



Research

NCAA Student-Athlete Gambling Behaviors and Attitudes: 2004-2012

Supplementary Tables
May 2013

Study Investigators

- Dr. Thomas Paskus, NCAA Principal Research Scientist
- Dr. Jeffrey Derevensky, Director International Center for Youth Gambling Problems and High-Risk Behaviors, McGill University

Current Study

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

Methods

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

Data Cleaning

- A high data cleaning standard was applied, which is especially important for the analysis of certain low-baserate items.
- Data were reviewed extensively via a series of validity checks and Item Response Theory (IRT) techniques to identify questionable patterns of response.
- Cases were excluded from analyses if strong evidence existed of insincere response (e.g., respondent appears to be a non-gambler in the first half of the survey and a heavy gambler in the second half; respondent endorses a combination of items with a statistical likelihood of close to zero).
- Similar data cleaning standards were applied across all three administrations of the wagering study. Data were then weighted in comparison to national participation rates within the sampled sports. These weighting functions effectively account for differences in sampling proportions within each cohort and then scale results in relation to national participation figures.

Comparing Responses from 2004, 2008 and 2012

- Comparisons are not available across all administrations for all items.
- Since survey sampling strategies were somewhat different in 2004 versus what was done in 2008 and 2012, several steps were taken to equate results as best possible in this report:
 - Comparisons are limited to 22 sports (11 men's sports and 11 women's sports) that were adequately sampled in each NCAA division within each administration.
 - When results were aggregated across sport, gender and/or division, the sample data for 2004, 2008 and 2012 were weighted in comparison to 2008 national participation rates within the 22 sports / 3 divisions. This ensured that over- or under-sampling student-athletes from a particular sport and/or division in a given year would not confound the results.
- In total, comparative data are available for:
 - 19,354 student-athletes from 2004;
 - 19,371 student-athletes from 2008; and
 - 22,935 student-athletes from 2012.

Study Definitions – Gambling Frequency

- Social gambling: Self-reported participation in a particular gambling activity on one or more occasion during the *past year*.
- Frequent gambling: Self-reported participation in a particular gambling activity *once per month or more* during the past year.
- Heavy gambling: Self-reported participation in a particular gambling activity *once per week or more* during the past year.

Key Questions for the NCAA

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

Key Questions for the NCAA

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

Results:

Gambling Behaviors and
Sports Wagering

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

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

Gambling Behaviors among Male Student-Athletes

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

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

Gambling Behaviors among Female Student-Athletes

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

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

Percentage of Male Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports (by NCAA Division)

Social	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Past Year			
Division I	17.1%	22.4%	18.7%
Division II	20.6%	27.9%	25.9%
Division III	30.7%	36.9%	31.9%

Frequent	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
1x / month+			
Division I	6.6%	6.8%	5.9%
Division II	8.7%	9.4%	8.5%
Division III	12.8%	12.1%	10.4%

Heavy	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
1x / week+			
Division I	2.8%	1.9%	2.1%
Division II	4.1%	2.9%	3.3%
Division III	6.7%	3.2%	3.1%

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

Percentage of Female Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports (by NCAA Division)

Social	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Past Year			
Division I	4.6%	4.1%	2.7%
Division II	7.9%	6.2%	5.4%
Division III	8.1%	9.1%	7.3%

Frequent	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
1x / month+			
Division I	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%
Division II	2.1%	0.7%	0.5%
Division III	1.7%	1.0%	0.8%

Heavy	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
1x / week+			
Division I	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
Division II	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Division III	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%

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

Percentage of Male Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports at Least Once/Month

(Divisions Combined within Sports)

Men's Sports	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Baseball	12.3%	12.7%	9.5%
Basketball	9.9%	10.0%	8.4%
Football	8.6%	9.0%	8.3%
Golf	14.2%	19.6%	20.2%
Ice Hockey	12.1%	7.6%	8.9%
Lacrosse	13.9%	10.1%	5.6%
Soccer	10.9%	10.6%	9.7%
Swimming	5.7%	4.3%	3.5%
Tennis	8.8%	8.4%	7.8%
Track / Cross Country	4.9%	5.4%	4.4%
Wrestling	12.4%	6.2%	6.0%

Percentage of Division I Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports at Least Once/Month

Men's Sports Div. I only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Baseball	8.2%	9.5%	9.3%
Basketball	6.1%	4.5%	5.9%
Football	5.4%	6.0%	4.6%
Golf	14.4%	20.5%	21.3%
Ice Hockey	9.2%	4.2%	7.8%
Lacrosse	9.7%	5.6%	4.3%
Soccer	6.5%	6.9%	7.0%
Swimming	4.1%	3.4%	3.0%
Tennis	9.9%	6.7%	3.4%
Track / XC	4.6%	5.3%	3.1%
Wrestling	8.5%	6.4%	2.7%

Women's Sports Div. I only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Basketball	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%
Field Hockey	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Golf	0.7%	1.7%	2.1%
Gymnastics	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lacrosse	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Softball	0.3%	1.1%	1.1%
Soccer	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%
Swimming	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%
Tennis	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%
Track / XC	1.3%	0.7%	0.2%
Volleyball	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%

Percentage of Division II Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports at Least Once/Month

Men's Sports Div. II only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Baseball	8.5%	9.4%	8.4%
Basketball	6.9%	9.9%	6.3%
Football	9.0%	10.0%	10.1%
Golf	14.4%	16.7%	19.0%
Ice Hockey	--	--	--
Lacrosse	3.9%	8.8%	6.9%
Soccer	13.6%	10.0%	8.2%
Swimming	7.4%	6.3%	6.4%
Tennis	5.9%	6.2%	10.2%
Track / XC	4.6%	5.6%	2.8%
Wrestling	10.0%	7.8%	4.4%

Women's Sports Div. II only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Basketball	0.6%	1.1%	0.8%
Field Hockey	--	1.7%	0.0%
Golf	--	0.0%	1.0%
Gymnastics	--	--	--
Lacrosse	--	--	2.1%
Softball	3.2%	0.6%	0.3%
Soccer	1.9%	0.9%	0.6%
Swimming	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%
Tennis	3.5%	2.3%	0.0%
Track / XC	1.2%	0.0%	0.3%
Volleyball	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%

Note: Within-sport percentages not shown or combined with other divisions if n < 50.

Percentage of Division III Student-Athletes Reporting That They Wager on Sports at Least Once/Month

Men's Sports Div. III only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Baseball	18.8%	18.1%	10.5%
Basketball	14.4%	14.0%	11.5%
Football	11.8%	11.7%	11.3%
Golf	13.9%	20.8%	20.1%
Ice Hockey	14.2%	9.9%	9.8%
Lacrosse	18.5%	12.6%	5.8%
Soccer	11.9%	12.8%	11.8%
Swimming	6.8%	4.6%	3.2%
Tennis	9.2%	10.6%	10.0%
Track / XC	5.3%	5.5%	7.1%
Wrestling	18.3%	5.1%	10.7%

Women's Sports Div. III only	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Basketball	2.4%	1.9%	1.4%
Field Hockey	1.3%	0.0%	0.5%
Golf	--	1.8%	0.9%
Gymnastics	--	--	--
Lacrosse	3.6%	0.5%	0.9%
Softball	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%
Soccer	2.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Swimming	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%
Tennis	2.4%	0.0%	1.2%
Track / XC	0.5%	0.7%	0.2%
Volleyball	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%

Note: Within-sport percentages not shown or combined with other divisions if n < 50.

Wagering Behaviors among Men's Golf Student-Athletes

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

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

Wagering Targets of Student-Athletes who Reported Sports Wagering in Past 12 Months

	2008 Study		2012 Study	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Pro Sports				
NFL	69.2%	59.4%	60.1%	57.7%
NBA	31.0%	20.0%	30.3%	21.2%
MLB	29.0%	20.3%	21.1%	12.7%
Auto Racing	7.5%	5.2%	(↓)	(↓)
Other pro	30.1%	14.5%	23.7%	12.3%
College Sports				
Football	48.4%	27.8%	37.5%	19.2%
Basketball (season)	37.5%	19.4%	29.1%	17.9%
Basketball (tourney)	62.6%	41.6%	53.1%	37.5%
Other college	19.1%	11.1%	10.7%	8.6%
HS or Youth Sports	--	--	6.7%	3.0%

Note: Auto racing not asked separately in 2012; included in "Other pro"

Gambling Severity (DSM Classification)

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

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

Results:

Genesis and Gambling
Companions

Genesis of Gambling Behaviors

- In the 2012 study, male student-athletes generally reported starting gambling earlier than females. Also, student-athletes in the 2012 cohort started gambling earlier on average than those in the 2008 cohort:

First Time Gambled for Money	2008 Study (Male Female)		2012 Study (Male Female)	
Before HS	25.5%	13.5%	32.9%	17.8%
HS	66.3%	63.0%	59.1%	57.3%
College	8.2%	23.5%	8.0%	24.8%

- The most typical entry point for male student-athletes is (1) card playing for money, (2) sports wagering or (3) games of personal skill. They are most likely to gamble with teammates or friends.
- Female student-athletes did not show a common entry point. The most frequent first gambling experiences were (1) cards, (2) lottery tickets, (3) slots or (4) sports. They are much more likely to gamble with a significant other or family members than with teammates.

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

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

First Gambling Experience among Student-Athletes who have Ever Gambled

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

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

Results:

Money for Gambling

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

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

“How Much Total Financial Debt (Student Loans, Personal Loans, Credit Card Debt) Are You Personally Currently Responsible for Paying Back?”

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

Results:

Gambling in the Digital Age

Methods Used for Placing Sports Bets

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

Notes:

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

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

Participation in Fantasy Sports

Males	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Participated in <u>free</u> fantasy league	37.6%	50.0%	50.7%
Participated in fantasy league with <u>entry fee and prize money</u>	15.5%	17.0%	18.7%
Consider participation in a fantasy league with and entry fee and a prize to be gambling?	--	34.3%	19.9%

Females	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Participated in <u>free</u> fantasy league	5.5%	8.4%	8.4%
Participated in fantasy league with <u>entry fee and prize money</u>	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%
Consider participation in a fantasy league with and entry fee and a prize to be gambling?	--	37.6%	17.7%

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

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

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

	2012 Study
Males	28.1%
Females	10.2%

Results:

Behavior Related to Contest
Fairness

Notes on Analysis of Low-Baserate Behaviors

- The study authors stress that the items described in this section, which ask student-athletes directly about contest fairness, be judged within a rigorous statistical context due to the difficulty in obtaining statistically reliable results from questions of this nature. In our judgment, factors that could lead to imprecise national estimates appear to push in both directions:
 - Content/phrasing of these questions may invite insincere response;
 - Despite lengths taken to ensure participant anonymity, persons engaging in illegal or eligibility-jeopardizing activity may still perceive an extreme risk in honestly answering certain questions.
- Any population estimate for a question with an extremely low baserate (e.g., only one to two percent of student-athletes endorsing) can easily be incorrect by a large relative margin due to the factors described above or to other research/statistical confounds.
- Determining whether a rate is truly different from zero (or some other meaningful baseline) or whether a change in the rate has occurred should be assessed using appropriate tests of statistical significance.

Notes on Analysis of Low-Baserate Behaviors

- The following tables show endorsement of behaviors related to contest fairness among student-athletes in Division I men's basketball and football. As a comparison, similar self-report rates are shown for all other males in aggregate (all males in Divisions I, II and III outside of Division I men's basketball and football).
- Examination of rates for Division I men's basketball and football in comparison to such a baseline group may tell a more meaningful story than evaluating whether the rates are statistically different than zero.
- Comparison with this baseline group of males highlights two issues: (a) given changes in the betting landscape (e.g., existence of betting lines in sports outside of Division I football and men's basketball), it is possible that movement on these items for this comparison group could be meaningful; (b) even employing extensive methodologies for identifying insincere responses on these items, a certain percentage of college males will indicate their contests are unfair even when it is clear that is unlikely (e.g., a Division III cross country runner is likely not being asked to change the outcome of a contest).

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

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

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

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

Have you ever posted information during the season on a social media website (e.g., Facebook or Twitter) about how you or your teammates are feeling, how the team is looking in practice or how you are preparing for an upcoming game?

2012 Study	Males	Females
Division I	8.0%	15.4%
Division II	9.7%	17.9%
Division III	11.6%	14.1%

Note: 7.8% in Division I men's basketball, 5.5% in Division I football, 14.2% in Division I women's basketball.

Have you ever been told by a coach not to post certain information about you or your team on a social media site?

2012 Study	Males	Females
Division I	17.4%	23.4%
Division II	10.4%	18.3%
Division III	12.7%	13.6%

Note: 19.3% in Division I men's basketball, 17.9% in Division I football, 29.3% in Division I women's basketball.

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players Reporting Having Been Asked to Influence the Outcome of a Game

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	2.4%	1.6%	2.1%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	2.3%	1.2%	1.2%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players Reporting Having Bet on Their Own Team

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	2.7%	2.0%	0.8%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	2.9%	2.2%	1.3%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	1.7%	2.2%	2.2%

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players Reporting Having Bet on Another Team at Their School

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	1.8%	1.4%	1.5%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	4.9%	3.4%	2.6%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	4.1%	2.6%	2.3%

Percentage of Division I Men's Basketball and Football Players
Reporting Having Known of a Teammate
who was a Student Bookie

	2004 Study	2008 Study	2012 Study
Division I Men's Basketball	1.8%	0.6%	0.3%
Division I Football (FBS or FCS)	1.3%	0.8%	0.6%
Percentage of all males outside MBB1 and MFB1 endorsing (all divisions)	3.0%	1.5%	1.4%

Additional 2012 Findings

- About 1% of survey participants said they are aware of coaches or other college employees who wager on sports.
- Roughly 5% of all males and 1% of females know a bookmaker.
- Just under 1.5% of males say that they have had a teammate who was a bookmaker (much smaller figure in Division I MBB and MFB).

Additional 2012 Findings

- Men's golfers stand apart on a number of these items:
 - 7% of Division I men's golfers say they have bet on their own team
 - 10% have bet on another team at their school
 - 24% have bet on teams at other colleges
 - 2% have been harmed/threatened because of gambling
 - 3% know of a coach who gambles on college sports
 - 3% know of other college employees who wager on sports
 - 13% know a bookie.

Results:

Education / Prevention

Have you received information on the NCAA rules concerning gambling?

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

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Study	Males	Females
Most athletes in college violate NCAA rules that prohibit sports wagering	67%	64%
Sports wagering is acceptable so long as you wager on a sport other than the one in which you participate	57%	44%
College coaches see sports wagering as acceptable so long as you don't bet on your own games	38%	23%
Student-athletes and coaches take NCAA rules about sports wagering seriously	64%	67%
I think sports wagering is a harmless pastime	70%	69%
People can consistently make a lot of money gambling	59%	52%

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

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

2012 Study	Males	Females
Most athletes in college violate NCAA rules that prohibit sports wagering	61%	44%
Sports wagering is acceptable so long as you wager on a sport other than the one in which you participate	56%	45%
College coaches see sports wagering as acceptable so long as you don't bet on your own games	43%	36%
Student-athletes and coaches take NCAA rules about sports wagering seriously	61%	76%
I think sports wagering is a harmless pastime	66%	57%
People can consistently make a lot of money gambling	60%	57%

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

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

2012 Study	Males	Females
Most athletes in college violate NCAA rules that prohibit sports wagering	55%	44%
Sports wagering is acceptable so long as you wager on a sport other than the one in which you participate	57%	38%
College coaches see sports wagering as acceptable so long as you don't bet on your own games	42%	23%
Student-athletes and coaches take NCAA rules about sports wagering seriously	61%	66%
I think sports wagering is a harmless pastime	67%	54%
People can consistently make a lot of money gambling	58%	44%

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

Questions?

Media Inquiries:

Emily Potter, NCAA

epotter@ncaa.org

Gambling Resources:

Mark Strothkamp, NCAA

mstrothkamp@ncaa.org

Research Study:

Tom Paskus, NCAA

tpaskus@ncaa.org

