The relationship between gambling advertising and gambling attitudes, intentions, and behaviours: a critical and meta-analytic review
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Abstract

Gambling advertising has become ubiquitous in westernised countries in the last two decades, yet there is little understanding of the relationship between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling attitudes, intentions and behaviour. We conduct a critical and meta-analytic review of the past two decades of empirical research. The research suggests a positive association between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes, intentions, and behaviour. The association is greatest for gambling behaviour. There is some evidence for a dose-response relationship. The quality and breadth of research on gambling advertising is weaker than comparable areas (e.g., alcohol, tobacco), with an absence of longitudinal and experimental studies. Gaps in, and methodological problems with, the field are discussed, and research directions recommended.
**Introduction**

Gambling is one of the world’s largest industries, generating over US$500 billion in revenue per year (1). The gambling industry has grown substantially in the past two decades due in part to technological advances (2). Because of its significant social, mental health, and economic costs, gambling has become a serious public health issue, and of concern to peak bodies such as the World Health Organisation (3).

Along with availability and pricing, restrictions on advertising has been identified as one of the most cost-effective measures for reducing harms from products such as alcohol and tobacco (4), and might also be effective for gambling. Restrictions of alcohol and tobacco advertising have been introduced in many countries on the back of reviews of the evidence showing an association between exposure to alcohol and tobacco advertising and greater consumption (5-7). However, effective regulations have yet to be developed for gambling advertising, and this appears in large part because of a lack of understanding of the relationship between gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes, intentions, and behaviour (8, 9). Instead, gambling industry expenditure on advertising is increasing, and remains largely free from effective regulation (10). The aim of this review is to examine the evidence on the relationship between gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes, intentions, and behaviours.

**The effect of gambling advertising: an understudied field**

That greater exposure to advertising of addictive products is associated with more positive attitudes, use initiation and more problematic use, is established (5, 6, 11, 12). For example, a systematic review of longitudinal research found that exposure to alcohol advertising was associated with greater drinking intentions, earlier initiation of drinking, and more problematic drinking (5). Similar relationships have been observed for tobacco (7). Despite comparable potential for harm, the effect of gambling advertising has historically
been understudied compared to other areas of addiction, restricted by regulatory requirements (13), and potentially compromised by vested interests (e.g., industry funded studies; 14). The historical lack of research on gambling advertising means that policy makers, advocates, researchers, and intervention designs are poorly informed (15). This review seeks to address this gap by establishing the relationship between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes, intentions, and behaviour.

**Methodology**

Following PRISMA guidelines (Figure 1), a literature search for studies published since 1999 (completed 20 July 2019) examining the effect of, or relationship between gambling advertising and attitudes, intentions, and behaviour was conducted using research databases (i.e., ISI Web of Knowledge, PsychInfo, PubMed, Scopus) and Google Scholar. Searches used Boolean operators to identify all papers and used combinations of the terms gambl* bet* casino* lott* promot* advert* market* intent* expect* behav* activit* spons* attitud* belie*. The lack of empirical research necessitated an inclusive approach to the review. We included research that did not report a statistical relationship (i.e., qualitative research) between gambling advertising and gambling outcomes, but which provided insights for the field. We also did not use a strict definition for what constituted gambling attitudes, intentions, or expectancies, but instead included any papers that described their outcomes as such. Papers were deemed eligible for inclusion (and further screening) if they were in English, published after 1999, and fit a combination of advertising keywords and outcome keywords. Reference lists of gambling advertising publications were examined for additional research sources. Experts were also contacted to identify additional work. The search strategies yielded N=255 results. Physical inspection of abstracts and results to ensure the studies were empirical in nature, not review articles, established associations between gambling advertising/marketing and attitudes, intentions and behaviour, resulted in the
exclusion of N=229 papers. A total 28 studies were identified and reviewed (Table 1). After examining the full text, we excluded one qualitative study conducted in young children (6-year olds) because of queries regarding cognitive capacity to recall gambling advertising (16). We describe the reported statistical and non-statistical relationships (qualitative) in text. Raw effect sizes for each study are reported in Table 1. Meta-analyses were conducted for studies where sufficient statistical information was provided, and effect sizes and confidence intervals calculated for attitudes, intentions, and behaviour (see Figures 2, 3, 4, respectively). In each case we converted available effect sizes to r’s and submitted these values to a random-effects analysis using MAVIS (an R statistical tool). A sufficient number of studies were identified to allow for tests of publication bias for gambling behaviour research. There was no statistical indication of publication bias in research on gambling intentions and advertising studies (funnel plot asymmetry, t(5)=1.46, p=.20), although the publication bias estimate should be treated with caution due to the smaller number of studies. There was no statistical indication of publication bias in gambling advertising and behaviour studies (funnel plot asymmetry, t(13)=1.11, p=.29).

**Gambling advertising and gambling attitudes**

Eleven studies have examined the link between gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes (see Table 1; 17-27). Attitude assessment included measures of affect, favourability, and interest. Five studies adopted quantitative methods, four reported significant associations between exposure to gambling advertising and more positive gambling-related attitudes. Only two studies correctly reported statistics to allow estimates of overall effect size. Effect sizes ranged from r=.12 to r=.62; Mean r=.40). Five qualitative studies reported a link between gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes. For example, in qualitative work Thomas and colleagues (25) found that participants perceived gambling advertising to be saturating, normalised gambling, and that advertising seeking to
incentivise gambling (betting promotions) was effective in influencing gambling-related attitudes.

There was some evidence for a dose-response relationship between gambling advertising and attitudes similar to that observed for alcohol marketing (5, 28, 29), although this is primarily based on retrospective self-report. Cross-sectional work in the United States (US; N=229) found that greater self-reported exposure to gambling advertisements was related to more positive gambling attitudes (22). Cross-sectional research from Australia found that exposure to gambling sponsorship of sporting events was related to favourable attitudes toward gambling (18). Research with adolescents (N=1,195) also suggests that exposure to lottery advertisements increases adolescents’ perceptions of success and likelihood of large cash prizes (30). A large Canadian survey of adolescents (N=1,147), found that gambling-related advertising is more likely to influence established gamblers and problem gamblers’ attitudes by prompting gambling. Counter-intuitively, participants did not believe that advertising would create new gamblers (17).

Gambling advertising appears to influence gambling attitudes by normalising and/or glamorising gambling (31). For example, research from Europe and Australia suggests that valued forms of entertainment, especially sport, are used to normalise betting and create positive attitudes toward gambling by seeing gambling as an interactive part of sport participation/viewing (25, 32-34). In other countries (e.g., Canada) advertisements function to normalise and romanticize lottery ticket purchases (34). However, whether lottery advertisements are successful in changing attitudes remains unclear (35-37).

Gambling advertising and gambling intentions

Only eight studies have examined the link between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling-related intentions or expectancies (see Table 1; 18-20, 22, 38, 39-41). Most
studies assessed intentions in a rudimentary manner by asking participants if they were going to engage in gambling behaviour, and/or within a set time period. All except three studies were cross-sectional (quantitative), and all studies except two (38, 40) reported an overall positive association between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling intentions. Only five reported sufficient statistics details to allow effect size calculations (effects sizes ranged from $r=.00$ to $r=.20$, Mean $r=.05$). This small (but significant) effect size suggests there is a link, although caution is warranted here as there are very few studies included in this calculation. Consistent with the findings on gambling attitudes, three studies found that participants who reported watching sports programs containing large amounts of gambling advertisements expressed greater intentions to gamble (18, 20). Notably, this work also suggests a dose-response relationship whereby higher self-reported exposure was related to greater intentions to gamble, particularly in riskier gamblers. Gambling intentions were also associated with gambling attitudes (18, 20).

Two studies used ecological momentary assessment techniques to reduce problems with recall (40,41), and both found that receipt of direct messaging (e.g., email and text prompts and promotions) was associated with greater gambling intent. And although there were no experimental studies on gambling advertising, one large population study in Hong Kong (N=4,208) found that gambling intentions were not changed (but gambling behaviour increased, see below) following a large increase in gambling advertising due to the removal of gambling marketing restrictions in neighbouring Macau (38). Similarly experiments with alcohol advertising suggest that young people’s exposure increases intentions to buy and consume alcohol (42, 43). It is reasonable to expect that gambling advertisements would increase gambling intentions in a similar fashion.
Gambling advertising and gambling behaviour

Our review found 23 studies examining relationships between gambling advertising and gambling behaviour (12, 17-21, 26, 36, 38, 40, 41, 44-55), with 14 studies using cross-sectional methods to assess the relationship. One study sought to conduct a longitudinal analysis of EMA data collected across one week in regular gamblers (41), with one experimental study and three quasi-experimental studies (i.e., naturalistic studies). Overall, 16 studies assessed the relationship between gambling advertising and gambling behaviours generally, and five studies examined the relationship with problem gambling exclusively. Because problem gambling measures also included measures of gambling frequency (a potential confound), and the overall number of studies is small, we simply treated these studies as having evidence for a gambling behaviour. All but one study suggested a statistically significant link between advertising and gambling behaviours (effects sizes ranged from $r=-.08$ to $r=.68$, Mean $r=.24$). Five studies used qualitative methods to assess gambling advertising impact on behaviour. For example, a Norwegian study (N=25) presented gambling advertising to gamblers and asked whether they felt the advert would affect their gambling (36). Approximately half of these gamblers indicated that the advertising would increase their gambling behaviour.

Quantitative cross-sectional research in Norwegian (N=6,034; 47), Australian (N=544; 48), and US samples (N=1,813; 50) show that greater exposure to gambling advertising (both self-report and proxy measures) is associated with gambling or problem gambling behaviour. US research analysing the link between gambling advertising expenditure and lottery scratch card revenue (sales) shows a dose-response relationship between the two whereby greater advertising expenditure is associated with greater purchasing of scratch cards (49, 51). Notably, a study involving three US states found that for each 1% increase in advertising expenditure there was a 0.1-0.24% increase in revenue due to
increased gambling (53). Novel work from Norway (N=1,293) examining the effect of a ban of electronic gambling machines (EMG’s), which because of their attractive built-in lighting and sound functions as advertising, found a drop-off in all gambling behaviour following the government ban on EMG’s (12). While it is possible that this reduction in gambling behaviour was due to a loss of accessibility to a familiar gambling method, the ban did not cover other forms of gambling which were normally located in the same place (i.e., supermarkets), which likely means the loss of EGMs lighting and built in advertising acted a loss in advertising, rather than just a loss of access. Furthermore, both studies using ecological momentary assessment (one using a longitudinal analysis; 41) found an association between advertising exposure, gambling frequency, and gambling expenditure (40,41).

Ultimately, the goal of gambling advertisements is to increase gambling behaviour frequency and/or expenditure amongst established gamblers, and develop new gamblers (32,33,56). Overall, the research suggests a significant positive relationship between exposure to gambling advertising and gambling-related behaviour. Effects vary, but suggest greater exposure equals more gambling.

Conclusions

Despite decades of research detailing the increasing harm caused by gambling (3) and the rapid increase in gambling advertising (8, 9), there has been a paucity of quality research, particularly longitudinal and experimental research, examining the relationship between gambling advertising and gambling-related attitudes, intentions and behaviour. .. Almost half the studies were qualitative, making it harder to apply the results to the research question. Quantitative studies on attitudes and intentions were rare, and even when they were available, many studies did not explain their measurement methods in enough detail nor provide enough statistics for measures of effect size. The research was also diverse, as some chose purely to
focus on problem gamblers, or certain types of gambling, or on a particular form of gambling advertising in certain areas. This lack of high-quality research has hampered previous reviews and policy makers. Even with these limitations, this research review of the past two decades, using available evidence shows that exposure to gambling-related advertising is likely associated with more positive gambling related-attitudes, greater gambling intentions, and increases in gambling and problem gambling behaviour.

The pattern of results is consistent with those found in the fields of alcohol and tobacco (5-7), however, the research on gambling advertising is considerably less developed than for alcohol and tobacco. In particular, there is an absence of longitudinal and experimental studies. The most convincing research on the association between advertising and attitudes, intentions and behaviour, comes from the large naturalistic quasi-experimental studies where due to government interventions gambling advertising is either banned, permitted, or increased (12, 38, 53). This work shows a dose-response relationship between advertising and behaviour, suggesting increases in advertising leads to increases in behaviours. As with research in alcohol and tobacco advertising, cross-sectional studies show that people reporting more exposure to gambling advertising were more likely to report positive gambling attitudes, intentions, and being gamblers. Although there are challenges in conducting largescale longitudinal studies in representative population samples, the absence of such research is hampering policy makers and advocates from developing effective policies and regulations regarding gambling advertising.

Gambling advertising research needs to address a number of significant design and measurement issues. Notably, poor methodological and statistical reporting is common. There is little justification and psychometric support for the choice of measures of exposure, attitudes, intentions, and indeed gambling behaviour. For example, one study (39) used different Likert scales to assess attitudes to promotion of gambling during televised sport, but
also used a scale developed in marketing to measure attitude to gambling sponsors of televised sport. Furthermore, links between measures of intention and behaviour have already been questioned in psychological research (57, 58), suggesting validity issues for measuring intent as a predictor of gambling behaviour. Accordingly, there is little consistency in measurement across studies, potentially compromising the integrity of the meta-analytic component of this study as it is unknown how much these measurement methods show convergent validity.

Lack of comprehensive analytical and statistical information and reporting makes assessment of the quality of evidence difficult, and undermines the credibility of the field. Sample selection and study designs utilised in the field (largely cross-sectional), mean that reverse causation cannot be ruled out. Sample selection needs to be better to avoid bias as it is known that the gambling industry advertises in areas, and to populations, where gambling is already common and problematic (e.g., young men, those with poor impulse control, low socioeconomic status areas; 59). Although experimental designs are impractical because of the ubiquitous nature of gambling advertising, longitudinal studies in young populations who may be less exposed can overcome inherent problems with establishing causal inferences (5). Direct measurements of gambling activity after observing gambling advertisements are more likely to be a valid measure of their impact. For example, a study could track gambling advertising in mobile phones compared to the installing and use of gambling applications, which appear to be a significant form of gambling (60).

Use of standardised definitions and measurement of advertising exposure and gambling behaviours would lead to better understanding of the causal mechanisms involved. For example, most studies developed their own definitions and measures to assess the impact of diverse forms of advertising against varying definitions of gambling attitudes, intentions, and behaviour. Notably, the studies on behaviour often use scales on problem gambling to
assess gambling, masking potential associations between gambling advertising and a broader range of gambling behaviours.

Overall, the breadth and quality of research in this area needs to be improved. Governments and non-gambling funded bodies need to invest in quality research on the effect of gambling advertising. In the absence of government funding for research in this area, it is possible that the gambling industry funded research, as found with the tobacco and alcohol industry, could result in a biased and/or unreliable evidence base (61-63). Although our research did not find evidence of publication bias in behaviour links to gambling advertising, it is worth remembering that much of the research examined in this review used problem gamblers as the sample of interest, which in turn, pathologizes the issue rather than discuss social harm. Therefore, industry funded studies may have an actual incentive to report a relationship in these studies, while divesting or downplaying any studies that use the general population. This may mask findings which are unfavourable to the gambling industry, while also showing no publication bias. To conduct these studies, public funding is required. Governments at state and/or federal/national levels gather considerable revenue from gambling, and disproportionately from those most at risk of being problem gamblers. Accordingly, it is their responsibility that they need to ensure that the societal harms associated with gambling are minimised by supporting research that can inform best practice for reducing gambling harms.

Gambling is a growing problem for most western societies (8), and the gambling industry’s profit motive means that they now spend record amounts on gambling advertising (10). The past two decades of research suggests that the gambling industries investment in advertising is effective. The more people are exposed to gambling advertising, the more likely they are to become gamblers and problem gamblers. In the absence of effective government regulation, gambling advertising is likely to increase and be more influential, and
lead to greater societal harm. Within this climate it is important that more and higher quality research on this issue is conducted in order to inform regulations and interventions that can reduce gambling harms.
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Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, are highlighted as:

- Of special interest

- Pitt et al show that even children are exposed to and have their attitudes influenced by gambling advertisements. The children saw gambling as fun and learnt how to bet from the advertising.
- Hing et al presented multiple types of television gambling advertisements to examine how different appeals translated into "likely" betting behaviour in an experimental design. Although this study had no control group, it did suggest that certain types of advertisements are more likely to convert attention into gambling behaviour.


- Binde and Romild report findings from a large Swedish longitudinal study, finding that a sense of being influenced by gambling advertising is linked to problem gambling. This study suggests that being aware of gambling advertisements and feeling their influence has an impact, but cannot directly demonstrate a link between gambling advertising and behaviour due to the measure used.


- Clemens et al showed that in a sample of 4,617 adolescents and young adults, gambling advertising linked to self-reported gambling behaviour. This study is notable because it used masked advertising to assess past exposure rather than direct self-report, and established a link in a large sample.


Russell et al investigated exposure to embedded advertising in sports and gambling behaviour. This study is notable because it had two predictors: self-report of watching sport (which had embedded advertising) and self-reported advertising exposure; the latter showed a negative link to behaviour, while the former showed a positive link.

This short study by Yazdi et al shows that online gamblers are more likely to show problem gambling than offline gamblers. This paper is notable as the ubiquity and expansion of online gambling advertising is likely to significantly impact gambling behaviour more than offline gambling.

This study by Yazdi et al shows that online gamblers are more likely to show problem gambling than offline gamblers. This paper is notable as the ubiquity and expansion of online gambling advertising is likely to significantly impact gambling behaviour more than offline gambling.

Stone HW. An analysis of selected determinants of Texas Lottery revenue. Texas: Southwest Texas University; 2000.


Table 1. Summary of studies reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>N’s</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Independent variables (IVs)</th>
<th>Outcome variables* (DV’s)</th>
<th>Relationship found</th>
<th>Recall of adverts</th>
<th>Self-report for outcome</th>
<th>Raw measures reported for effect size</th>
<th>Attitude link and average effect size</th>
<th>Intent link and average effect size</th>
<th>Behaviour link and average effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Hing, Russell, Thomas, Jenkinson (2019) (40)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Regular gamblers (18+ years)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional (repeated measure/ecological momentary assessments)</td>
<td>advertising observed (recall- but immediate through ecological assessment)</td>
<td>Intent AND Problem Gambling AND Gambling Behaviour (actual betting, amount spent- split on race vs sport bet)</td>
<td>Yes and no; exposure to advertising associated with higher betting and spend, but not with intentions (with some exceptions of direct advertising)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: gambling exposure DV for race betting, all odd ratios: intent:1.00 Behav (actual spend): 1.24 DV for race betting, all odds ratio: intent:1.03 Behav (actual spend): 1.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes and No: Sports betting r=.01, Race betting r=.00</td>
<td>Yes; sports betting r=.06, race betting .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens, Hanewinkel, &amp; Morgenstern, (2017) (43)</td>
<td>4617</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Adolescent s and young adults 13-25 years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Presented masked advertising</td>
<td>Gambling behaviour</td>
<td>Yes, top quartile of exposure had higher gambling rates than lowest</td>
<td>No, Recognition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: correct recall rate DVs and their Ds from ORs, comparing bottom quartile to top quartile of exposure to advertising: Lifetime prev of gambling (.468) 12-month prevalence (.473) Current gambling (called once a week): (.692)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes: r=0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (publisher, year, page)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>Problem Gambling</td>
<td>IV (Advertising exposure)</td>
<td>DV (Involvement in gambling)</td>
<td>Involvement in gambling with IV (beta)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derevensky, Sklar, Gupta, &amp; Messerlian (2010) (17)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Adolescent s and young adults 12-19 years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Attitudes AND Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes, gambling severity much higher amongst those who viewed ad, more positive attitudes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: exposure to ads (continuous) DV (Correlations coefficients reported): with problem gambling severity TV: .166 Radio: .096 Billboard: .125 Newspaper: .160 Magazine: .212 Spam email: .144 Store ads: .145 Internet popups: .028 (not used for average effect calculation, as authors identified issues with IV).</td>
<td>Yes; indirect as self-report of link by gamblers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanss, Mentzoni, Griffiths, &amp; Pallesen (2015) (47)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes, those who reported seeing gambling advertising more reported that advertising increased their</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: advertising exposure (all types) DV (as betas): Involvement in gambling (B=.13) Problem gambling 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; r=0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Lamont, Vitaras, &amp; Fink (2015) (20)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Self-report of watching show with embedded advertising</td>
<td>Attitude AND Intent AND Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes, main finding that intent to bet is higher in those who saw ads. Problem gamblers (i.e., higher frequency gamblers) have positive attitudes towards gambling</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: exposure to show with advertising DV: as Betas Gambling intention: $B=.107$</td>
<td>Yes: indirect. self-report of link by gamblers</td>
<td>Yes: r=0.03</td>
<td>Yes: indirect. self-report of link by gamblers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Vitartas, &amp; Lamont (2013)</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall, aided and unaided)</td>
<td>Attitude AND Intent AND Gambling Behaviour</td>
<td>Yes, main finding is those who gamble also have significantly higher exposure to advertising, and have better attitudes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Vitartas, &amp; Lamont (2014)</td>
<td>Reanalysis of combined Adult and Adolescent studies/samples</td>
<td>Cross-sectional and cross-sectional qualitative</td>
<td>Varied: some mock advertising, some advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Intent AND Gambling Behaviour</td>
<td>Somewhat: self-report suggests no effect of advertising in recall, but presenting mock ads increases intent. Self-report of ad exposure higher amongst problem gamblers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Lamont, Vitartas, &amp; Fink (2015) (48)</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults sports betters 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Self-report of watching show with embedded advertising</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes and no: respondents claimed no effect, but problem gamblers (as defined by frequency of gambling) self-reported impacted frequency and increased their problem</td>
<td>Yes and No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: Did exposure to ads increase the frequency of sports betting? Single question DV: means and SDs provided for different groups; compared “problem gamblers” (N=120, M=3.5, SD=.09) to “non-problem” (N=273, M=2.6, SD=1.1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes: =0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Vitartas, Lamont &amp; Fink (2014) (39)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adolescent s 12-17 year</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Self-report of watching show with embedded advertising</td>
<td>Attitude AND Intent</td>
<td>Yes and no, intent linked to advertising, but no link between attitudes (indirect). Multivariate relationship also insignificant for both attitude and intent as linked to advertising</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: exposure to gambling promotions DV: Correlations reported. Intention to bet during sport r= .20, N=131</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes: r=0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Amount Spent on Advertising</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour</td>
<td>Attitude AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>IV: Exposure to Gambling Promotion</td>
<td>DV: Category of Gambler</td>
<td>Chi Square DF N=977</td>
<td>Correlation r=.12</td>
<td>IV: Exposure to Gambling Promotion</td>
<td>Corelation r=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korn, Reynolds &amp; Hurson (2005) (21)</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Adolescents 13-17 years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional and cross sectional qualitative</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Yes, those who recalled ads more likely to have gambling problem, qualitative component on attitudes linked to advertising</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: exposure to gambling promotion (various types)</td>
<td>DV: category of gambler (non (N=174), social (623), at risk(19), problem(61)). Chi square DF 3, overall N=977 TV casinos lotteries, proline: $\chi^2=14.942$ Newspapers: $\chi^2=10.593$ Mags: $\chi^2=11.936$ Subway: $\chi^2=6.927$ TV for poker only: $\chi^2=31.31$</td>
<td>Yes; r=0.62</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative component suggests link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Lemanski, &amp; Jun (2008) (22)</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mean age reported 20.5 years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, multi-year</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Yes, but advertising affects intent through attitude change toward ads.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$\gamma = .77$ between ad exposure and attitude, $B=.27$ between ad attitude and intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munoz (2009) (49)</td>
<td>State USA</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, multi-year</td>
<td>Amount spent by state on advertising on scratch</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour (sales of scratch tickets)</td>
<td>Yes, amount spent by state on advertising has direct return on investment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Provided correlation between scratch ad expenditure and scratch revenue: 0.38 Also provided correlation on lotto ad expend and</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; r=0.18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Hing, Browne, Li, &amp; Vitartas (2019) (50)</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Self-report of watching show with embedded advertising, Availability of micro-betting</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes and no; exposure to sports positively correlates with micro-betting, but self-reported ad exposure negatively correlates with betting</td>
<td>Yes and No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: Frequency of exposure to gambling ads OR Watching sport DV: number of times micro betting Odds ratio (0.742- Frequency of exposure to gambling ads AND Watching sport OR- 2.408)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes for direct exposure to sport ($r$=0.48) no for recalled advertising ($r$=–0.16). Average is No; $r$=–0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Amount spent by state on advertising</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour (sales)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, multi-year</td>
<td>IV: Ad expenditure</td>
<td>DV: Correlation on lottery sales</td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>r=0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (2000) (51)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Yes, lottery advertising expenditure correlates strongly with revenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazdi &amp; Katzian (2017) (52)</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Adolescent s and adults 16+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Yes, online has more problem gambling. However, authors do not state directly that online=greater advertising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>r=0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainsbury, King, Russell, Delfabbro, Derevensky, &amp; Hing (2016) (46)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults gamblers 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Yes, problem gamblers see more gambling advertising than non-problem gamblers on social media. Those at risk also more likely to report being influenced.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>r=0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binde &amp; Romild (2019) (44)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Yes and no; self-report suggests that amongst those who say gambling advertising is influential, the more problem gambling they have. However, overall low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>广告影响</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binde (2009) (36)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years with problems</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>Presented actual ads</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour</td>
<td>Yes, about 75% suggested some impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Cherney, Blaszczynski, Gainsbury &amp; Lubman (2014) (54)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Yes, felt that exposure to advertising increased problem behaviour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont, Hing, &amp; Vitartas (2016) (23)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18+ years Sport watchers</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>Presented actual adverts</td>
<td>Attitude (feelings)</td>
<td>Yes, generally positive reactions such as joy and arousal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt, Thomas, Bestman., Daube, &amp; Derevensky (2017) (24)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Children 8-16 years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Yes, children learnt content, understood how to make a bet, and how exciting ad was</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Lewis, McLeod &amp; Haycock (2012) (25)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>Advertising observed (recall)</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Yes, generally positive (describing mutually beneficial, fitting masculinity), but some groups (especially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age/Population</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Location/Advertising</td>
<td>Response Methods</td>
<td>Length of Study</td>
<td>Behaviour/Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Tse, Abbott, Townsend, Kingi, &amp; Manaia (2006)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, qualitative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Yes, over 75% of participants stated that advertising attracted them, and some participants suggested that it influenced their behaviour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes; N/A; qualitative</td>
<td>Yes; qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing, Vitartas, &amp; Lamont (2017)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Adult gamblers 18+ years</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>Yes, presenting “typical” advertisement increased behaviour more than “neutral” in most gamblers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Somewhat; asked “would you bet right now”</td>
<td>Provided “importance” of appeals compared to gambling type. Not possible to compare directly, and therefore no effect size.</td>
<td>Yes; N/A; not possible to convert to R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Wong Sau-kuen, &amp; Man-chun (2012)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Adolescent/adults 16+ years</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4208</td>
<td>Yes and no, expenditure tripled, while increase of 10.8 to 13.2% of gambling in past year. Intent did not increase.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.4% increase in gambling after two years</td>
<td>N/A; No; Yes; not possible to convert to R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Ban on EGMs</td>
<td>Gambling Behaviour AND Problem Gambling</td>
<td>Problem Gambling Behaviour Drop</td>
<td>Problem Gambling Behaviour, chasing Drop</td>
<td>Odds Ratios (OR) for Gambling Behaviour</td>
<td>Advertising (revenue) Relatedness</td>
<td>Advertising (revenue) Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; r=0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (2009) (12)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.2% to 0.3%</td>
<td>3.5% to 1.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; r=0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang (2004) (51)</td>
<td>Three states USA</td>
<td>Adults 18+ years</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.1% to 0.24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes; not possible to convert to R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Hing, Browne, &amp; Rawat (2018) (41)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Regular gambling adults (98 sport, 104 race)</td>
<td>Longitudinal (repeated measure/ecological momentary assessments across one week)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes and no; emails increase intent, but not actual behaviour, while text associated with higher intent and betting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV: gambling exposure-email or text. Note different N's for type of bet, and ORs given here for log transformed DV. DV for sports bet: Intent, email: OR=1.62 Intent: text: OR=1.18 Behav, email: OR=1.53 Behav, text: OR=2.58 DV for race bet: N/A</td>
<td>Yes; sports bettors: r=.08, race bettors, r=.05 average between sports and race bettors: r=.07</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes, for sports bettors (race bettors data unavailable): r=.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent, email: OR=1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent: text OR=1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unless otherwise indicated, behaviour refers to frequency of past gambling behaviour*
Figure 2: Coefficients and confidence intervals for relations between gambling advertising and gambling attitudes. Author initials and year of publication for studies are provided alongside coefficients. Figures created using MAVIS (64)
Figure 3: Coefficients and confidence intervals for relations between gambling advertising and gambling intentions. Author initials and year of publication for studies are provided alongside coefficients. Figures created using MAVIS (64)
Figure 4: Coefficients and confidence intervals for relations between gambling advertising and gambling behaviours. Author initials and year of publication for studies are provided alongside coefficients. Figures created using MAVIS (64)