrons who were more likely to self-select out of survey participation may affect the results. In addition, interviewers were instructed not to approach any patron who appeared drunk or upset. Patrons who were not comfortable conducting an interview in English were also excluded. However, it should be noted that all such exclusions were relatively rare and no systematic patterns in refusals were reported.

The time of year during which the survey was conducted may have also affected the results. Most of the surveys were done in the late spring and early summer, and would thus tend to under-represent tourists who travel from outside the region or the country. Three of the Brantford surveys were done in the summer. The summer is a period during which there may be more tourists attending a charity casino or horse racing venue than at certain other times of year.

Community Context of the Surveys

The charity casino communities

Each of the charity casino or Horse Park sites is in a different position in terms of its ability to draw potential patrons from outside the host city. It has been noted in other patron surveys (e.g., Gazel & Thompson, 1995) that the “basis for positive economic impacts [on the host city or area] is found in the patronage of non-local ... players”.

Below is a summary of the geographical proximities of other population centres to each of the host communities for the gaming venues surveyed. It can be seen that Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay are in a very different position in this respect from the other host communities -- their ability to draw patrons from other large population centres that do not have a gaming venue of their own is limited. Later in this report, it will be shown that these geographical placements are reflected in the numbers of patrons coming from outside the host city, county, and country.

Sault Ste. Marie

Sault Ste. Marie lies within Algoma District, in North-eastern Ontario. The Sault Ste. Marie Census Agglomeration (CA) contained 84,249 people at the last census. On the Canadian side, the Sault Ste. Marie casino is a considerable distance from most sizable cities and towns. Blind River is 140 km, and Elliot Lake is 200 km from Sault Ste. Marie. On the American side, the Keewatin Casino is within a 20 min drive from the bridge, and seven other casinos are within a 2 hr drive.

Brantford

Brantford lies within Brant County, in South-eastern Ontario. Brantford contained 78,908 people at the last census. It is surrounded by land, and is 90 km from Toronto, 85 km from London, 85 km from Stratford, 40 km from Kitchener-Waterloo, and 40 km from Hamilton. Within Ontario, Niagara Falls, 105

km away, also hosts a large commercial casino, as does Windsor, 270 km away. Brantford is 144 km northwest of Buffalo, New York, at the nearest American border crossing.

Point Edward and Sarnia

Point Edward and Sarnia are within Lambton County, in South-western Ontario. Sarnia, with a 2001 population of 88,331 at the last census, has 450 slot machines installed at Hiawatha Horse Park. The Village of Point Edward, with a population of 2,257, is immediately adjacent to Sarnia and is the site of a charity casino with 450 slot machines and 30 gaming tables on the waterfront site next to the Bluewater Bridge. On the Canadian side, London is 100 km away, Kitchener-Waterloo is 190 km away, and Toronto is 300 km away. On the American side, the U.S. cities of Flint and Detroit are within 105 km of the Bluewater Bridge.

Thunder Bay

Thunder Bay lies in Northwestern Ontario. Thunder Bay had a population of 121,986 at the last census. It is a considerable distance from any other large Canadian population center; Nipigon is 110 km away and Terrace Bay is 215 km away. On the American side, Thunder Bay is 67 km north of Minnesota at the Canada - U.S. border point of Pigeon River, close to Grand Portage, the nearest casino.

Gananoque

Gananoque, within Leeds and Grenville United Counties, has a population of 5,167. It is close to several good-sized Canadian municipalities: Kingston (30 km away), Brockville (53 km away), and Ottawa (167 km away). Gananoque is “the gateway to the Thousand Islands”, lying 16 km from the bridge to the U.S. The closest American city of any size is Watertown, which is 69 km away.

Survey Results

The survey respondents

A total of 7,226 gambling patrons responded to the nine surveys conducted from 2002 to 2004. The number of patrons surveyed at each site is displayed in Table 2 (again, only the four Brantford patron surveys conducted from 2002 to 2004 are included in Table 1 and the following tables; where the results differ from the original 2000 survey in Brantford, the differences are noted in the text of this report.)¹

Table 1. “Where do you live?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
local community	17.6%	56.2%	40.3%	86.5%	90.0%	43.4%	57.5%
outside of local community proper, but within the same County	43.6%	10.5%	4.7%	3.3%	3.3%	4.2%	10.7%
outside of local County but within Ontario	23.8%	14.1%	12.6%	5.4%	4.5%	51.3%	19.1%
outside of Ontario but within Canada	2.6%	.5%	.9%	1.9%	2.0%	.1%	1.3%
outside of Canada	12.4%	18.7%	41.4%	2.9%	.2%	.9%	11.3%
Total Responses	1069	1085	1036	1362	1291	1379	7222

¹ It should be noted that in the following analysis, the data from the four Brantford surveys conducted by Shercon Associates were converted from Microsoft Excel to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, and combined into a single data file for analysis. In some instances, the results reported differ slightly from those reported by Shercon in their 2004 report. However, the variances from the original findings are minor (e.g., a difference of 4 over a total of 1,383 patrons surveyed). Variances in the total number of responses to individual questions reflect missing data or miscoded data for a small number of cases.

In addition to recording their home communities, interviewers recorded the age and gender of the patrons interviewed. Also, visitor patrons were asked questions about the purpose of their visit to the community; whether they had come alone or with family, friends, or colleagues, whether they had come with an organized tour or on their own, and whether it was their first trip to the city.

The home community of survey respondents

One of the first and most important hypotheses that the patron surveys were intended to test was whether, and to what extent, the gaming venue was able to attract outside visitors. As suggested earlier, this is a key factor in estimating the impact of a casino on the economy of a local area. The extent to which the casino's revenues derive from outside visitors rather than local patrons will directly affect the extent to which the site represents a net gain in revenues to the community. Conversely, the higher the amounts wagered by local residents, the greater the potential diversion of disposable income to the gaming venue, rather than to local businesses and charities.

Table 2 shows the proportions of respondents who live within the host community, and the proportions of respondents who live outside it. Across all the surveys together, three out of five (58%) of survey respondents were from the host city, and another 11% were from the surrounding county.

It can be seen that there is considerable variance in the percentage of survey respondents who live in the various host cities. The proportion of host city residents in the surveys ranges from a high of 90% in Thunder Bay, to a low of 18% in Gananoque. Clearly, this proportion is influenced by the proximity of other large gambling venues on either side of the Canada - U.S. border, the proximity of other large municipalities from which charity casino visitors travel, and (as will be seen later in the discussion of visitors' stated "main purpose" for being in the host city) the ability of the host city to draw visitors for reasons other than the charity casino. The following proportions of host city and county residents were found (among survey respondents):

- In Thunder Bay, 9 out of 10 (90%) were from the host city, and 3% were from the surrounding county;
- In Sault Ste. Marie, almost 9 out of 10 (87%) were from the host city, and 3% were from the surrounding county;
- In Point Edward-Sarnia,
 - almost 6 out of 10 (56%) respondents at Hiawatha Horse Park were from the host city (here, either Point Edward or Sarnia), and 11% were from the surrounding county;
 - 4 out of 10 (40%) at the charity casino were from the host city (here, either Point Edward or Sarnia), and 5% were from the surrounding county;
- In Brantford, 4 out of ten (43%) were from Brantford, and 4% were from the surrounding county -- this differs from the 2000 Brant survey in which 35% were from Brantford and 6% were from the surrounding county;
- In Gananoque, one in six (18%) were from Gananoque, and 44% were from the surrounding county.

The proportions of patrons surveyed who came from outside the surrounding county but still within Canada also varied considerably, from a low of 7% in Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, to a high of 51% in Brantford. The vast majority of these patrons came from elsewhere within Ontario. The proportions of patrons surveyed who came from Canada but outside the host county were as follows:

- Thunder Bay - 7%;
- Sault Ste. Marie - 7%;
- Point Edward-Sarnia,
 - charity casino -14%; and,
 - Hiawatha Horse Park – 15%;

- Gananoque - 26%; and,
- Brantford - 51%.

The proportions of patrons surveyed who came from outside of Canada also varied considerably, from a low of less than 1% in Thunder Bay to a high of 41% at the Point Edward charity casino. The proportions of patrons surveyed that came from outside of Canada were as follows:

- Thunder Bay - less than 1%;
- Brantford - 1%;
- Sault Ste. Marie - 3%;
- Gananoque - 12%;
- Point Edward/Sarnia,
 - Hiawatha Horse Park - 19%; and,
 - charity casino - 41%.

Gender of patrons

It has often been suggested that there are certain groups of people who are more vulnerable than others to the attractions of a gambling venue. For example, communities have expressed concern about seniors engaging in frequent gambling as a source of socialization as well as entertainment, and about the extent to which casinos market to seniors and facilitate or even partly subsidize (through vouchers, free transportation and the like) their attendance at the site. Others express particular concern about gambling among young men who are also drinkers or smokers.

It is therefore important for gambling research to learn more about the characteristics -- age, education, gender, marital status, etc. -- of those people who patronize gambling venues, frequently and otherwise. The literature on problem and pathological gamblers reveals there are certain characteristics that tend to distinguish them from the general population. For example, the National Council of Welfare (1996), relying on eight prevalence studies in various provinces, found patterns suggesting that a problem gambler is more likely to be male, single, and under 30 years of age. More recent research (e.g., Ipsos-Reid and Gemini Research, 2003) in British Columbia suggested that being unemployed or underemployed was a risk factor for problem gambling.

Table 3 shows that across all the surveys, a slight majority (54%) of charity casino patrons were women. At Hiawatha Horse Park, this difference was marked, with 63% being female patrons. In Thunder Bay (51%) and Brantford (52%), a slight majority of patrons were male. The proportions of female patrons surveyed at each venue were as follows:

- Brantford - 48%;
- Thunder Bay - 49%;
- Sault Ste. Marie - 52%;
- Point Edward-Sarnia,
 - charity casino - 56%; and,
 - Hiawatha Horse Park - 63%;
- Gananoque - 58%.

Table 3. "Gender of respondent" by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
male	42.4%	37.3%	43.6%	48.0%	50.6%	52.0%	46.2%
female	57.6%	62.7%	56.4%	52.0%	49.4%	48.0%	53.8%
Total Responses	1065	1071	1027	1360	1287	1357	7167

Both Residents and Non-Residents of city

The proportion of women among the patrons surveyed varied with whether they were from the host city or from outside, although the differences were not statistically significant. Except at Hiawatha Horse Park, visitors from outside the city were more likely to be male than the city residents. This difference was small at Thunder Bay, but there was a 5% to 7% difference between visitors and city residents at the other charity casinos. At Hiawatha, visitors from outside the city were more likely to be female.

Age of patrons

Table 4 shows the age patterns of patrons in the various surveys. The findings suggest that an overwhelmingly large group of patrons at the charity casinos and Hiawatha Horse Park are age 35 or older. Across all the surveys, only 13% of patrons were age 34 or younger, and 87% were age 35 or older (including 40% who were between age 35 and 55, 21% who were between age 56 and 64, and 26% who were age 65 or older). Only 5% were under age 25. The only major variations in these overall patterns were seen in Thunder Bay: a smaller proportion (13%) of visitor patrons was age 65 or older compared to 25% in the surveys as a whole. A larger proportion of Thunder Bay visitor patrons were in the 35 to 55 age group.

Table 4. “To what age category do you belong?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Samia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
19-20	.9%	.9%	2.9%	2.3%	1.2%	2.3%	1.8%
21-24	2.5%	2.2%	4.6%	3.4%	3.0%	5.9%	3.6%
25-34	6.6%	7.0%	5.1%	7.0%	9.2%	11.1%	7.8%
35-55	39.9%	40.7%	33.1%	38.0%	43.3%	43.2%	39.9%
56-64	24.0%	22.4%	23.5%	21.7%	16.7%	17.9%	20.8%
65 and over	26.0%	26.7%	30.8%	27.6%	26.7%	19.3%	26.0%
Total Responses	1062	1066	1025	1357	1286	1337	7133

Both Residents and Non-Residents of city

First trip to the gaming venue

The surveys were administered approximately 2 yrs (or more) after the opening of each gaming venue. It is therefore not surprising that only a small minority -- from 4% to 8% -- of patrons surveyed indicated they were visiting the casino or Horse Park for the first time. More will be said about this and related questions later in the report, in a section that deals with gambling patterns reported by patrons who were surveyed at the various sites.

Attracting Outside Visitors to the Community

As noted earlier, analysts of the impacts of gaming venues on local communities (e.g., Gazel & Thompson, 1995; Grinols, 2004) suggest the extent to which a host community for a gaming facility will realize a net benefit is strongly tied to the facility’s capacity to attract patrons from outside the host city and state or province. It was therefore important for the patron surveys to address several key questions related to the geographical origins of the patrons who participated in the surveys, most importantly:

- Did the charity casinos or Horse Park attract outside visitors?
- Did these outside visitors come to the community to gamble there, or was their visit incidental to another, primary purpose for their travel?
- Did the outside visitors spend any money in the local community (i.e., outside the charity casino or Horse Park)?

Accordingly, patrons who indicated they were not residents of the host city were asked additional questions about their visit. These were intended to discover whether the gaming venue was able to attract

outside visitors to the host city, and in what proportions. In addition, further questions measured the extent to which these visitor patrons spent money in the host city, and on what kinds of services.

Purpose of visit to the community

Visitor patrons were asked, “What is the main purpose of your visit to [the community]?” Responses to this initial query appear to bode well for most of the communities -- the results suggest the casinos and Horse Park do in fact attract visitors to the host city.

Table 5 shows that for all of surveys, 70% of visitor patrons said the main purpose of their visit was to attend the charity casino or Horse Park. Another 5% said their main purpose was tourism of other kinds, 7% said it was to visit family or friends, 6% said it was business, and 12% gave other main purposes.

However, a closer look at the individual surveys shows two distinct patterns in the main purpose of the trip, as stated by visitor patrons. The first pattern was seen in two communities (Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie), where visitor patrons who said the main purpose of their visit was to attend the charity casino were in the *minority* (11% and 20%, respectively). The second pattern was seen in the other surveys, where patrons who said the main purpose of their visit was to gamble were in the *majority* (64% to 81%).

Table 5. “What is the main purpose of this trip to this community?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
to visit the charity casino/horse park	78.4%	64.4%	80.1%	19.6%	10.9%	80.8%	70.8%
tourism of other kinds	2.8%	7.2%	3.9%	17.4%	10.9%	1.5%	4.6%
to visit friends or family	4.2%	6.3%	3.6%	17.4%	38.0%	6.8%	7.3%
business	2.7%	5.9%	4.7%	18.5%	18.6%	3.9%	5.5%
other	11.8%	16.2%	7.8%	27.2%	21.7%	6.9%	11.8%
Total Responses	879	475	617	184	129	778	3062

Non-Residents of city only

The proportions of visitor patrons that stated the “main purpose” of their trip to the host city was to visit the charity casino or Horse Park were as follows:

- Thunder Bay - 11%;
- Sault Ste. Marie - 20%;
- Point Edward-Sarnia,
 - Hiawatha Horse Park - 64%; and,
 - charity casino - 80%;
- Gananoque - 78%;
- Brantford - 81%.

Table 5 shows the other stated “main purposes” of the trip to the community. Overall, less than 10% of visitors indicated their main purpose was business, to visit family or friends, or to engage in other tourism activities. Another 12% had other miscellaneous reasons for their visit.

In Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, the pattern was different. As fewer visitors were principally in the city to visit the charity casino, higher proportions were seen in the other “main purposes”:

- In Thunder Bay, 38% said their main purpose was to visit family or friends, 19% said it was business, 11% said it was tourism of other kinds, and 22% said it was another purpose;
- In Sault Ste. Marie, 27% said it was another miscellaneous purpose, 19% said it was business, 17% said it was either to visit family or friends, and 17% said it was tourism of other kinds.

These results suggest the casinos in Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie are not as successful in attracting visitors who are interested in gambling. Taken together with the results seen earlier, it is clear that in Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, much fewer -- only about 1 in 10 -- of the patrons are outside visitors (as compared to at least 4 out of 10 in the other four venues), and that of those outside visitor patrons in Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, fewer come principally to visit the charity casino.

Returning to the host city to gamble

It was also important to discover whether repeat visitors were attracted by the gambling venue. Accordingly, visitors were asked, "Is this your first trip to [the community]?" Charity casino or Horse Park slots definitely have the capacity to attract repeat visitors to the host community. As seen in Table 6, among those who were not in the community for the first time, 73% said the purpose of their visit was to visit the gaming venue ($V = .078, p = .000$).

Table 6. "What is the main purpose of this trip to this community?" by "Is this your first trip to the city?"

	Yes	No	Total
To visit the charity casino/Horse Park	42.9%	72.6%	70.8%
Other purpose	57.1%	27.4%	29.2%
Total responses	189	2,868	3,057

However, this association does not hold for all sites when the association is examined for each site individually. In fact, only for the Brantford and Gananoque sites is there a significant correlation. Table 7 shows that among the visitor patrons surveyed in Brantford, Point Edward-Sarnia, and Gananoque, 6% or less were on their first trip. In Sault Ste. Marie, 22% were on their first trip, and in Thunder Bay, 12% were on their first trip.

Table 7. "Is this your first trip to the city?" by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	4.7%	4.0%	6.2%	21.7%	11.6%	4.6%	6.2%
No	95.3%	96.0%	93.8%	78.3%	88.4%	95.4%	93.8%
Total Responses	880	473	615	184	129	780	3061

No n-Residents of city only

Organized Tours

In all the surveys, less than 3% of the outside visitors came with an organized tour. This question was not posed in the 2002-2004 surveys in Brantford. However, the 2000 survey had found that less than 1% of the outside visitors had come with an organized tour.

Coming Alone or With Others

Visitors from outside the host city were also asked, "Did you come to [the host city] alone, or with family, friends or colleagues?" The vast majority of visitor patrons came to the city with one or more other people. Groups of two were most common among the visitor patrons surveyed. In all of the surveys, except in Brantford and Thunder Bay, only one out of five came to the city alone. In Brantford, 31% had come to the city alone, and in Thunder Bay, 34% had come alone.

Visitors' Contributions to Other Revenues in the Host City

The extent to which visitor patrons also spend money in the host community, but outside the casino, will directly affect whether the casino is a net economic benefit or liability to the host community. The next part of the interview was intended to discover, for those patrons who said they did not live in the host city, to what extent they were contributing to tourism revenues in the city. This is an important issue for cities that host charity casinos and other gaming venues, since their decision to accept the installation may have been motivated, at least in part, by assumptions about the extent to which the gaming venue would attract more visitors to the area. More specifically, some business owners and other stakeholders in the host cities would have made positive assumptions about how many visitor patrons would, besides gambling, also spend money in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, and other city establishments. As well, these expenditures, and the tax revenues that flow from them, can benefit not just businesses, but also the municipality that hosts the gaming venue, and can help offset the costs of hosting the gaming venue.

Staying overnight

The extent to which visitor patrons would be able to spend money in the host city would be affected by the length of their stay. Except in Brantford, visitor patrons were asked, "How many nights are you staying in [the host city]?" In Brantford, the question was, "Are you staying overnight in Brantford?"

The survey results show that overnight stays by casino patrons vary dramatically with the individual community. In Gananoque, Brantford, Point Edward and Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park), 9 out of 10 patrons said they were only in the host city for the day. The pattern was very different in Sault Ste. Marie, where over half (53%) of the visitor patrons said they would be staying in the city for one or more nights (two-thirds of them only one or two nights). In Thunder Bay, four out of five (80%) of the visitor patrons were staying one or more nights (two-thirds of them only one or two nights).

Staying in commercial accommodations

To the extent that outside visitors to the charity casino or Horse Park may be staying at a hotel/motel while in the host city, they will be contributing revenue to important local businesses. Those visitor patrons who said they would be spending at least one night in the host city were next asked, "Will you be spending or have you already spent at least one night in a hotel or motel in [the host city]?" Table 8 shows the responses to this question among overnight visitors. The number of respondents to the question is small (103 or fewer at each site) because the table only reflects outside visitors to the gaming venue, and of those, only the people who were staying for at least one night. Again, the proportion of overnight visitor patrons staying in commercial accommodation varies dramatically with the individual community. The proportion of overnight visitors who indicated they would stay, or had stayed, at least one night in commercial accommodations ranges from a high of 78% in Sault Ste. Marie to a low of 25% in Brantford.

Table 8. "Will you be spending or have you already spent at least 1 night in a hotel or motel in this community?" by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	69.4%	46.4%	68.2%	77.6%	51.5%	25.0%	57.9%
No	30.6%	53.6%	31.8%	22.4%	48.5%	75.0%	42.1%
Total Responses	49	28	44	98	103	60	382

Non-Residents of city only

The percentages of *overnight* visitor patrons who indicated they would stay in a hotel/motel for at least one night were as follows:

- Sault Ste. Marie - 78%;
- Gananoque - 69%;
- Point Edward - 68%;
- Thunder Bay - 52%;
- Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park “visitor patrons”) - 46%;
- Brantford - 25%.

However, perhaps the more meaningful statistic, from the point of view of hotel operators in the host community, is the percentages of *all* visitor patrons (not just overnight visitors) who indicated they would spend at least one night in commercial accommodations. In four out of six of the sites, these figures are dramatically low -- 5% or fewer of visitor patrons stayed in a hotel, motel or other commercial establishment. In the other sites (Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie), although more casino patrons stayed in commercial accommodation, it will be recalled that for the majority, it was not the casino -- but other reasons -- that drew them to the area in the first place. The percentages of *all* visitor patrons (not just overnight visitors) who spent at least one night in commercial accommodation were as follows:

- Thunder Bay - 42%;
- Sault Ste. Marie - 41%;
- Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park “visitor patrons”) - 5%;
- Gananoque - 4%;
- Point Edward - 3%;
- Brantford - 2 %.

Eating at area restaurants

Another important issue for area businesses is whether restaurants in the host cities, especially those relatively close to the charity casino or Horse Park, would benefit from the advent of the gaming venue. This question was addressed in the next part of the surveys. Patrons from outside the host city were asked, “Have you eaten, or do you plan to eat, at a restaurant in [the host city], other than the one inside the [gaming venue], during this trip to [the host city]?”

Table 9. “Have you eaten, or do you plan to eat, at a restaurant in this city other than the one inside the charity casino/Horse Park during this trip?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	12.9%	18.2%	17.6%	63.0%	79.8%	17.2%	21.6%
No	87.1%	81.8%	82.4%	37.0%	20.2%	82.8%	78.4%
Total Responses	876	472	612	184	129	773	3046

Non-Residents of city only

As expected, in those sites (Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay) where more visitor patrons were staying overnight, the percentage that indicated they would be eating in an area restaurant outside the casino was relatively high (63% and 80%, respectively). In the remaining sites, where visitor patrons tended not to stay overnight, fewer than one in five visitor patrons ate at a restaurant outside the casino or Horse Park.

Shopping

Another key issue for area businesses is whether other retail establishments in the host cities would see more visitors shopping outside of the charity casino or Horse Park. Accordingly, visitor patrons were asked, “Have you done, or do you plan to do, any shopping, other than inside the [charity casino or Horse Park] during this trip?”

Table 10 suggests the same kind of pattern for shopping among gaming patrons from outside the host city as was seen earlier for eating at area restaurants outside the charity casino or Horse Park. In those sites (Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay), where more visitor patrons were staying overnight, the percentage who indicated they would be doing any shopping outside of the gambling venue was considerably higher (45% and 68%, respectively) than in the sites where visitor patrons tended not to stay overnight. One in ten, or fewer, visitor patrons in the other four sites had shopped or were planning to shop outside of the charity casino or Horse Park, except at Hiawatha where one in five were planning to do some shopping.

Table 10. “Have you done, or do you plan to do, any shopping other than inside the charity casino/Horse Park while on this visit to the city?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	7.1%	19.3%	11.1%	45.1%	68.2%	9.9%	15.3%
No	92.9%	80.7%	88.9%	54.9%	31.8%	90.1%	84.7%
Total Responses	878	472	614	184	129	779	3056

Non-Residents of city only

Other area attractions

The surveys sought to discover whether outside visitors would spend some time visiting other area attractions besides the charity casino or Horse Park during their trip to the host city. The visitor patrons were asked, “Are you planning to visit, or have you visited, other attractions in the area on this visit?” Table 11 shows that a minority of the outside patrons were visiting other tourism destinations in the host city. In Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie, the proportion was higher (23% and 14%, respectively), but in the other sites, fewer than 1 in 10 were doing other touring while in town.

Table 11. “Are you planning to visit, or have you visited, other attractions in the area on this visit?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	2.0%	5.7%	8.3%	14.1%	23.3%	3.1%	5.8%
No	98.0%	94.3%	91.7%	85.9%	76.7%	96.9%	94.2%
Total Responses	879	471	614	184	129	776	3053

Non-Residents of city only

Total tourism spending among outside visitors

Of critical importance to communities hosting a gambling venue is the question of the dollar value of secondary business they can expect to gain from visitors who are attracted to the area by the casino or racetrack slots. The surveys sought an estimate from outside visitors of how much money they would be spending in the host city during their current trip. The visitor patrons were accordingly asked, “Could you estimate for me how much money you will be spending in total on hotel or motel accommodation, restaurants, and shopping outside the [casino/Horse Park] in this city during this trip?” Table 12 shows that, other than in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, an overwhelming majority of visitor patrons indicated they would be spending nothing in the host city outside the gaming venue -- 70% to 84% of all visitor patrons in Gananoque, Point Edward, Sarnia, and Brantford said they would be spending no money at all in the host community outside the gaming venue. A total of 17% in Sault Ste. Marie and 3% in Thunder Bay also said they would spend nothing. The different pattern in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay partly reflects the approximately 40% of visitor patrons who were spending at least one night in commercial accommodations.

Table 12. “Could you estimate for me how much money you will be spending in total on hotel or motel accommodation, restaurants and shopping outside of the casino/Horse Park and other amusements in this city during this trip?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Samia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Nothing	83.5%	70.4%	75.0%	17.3%	3.2%	72.5%	70.6%
\$1 to \$50	7.1%	8.4%	10.1%	16.0%	5.3%	15.9%	10.7%
\$51 to \$100	4.1%	8.9%	6.9%	19.9%	24.5%	6.0%	7.4%
\$101 to \$200	3.1%	6.0%	2.6%	25.0%	21.3%	2.6%	5.1%
\$201 to \$500	1.2%	3.9%	4.3%	18.6%	35.1%	2.2%	4.5%
\$501 to \$1,000	.5%	1.7%	.2%	2.6%	5.3%	.6%	.9%
\$1,000 to \$5,000	.6%	.7%	1.0%	.6%	5.3%	.1%	.7%
Total Responses	847	415	507	156	94	779	2798

Non-Residents of city only

Among those visitor patrons in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay who said they would be spending money outside of the gaming venue, most Sault Ste. Marie patrons reported \$101 to \$200 and most Thunder Bay patrons reported \$201 to \$500. Among the visitor patrons in the remaining communities who said they would be spending money in the community outside of the gaming venue, a majority said they would spend \$100 or less. Only 5% to 12% said they would spend more than \$100.

Gaming Patterns among Patrons

In this section of the report, patterns of gambling frequency and wagering among casino and racetrack slots patrons will be examined. These are important indicators of how much of the casino’s revenues are derived from local residents, and how much is coming from outsiders.

It should be noted that there is a difference between frequent and “problem” or “pathological” gambling. Although the patron surveys did not directly measure problem or pathological gambling, the frequency and amount of wagering are also related to questions around how many patrons engage in responsible gambling and how many may have developed or are developing excessive or unhealthy gambling habits.

The relationship between the proximity of a gaming venue (i.e., like a casino) and the frequency of gambling has been addressed in other surveys. For example, Gerstein et al. (1999) used a national telephone survey of 2,417 American adults and a patron exit survey of 530 American adults and concluded that the availability of a casino within 50 miles almost doubled the percentage of the population who had gambled in the previous year (i.e., 40% of those living within 50 miles of a casino had gambled within the past year compared to 23% of those living between 50 and 250 miles of a casino). Welte et al. (2003) used a national telephone survey of 26,331 American adults and concluded that having a casino within 10 miles of home was positively related to the frequency of gambling. Both studies also concluded that there was a concomitant increase in problem and pathological gamblers within the population living close to a casino.

First visit to the charity casino or Horse Park

It will be recalled that the vast majority of patrons surveyed at each venue said they had been to the charity casino or Horse Park before. Table 13 displays the precise answers to the question, “Is this your first visit to the [charity casino or Horse Park]?” Less than 1 in 10 patrons at any site said it was their first visit.

Table 13. “Is this your first visit to the charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
Yes	8.3%	4.4%	6.8%	6.2%	4.5%	6.5%	6.1%
No	91.7%	95.6%	93.2%	93.8%	95.5%	93.5%	93.9%
Total Responses	1066	1080	1031	1362	1291	1381	7211

Both Residents and Non-Residents of city

Frequency of visiting the charity casino or Horse Park

Two questions were posed to the patrons to determine the frequency of their trips to the gaming venue. The first question was: “How long ago was your last visit to this [charity casino or Horse Park]?” The current surveys found differences in gambling frequency responses, based on whether the patron was from the host city or not. Table 14 shows the responses to this question among host city residents, and Table 15 shows the responses to the question among visitor patrons. The results show that host city residents are more likely than visitor patrons to say their last visit to the gaming venue was quite recent.

As shown in Table 14, over all the surveys combined, 45% of the patrons who live in the host city indicated their last visit to the charity casino or Horse Park was “yesterday” or “a few days ago”. When the response “last week” is added to this group, the percentage rises to 71%. Only one in five (18%) of host city residents indicated their last visit was “about a month ago” or “more than a month ago”. More precisely, among host city patrons surveyed:

- 24% said their last visit was the day before;
- 21% said their last visit was a few days before;
- 26% said their last visit was last week;
- 12% said their last visit was within the previous month;
- 8% said their last visit was about a month before; and
- 11% said their last visit was about a month before.

Table 14. “How long ago was your last visit to this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
yesterday	20.8%	15.5%	18.3%	25.7%	30.4%	20.6%	23.8%
a few days ago	24.6%	16.9%	25.7%	23.7%	20.3%	17.8%	21.1%
last week	26.2%	27.7%	26.7%	24.7%	23.6%	27.9%	25.6%
within the past month	12.6%	15.9%	12.3%	10.6%	9.7%	11.5%	11.5%
about a month ago	3.8%	8.6%	6.4%	6.2%	7.3%	11.0%	7.5%
more than a month ago	12.0%	15.5%	10.6%	9.1%	8.8%	11.2%	10.5%
Total Responses	183	593	405	1144	1120	591	4036

Residents of city only

Although the results are similar in each of the surveys at the individual sites, city residents’ last visit was slightly more recent in Thunder Bay and slightly less recent in Point Edward and the Hiawatha Horse Park in Sarnia.

Table 15. “How long ago was your last trip to this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
yesterday	9.7%	3.2%	7.2%	5.3%	6.3%	9.5%	7.8%
a few days ago	13.7%	10.7%	13.2%	6.1%	5.4%	9.9%	11.4%
last week	25.4%	27.6%	24.0%	20.5%	12.5%	25.8%	24.8%
within the past month	18.1%	17.4%	19.3%	9.1%	12.5%	18.1%	17.6%
about a month ago	9.9%	10.5%	12.6%	12.1%	14.3%	12.3%	11.5%
more than a month ago	23.3%	30.6%	23.6%	47.0%	49.1%	24.4%	27.0%
Total Responses	791	438	554	132	112	706	2733

Non-Residents of city only

In contrast, Table 15 shows that over all the surveys combined, 19% of the visitor patrons indicated their last visit to the charity casino or Horse Park was “yesterday” or “a few days ago”. When the response “last week” is added to this group, the percentage rises to 44%. Two in five (39%) visitor patrons indicated their last visit was “about a month ago” or “more than a month ago”. More precisely, among the visitor patrons surveyed:

- 8% said their last visit was the day before;
- 11% said their last visit was a few days before;
- 25% said their last visit was last week;
- 18% said their last visit was within the previous month;
- 12% said their last visit was about a month before; and
- 27% said their last visit was about a month before.

Although the results are similar in each of the surveys at the individual sites, visitors to Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie were less likely to have recently visited the charity casino than in other sites. This may be a function of the distances that many visitors have to travel in order to get to Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay. About half of the visitor patrons surveyed at those sites said their last visit was “more than a month ago”.

The next question, which was intended to measure the frequency of visiting the gaming venue, was “How often do you usually visit this [charity casino/Horse Park]?” Again, the results are different for host city residents and visitors, and again, host city residents are more likely to say they visit the gaming venue frequently.

Table 16. “How often do you usually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
daily	.5%	3.7%	4.0%	6.0%	8.4%	4.7%	5.7%
most days	11.0%	8.3%	12.4%	9.1%	16.1%	9.1%	11.3%
at least twice a week	24.2%	17.7%	25.7%	27.0%	21.4%	20.8%	22.9%
once a week	26.0%	24.8%	21.8%	19.5%	19.2%	23.0%	21.3%
2-3 times per month	14.8%	16.7%	16.3%	18.4%	14.7%	14.4%	16.2%
once a month	11.5%	11.0%	8.7%	9.2%	9.0%	12.2%	9.9%
less than once a month	9.9%	17.9%	11.1%	10.8%	11.2%	15.9%	12.7%
Total Responses	182	593	404	1144	1119	592	4034

Residents of city only

Table 16 shows the results for host city residents. A surprising proportion of patrons from the host city indicated they visited the gaming venue “daily” or “most days” -- from a low of 12% to a high of 26%

surveyed at each site, with an average of 17% at all sites combined. The frequency percentages of host city residents who visited the gaming venue were as follows:

- Gananoque, less than 1% visited the charity casino “daily” and 11% “most days”;
- Sarnia (Hiawatha Horse Park), 4% visited the charity casino “daily” and 8% “most days”;
- Point Edward, 4% visited the charity casino “daily” and 12% “most days”;
- Brantford, 5% visited the charity casino “daily” and 9% “most days”;
- Sault Ste. Marie, 6% visited the charity casino “daily” and 9% “most days”;
- Thunder Bay, 8% visited the charity casino “daily” and 16% “most days”.

When the responses for “at least twice a week” and “once a week” are added, an overall three out of five (61%) host city patrons surveyed said they usually visited the gaming venue once a week or more. For the individual surveys, this frequency varied from a low of 55% to a high of 65%. Another 24% to 28% of host city patrons visited the casino “two to three times a month” or “once a month”. Finally, city patrons who indicated they visited the charity casino or Horse Park “less than once a month” varied from a low of 10% to a high of 18%. Averaged across all surveys, 13% of host city patrons said they usually visit the gaming venue “less than once a month”.

Table 17. “How often do you usually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
daily	1.3%	.2%	.5%			1.4%	.9%
most days	3.8%	1.8%	3.8%	.8%	.9%	3.7%	3.2%
at least twice a week	11.3%	8.9%	11.4%	5.3%	1.8%	10.2%	10.0%
once a week	20.1%	19.2%	18.6%	6.8%	8.9%	16.1%	17.5%
2-3 times per month	22.5%	17.2%	18.1%	15.2%	10.7%	18.8%	19.0%
once a month	14.6%	22.4%	18.2%	15.2%	14.3%	19.0%	17.7%
less than once a month	26.3%	30.2%	29.4%	56.8%	63.4%	30.7%	31.7%
Total Responses	786	437	554	132	112	706	2727

Non-Residents of city only

Table 17 shows the results for patrons from outside the host city. Overall, just over 41% of the visitor patrons visited the charity casino or Horse Park once a week or more, and over two-thirds (68%) visited the gaming venue two or three times a month or less. Considerably fewer visitor patrons than host city residents indicated they visited the gaming venue “daily” or “most days” (only 4% for all sites combined).

Table 18. “How often do you usually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Residence

Residence	'Daily' or 'Most Days'	'Daily' or 'Most Days' or 'Twice a Week'	'Once a Week' or 2 or 3 times per month'	'Once a Month' or (even) 'Less Frequently'	Less Frequently than 'Once a Month'	Total
local community	86.1%	80.8%	60.3%	40.3%	37.1%	37.1%
outside of local community proper, but within the same County	5.1%	6.8%	12.9%	12.4%	11.0%	11.0%
outside of local County but within Ontario	5.6%	7.7%	15.6%	29.3%	32.6%	32.6%
outside of Ontario but within Canada	.3%	.3%	.2%	2.5%	3.6%	3.6%
outside of Canada	2.9%	4.4%	10.9%	15.5%	15.8%	15.8%
Total Responses	798	1995	2507	2259	1376	1376

All respondents who provided answers.

Table 18 summarizes the relationship between frequency of gambling and the patron's place of residence. It can be seen that while overall, 60% of the patrons who responded to both questions said they were host city residents, fully 86% of the patrons who said they gambled "daily" or "most days" were host city residents, and a further 5% were from the surrounding county. This correlation is statistically significant ($V = .184, p = .000$).

Correlates of More Frequent Gaming

Any connections between the reported frequency of visiting the charity casino or Horse Park and patron characteristics, such as age and gender, were examined (see Appendix C for data tables of analyses and significance tests). First, visit frequency was examined for different age groupings. When all sites are combined, a statistically significant relationship ($V = .103, p = .000$) was found between last visit recency and age (see in Table 19). Patrons age 65 and older were more likely to say they had last been to the gambling venue "yesterday" or "a few days ago", and less likely to say they had last been "about a month ago" or "more than a month ago", than were the younger age groups. This finding was also statistically significant at all the individual sites, except for Brantford and Gananoque.

Table 19. "How long ago was your last visit to this charity casino/Horse Park?" by Age

	19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
yesterday	16.9%	16.4%	19.9%	17.4%
a few days ago	11.9%	15.6%	22.3%	17.2%
last week	20.2%	25.3%	26.4%	25.3%
within the past month or about a month ago	19.0%	24.7%	19.3%	23.0%
more than a month ago	32.0%	18.0%	12.1%	17.1%
Total Responses	337	4592	1768	6697

The same pattern was seen in patrons' reported usual frequency of visiting the gaming venue. As shown in Table 20, those age 65 and older were more likely to say they usually visit the gaming venue "daily" or "at least twice a week", and were less likely to say they usually went "once a month" or "less than once a month" ($V = .123, p = .000$). This correlation was also statistically significant at all of the sites, when examined individually.

Table 20. "How often do you usually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?" by Age

	19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
daily or most days	8.6%	10.4%	16.3%	11.8%
at least twice a week	9.5%	16.7%	22.0%	17.7%
once a week	11.0%	19.5%	21.9%	19.7%
2-3 times per month	17.8%	18.2%	15.2%	17.3%
once a month	14.2%	13.8%	11.0%	13.1%
less than once a month	38.9%	21.5%	13.8%	20.3%
Total Responses	337	4589	1766	6692

Next, gender differences in visit frequency were examined. Table 21 shows that when all survey results were examined together, men (22%) were more likely than women (14%) to say their last visit to the gaming venue had been "yesterday" ($V = .106, p = .000$). At the individual sites, this correlation was not

statistically significant in Brantford, Point Edward, Gananoque, or Sarnia. However, a strong association ($p = .000$) was found in Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie.

Table 21. “How long ago was your last visit to this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Gender

	male	female	Total
yesterday	21.6%	13.7%	17.3%
a few days ago	16.4%	17.8%	17.2%
last week	23.6%	26.8%	25.3%
within the past month	12.8%	15.0%	14.0%
about a month ago	9.1%	9.2%	9.1%
more than a month ago	16.5%	17.6%	17.1%
Total Responses	3070	3661	6731

Patrons’ usual frequency of visiting the gaming venue was also examined for gender differences. As shown in Table 22, the male patrons’ reported frequency of visiting exceeded the women’s reported frequency of visiting ($V = .110, p = .000$). The differences seen in the combined surveys were also statistically significant in the individual sites of Brantford, Sault Ste. Marie, and Thunder Bay, but not in Gananoque, Point Edward, and Sarnia.

Table 22. “How often do you usually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?” by Gender

	male	female	Total
daily	5.5%	2.2%	3.7%
most days	9.6%	6.7%	8.0%
at least twice a week	18.3%	17.2%	17.7%
once a week	18.2%	21.0%	19.7%
2-3 times per month	16.6%	18.1%	17.4%
once a month	12.4%	13.7%	13.1%
less than once a month	19.4%	21.1%	20.3%
Total Responses	3071	3654	6725

Engaging Less Often in other Forms of Gaming

Another important issue for many host city residents is the extent to which the charity casinos or Horse Park may draw patrons away from other gaming opportunities. This is an issue because many (though not all) of the other gaming opportunities, such as raffles or bingos, directly benefit local charities. Although the proceeds from charity casinos and the Horse Park also benefit local charities (i.e., through Trillium and other provincial monies available for such purposes), many local charities argue they have lost revenue and the flexibility to use bingo and other proceeds for the work they -- as opposed to Trillium and the province -- consider most important. They further argue that Trillium funding cannot be used for certain causes, and the documentation required to access Trillium funds effectively disqualifies certain smaller charities that cannot afford to provide such documentation.

Accordingly, patrons were next asked, “Because of the charity casino/Horse Park, do you now play other types of gaming, such as bingo, sports lotteries, or horse betting, more often, about the same, or less often?” In Brantford, patrons were asked a slightly different question: “Are there other games, such as bingo, which you play less often now because of this or another casino?”² Table 23 and Table 24 show the results for all sites, except for Brantford.

² 8% of the respondents who were residents of Brantford answered “yes”, while 92% answered “no”.

Table 23. “Because of the charity casino/Horse Park, do you now play other types of games, such as bingo, sports lotteries, or horse betting, more often, about the same, or less often?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	All Sites Combined
more often	4.4%	8.9%	6.0%	13.5%	13.4%	11.4%
the same (neither more nor less often)	83.3%	72.4%	73.6%	65.6%	67.2%	69.1%
less often	12.2%	18.6%	20.4%	20.9%	19.4%	19.5%
Total Responses	180	606	417	1177	1160	3540

Residents of city only

As shown in Table 23, for host city residents over all the surveys, 7 out of 10 (69%) reported not changing their frequency of other forms of gaming because of the charity casino or Horse Park. However, among those who reported a change, city patrons were now more likely (one in five or 20%) to play other games less often. At the individual sites, this varied from a low of 12% in Gananoque to a high of 21% in Sault Ste. Marie.

Interestingly, approximately 1 in 10 city patrons (11%) said that because of the charity casino, they now played other games *more* often (Brantford patrons who played other games more often are not reflected in these figures). At the individual sites, this varied from a low of 4% in Gananoque to a high of 14% in Sault Ste. Marie. It is not clear whether these individuals were actually now engaging in both casino and other forms of gaming more often, or whether their interest in other forms of gaming had been sparked by the advent of the charity casino or Horse Park.

Table 24. “Because of the charity casino/Horse Park, do you now play other types of games, such as bingo, sports lotteries, or horse betting, more often, about the same, or less often?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	All Sites Combined
more often	4.9%	8.1%	7.3%	5.5%	13.2%	6.9%
the same (neither more nor less often)	81.5%	74.5%	78.2%	85.2%	78.3%	79.1%
less often	13.6%	17.4%	14.5%	9.3%	8.5%	14.1%
Total Responses	696	470	606	183	129	2084

Non-Residents of city only

These results are different from those of the general population at the sites. As part of the larger charity casino impact study, Robert Hann & Associates administered the South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS) in a general telephone survey before and after the advent of the charity casinos in the first four sites (i.e., excluding Gananoque). In those surveys, an overall drop in bingo playing from 12% to 8% was observed (a one-third decrease in bingo playing in the general population). This contrast may suggest that some charity casino patrons are now more frequent gamers in a variety of venues.

As shown in Table 24, reported changes in patterns of other forms of gaming by visitor patrons were less marked. Overall, 79% of visitor patrons reported no changes in their frequency of playing other games. However, approximately one in eight (14%) visitor patrons reported betting on games outside of the charity casino or Horse Park less often. Just over 1 in 20 (7%) reported betting on games outside of the charity casino or Horse Park more often.³

³ 6% of the respondents who were not residents of Brantford said they now played other types of games less often, while 94% indicated they did not.

Setting a Limit on Wagering or Time in the Gaming Venue

The next important issue addressed in the surveys was limit-setting. One of the means routinely advocated for responsible gambling is to set a limit on wagering before entering the gaming venue, and to stick to it. Accordingly, patrons were asked, “May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the [charity casino/Horse Park]?”⁴

Responses for host city residents and outside visitors were similar, and are displayed in Table 25. One third (31%) of patrons said they had not set limits on how much they would wager. It may be that in some instances, these people did not set limits because they had only come to watch. It will be shown later in this report that when patrons were asked about how much money they had actually wagered, 4% of patrons for all the studies combined said they had wagered nothing, and had only come to watch.

Among the 69% who set a dollar limit, 12% also set a time limit. Among the 31% who did not set a dollar limit, 4% set a time limit (i.e., making a total of 15% of all patrons setting a time limit). There were no significant differences in patterns at each individual site, and between host city residents and outside visitors.

Table 25. “May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/Horse Park?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	All Sites Combined
no type of limits set	22.2%	25.9%	26.2%	27.9%	30.4%	26.8%
dollar limit only	62.0%	56.2%	55.5%	56.7%	56.8%	57.3%
both dollar and time limit	11.8%	12.6%	13.3%	12.1%	9.6%	11.8%
time limit only	4.1%	5.3%	5.0%	3.3%	3.2%	4.1%
Total Responses	1010	1070	1027	1360	1287	5754

Both Residents and Non-Residents of city

i. Time Limits

Patrons in all surveys (except Brantford) were asked, “May I ask what time limit you set for yourself?” Table 26 displays the results for the approximately 15% of patrons who used a time limit as one of their responsible gambling tools.

Table 26. “May I ask what time limit you set for yourself?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	All Sites Combined
up to 1 hour	12.8%	24.7%	18.4%	27.1%	20.7%	21.2%
over 1 and up to 2 hours	24.4%	31.1%	36.8%	31.9%	29.3%	30.9%
over 2 and up to 3 hours	23.7%	18.9%	22.7%	13.5%	18.3%	19.2%
over 3 and up to 5 hours	22.4%	15.3%	15.7%	3.9%	7.9%	12.6%
over 3 and up to 8 hours	12.2%	5.3%	3.8%	1.0%	.6%	4.3%
over 8 and up to 24 hours	3.8%	1.6%	1.1%	2.4%	1.2%	2.0%
over 24 hours	.6%	3.2%	1.6%	20.3%	22.0%	9.8%
Total Responses	156	190	185	207	164	902

Only respondents who set a time limit and Both Residents and Non-Residents of city

Overall, among those who set a time limit, half the patrons (52%) set a limit of 2 hrs or less, and half (48%) set a limit of more than 2 hrs. This differed for host city residents and visitors: 57% of city residents

⁴ Unfortunately, Table 24 and Table 25 do not include data for Brantford, since those conducting the survey asked only about whether a dollar limit was set. However, 73% of Brantford patrons indicated they set a dollar limit for themselves.

who set a time limit gave themselves 2 hrs or less at the gaming venue, whereas only 45% of outside visitors gave themselves 2 hrs or less.

Some patrons set rather lengthy time limits for their gaming. Over all the studies, 4% of patrons who set a time limit gave themselves between 3 and 8 hrs, and 2% gave themselves between 8 and 24 hrs. Some patrons gave themselves even longer, especially in Sault Ste. Marie (20%) and Thunder Bay (22%), where all patrons who set a time limit gave themselves over 24 hrs. This included 22% and 23%, respectively, of the city patrons who set a time limit (the number of visitor patrons who set a time limit in these sites -- 32% and 13%, respectively -- is too small a group to generalize from.) At the other sites, 3% or fewer of patrons who set a time limit gave themselves over 24 hrs.

ii. Dollar Limits

Patrons who set a dollar limit on their wagering were next asked, “May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?” As the responses differed significantly for host city residents and outside visitors, the results are displayed separately in Table 27 and Table 28. In brief, more host city residents set low limits (\$49 or less), and fewer set high limits (over \$200). All figures are presented in Canadian dollars.

Table 27. “May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Samia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
\$0 to \$9	4.4%	2.5%	2.1%	1.6%	.9%	.2%	1.6%
\$10 to \$49	50.7%	40.9%	42.5%	48.5%	40.9%	44.5%	44.2%
\$50 to \$99	19.9%	26.0%	25.7%	25.3%	23.6%	26.1%	24.8%
\$100 to \$199	15.4%	23.8%	18.6%	17.6%	25.2%	21.5%	21.1%
\$200 to \$499	8.1%	6.4%	8.9%	6.1%	8.1%	6.9%	7.2%
over 500	1.5%	.5%	2.1%	.9%	1.2%	.7%	1.0%
Total Responses	136	408	280	788	741	418	2771

Only respondents who set a dollar limit and Residents of city only

As shown in Table 27, just under half (46%) of host city residents set a limit of \$49 or less.⁵ A limit of \$10 to \$49 was the modal limit (the limit most frequently chosen). Nearly three quarters (71%) of the host city residents who set a dollar limit gave themselves up to \$99, 7% gave themselves from \$201 to \$499, and a very small proportion (less than 1%) gave themselves \$500 or more.

Table 28 shows that just under a quarter (22%) of outside visitors set a limit of \$49 or less. A limit of \$100 to \$199 was the modal limit. Under half (42%) of the outside visitors who set a dollar limit gave themselves up to \$99. Another third (32%) gave themselves from \$100 to \$199, and 21% gave themselves from \$200 to \$499. Finally, 5% set a limit of \$500 or more.

Table 28. “May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Samia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
\$0 to \$9	.5%	3.4%	.7%	.8%		.5%	1.0%
\$10 to \$49	22.6%	18.5%	12.9%	35.8%	37.3%	22.2%	21.4%
\$50 to \$99	19.6%	20.5%	18.9%	21.1%	16.9%	18.7%	19.3%
\$100 to \$199	28.5%	37.9%	31.8%	26.0%	20.5%	33.9%	31.5%
\$200 to \$499	22.5%	18.1%	28.6%	13.8%	22.9%	19.8%	21.8%
over 500	6.3%	1.7%	7.0%	2.4%	2.4%	4.9%	5.0%
Total Responses	583	298	402	123	83	567	2056

Only respondents who set a dollar limit and Non-R residents of city only

⁵ Although not shown here, 24% set a limit of \$25 or less.

iii. Correlates of Dollar Limits

Age differences were seen in the dollar limits that patrons set for themselves. Table 29 shows that younger patrons (age 19-24) were more likely to set a low limit (\$0-49) on their betting ($V = .062, p = .000$). This difference was also statistically significant at the individual sites, except for Gananoque and Thunder Bay.

Table 29. “May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?” by Age

	19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
\$0 to \$49	51.2%	34.1%	37.4%	35.8%
\$50 to \$99	20.1%	22.4%	23.3%	22.5%
\$100 to \$199	19.3%	26.9%	23.0%	25.5%
\$200 and over	9.4%	16.6%	16.3%	16.2%
Total Responses	244	3359	1195	4798

Gender differences in wagering limits were also examined. Women were more likely to set lower dollar limits (\$0-49), as shown in Table 30, and less likely to set high limits (\$200 and over) than were men ($V = .148, p = .000$). In the individual patron surveys, this difference was found to be statistically significant, except at the individual site of Hiawatha Horse Park in Sarnia.

Table 30. “May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?” by Gender

	male	female	Total
\$0 to \$49	30.7%	39.8%	35.8%
\$50 to \$99	20.5%	24.0%	22.5%
\$100 to \$199	27.7%	23.9%	25.6%
\$200 and over	21.1%	12.2%	16.2%
Total Responses	2123	2687	4810

Monies Wagered

Finally, patrons were asked, “May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?” In the surveys (except for Brantford), two other questions were posed first -- the patron’s age and their postal code - - in order to provide a short pause between the question on the limit set and the funds actually wagered.

Again, differences in the responses of host city patrons and visitor patrons were examined. Here, when all sites were combined, overall city patrons were seen to wager less on the current visit (i.e., when the patron survey was conducted) than visitor patrons.

Table 31. “May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
nothing, came to watch	5.6%	4.8%	3.5%	4.7%	6.5%	1.9%	4.8%
less than \$10	7.9%	4.6%	6.7%	6.5%	5.5%	.6%	5.2%
\$10-\$49	36.5%	29.6%	36.7%	40.6%	32.4%	30.8%	34.7%
\$50-\$99	26.4%	28.1%	19.7%	21.6%	22.7%	32.0%	24.3%
\$100-\$199	13.5%	22.9%	19.5%	17.1%	19.9%	23.9%	19.7%
\$200-\$499	8.4%	8.8%	10.2%	7.7%	10.1%	10.2%	9.1%
\$500 or more	1.7%	1.2%	3.7%	1.9%	2.9%	.8%	2.1%
Total Responses	178	581	401	1136	1132	532	3960

Residents of city only

The responses of the host city residents are shown in Table 31. Differences among the individual sites were not significant. It is interesting that 5% said they had wagered nothing and had only come to observe. Over all the surveys:

- Somewhat less than half (45%) of patrons from the host city wagered \$49 or less, including 5% who said they had wagered nothing at all (\$10-49 was the modal response). The 45% who wagered \$49 or less is virtually identical to the 46% of host city patrons who had earlier responded that they had set a limit of \$49 or less.
- Just over two-thirds (69%) of the host city patrons wagered \$99 or less. This is almost identical to the 71% of host city patrons who had earlier said they had set a limit of \$100 or less.
- One-fifth (19%) of the host city patrons said they had wagered between \$100 and \$199. This is very close to the 21% who said they had set a limit of \$101 to \$199.
- One-tenth (11%) said they had wagered \$200 or more. This exceeded only modestly the 8% who said they had set a limit of \$200 or more.

Table 31. “May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?” by Site

	Gananoque	Hiawatha-Sarnia	Point Edward	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay	Brant	All Sites Combined
nothing, came to watch	2.4%	1.1%	2.2%	5.1%	5.8%	1.2%	2.2%
less than \$10	1.4%	1.1%	2.1%	4.5%	5.8%	1.2%	1.8%
\$10-\$49	19.2%	17.4%	14.5%	32.6%	30.6%	18.7%	19.2%
\$50-\$99	18.5%	21.2%	18.3%	25.8%	28.9%	22.1%	20.6%
\$100-\$199	27.7%	32.9%	26.9%	20.2%	14.9%	29.5%	27.7%
\$200-\$499	22.3%	23.3%	25.5%	9.6%	11.6%	20.3%	21.4%
\$500 or more	8.5%	3.0%	10.5%	2.2%	2.5%	7.1%	7.1%
Total Responses	834	438	580	178	121	689	2840

Non-Residents of city only

Table 32 shows the responses of outside visitor patrons. The differences among the individual sites were not significant. Compared to the 5% of host city residents seen above, only 2% said they had wagered nothing and had only come to observe. Over all the surveys:

- One-quarter (23%) of visitor patrons wagered \$49 or less, including the 2% who said they had wagered nothing at all. However, the modal response was \$100 to \$199.
- The 23% wagering \$49 or less is very close to the 22% who had earlier said they set a limit of \$49 or less.
- Somewhat less than half (44%) of visitor patrons wagered \$99 or less. This is close to the 42% of visitor patrons who had earlier said they had set a limit of \$99 or less.
- One-quarter (28%) of visitor patrons said they had wagered between \$100 and \$199. This was moderately below the size of the group (32%) who said they had set a limit of \$100 to \$199.
- Three out of ten (29%) said they had wagered \$200 or more. This only slightly exceeds the size of the group (27%) who said they had set a limit of \$200 or more.

i. Correlates of Wager Amounts

As shown in Table 33, younger patrons (age 19-24) were more likely to wager \$49 or less on the current visit than were older patrons, and those age 25 to 64 were least likely to wager amounts in the lowest range ($V = .057, p = .000$). The youngest patrons were also least likely to wager in the highest ranges (\$100 or more). At least half of the patrons in all age categories said they wagered less than \$100. At the individual sites, these age-related differences were statistically significant, except in Gananoque and Thunder Bay.

Table 33. “May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?” by Age

	19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
\$0 to \$49	49.3%	34.0%	37.7%	35.8%
\$50-\$99	20.5%	22.7%	23.2%	22.7%
\$100-\$199	15.9%	24.0%	21.9%	23.0%
\$200 and over	14.3%	19.3%	17.2%	18.5%
Total Responses	371	4676	1721	6768

As shown in Table 34, women were significantly more likely to wager amounts under \$50 and significantly less likely to wager \$100 or more than were men ($\chi^2 = 64.6$, $df = 3$, $p = .000$). At the individual sites, these differences were statistically significant, except in Samia.

Table 34. “May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?” by Gender

	male	female	Total
nothing, came to watch	4.9%	2.7%	3.7%
less than \$10	3.4%	4.2%	3.8%
\$10-\$49	25.0%	31.0%	28.2%
\$50-\$99	20.8%	24.5%	22.8%
\$100-\$199	23.8%	22.4%	23.1%
\$200-\$499	16.5%	12.4%	14.3%
\$500 or more	5.7%	2.9%	4.2%
Total Responses	3136	3647	6783

Table 35 examines the relationship between dollar and time limits and the amounts actually wagered for the sites outside of Brantford. Across all sites, in general, people who set limits on themselves tend to wager less ($V = .135$, $p = .000$). For those who did not set any kind of limit (dollar or time), the modal amount wagered was \$200 or more, which is higher than any of the groups that set some kind of limit (dollar, time, or both). On the other hand, for those who did not set any kind of limit, the next most frequent wagering was under \$50, which was the modal wagering for all of the groups that set some kind of limit.

Setting only a dollar limit is associated with the lowest wagering overall. Setting both a dollar and time limit is not associated with lower wagering, but is actually associated with a slightly higher overall wagering amount than setting a dollar limit only. Setting only a time limit appears to be the least successful strategy for keeping wagering low, but is still associated with lower wagering than setting no limits at all.

Table 35. “May I ask if you set a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/Horse Park?” by “How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?”

	\$0 to \$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200 and over	Total
no type of limits set	27.2%	17.7%	23.5%	31.6%	100.0%
dollar limit only	42.7%	23.7%	21.3%	12.3%	100.0%
both dollar and time limit	40.5%	24.0%	21.4%	14.2%	100.0%
time limit only	29.6%	21.1%	27.8%	21.5%	100.0%
Total Responses	2091	1218	1227	995	5531

Table 36 shows the relationship between reported frequency of visiting the gaming venue and the amount wagered on the current visit. Although the correlation is significant ($V = .053, p = .000$), there is no single clear pattern in this relationship. Attendance “daily” is associated with the largest proportion of wagering nothing (6%) and wagering under \$50 (45%) on the current visit. However, another 40% of “daily” patrons wagered \$100 or more on the current visit, and 21% wagered \$200 or more. Patrons who said they visited the gaming venue “most days” had lower levels of wagering “less than \$50” on the current visit (37%), and also engaged in wagering \$100 or higher more (43%) than “daily” patrons. Wagering among those who reported going once a week was higher overall than among those who reported going “at least twice a week”, but not more often than that.

The highest modal levels of wagering (from \$100-199) were seen among 26% of those patrons who said they visited the gaming venue “once a month” or “two to three times a month”. These two groups were also least likely to say they had wagered less than \$50 during the current visit. For all other groups, the modal wagering level reported on this visit was from \$10 to \$49. Patrons who said they visited the gaming venue “once a month” or “two to three times a month” were also the most likely (46%) to have wagered \$100 or more on the current visit.

Patrons who said they visited the gaming venue less than once a month tended to wager among the lowest amounts overall. Specifically, they wagered under \$50 on the current visit at virtually the same rate as “daily” patrons, and wagered \$100 or more at a lower rate (38%) than any other frequency group.

Table 36. “How often do you actually visit this charity casino/Horse Park?” by “How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?”

	nothing, came to watch	less than \$10	\$10-\$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200-\$499	\$500 or more	Total
daily	5.9%	7.9%	31.4%	14.6%	18.8%	15.9%	5.4%	100.0%
most days	3.1%	5.2%	28.7%	19.8%	24.7%	12.9%	5.6%	100.0%
at least twice a week	3.4%	4.0%	29.8%	22.7%	21.5%	13.2%	5.4%	100.0%
once a week	3.3%	3.2%	27.8%	23.1%	24.5%	14.4%	3.7%	100.0%
2-3 times per month	2.6%	2.5%	23.8%	25.4%	26.3%	14.7%	4.6%	100.0%
once a month	3.0%	3.0%	24.9%	23.4%	25.6%	17.0%	3.1%	100.0%
less than once a month	4.9%	4.2%	31.1%	22.1%	18.9%	15.4%	3.4%	100.0%
Total Responses	227	239	1785	1448	1474	941	271	6385

Differential contributions to amounts wagered

Other patron surveys (e.g., Williams & Wood, 2004) have suggested that problem or pathological gamblers contribute a surprisingly high proportion of the revenues earned by casinos and other gaming venues. This issue is of critical interest to communities since such high cumulative wagering would, in turn, affect the personal lives of the patrons involved, and to some extent, the community where they live. As noted earlier, the current surveys were not intended to assess how many patrons qualified as problem or pathological gamblers. However, the surveys were able to explore questions about the amounts wagered by patrons who admitted to frequent gaming. An estimate of the proportional contributions to gross wagering by the various patron groups was made based on:

- the number of patrons in our sample reporting various frequencies of gambling, multiplied by:
- the proportions of patrons in each frequency group who wagered various amounts, multiplied by:
- the amounts of monies wagered, as reported by each frequency group (using the a “multiplier” set at the mid-point of the wagering range for the lower levels of wagering, and an estimate of wagering set at a lower level for the higher levels -- see below), multiplied by:
- a value reflecting the number of annual visits estimated by patrons at the various frequency levels.

The numbers used in the formula and the results are shown in Table 37. These estimates show that a relatively small proportion of patrons account for a surprisingly large proportion of the monies wagered at the casinos and Horse Park slots. Table 37 shows that the patrons who said they gambled “daily” or “most days” make up 4% and 8%, respectively, of the total number of patrons surveyed. It can be seen from the table that somewhat more of these frequent gamblers wage smaller amounts on each visit. However, their wagering adds up over time. When the calculation described above is performed, it reveals that these groups (“daily” and “most days” patrons) account for 53% of the gross monies wagered over a year. When the patrons who said they visited the charity casino or Horse Park “twice a week” are added, these three groups of most-frequent gamblers make up 30% of the patrons surveyed, and account for 77% of the gross monies wagered over a year.

Table 37. Differential contributions of various patron groups to gross wagering reported

Frequency Group		“Daily”	“Most days”	“Twice a week”	“Once a week”	“2-3 times a	“Once a month”	“< 1x month”	Total
Number of patrons		257	541	1197	1339	1170	886	1,380	6,765
% of total patrons surveyed		3.8	8.0	17.7	19.8	17.3	13.0	20.4	100%
% of Frequency group at Wagering levels & midpoint multiplier									
\$0	% x \$0	5.9	3.1	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0	4.9	
< \$10	% x \$5	7.9	5.2	4.0	3.2	2.5	3.0	4.2	
\$10-\$49	% x \$30	31.4	28.7	29.8	27.8	23.8	24.9	31.1	
\$50-\$99	% x \$75	14.6	19.8	22.7	23.1	25.4	23.4	22.1	
\$100-\$199	% x \$150	18.8	24.7	21.5	24.5	26.3	25.6	18.9	
\$200-\$499	% x \$300	15.9	12.9	13.2	14.4	14.7	17.0	15.4	
\$500 & over	% x \$500	5.4	5.6	5.4	3.7	4.6	3.1	3.4	
Est. total wagered on current visit		\$31.8K	\$73.4K	\$149.4K	\$155.6K	\$136.3K	\$114.6K	\$161.9K	\$823K
x Est. no. annual visits		365	300	104	52	30	12	6	
Total annual gross wagering		\$11.6 M	\$22.0 M	\$15.5 M	\$8.1 M	\$4.1 M	\$1.4 M	\$1.0 M	\$63.7 M
% of total for all groups		18.2%	34.5%	24.3%	12.7%	6.4%	2.1%	1.5%	99.7%

In earlier sections of this report, certain characteristics were seen among these frequent gamblers who contribute such a high proportion of the revenues collected by the charity casinos and Horse Park slots. Specifically:

- they tend to be from the local community - whereas, overall, 58% of the patrons in the surveys were from the local city, 86% of patrons who said they came “daily” or “most days” were from the local city, and 91% were from the local city or its surrounding county;
- they tend to be older - whereas 26% of all patrons interviewed were age 65 or older, 36% of the patrons who said they came “daily” or “most days” were age 65 or older;
- they tend to be male - whereas 46% of all patrons interviewed were male, 59% of the patrons who said they came “daily” or “most days” were male.

In addition, further analysis shows there are other correlates of very frequent casino or Horse Park slots attendance among the patrons interviewed:

- they are more likely than patrons as a whole to come alone ($V = .127, p = .000$) - whereas 25% of patrons in general come alone, 36% of the patrons who said they came “daily” or “most days”

- said they came alone on the current visit (this pertains only to patrons interviewed who were from outside the local community); and
- they are less likely to set a limit on how much they will wager ($V = .134, p = .000$) - whereas 71% of all patrons said they set a dollar limit on wagering, only 57% of patrons who said they came “daily” or “most days” also said they set dollar limits on their visit.

Concluding Comments

The above sections provide information that is important to developing a better understanding of the nature of gambling at charity casinos and Horse Parks in each of the five communities. The information also provides some of the critical building blocks for larger studies that attempt to estimate the impact of these gambling venues on those communities.

It would be impossible to develop such information unless patrons were willing to contribute their time to answering this type of survey. For their gracious cooperation in doing so, we gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the over 7,000 patrons who participated in the study.

References

- Gazel, R., & Thompson, W. (1995). *Casino gamblers in Illinois: Who are they?* Nevada, United States: University of Nevada at Las Vegas.
- Gerstein, D., Hoffmann, J., Larison, C., Engelman, L., Murphy, S., Palmer, A., et al. (1999). *Gambling impact and behavior study: Report to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Grinols, E. L. (2004). *Gambling in America: Costs and benefits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hann, R. G., & Nuffield, J. (2005, December). *Local community impacts of the charity casinos*. Prepared for Addiction Programs, Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Retrieved from <http://www.gamblingresearch.org/contentdetail.sz?cid=3159>
- Ipsos-Reid and Gemini Research. (2003). *British Columbia Problem Gambling Prevalence Study: Final Report*. Toronto: Ipsos-Reid.
- McCusker, C., & B. Gettings. (1997). Automaticity of cognitive biases in addictive behaviours: Further evidence with gamblers. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 36, 543-554.
- National Council of Welfare. (1996). *Gambling in Canada*. Ottawa.
- Nuffield, J. (2001, July). *Report on the Brantford Charity Casino patron survey and parking lot count July 7 to 14, 2000*. Prepared for Addiction Programs, Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Retrieved from <http://www.gamblingresearch.org/contentdetail.sz?cid=2469>
- Shercon Associates Inc. (2004). *Brantford charity casino community impact study*. Oakville: Author.
- Statistics Canada. (2003, April). Fact-sheet on gambling. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 4(4), 1-5. Ottawa: Author.
- Volberg, R. (2004, February 10). Fifteen years of problem gambling prevalence research: What do we know? Where do we go? *eGambling*, 10, 1-19. Retrieved from http://www.camh.net/egambling/issue10/ejgi_10_volberg.html
- Welte, J. W., Wieczorek, W. F., Barnes, G. M., Tidwell, M-C., & Hoffman, J. H. (2003). *The relationship of ecological and geographic factors to gambling behavior and pathology*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Wiebe, J., Single, E., & Falkowski-Ham, A. (2001, December 4). Measuring gambling and problem gambling in Ontario. *Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse and Responsible Gambling Council (Ontario)*. Retrieved from http://www.responsiblegambling.org/rgc_research_reports.cfm
- Williams, R., & Wood, R. (2004, June 23). The demographic sources of Ontario gaming revenue. *Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre*. Retrieved from <http://www.gamblingresearch.org/contentdetail.sz?cid=198&pageid=1042&r=s>

Appendix A. Brantford Charity Casino Patron Survey

1. Interviewer's name _____
2. Date of interview DD ____ MM ____ YY ____ Time of day _____ circle AM or PM
3. Gender of respondent (circle one)
 1. Male
 2. Female

“Excuse me, may I have a minute of your time to ask a few questions about your experience at the charity casino? The interview is completely confidential, and will help us to understand better who is visiting the casino and what their experience is like. [If asked, state] This research is being done by Robert Hann & Associates as part of their study of the impact of the charity casino on the community.”

4. First, where do you live? (circle one)
 1. Brantford →→**If respondent is from Brantford, skip to Question 15**
 2. Outside Brantford, but within Brant County
Specify closest city, town or reserve _____
 3. Outside Brant County, but within Ontario
Specify closest city, town or reserve _____
 4. Outside Ontario, but within Canada
 5. Outside Canada
Specify closest city and state/country _____
5. What is the main purpose of your visit to Brantford? (circle one)
 1. To visit the charity casino
 2. Tourism of other kinds
 3. To visit friends or family
 4. Business
 5. Other
6. Did you come to Brantford alone, or with family, friends or colleagues? (circle one)
 1. Alone
 2. With one other
 3. With two or more others
7. Did you come with an organized tour, or on your own? (circle one)
 1. Organized tour bus, etc.
 2. Other
8. Is this your first trip to Brantford? (circle one)
 1. Yes
 2. No
9. [If respondent is from outside Brantford] Are you staying overnight in Brantford? (circle one)
 1. Yes – at least one night on this visit
 2. No
10. [If “yes” to Question 9] Will you be spending, or have you already spent, at least one night at a hotel or motel during this trip to Brantford? (circle one)
 1. Yes
 2. No
11. Have you eaten, or do you plan to eat, at a restaurant in Brantford other than the one inside the charity casino, during this trip to Brantford? (circle one)
 1. Yes
 2. No
12. Have you done, or do you plan to do, any shopping while on this visit to Brantford? (circle one)
 1. Yes
 2. No

13. Are you planning to visit, or have you visited other attractions in the Brantford area on this visit?
1. Yes 2. No
14. Could you estimate for me how much money you will be spending in total on hotel or motel accommodation, restaurants outside the casino, shopping and other amusements in Brant County during this trip? (circle one)
1. Nothing, or \$ _____ estimated amount
15. Is this your first visit to the Brantford Charity Casino? (circle one)
1. Yes 2. No

→→→**If respondent answers “yes” to Question 15, skip to Question 18.**

16. **[If “no” to Question 15]** How long ago was your last visit? (circle one)
1. Yesterday
2. A few days ago
3. Last week
4. Within the past month
5. About a month ago
6. More than a month ago
17. **[If “no” to Question 15]** How often do you visit the Brantford Charity Casino? (circle one)
1. Daily
2. Most days
3. At least twice a week
4. Once a week
5. 2-3 times a month
6. Once a month
7. Less than once a month
18. Are there other games, such as bingo, which you play less often now because of this or another Charity Casino? (circle one)
1. Yes 2. No
19. May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the casino? (circle one)
1. Yes, set a limit 2. No, set no limit 3. Refused to answer
20. **[If “yes” to previous question]** May I ask what was that limit which you set for yourself?
\$ _____ actual limit set by respondent
21. May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit? Was it: (circle one)
1. Nothing (came to watch or as a companion)
2. Less than \$10
3. \$10-49
4. \$50-99
5. \$100-199
6. \$200-499
7. \$500 or more
8. Don't know
9. Refused to answer

22. May I ask your age? Is it: (circle one)

1. 18-20
2. 21-24
3. 25-34
4. 35-49
5. 50-64
6. 65 or older

“That concludes the interview. I want to thank you very much for participating.”

Appendix B. Patron Survey Instrument for 2002-2004 Surveys

- Q1casino location*
- [A00300] 1 Mark the Charity Casino Locations
- ₁ Sault Ste Marie
 - ₂ Thunder Bay
 - ₃ Point Edward
 - ₄ Hiawatha Race Park
 - ₅ Thousand Island (Gananoque)
- Q2community*
- [A00800] 2 NOTE the local community
- ₁ Sault Ste Marie
 - ₂ Thunder Bay
 - ₃ Sarnia
 - ₄ Gananoque/Landsdown
- Q3respondents*
- [A00100] 3 Excuse me; may I have a minute of your time to ask a few questions about your experience at the charity casino/Horse Park? For your time you can enter your name in a draw for a \$50 gift certificate at a local restaurant. The interview is completely confidential and will help us understand better who is visiting the casino/Horse Park and what their experience is like. IF ASKED STATE This research is done by the Ontario Government as part of a study of the impact of the charity casino/Horse Park on the community.
- ₁ Yes
 - ₂ No
- Q4residence*
- [A00200] 4 To begin, where do you live?
- ₁ local community
 - ₂ outside of local community proper, but within the same County
 - ₃ outside of local County but within Ontario
 - ₄ outside of Ontario but within Canada
 - ₅ outside of Canada
- community2*
- [A00U00] 5 Specify closest city, town, or reserve
-
-
- community3*
- [A00V00] 6 Specific closest city, town, reserve
-
-
- community4*
- [A00X00] 7 Specify the city, province in Canada
-
-

UScommunity5

[A00W00] 8 Specify closest city/state & country

Q5purpose

[A00400] 9 What is the main purpose of this trip to [@A00800]. HAVE THEM CHOOSE ONLY ONE

- 1 to visit the charity casino/Horse Park
- 2 tourism of other kinds
- 3 to visit friends or family
- 4 business
- 5 other

Q6party size

[A00500] 10 Did you come to the [@A00800] casino/Horse Park alone, or with family, friends or colleagues?

- 1 alone
- 2 with one other
- 3 with two or more others

Q7tour group

[A00600] 11 Did you come to [@A00800] with an organized tour group or on your own?

- 1 organized tour bus etc
- 2 other

Q8communityfirst

[A00700] 12 Is this your first trip to [@A00800]?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q9overnight stay

[A00900] 13 How many nights are you staying in [@A00800] ?

- 1 only here for the day
- 2 1 night
- 3 2 nights
- 4 3 nights
- 5 more than three nights

Q10accommodation

[A00A00] 14 Will you be spending or have you already spent at least one night in a hotel or motel in this community during this trip?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q11food and beverage

[A00B00] 15 Have you eaten, or do you plan to eat, at a restaurant in [@A00800] other than the one inside the charity casino/Horse Park, during this trip?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q12shop

- [A00C00] 16 Have you done, or do you plan to do any shopping other than inside the casino while on this visit to [A00800]?
- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q13attraction

- [A00D00] 17 Are you planning to visit, or have you visited other attractions in the [A00800] area on this visit?
- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q14spend

- [A00E00] 18 Could you estimate for me how much money you will be spending in total on hotel or motel accommodation, restaurants and shopping outside of the casino/Horse Park and other amusements in [A00800] during this trip. PROMPT to the nearest 10's of Cdn dollars is fine.
- Answer: _____

Q15casinofirst

- [A00F00] 19 Is this your first visit to the [A00300] Charity Casino/Horse Park?
- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q16past visit

- [A00G00] 20 How long ago was your last visit to [A00300] charity casino/Horse Park?
- ₁ yesterday
- ₂ a few days ago
- ₃ last week
- ₄ within the past month
- ₅ about a month ago
- ₆ more than a month ago

Q17frequency

- [A00H00] 21 How often do you usually visit the [A00300] charity casino/Horse Park?
- ₁ daily
- ₂ most days
- ₃ at least twice a week
- ₄ once a week
- ₅ 2-3 times per month
- ₆ once a month
- ₇ less than once a month

Q18other venues

- [A00I00] 22 Because of the charity casino/Horse Park, do you now play other types of gaming, such as bingo, sports lotteries, or horse betting, more often, about the same or less often?
- ₁ more often
- ₂ the same (neither more nor less often)
- ₃ less often

Q19limits

- 23 May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/Horse Park? (THEY CAN SELECT ONE OR MORE)
- [A00J01] yes, I set a time limit
- [A00J04] yes, I set an \$ limit
- [A00J02] no, I set no limits

Q20time limit

[A00K00] 24 May I ask what time limit you set for yourself? RECORD IN HALF HOURS EG 1.5

Answer: _____

Q21money limit

[A00L00] 25 May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself? RECORD IN CDN \$

Answer: _____

Q22age

[A00N00] 26 Now we have few questions about you. Which age category do you belong?

- ₁ 19-20
- ₂ 21-24
- ₃ 25-34
- ₄ 35-55
- ₅ 56-64
- ₆ 65 and over

Q23postal code

[A00O00] 27 and what is your postal code/zip code?

Q24wager

[A00M00] 28 Oh, I have one last question, may I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit? Was it:

- ₁ nothing, came to watch
- ₂ less than \$10
- ₃ \$10-\$49
- ₄ \$50-\$99
- ₅ \$100-\$199
- ₆ \$200-\$499
- ₇ \$500 or more
- ₈ don't remember

Q25gender

[A00P00] 29 Record sex of respondent

- ₁ male
- ₂ female

thanks

30 Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey. You can enter in a draw for a \$50 gift certificate at a local restaurant. Have a great day.

Q26genderrefuse

[A00T00] 31 Record their gender

- ₁ male
- ₂ female

Q27age estimate

- [A00R00] 32 Give an idea of their age.
- _1 young adults 19-24
 - _2 adults (25-54)
 - _3 older adults (55-65)
 - _4 seniors >65

next

- 33 Close and save information and begin a new survey.

Appendix C. Supporting Community/Venue Specific Statistical Tables

Summary of Tests of Significance for Following Community/Venue Specific Tables

Table #	Table Title	Groups Included	Level of Statistical Significance of Differences Observed Pearson Chi-Square Tests – shaded = significant at .05)					
			Brant	Gananoque	Point Edward	Sarnia-Hiawatha	Sault Ste. Marie	Thunder Bay
C1	Variations By Age							
C1.1	"How long ago was your last visit to this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by Age	all	.097	.649	.000	.002	.000	.000
C1.2	"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by Age	all	.000	.030	.000	.002	.000	.000
C1.3	"May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?" by Age	all	.038	.542	.007	.002	.011	.732
C1.4	"May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?" by Age	all	.004	.657	.038	.000	.001	.385
C2	Variations by Gender							
C2.1	"How long ago was your last visit to this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by Gender	all	.033	.184	.416	.079	.000	.000
C2.2	"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by Gender	all	.023	.325	.333	.355	.000	.000
C2.3	"May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?" by Gender	all	.000	.000	.001	.332	.000	.100
C2.4	"May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?" by Gender	all	.000	.000	.006	.054	.002	.032
C3	Other CrossTabulations							
C3.1	"What is the Main Purpose of This Trip to this Community?" by "Is This Your First Trip to the City?"	all	.002	.000	.065	.117	.597	.579
C3.2	"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"	all	.086	.007	.011	.004	.038	.013
C3.3	"May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/ horsepark?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"	all	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
C3.4	"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ Horse Park?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"	all	.086	.007	.011	.004	.038	.013
C3.5	"May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/ horsepark?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"	all		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Table C1.1

"How long ago was your last visit to this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by Age

Site		19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
Gananoque	yesterday	19.2%	11.5%	11.6%	11.8%
	a few days ago	15.4%	15.0%	17.4%	15.7%
	last week	34.6%	24.8%	27.0%	25.7%
	within the past month or about a month ago	15.4%	26.3%	25.5%	25.8%
	more than a month ago	15.4%	22.3%	18.5%	21.1%
	Total Responses	26	685	259	970
Hiawatha- Sarnia	yesterday	16.1%	9.7%	11.3%	10.3%
	a few days ago	12.9%	12.3%	19.0%	14.1%
	last week	12.9%	28.4%	28.1%	27.8%
	within the past month or about a month ago	12.9%	27.0%	24.8%	26.0%
	more than a month ago	45.2%	22.7%	16.8%	21.8%
	Total Responses	31	715	274	1020
Point Edward	yesterday	6.3%	13.3%	10.1%	11.9%
	a few days ago	7.9%	17.2%	23.6%	18.6%
	last week	19.0%	25.1%	26.6%	25.2%
	within the past month or about a month ago	25.4%	28.0%	22.9%	26.2%
	more than a month ago	41.3%	16.4%	16.8%	18.2%
	Total Responses	63	593	297	953
Sault Ste. Marie	yesterday	25.4%	22.1%	27.1%	23.7%
	a few days ago	14.9%	18.7%	31.0%	21.9%
	last week	13.4%	24.3%	26.0%	24.2%
	within the past month or about a month ago	10.4%	20.5%	10.3%	17.1%
	more than a month ago	35.8%	14.4%	5.6%	13.1%
	Total Responses	67	847	358	1272
Thunder Bay	yesterday	23.4%	25.9%	35.0%	28.3%
	a few days ago	8.5%	17.1%	24.9%	18.9%
	last week	25.5%	22.5%	22.5%	22.6%
	within the past month or about a month ago	10.6%	20.7%	11.7%	17.8%
	more than a month ago	31.9%	13.8%	6.0%	12.4%
	Total Responses	47	846	334	1227
Brant	yesterday	14.6%	13.4%	18.7%	14.5%
	a few days ago	12.6%	13.2%	13.8%	13.3%
	last week	21.4%	26.8%	29.7%	26.9%
	within the past month or about a month ago	27.2%	27.4%	25.6%	27.0%
	more than a month ago	24.3%	19.2%	12.2%	18.2%
	Total Responses	103	906	246	1255

Table C1.2

"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by Age

Site		19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
Gananoque	daily or most days	11.5%	5.6%	7.7%	6.3%
	at least twice a week	7.7%	13.0%	16.2%	13.7%
	once a week	19.2%	21.5%	21.6%	21.5%
	2-3 times per month	34.6%	20.3%	22.0%	21.2%
	once a month	11.5%	13.1%	17.0%	14.1%
	less than once a month	15.4%	26.5%	15.4%	23.2%
	Total Responses	26	679	259	964
Hiawatha- Sarnia	daily or most days	9.7%	6.7%	10.3%	7.8%
	at least twice a week	9.7%	12.6%	18.3%	14.0%
	once a week	9.7%	22.7%	23.1%	22.4%
	2-3 times per month	9.7%	16.8%	18.7%	17.1%
	once a month	12.9%	17.5%	11.7%	15.8%
	less than once a month	48.4%	23.8%	17.9%	23.0%
	Total Responses	31	715	273	1019
Point Edward	daily or most days	3.2%	9.4%	10.1%	9.2%
	at least twice a week	9.5%	16.0%	22.3%	17.5%
	once a week	4.8%	21.1%	20.9%	20.0%
	2-3 times per month	19.0%	18.7%	14.5%	17.4%
	once a month	17.5%	14.5%	12.5%	14.1%
	less than once a month	46.0%	20.2%	19.6%	21.7%
	Total Responses	63	593	296	952
Sault Ste. Marie	daily or most days	11.9%	11.4%	19.0%	13.6%
	at least twice a week	13.4%	23.7%	29.6%	24.8%
	once a week	11.9%	16.2%	24.3%	18.2%
	2-3 times per month	11.9%	20.9%	12.3%	18.0%
	once a month	10.4%	11.1%	6.7%	9.8%
	less than once a month	40.3%	16.7%	8.1%	15.6%
	Total Responses	67	848	358	1273
Thunder Bay	daily or most days	10.6%	18.3%	34.4%	22.4%
	at least twice a week	10.6%	18.9%	23.1%	19.7%
	once a week	12.8%	18.3%	18.6%	18.2%
	2-3 times per month	21.3%	16.1%	9.0%	14.3%
	once a month	14.9%	10.3%	6.9%	9.5%
	less than once a month	29.8%	18.2%	8.1%	15.9%
	Total Responses	47	847	334	1228
Brant	daily or most days	7.8%	9.0%	10.6%	9.2%
	at least twice a week	6.8%	14.4%	19.1%	14.7%
	once a week	11.7%	18.9%	22.8%	19.0%
	2-3 times per month	17.5%	16.6%	17.5%	16.9%
	once a month	15.5%	16.8%	13.8%	16.1%
	less than once a month	40.8%	24.3%	16.3%	24.0%
	Total Responses	103	907	246	1256

Table C1.3

"May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?" by Age

Site		19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
Gananoque	\$0 to \$49	44.0%	29.6%	25.5%	29.1%
	\$50 to \$99	12.0%	19.4%	21.7%	19.7%
	\$100 to \$199	20.0%	25.5%	28.8%	26.2%
	\$200 and over	24.0%	25.5%	23.9%	25.0%
	Total Responses	25	506	184	715
Hiawatha- Sarnia	\$0 to \$49	69.6%	33.1%	32.8%	34.2%
	\$50 to \$99	17.4%	23.2%	26.6%	23.8%
	\$100 to \$199	13.0%	32.3%	24.3%	29.7%
	\$200 and over		11.4%	16.4%	12.3%
	Total Responses	23	501	177	701
Point Edward	\$0 to \$49	48.9%	23.8%	26.8%	26.4%
	\$50 to \$99	20.0%	21.5%	22.4%	21.7%
	\$100 to \$199	15.6%	29.6%	22.0%	26.4%
	\$200 and over	15.6%	25.0%	28.8%	25.5%
	Total Responses	45	432	205	682
Sault Ste. Marie	\$0 to \$49	61.1%	44.3%	55.9%	48.2%
	\$50 to \$99	20.4%	25.4%	24.0%	24.7%
	\$100 to \$199	16.7%	20.9%	13.5%	18.8%
	\$200 and over	1.9%	9.4%	6.6%	8.2%
	Total Responses	54	627	229	910
Thunder Bay	\$0 to \$49	43.5%	40.6%	43.1%	41.3%
	\$50 to \$99	26.1%	23.4%	21.3%	23.0%
	\$100 to \$199	30.4%	24.8%	24.2%	24.8%
	\$200 and over		11.2%	11.4%	10.9%
	Total Responses	23	589	211	823
Brant	\$0 to \$49	44.6%	29.7%	36.0%	32.1%
	\$50 to \$99	21.6%	21.2%	23.8%	21.7%
	\$100 to \$199	21.6%	29.4%	27.5%	28.4%
	\$200 and over	12.2%	19.7%	12.7%	17.8%
	Total Responses	74	704	189	967

Table C1.4

"May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?" by Age

Site		19 to 24	25 to 64	65 and over	Total
Gananoque	\$0 to \$49	37.8%	26.8%	28.7%	27.7%
	\$50-\$99	18.9%	19.2%	22.1%	19.9%
	\$100-\$199	18.9%	25.8%	24.4%	25.2%
	\$200 and over	24.3%	28.2%	24.8%	27.2%
	Total Responses	37	713	258	1008
Hiawatha- Sarnia	\$0 to \$49	66.7%	29.2%	30.7%	30.8%
	\$50-\$99	12.1%	26.4%	23.6%	25.2%
	\$100-\$199	18.2%	28.3%	24.4%	27.0%
	\$200 and over	3.0%	16.1%	21.3%	17.0%
	Total Responses	33	727	254	1014
Point Edward	\$0 to \$49	44.2%	28.9%	29.6%	30.3%
	\$50-\$99	18.2%	17.8%	21.0%	18.8%
	\$100-\$199	15.6%	26.6%	20.3%	23.9%
	\$200 and over	22.1%	26.6%	29.2%	27.0%
	Total Responses	77	612	291	980
Sault Ste. Marie	\$0 to \$49	70.7%	47.1%	54.4%	50.4%
	\$50-\$99	14.7%	22.9%	21.9%	22.2%
	\$100-\$199	10.7%	18.5%	16.5%	17.5%
	\$200 and over	4.0%	11.5%	7.1%	9.9%
	Total Responses	75	887	351	1313
Thunder Bay	\$0 to \$49	44.2%	44.3%	44.1%	44.2%
	\$50-\$99	30.8%	22.4%	24.6%	23.3%
	\$100-\$199	17.3%	18.9%	20.7%	19.3%
	\$200 and over	7.7%	14.4%	10.5%	13.1%
	Total Responses	52	867	333	1252
Brant	\$0 to \$49	38.1%	23.9%	31.2%	26.5%
	\$50-\$99	24.7%	26.1%	26.5%	26.1%
	\$100-\$199	17.5%	27.5%	28.2%	26.8%
	\$200 and over	19.6%	22.5%	14.1%	20.6%
	Total Responses	97	870	234	1201

Table C2.1

"How long ago was your last visit to this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by Gender

Site		male	female	Total
Gananoque	yesterday	11.8%	11.9%	11.8%
	a few days ago	15.0%	16.1%	15.6%
	last week	25.2%	25.8%	25.6%
	within the past month	15.4%	18.2%	17.1%
	about a month ago	7.8%	9.4%	8.7%
	more than a month ago	24.8%	18.6%	21.2%
	Total Responses	408	565	973
Hiawatha- Sarnia	yesterday	13.1%	8.6%	10.3%
	a few days ago	12.3%	15.3%	14.2%
	last week	26.4%	28.7%	27.8%
	within the past month	17.6%	16.0%	16.6%
	about a month ago	10.7%	8.8%	9.5%
	more than a month ago	20.0%	22.7%	21.7%
	Total Responses	375	649	1024
Point Edward	yesterday	14.2%	10.2%	11.9%
	a few days ago	18.4%	18.5%	18.4%
	last week	24.5%	25.8%	25.2%
	within the past month	15.2%	17.2%	16.3%
	about a month ago	10.8%	9.1%	9.8%
	more than a month ago	16.9%	19.2%	18.2%
	Total Responses	408	547	955
Sault Ste. Marie	yesterday	30.4%	17.5%	23.5%
	a few days ago	19.2%	24.3%	21.9%
	last week	21.2%	27.1%	24.3%
	within the past month	8.8%	11.8%	10.4%
	about a month ago	7.3%	6.4%	6.8%
	more than a month ago	13.0%	13.0%	13.0%
	Total Responses	599	676	1275
Thunder Bay	yesterday	34.5%	21.8%	28.2%
	a few days ago	18.2%	19.7%	19.0%
	last week	20.0%	25.1%	22.6%
	within the past month	9.8%	10.3%	10.0%
	about a month ago	6.8%	9.0%	7.9%
	more than a month ago	10.6%	14.2%	12.4%
	Total Responses	614	614	1228
Brant	yesterday	17.0%	11.5%	14.3%
	a few days ago	14.3%	12.6%	13.5%
	last week	25.7%	28.0%	26.8%
	within the past month	13.5%	17.0%	15.2%
	about a month ago	11.6%	12.6%	12.1%
	more than a month ago	18.0%	18.2%	18.1%
	Total Responses	666	610	1276

Table C2.2

"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by Gender

Site		male	female	Total
Gananoque	daily	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
	most days	6.4%	4.3%	5.2%
	at least twice a week	12.5%	14.6%	13.8%
	once a week	21.1%	21.8%	21.5%
	2-3 times per month	20.4%	21.6%	21.1%
	once a month	12.3%	15.4%	14.1%
	less than once a month	26.0%	21.3%	23.3%
	Total Responses	407	560	967
Hiawatha- Sarnia	daily	3.5%	1.5%	2.2%
	most days	6.4%	4.9%	5.5%
	at least twice a week	13.9%	14.0%	14.0%
	once a week	23.7%	21.8%	22.5%
	2-3 times per month	16.5%	17.3%	17.0%
	once a month	15.2%	16.4%	15.9%
	less than once a month	20.8%	24.1%	22.9%
	Total Responses	375	648	1023
Point Edward	daily	2.2%	1.6%	1.9%
	most days	8.8%	6.4%	7.4%
	at least twice a week	18.6%	16.5%	17.4%
	once a week	16.7%	22.5%	20.0%
	2-3 times per month	17.6%	17.2%	17.4%
	once a month	14.2%	13.9%	14.0%
	less than once a month	21.8%	21.8%	21.8%
	Total Responses	408	546	954
Sault Ste. Marie	daily	8.3%	2.7%	5.3%
	most days	9.5%	7.1%	8.2%
	at least twice a week	24.8%	24.7%	24.8%
	once a week	16.5%	19.7%	18.2%
	2-3 times per month	15.5%	20.4%	18.1%
	once a month	10.3%	9.3%	9.8%
	less than once a month	15.0%	16.0%	15.5%
	Total Responses	600	675	1275
Thunder Bay	daily	10.9%	4.4%	7.6%
	most days	16.3%	13.0%	14.6%
	at least twice a week	21.2%	18.0%	19.6%
	once a week	16.3%	20.3%	18.3%
	2-3 times per month	13.5%	15.1%	14.3%
	once a month	7.8%	11.2%	9.5%
	less than once a month	14.0%	17.9%	15.9%
	Total Responses	614	615	1229
Brant	daily	3.9%	1.6%	2.8%
	most days	7.6%	4.4%	6.1%
	at least twice a week	15.6%	14.6%	15.1%
	once a week	17.5%	20.3%	18.9%
	2-3 times per month	17.4%	16.9%	17.1%
	once a month	15.7%	16.2%	16.0%
	less than once a month	22.2%	25.9%	24.0%
	Total Responses	667	610	1277

Table C2.3

"May I ask what dollar limit you set for yourself?" by Gender

Site		male	female	Total
Gananoque	\$0 to \$49	18.4%	36.2%	29.2%
	\$50 to \$99	17.0%	21.3%	19.6%
	\$100 to \$199	29.8%	23.6%	26.0%
	\$200 and over	34.8%	19.0%	25.2%
	Total Responses	282	437	719
Hiawatha- Sarnia	\$0 to \$49	32.0%	35.5%	34.2%
	\$50 to \$99	21.9%	24.6%	23.6%
	\$100 to \$199	34.0%	27.5%	29.8%
	\$200 and over	12.1%	12.5%	12.4%
	Total Responses	256	448	704
Point Edward	\$0 to \$49	19.4%	31.2%	26.3%
	\$50 to \$99	21.2%	22.1%	21.7%
	\$100 to \$199	27.6%	25.6%	26.4%
	\$200 and over	31.8%	21.1%	25.6%
	Total Responses	283	398	681
Sault Ste. Marie	\$0 to \$49	44.2%	51.7%	48.3%
	\$50 to \$99	20.3%	28.4%	24.7%
	\$100 to \$199	23.4%	14.9%	18.8%
	\$200 and over	12.1%	5.0%	8.2%
	Total Responses	414	497	911
Thunder Bay	\$0 to \$49	40.6%	42.2%	41.4%
	\$50 to \$99	21.2%	24.6%	23.0%
	\$100 to \$199	24.7%	24.8%	24.8%
	\$200 and over	13.5%	8.4%	10.8%
	Total Responses	392	431	823
Brant	\$0 to \$49	24.2%	39.9%	31.9%
	\$50 to \$99	21.0%	22.7%	21.8%
	\$100 to \$199	29.2%	27.9%	28.6%
	\$200 and over	25.6%	9.5%	17.7%
	Total Responses	496	476	972

Table C2.4

"May I ask how much you actually wagered in total on this visit?" by
Gender

Site		male	female	Total
Gananoque	\$0 to \$49	20.4%	33.0%	27.7%
	\$50-\$99	18.8%	20.7%	19.9%
	\$200-\$499	50.9%	40.9%	45.1%
	\$200 and over	9.9%	5.5%	7.3%
	Total Responses	426	585	1011
Hiawatha- Sarnia	\$0 to \$49	30.1%	31.1%	30.7%
	\$50-\$99	22.1%	26.9%	25.1%
	\$200-\$499	44.5%	40.7%	42.1%
	\$200 and over	3.2%	1.2%	2.0%
	Total Responses	375	643	1018
Point Edward	\$0 to \$49	26.2%	33.3%	30.2%
	\$50-\$99	18.2%	19.4%	18.9%
	\$200-\$499	45.1%	41.7%	43.2%
	\$200 and over	10.5%	5.6%	7.8%
	Total Responses	428	552	980
Sault Ste. Marie	\$0 to \$49	49.1%	51.6%	50.4%
	\$50-\$99	19.3%	24.9%	22.2%
	\$200-\$499	28.7%	22.3%	25.4%
	\$200 and over	2.8%	1.2%	2.0%
	Total Responses	637	676	1313
Thunder Bay	\$0 to \$49	44.7%	43.8%	44.3%
	\$50-\$99	20.9%	25.9%	23.3%
	\$200-\$499	30.5%	28.5%	29.5%
	\$200 and over	3.9%	1.8%	2.9%
	Total Responses	637	614	1251
Brant	\$0 to \$49	20.9%	32.1%	26.2%
	\$50-\$99	24.5%	28.4%	26.4%
	\$200-\$499	49.0%	36.7%	43.1%
	\$200 and over	5.7%	2.8%	4.3%
	Total Responses	633	577	1210

Table C3.1

" What is the Main Purpose of This Trip to this Community?" by "Is This Your First Trip to the City?"

Site		Yes	No	Total
Gananoque	to visit the charity casino/horse park	34.1%	80.5%	78.4%
	other purpose	65.9%	19.5%	21.6%
	Total Responses	41	838	879
Hiawatha- Sarnia	to visit the charity casino/horse park	47.4%	65.0%	64.3%
	other purpose	52.6%	35.0%	35.7%
	Total Responses	19	454	473
Point Edward	to visit the charity casino/horse park	68.4%	80.8%	80.0%
	other purpose	31.6%	19.2%	20.0%
	Total Responses	38	577	615
Sault Ste. Marie	to visit the charity casino/horse park	22.5%	18.8%	19.6%
	other purpose	77.5%	81.3%	80.4%
	Total Responses	40	144	184
Thunder Bay	to visit the charity casino/horse park	6.7%	11.4%	10.9%
	other purpose	93.3%	88.6%	89.1%
	Total Responses	15	114	129
Brant	to visit the charity casino/horse park	61.1%	81.8%	80.8%
	other purpose	38.9%	18.2%	19.2%
	Total Responses	36	741	777

Table C3.2

"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"

Site		\$0 to \$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200 and over	Total
Gananoque	daily or most days	13.6%	22.0%	23.7%	40.7%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	25.2%	19.7%	24.4%	30.7%	100.0%
	once a week	24.0%	20.0%	22.5%	33.5%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	22.7%	20.1%	35.6%	21.6%	100.0%
	once a month	25.0%	18.8%	28.1%	28.1%	100.0%
	less than once a month	34.6%	20.1%	19.2%	26.2%	100.0%
	Total Responses	238	184	236	264	922
Hiawatha- Sarnia	daily or most days	36.1%	20.8%	29.2%	13.9%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	34.0%	29.1%	19.1%	17.7%	100.0%
	once a week	26.0%	26.5%	31.1%	16.4%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	20.9%	23.9%	28.8%	26.4%	100.0%
	once a month	28.6%	25.3%	30.5%	15.6%	100.0%
	less than once a month	39.1%	24.9%	23.6%	12.4%	100.0%
	Total Responses	297	248	263	166	974
Point Edward	daily or most days	39.5%	15.1%	16.3%	29.1%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	34.4%	15.3%	20.9%	29.4%	100.0%
	once a week	33.9%	19.1%	20.2%	26.8%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	19.2%	20.5%	34.0%	26.3%	100.0%
	once a month	24.0%	25.6%	23.2%	27.2%	100.0%
	less than once a month	31.8%	15.7%	21.7%	30.8%	100.0%
	Total Responses	275	168	210	258	911
Sault Ste. Marie	daily or most days	51.8%	16.1%	17.9%	14.3%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	48.3%	22.8%	18.9%	9.9%	100.0%
	once a week	52.3%	18.5%	21.6%	7.7%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	43.8%	31.3%	15.6%	9.4%	100.0%
	once a month	51.6%	18.9%	18.9%	10.7%	100.0%
	less than once a month	54.4%	22.6%	12.8%	10.3%	100.0%
	Total Responses	616	274	218	125	1233
Thunder Bay	daily or most days	42.5%	17.9%	23.9%	15.7%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	42.9%	20.2%	21.4%	15.5%	100.0%
	once a week	43.5%	22.7%	23.1%	10.6%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	42.2%	28.3%	16.2%	13.3%	100.0%
	once a month	39.1%	31.3%	15.7%	13.9%	100.0%
	less than once a month	53.5%	23.8%	13.0%	9.7%	100.0%
	Total Responses	527	274	235	159	1195
Brant	daily or most days	29.5%	21.0%	28.6%	21.0%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	24.0%	29.8%	26.3%	19.9%	100.0%
	once a week	24.5%	31.3%	27.9%	16.3%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	20.9%	26.5%	30.1%	22.4%	100.0%
	once a month	23.0%	21.5%	31.9%	23.6%	100.0%
	less than once a month	32.3%	24.7%	21.1%	21.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	298	300	312	240	1150

Table C3.3

"May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/ horsepark?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"

Site		\$0 to \$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200 and over	Total
Gananoque	no type of limits set	16.6%	13.3%	24.2%	46.0%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	32.6%	21.9%	25.7%	19.9%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	23.0%	24.8%	23.9%	28.3%	100.0%
	time limit only	19.5%	19.5%	26.8%	34.1%	100.0%
	Total Responses	266	196	244	263	969
Hiawatha- Sarnia	no type of limits set	19.8%	20.2%	26.5%	33.5%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	35.1%	27.2%	27.4%	10.3%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	33.3%	26.2%	27.0%	13.5%	100.0%
	time limit only	28.3%	24.5%	28.3%	18.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	312	256	276	173	1017
Point Edward	no type of limits set	19.9%	13.5%	21.1%	45.4%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	34.0%	19.4%	25.4%	21.2%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	36.1%	26.3%	21.1%	16.5%	100.0%
	time limit only	26.5%	18.4%	28.6%	26.5%	100.0%
	Total Responses	297	184	234	265	980
Sault Ste. Marie	no type of limits set	34.6%	19.7%	24.2%	21.4%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	57.0%	23.8%	13.4%	5.8%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	56.8%	18.5%	19.8%	4.9%	100.0%
	time limit only	41.5%	26.8%	26.8%	4.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	662	291	230	130	1313
Thunder Bay	no type of limits set	35.9%	19.3%	22.2%	22.7%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	48.8%	25.4%	18.1%	7.7%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	47.1%	25.6%	15.7%	11.6%	100.0%
	time limit only	33.3%	15.4%	28.2%	23.1%	100.0%
	Total Responses	554	291	243	164	1252

Table C3.4

"How often do you usually visit this Charity Casino/ horse park?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"

Site		\$0 to \$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200 and over	Total
Gananoque	daily or most days	13.6%	22.0%	23.7%	40.7%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	25.2%	19.7%	24.4%	30.7%	100.0%
	once a week	24.0%	20.0%	22.5%	33.5%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	22.7%	20.1%	35.6%	21.6%	100.0%
	once a month	25.0%	18.8%	28.1%	28.1%	100.0%
	less than once a month	34.6%	20.1%	19.2%	26.2%	100.0%
	Total Responses	238	184	236	264	922
Hiawatha- Sarnia	daily or most days	36.1%	20.8%	29.2%	13.9%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	34.0%	29.1%	19.1%	17.7%	100.0%
	once a week	26.0%	26.5%	31.1%	16.4%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	20.9%	23.9%	28.8%	26.4%	100.0%
	once a month	28.6%	25.3%	30.5%	15.6%	100.0%
	less than once a month	39.1%	24.9%	23.6%	12.4%	100.0%
	Total Responses	297	248	263	166	974
Point Edward	daily or most days	39.5%	15.1%	16.3%	29.1%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	34.4%	15.3%	20.9%	29.4%	100.0%
	once a week	33.9%	19.1%	20.2%	26.8%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	19.2%	20.5%	34.0%	26.3%	100.0%
	once a month	24.0%	25.6%	23.2%	27.2%	100.0%
	less than once a month	31.8%	15.7%	21.7%	30.8%	100.0%
	Total Responses	275	168	210	258	911
Sault Ste. Marie	daily or most days	51.8%	16.1%	17.9%	14.3%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	48.3%	22.8%	18.9%	9.9%	100.0%
	once a week	52.3%	18.5%	21.6%	7.7%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	43.8%	31.3%	15.6%	9.4%	100.0%
	once a month	51.6%	18.9%	18.9%	10.7%	100.0%
	less than once a month	54.4%	22.6%	12.8%	10.3%	100.0%
	Total Responses	616	274	218	125	1233
Thunder Bay	daily or most days	42.5%	17.9%	23.9%	15.7%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	42.9%	20.2%	21.4%	15.5%	100.0%
	once a week	43.5%	22.7%	23.1%	10.6%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	42.2%	28.3%	16.2%	13.3%	100.0%
	once a month	39.1%	31.3%	15.7%	13.9%	100.0%
	less than once a month	53.5%	23.8%	13.0%	9.7%	100.0%
	Total Responses	527	274	235	159	1195
Brant	daily or most days	29.5%	21.0%	28.6%	21.0%	100.0%
	at least twice a week	24.0%	29.8%	26.3%	19.9%	100.0%
	once a week	24.5%	31.3%	27.9%	16.3%	100.0%
	2-3 times per month	20.9%	26.5%	30.1%	22.4%	100.0%
	once a month	23.0%	21.5%	31.9%	23.6%	100.0%
	less than once a month	32.3%	24.7%	21.1%	21.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	298	300	312	240	1150

Table C3.5

"May I ask if you set yourself a limit on how much you would wager on the slots or tables on this visit to the charity casino/ horsepark?" by "How much you actually wagered in total on this visit?"

Site		\$0 to \$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200 and over	Total
Gananoque	no type of limits set	16.6%	13.3%	24.2%	46.0%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	32.6%	21.9%	25.7%	19.9%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	23.0%	24.8%	23.9%	28.3%	100.0%
	time limit only	19.5%	19.5%	26.8%	34.1%	100.0%
	Total Responses	266	196	244	263	969
Hiawatha- Sarnia	no type of limits set	19.8%	20.2%	26.5%	33.5%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	35.1%	27.2%	27.4%	10.3%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	33.3%	26.2%	27.0%	13.5%	100.0%
	time limit only	28.3%	24.5%	28.3%	18.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	312	256	276	173	1017
Point Edward	no type of limits set	19.9%	13.5%	21.1%	45.4%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	34.0%	19.4%	25.4%	21.2%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	36.1%	26.3%	21.1%	16.5%	100.0%
	time limit only	26.5%	18.4%	28.6%	26.5%	100.0%
	Total Responses	297	184	234	265	980
Sault Ste. Marie	no type of limits set	34.6%	19.7%	24.2%	21.4%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	57.0%	23.8%	13.4%	5.8%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	56.8%	18.5%	19.8%	4.9%	100.0%
	time limit only	41.5%	26.8%	26.8%	4.9%	100.0%
	Total Responses	662	291	230	130	1313
Thunder Bay	no type of limits set	35.9%	19.3%	22.2%	22.7%	100.0%
	dollar limit only	48.8%	25.4%	18.1%	7.7%	100.0%
	both dollar and time limit	47.1%	25.6%	15.7%	11.6%	100.0%
	time limit only	33.3%	15.4%	28.2%	23.1%	100.0%
	Total Responses	554	291	243	164	1252