

ROTORUA RESIDENTS GAMBLING SURVEY 2017

PREPARED FOR
ROTORUA LAKES COUNCIL

BY
APR CONSULTANTS

05 April 2017



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 2016, Rotorua Lakes Council (RLC) contracted APR Consultants Ltd (APR) to undertake a survey programme to gauge the opinions of Rotorua residents on gambling in Rotorua, with particular emphasis on Class Four Gambling Machines.

A total of 496 surveys were received from Rotorua residents. These comprised 350 telephone surveys, 100 face to face surveys and 46 online surveys.

Residents gambling habits

Of the 496 respondents, 389 indicated some form of gambling activity over a six month period (78.4% of respondents undertook some form of gambling in a six month period). The most common gambling was entering a NZ raffle such as Lotto (60.7% of respondents). This was followed by entering a competition or purchasing raffle tickets (38.9%) and buying a scratch ticket like Instant Kiwi (30.2%).

Of the 389 respondents who had undertaken some form of gambling, the median number of different types of gambling undertaken over a six month period was two activities, with an average of 2.25 activities. The median frequency of respondents gambling activities was nine times, with the average being 20.8 times. The median amount spent while gambling was \$20 per time, with the average being \$38.03 per time. The median total amount spent over a six month period on all forms of gambling was \$120.00 per person, with the average being \$435.38 per person.

Gambling activity by type of gambling

	Average spend	Rank of usage	Rank of spending
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	\$1,412.81	6	1
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	\$37.88	2	10
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	\$189.73	1	6
Participated in a work bet	\$10.36	5	11
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	\$40.14	3	9
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	\$1,196.00	11	2
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	\$229.92	8	5
Played housie or bingo	\$256.47	9	4
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	\$268.78	4	3
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	\$43.41	9	8
Visited a Casino	\$183.91	7	7

Note: For rankings, 1 is the highest to 11 being the lowest

The table above shows the average spend from the various gambling activities by respondents over the previous six month period. The most money was spent while playing pokie machines despite this only being the sixth most common form of gambling activity (out of the 11 surveyed). Respondents spent on average \$1,412.81 playing pokie machines over a six month period. This was followed by playing at an online casino, which was the least most popular form of gambling identified in this survey but still had an average spend of \$1,196.00 over the six months surveyed.

Type 4 Gambling Machines (pokie machines) frequency of use

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 40 respondents (8.1% of the total sample) indicated that they had played on pokie machines within the previous six month period. From these 40 respondents, the median number of visits was six times in six months with an average of 31.81 visits. The median spend per visit was \$20.00 with the average being \$44.31. The total median spend was \$135.00 per respondent with the average being \$1,412.81 over six months.

Although this was only the sixth most popular form of gambling from the 11 identified in this research, this form had the highest average spend over the six month period sampled.

Problem gamblers

Of all survey respondents, 81 (16.3% of the total sample) indicated that they had been impacted by a problem gambler. The highest frequency of effects were not being able to pay bills, following by affecting relationships, wasting money and losing savings/going bankrupt. All respondents were asked if they felt a need to reduce their current level of gambling. Only 18 respondents (3.6% of the total sample) indicated that they had a need to reduce their levels of gambling.

The current situation with Class 4 Gambling Machines in Rotorua

Respondents were read a summary of the current situation in Rotorua as outlined below and then asked questions relating to it.

The current situation:

- Rotorua currently has 26 gambling venues which can have pokie machines.
- These venues are licenced to contain 389 machines between them.
- \$19.5 million was spent in these machines in the 2014/2015 year within the Rotorua District.
- For every \$1, roughly \$0.40 of the money goes to community purposes. This was approximately \$7.8 million going to the community in the 2014/2015 period.

Firstly, respondents were asked what they thought should happen with the numbers of pokie machines in Rotorua, asking if numbers should greatly increase, increase, stay the same, decrease or greatly decrease. Most respondents wanted the numbers of machines to decrease with 76.5% of respondents indicating a desire to decrease (34.6%) or greatly decrease (41.9%) the numbers of machines. A further 22.4% wanted numbers to stay the same with only 1.1% wanting numbers to increase. No-one wanted numbers to greatly increase.

Respondents were asked for any reasons for their decision. Comments were coded into categories by APR. The highest frequencies of comments were related to:

- reasons why pokie machines are bad (27.0% of respondents); and
- the perception that machines seem to be targeting at those who cannot afford to play (20.8%).

Next, respondents were asked what they thought should happen with the numbers of pokie machine venues in Rotorua, asking if the numbers of venues should greatly increase, increase, stay the same, decrease or greatly decrease. Most respondents wanted the numbers of venues to decrease with 75.5% of respondents indicating a desire to decrease (39.6%) or greatly decrease (35.9%) the numbers of pokie machine venues. A further 22.7% wanted numbers to stay the same with only 1.8% wanting numbers to increase. No-one wanted numbers to greatly increase.

Respondents were asked for any reasons for their decision. The greatest number of comments were related to:

- having too many venues (30.2% of respondents);
- lowering the number of machines (10.3%); and
- reasons for pokie machines being bad (9.1%).

Placement of pokie machines

Rotorua currently has 13 pokie machine venues in the city centre and another 13 in the suburbs. Respondents were invited to make any comments on this. The major issues identified were:

- venues are seen as being mainly in the suburbs and seem to be targeted at low socio-economic groups (27.0% of respondents); and
- have all machines centralised with a high class venue (10.7% of respondents).

Ability to move machines around venues in special circumstances

Respondents were informed that although the numbers of machines cannot increase, machines can be moved from one venue to another in special circumstances (ie, a venue closing). They were then asked if they support pokie machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances. A majority of respondents (60.2%) were opposed (26.1%) or strongly opposed (34.1%) to this. A further 23.9% were neutral with 15.9% supporting it (15.5% indicating support and 0.4% strongly supporting it). Reasons included:

- needing to work to reduce overall numbers (36.5% of respondents); and
- reducing numbers by removing machines if a venue closes (23.2% of respondents).

Restrictions on pokie machine use

Respondents were asked if they thought any restrictions should be placed on pokie machines and if yes, what they should be. Respondents were unprompted. All comments given were coded into categories for analysis by APR.

The highest frequency of comments were:

- There should be a restriction on the amount that can be spent on machines (13.5% of all respondents);
- that there should be an age limit on players (11.9%);
- time limit on players playing machines (7.5%);
- strict monitoring/entry by permit or having a token system (indicating only being able to play using tokens, and only a certain amount being available to purchase each day)(6.7%);
- restricting those on a benefit and problem gamblers (6.3%); and
- limiting opening hours (5.0%).

Reducing Pokie Machines in Rotorua

Respondents were read a summary of the current situation in Rotorua as outlined below and then asked questions relating to it.

The current Rotorua policy sets a cap on the number of machines, and this has been dropping over time.

- The number of machines in Rotorua has dropped from 518 (in 2004) to 389 (in 2016).
- Despite the drop, Rotorua has significantly more machines per population compared to the average throughout NZ. Including tourists, Rotorua has 5.4 machines per thousand people while the national average is 3.8 machines per thousand.
- If we had the same ratio as NZ, Rotorua would be limited to 247 machines, rather than the current 389.
- RLC has been reducing the number of machines over time. Over the past 6 years numbers have dropped by 6.5% (compared to a 15% reduction nationally).

Respondents were asked what action they felt RLC should take regarding the level of pokie machines in Rotorua. Whether they thought they should be reduced at a fast rate, reduced at a slow rate, left at current levels, increased at a slow rate or increased at a fast rate. Most respondents indicated that numbers should be reduced (87.2% of respondents) with 49.4% indicating reduce numbers at a fast rate and 37.8% indicating that numbers should be reduced at a slow rate. A further 12.0% wanted numbers to remain at current levels. Only 0.8% of respondents wanted numbers increased at a slow rate (0.6%) or at a fast rate (0.2%).

Respondents were asked to outline any reasons for their views. The top four categories were all to do with lowering the number of pokie machines. The highest categories were:

- reasons why numbers should be reduced at a slow rate (23.4% of respondents);
- reasons for reducing at a fast rate (20.4%);
- aim for the national rate (19.0%);
- get rid of machines totally (8.5%); and
- have machines targeted at tourists (4.6%).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
1.0 INTRODUCTION	6
2.0 METHODOLOGY	6
3.0 SURVEY RESULTS	7
3.1 Rotorua Residents Gambling Habits	7
3.2 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period	8
3.3 Frequency of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period	8
3.4 Average Spend While Gambling (per visit)	8
3.5 Total Spend Over a Six Month Period While Gambling	9
3.6 Rotorua Residents Gambling Activity via Activity Type	9
3.6.1 Pokie Machines	10
3.6.2 Competitions/raffle tickets	11
3.6.3 NZ Raffles (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	12
3.6.4 Work bets	13
3.6.5 Scratch tickets (ie, Instant Kiwi)	14
3.6.6 Online Casinos	15
3.6.7 Gambling playing cards/games for money with friends/family	16
3.6.8 Playing housie or bingo	17
3.6.9 Betting on a horse/dog race	18
3.6.10 Sports betting	19
3.6.11 Visiting a Casino	20
3.7 Problem Gamblers	21
3.8 Pokie Machines in Rotorua	21
3.8.1 Change in the number of machines in Rotorua	22
3.8.2 Change in the number of venues that house pokie machines in Rotorua	23
3.8.3 Current placement of pokie machine venues in Rotorua	24
3.8.4 Ability to move machines around venues in special circumstances	24
3.8.5 Restrictions on pokie machine use	25
3.9 Reducing Pokie Machines in Rotorua	26
3.9.1 Respondents who benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts	27
3.10 Survey demographics	27
APPENDIX ONE: SURVEY FORM	29
APPENDIX TWO: RAW SURVEY RESULTS	34
APPENDIX THREE: CROSS-TABULATIONS	137

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In December 2016, Rotorua Lakes Council (RLC) contracted APR Consultants Ltd (APR) to undertake a survey programme to gauge the opinions of Rotorua residents on gambling in Rotorua, with particular emphasis on Class Four Gambling Machines.

This survey was undertaken in January and February 2017.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

APR meet with representatives from RLC to discuss the survey objectives. Following this meeting, APR designed a survey and worked with RLC to ensure that they were satisfied with the survey content and that it matched their requirements. Once the paper version of the survey was agreed upon, an electronic version of the survey was also produced.

Key aspects of the survey programme were:

- The survey would primarily be through phone contact but would be supplemented with online and hard copy survey forms.
- That Council required robust information from the surveys that were able to be analysed by gender, ethnicity, residence location and income.
- That the survey would be a mix of open (qualitative) and closed (quantitative) questions.
- That the report should be available to Council in February 2017.

The survey was undertaken primarily by telephone using a list of random Rotorua residential telephone numbers generated from the Rotorua White Pages Telephone directory. These were supplemented by 100 additional Face to face surveys undertaken in Rotorua's CBD and surrounds. Although the survey was mainly random, there was an online component where Rotorua residents could have their say should they wish to. The online surveys were sent out to groups that are traditionally hard to target via traditional land line surveys and focussed on youth, Maori and diverse ethnic groups.

A total of 501 surveys were collected during this research. Out of these, 496 surveys were used for this report.

The surveys that were removed from the sample were either due to being from outside of the Rotorua district or those that provided incomplete demographic data.

Note that for this survey, there was the potential for self-reporting bias resulting in under reporting of problem gambling as some respondents may have under reported their actual gambling habits.

3.0 SURVEY RESULTS

A total of 496 surveys were received from Rotorua residents. These were made up from 350 telephone surveys, 100 face to face surveys and 46 online surveys.

3.1 Rotorua Residents Gambling Habits

Rotorua residents were asked about what forms of gambling they had undertaken over the previous six month period.

	Number	Percent
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	301	60.7%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	193	38.9%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	150	30.2%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	61	12.3%
Participated in a work bet	57	11.5%
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	40	8.1%
Visited a Casino	30	6.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	27	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	17	3.4%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	17	3.4%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	15	3.0%
Other	4	0.8%
Sample	496	

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Of the 496 respondents, 389 indicated some form of gambling activity over a six month period (78.4% of respondents undertook some form of gambling in a six month period). The most popular was entering a NZ raffle like Lotto (60.7% of respondents). This was followed by entering a competition or purchasing raffle tickets (38.9%) and buying a scratch ticket like Instant Kiwi (30.2%).

Respondents were asked how much they considered people in their household currently gamble. Most identified that they gambled a little (55.2%), with 6.9% identifying a moderate amount (5.0%) or a lot (1.8%). A total of 183 respondents (36.9%) said that people in their household didn't gamble at all.

	Number	Percent
Not at all	183	36.9%
A little	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	25	5.0%
A lot	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

3.2 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period

Of the 389 respondents who had undertaken some form of gambling, the median number of different types of gambling undertaken was two activities, with an average of 2.25 activities.

Sample	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1

The minimum number of types of gambling was one activity, with the maximum being eight different forms of gambling.

3.3 Frequency of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period

Of the 389 respondents who had undertaken some form of gambling, the median frequency of respondents gambling activities was nine times over a six month period, with the average being 20.8 times.

Sample	389
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	375
Total no. of uses for sample	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	20.80
Median frequency of use	9
Mode frequency of use	1

The minimum frequency was 0.5 visits over the six month period (once a year), with the highest being 375 visits over the same period. The 389 respondents undertook 8,093 gambling activities over a six month period.

3.4 Average Spend While Gambling (per visit)

Of the 389 respondents who had undertaken some form of gambling, the median amount spent while gambling was \$20 per time, with the average being \$38.03.

Sample	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

The minimum spend was \$1.0 per visit, with the highest being \$580.

3.5 Total Spend Over a Six Month Period While Gambling

Of the 389 respondents who had undertaken some form of gambling, the median amount spent over a six month period on all forms of gambling was \$120.00 per person, with the average being \$435.38 per person.

Sample	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

The minimum spend was \$1.00 over a six month period with the highest being \$20,870.00. The 389 respondents spent a total of \$169,364.65 over the six month period sampled.

3.6 Rotorua Residents Gambling Activity via Activity Type

The following section reports upon how popular the various gambling activities were, the frequency they are undertaken and how much was spent undertaking each activity.

	Average spend	Rank of usage	Rank of spending
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	\$1,412.81	6	1
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	\$37.88	2	10
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	\$189.73	1	6
Participated in a work bet	\$10.36	5	11
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	\$40.14	3	9
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	\$1,196.00	11	2
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	\$229.92	8	5
Played housie or bingo	\$256.47	9	4
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	\$268.78	4	3
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	\$43.41	9	8
Visited a Casino	\$183.91	7	7

Note: For rankings, 1 is the highest to 11 being the lowest

The table above shows the average spends from the various gambling activities by respondents over a six month period. The most money was spent while playing pokie machines despite this only being the sixth highest popular gambling activity (out of the 11 surveyed). Respondents spent on average \$1,412.81 playing pokie machines over a six month period. This was followed by playing at an online casino, which was the least most popular form of gambling identified in this survey but still had an average spend of \$1,196.00 over the six months surveyed.

3.6.1 Pokie Machines

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 40 respondents (8.1% of the total sample) indicated that they had played on pokie machines within a six month period. This was the sixth most popular form of gambling from the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	40
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	288
Total no. of uses for sample	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	31.81
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	1

Of these 40 respondents, the median amount of visits was six in a six month period, with the average being 31.81 visits. The minimum number of visits was one visit, with the maximum being 288 visits.

Sample	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 40 respondents provided details on how much they spent per visit. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$44.31 per visit. The lowest identified spend per time was \$5.00 with the maximum per time being \$200.00.

Sample	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$135.00 per respondent while playing pokie machines with the average being \$1,412.81. The lowest total spend was \$7.50 with the maximum spend being \$14,400.00. The 40 respondents spent a total of \$56,512.50 in a six month period playing pokie machines.

Although this was only the sixth most popular form of gambling from the 11 identified in this research, this form had the highest average spend over the six month period sampled.

3.6.2 Competitions/raffle tickets

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 193 respondents (38.9% of the total sample) indicated that they had entered a completion/brought raffle tickets within a six month period. Of these, 190 respondents provided details of activity. This was the second most popular gambling activity out of the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	190
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	48
Total no. of uses for sample	718.5
Average frequency of use	3.78
Median frequency of use	2
Mode frequency of use	1

Of these 190 respondents, the median amount of competitions entered was two in a six month period, with the average being 3.78 competitions. The minimum number of entries was 0.5 competitions (or one per year), with the maximum being 48 competitions.

Sample	190
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,546.50
Average spend (per time)	\$8.14
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00

These 190 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while entering competitions. The median spend was \$5.00 with the average being \$8.14. The lowest identified spend per time was \$1.00 with the maximum per time being \$100.00.

Sample	190
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$600.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$7,196.25
Average spend (over six month period)	\$37.88
Median spend (over six month period)	\$10.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$10.00 per respondent while entering competitions with the average being \$37.88 over a six month period. The lowest total spend was \$1.00 with the maximum spend being \$600.00. The 190 respondents spent a total of \$7,196.25 in a six month period entering competitions or purchasing raffle tickets.

3.6.3 NZ Raffles (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 301 respondents (60.7%) indicated that they had brought tickets in a national raffle within a six month period. Of these, 298 respondents provided details of their activity.

This was the most popular form of gambling activity out of the 11 types identified in this research.

Sample	298
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	132
Total no. of uses for sample	3,649.5
Average frequency of use	12.25
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	24

Of these 298 respondents, the median amount of New Zealand raffles entered was six in a six month period, with the average being 12.25. The minimum number of entries was 0.5 (or one per year), with the maximum being 132 times.

Sample	298
Minimum spend (per time)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$56.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$4,698.60
Average spend (per time)	\$15.77
Median spend (per time)	\$16.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 298 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while purchasing tickets. The median spend was \$16.00 with the average being \$15.77. The lowest identified spend per time was \$2.00 with the maximum per time being \$56.00.

Sample	298
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,584.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$56,539.40
Average spend (over six month period)	\$189.73
Median spend (over six month period)	\$104.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$104.00 per respondent while purchasing tickets for a NZ raffle with the average being \$189.73. The lowest total spend was \$2.00 with the maximum spend being \$1,584.00. The 298 respondents spent a total of \$56,539.40 in a six month period purchasing tickets for NZ raffles.

3.6.4 Work bets

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 57 respondents (11.5%) indicated that they had participated in a work bet within a six month period. Of these, 56 respondents provided details of their activity.

This was the fifth most popular form of gambling activity out of the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	56
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	93.0
Average frequency of use	1.66
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	1

Of these 56 respondents, the median amount of competitions entered was once in a six month period, with the average being 1.66. The minimum number was 0.5 bets (or one per year), with the maximum being 24 bets.

Sample	56
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$50.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$449.50
Average spend (per time)	\$8.03
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$2.00

These 56 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while entering work competitions. The median spend was \$5.00 with the average being \$8.03. The lowest identified spend per time was \$1.00 with the maximum per time being \$50.00.

Sample	56
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$580.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$10.36
Median spend (over six month period)	\$2.50
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$2.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$2.50 per respondent while participating in a workplace bet with the average being \$10.36. The lowest total spend was \$0.50 with the maximum spend being \$120.00. The 56 respondents spent a total of \$580.00 in a six month period on work place betting.

3.6.5 Scratch tickets (ie, Instant Kiwi)

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 150 respondents (30.2%) indicated that they had purchased scratch tickets within a six month period. Of these, 139 respondents provided details of their activity.

This was the third most popular gambling activity out of the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	139
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	1,132.5
Average frequency of use	8.15
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	6

Of these 139 respondents, the median amount of scratch tickets purchased was six in a six month period, with the average being 8.15. The minimum number was 0.5 purchases (or one per year), with the maximum being 180 purchases.

Sample	139
Minimum spend (per time)	\$0.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$20.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$741.50
Average spend (per time)	\$5.33
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00

These 139 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while purchasing scratch tickets. The median spend was \$5.00 with the average being \$5.33. The lowest identified spend per time was \$0.00 (a gift) with the maximum per time being \$20.00.

Sample	139
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$480.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$5,579.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$40.14
Median spend (over six month period)	\$18.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$30.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$18.00 per respondent while purchasing a scratch ticket with the average being \$40.14. The lowest total spend was \$0.00 with the maximum spend being \$480.00. The 139 respondents spent a total of \$5,579.00 in a six month period on purchasing scratch tickets.

3.6.6 Online Casinos

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 15 respondents (3.0% of the total sample) indicated that they had gambled at online casinos within a six month period. Of these, 10 respondents provided details of their activity.

This was the least most popular form of gambling activity. Despite this, the average spend from respondents undertaking this form of gambling was second only to pokie machines at \$1,196.00 per person over the six month period.

Sample	10
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	283.0
Average frequency of use	28.30
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	6

Of these 10 respondents, the median amount of gambling at an online casino was six in a six month period, with the average being 28.30 times. The minimum number was one time, with the maximum being 180 times.

Sample	10
Minimum spend (per time)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$295.00
Average spend (per time)	\$29.50
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 10 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while gambling at online casinos. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$29.50. The lowest identified spend per time was \$10.00 with the maximum per time being \$100.00.

Sample	10
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$20.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$9,900.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$11,960.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$1,196.00
Median spend (over six month period)	\$180.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$180.00 per respondent while participating in online gambling with the average being \$1,196.00 over a six month period. The lowest total spend was \$20.00 with the maximum spend being \$9,900.00. The 10 respondents spent a total of \$11,960.00 in a six month period while gambling at online casinos.

3.6.7 Gambling playing cards/games for money with friends/family

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 27 respondents (5.4%) indicated that they had gambled playing cards/games with friends or family within a six month period. Of these, 24 respondents provided details of their activity.

This was the eighth most popular form of gambling activity from the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	24
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	183.0
Average frequency of use	7.63
Median frequency of use	4
Mode frequency of use	1

Of these 24 respondents, the median amount of gambling playing cards/games for money with friends/family was four in a six month period, with the average being 7.63. The minimum number was one time, with the maximum being 24 times.

Sample	24
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$517.00
Average spend (per time)	\$21.54
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 24 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while gambling playing games with friends or family. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$21.54. The lowest identified spend per time was \$1.00 with the maximum per time being \$100.00.

Sample	24
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,800.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$5,518.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$229.92
Median spend (over six month period)	\$35.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$35.00 per respondent while participating in gambling playing cards/games with friends and/or family with the average being \$229.92. The lowest total spend was \$1.00 with the maximum spend being \$1,800.00. The 24 respondents spent a total of \$5,518.00 in a six month period playing games/cards.

3.6.8 Playing housie or bingo

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 17 respondents (3.4%) indicated that they had gambled playing housie or bingo within a six month period. Of these, 15 respondents provided details of their activity. This was the ninth most popular gambling activity out of the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	15
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	162.0
Average frequency of use	10.80
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	24

Of these 15 respondents, the median amount of gambling playing housie or bingo was six in a six month period, with the average being 10.8 times. The minimum number was one time, with the maximum being 24 times.

Sample	15
Minimum spend (per time)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$70.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$397.00
Average spend (per time)	\$26.47
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$10.00

These 15 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while playing housie or bingo. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$26.47. The lowest identified spend per time was \$2.00 with the maximum per time being \$70.00.

Sample	15
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$5.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,440.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$3,847.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$256.47
Median spend (over six month period)	\$100.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$240.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$100.00 per respondent while participating in housie or bingo with the average being \$256.47. The lowest total spend was \$5.00 with the maximum spend being \$1,440.00. The 15 respondents spent a total of \$3,847.00 in a six month period playing housie/bingo.

3.6.9 Betting on a horse/dog race

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 62 respondents (12.5%) indicated that they had bet on a house/dog race within a six month period. This was the fourth most popular gambling activity.

Sample	62
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	429.8
Average frequency of use	6.93
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	0.5

Of these 62 respondents, the median amount of betting on a horse/dog race was once in a six month period, with the average being 6.93. The minimum number was 0.5 times (once per year), with the maximum being 180 times.

Sample	62
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$120.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,567.00
Average spend (per time)	\$25.27
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 62 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while betting on a horse/dog race. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$25.27. The lowest identified spend per time was \$1.00 with the maximum per time being \$120.00.

Sample	62
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$10,800.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$16,664.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$268.78
Median spend (over six month period)	\$21.25
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$21.25 per respondent while betting on a house/dog race with the average being \$268.78 over a six month period. The lowest total spend was \$1.00 with the maximum spend being \$10,800.00. The 62 respondents spent a total of \$16,664.50 in a six month period betting on a house/dog race.

3.6.10 Sports betting

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 17 respondents (3.4%) indicated that they had bet on a sports event within a six month period. This was the ninth most popular gambling activity out of the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	17
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	10
Total no. of uses for sample	44.5
Average frequency of use	2.62
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	0.5

Of these 17 respondents, the median amount of betting on sports was once in a six month period, with the average being 2.62. The minimum number was 0.5 times (once per year), with the maximum being 10 times.

Sample	17
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$60.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$363.50
Average spend (per time)	\$21.38
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

These 17 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while betting on sports events. The median spend was \$20.00 with the average being \$21.38. The lowest identified spend per time was \$1.00 with the maximum per time being \$60.00.

Sample	17
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$738.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$43.41
Median spend (over six month period)	\$40.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$40.00 per respondent while betting on sports with the average being \$43.41 over a six month period. The lowest total spend was \$0.50 with the maximum spend being \$120.00. The 17 respondents spent a total of \$738.00 in a six month period betting on sports.

3.6.11 Visiting a Casino

Of the 496 respondents to the survey, 30 respondents (6.0%) indicated that they had visited a Casino within a six month period. Of these, 23 respondents provided details of their spending.

This was the seventh most popular form of gambling activity over the 11 identified in this research.

Sample	23
Minimum frequency of use	0.1
Maximum frequency of use	6
Total no. of uses for sample	32.1
Average frequency of use	1.40
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	1

Of these 23 respondents, the median amount of casino visits was one in a six month period, with the average being 1.40. The minimum number was 0.1 times, with the maximum being six times.

Sample	23
Minimum spend (per time)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$500.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$2,445.00
Average spend (per time)	\$106.30
Median spend (per time)	\$90.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$90.00

These 23 respondents provided details on how much they spent per time while visiting casinos. The median spend was \$90.00 with the average being \$106.30. The lowest identified spend per time was \$10.00 with the maximum per time being \$500.00.

Sample	23
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,000.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$4,230.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$183.91
Median spend (over six month period)	\$50.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$90.00

Over a six month period, the total median spend was \$50.00 per respondent while visiting a casino with the average being \$183.91. The lowest total spend was \$10.00 with the maximum spend being \$1,000.00. The 23 respondents spent a total of \$4,230.00 in a six month period while visiting a casino.

3.7 Problem Gamblers

Respondents were asked if them, or anyone in their household had been impacted by a problem gambler at work, home or socially. Out of all respondents, 81 (16.3% of the total sample) had been impacted by a problem gambler.

	Number	Percent
Could not pay bills/rent/food	34	6.9%
Family affected/relationship break-ups/lost friends	25	5.0%
Addicted/wasting money on gambling	21	4.2%
Lost savings/house/bankruptcy	12	2.4%
Increased anti-social activities/stealing/domestic violence/lying	10	2.0%
Lost money gambling/having to borrow money to survive/relying on others	10	2.0%
Kids abandoned or neglected	5	1.0%
Undergone treatment/counselling/solutions to gambling found	4	0.8%
Emotional/physical breakdown	2	0.4%
Lost self respect/family/friends	2	0.4%
Other	3	0.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

The impacts felt were grouped into categories by APR Consultants. The highest frequency of effects were not being able to pay bills (6.9% of all respondents), following by affecting relationships (5.0%), wasting money (4.2%) and losing savings/going bankrupt (2.4%).

For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 4a.

Respondents were then asked if they felt a need to reduce their current level of gambling. Only 18 respondents (3.6% of the total sample) indicated that they felt a need to reduce their levels of gambling.

	Number	Percent
Yes	18	3.6%
No	470	94.8%
Don't know	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

These 18 respondents were offered to confidentially leave their name and contact details so they could be sent information on where they could get help. All of these respondents refused this offer.

3.8 Pokie Machines in Rotorua

Respondents were read a summary of the current situation in Rotorua as laid out below and then asked questions relating to it.

The current situation:

- Rotorua currently has 26 gambling venues which can have pokie machines.
- These venues are licenced to contain 389 machines between them.
- \$19.5 million was spent in these machines in the 2014/2015 year within the Rotorua District.
- For every \$1, roughly \$0.40 of the money goes to community purposes. This was approx. \$7.8 million going to the community in the 2014/2015 period.

3.8.1 Change in the number of machines in Rotorua

Firstly, respondents were asked what they thought should happen with the numbers of pokie machines in Rotorua, asking if numbers should greatly increase, increase, stay the same, decrease or greatly decrease.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	5	1.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	105	21.2%	22.4%
Decrease	162	32.7%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	196	39.5%	41.9%
NA/Don't know	26	5.2%	
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Most respondents wanted the numbers of machines to decrease with 76.5% of respondents indicating a desire to decrease (34.6%) or greatly decrease (41.9%) the numbers of machines. A further 22.4% wanted numbers to stay the same with only 1.1% wanting numbers to increase. No-one wanted numbers to greatly increase.

	Number	Percent
Pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive	134	27.0%
Tend to target poor who cannot afford to play/remove from certain areas	103	20.8%
Too many machines in Rotorua/reduce numbers	43	8.7%
Good that they give back to the community	37	7.5%
Too much spent on gambling/waste of money	35	7.1%
Help for those with gambling problems/problem gamblers	30	6.0%
Don't agree with gambling	21	4.2%
People should be able to gamble if they want to/not aware of any issues	19	3.8%
It is a balancing act with good and bad sides	15	3.0%
Don't want to see any more machines	13	2.6%
Recipients of community money	11	2.2%
Have a casino in Rotorua/target tourists	10	2.0%
Increase the community contribution	7	1.4%
Don't want to encourage gambling	5	1.0%
Enforce standards/high class of dress/current venues attract shabby patrons	3	0.6%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	8	1.6%
Other	9	1.8%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Respondents were asked for any reasons for their decision. Comments were coded into categories by APR. The highest frequency of comments were related to reasons why pokie machines are bad (27.0% of respondents), followed by the observation that machines seem to be targeting at those who cannot afford to play (20.8%). For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 8.

3.8.2 Change in the number of venues that house pokie machines in Rotorua

Next, respondents were asked what they thought should happen with the numbers of pokie machine venues in Rotorua, asking if the numbers of venues should greatly increase, increase, stay the same, decrease or greatly decrease.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	8	1.6%	1.8%
Stay the same	102	20.6%	22.7%
Decrease	178	35.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	161	32.5%	35.9%
NA/Don't know	45	9.1%	
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Most respondents wanted the numbers of venues to decrease with 75.5% of respondents indicating a desire to decrease (39.6%) or greatly decrease (35.9%) the numbers of pokie machine venues. A further 22.7% wanted numbers to stay the same with only 1.8% wanting numbers to increase. No-one wanted numbers to greatly increase.

	Number	Percent
Too many venues/lower number/make less accessible	150	30.2%
Lower number of machines	51	10.3%
Pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive	45	9.1%
Distribution/location of machines/Casino	43	8.7%
Leave numbers the same/don't increase numbers/have enough venues now	30	6.0%
People waste money on them/too much spent	14	2.8%
Don't like gambling	7	1.4%
Increase number of venues	6	1.2%
Suggested solutions for tackling problem gambling	6	1.2%
Machines are not the problem - just some of the people who play them	4	0.8%
Don't have any problems with gambling machines/people have a right to use	3	0.6%
Addictive to some people	2	0.4%
Some venues have unacceptable standards	2	0.4%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	14	2.8%
Other	8	1.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Respondents were asked for any reasons for their decision. Comments were coded into categories by APR. The highest frequency of comments were related to having too many venues (30.2% of respondents). This was followed by lowering the number of machines (10.3%) and reasons for pokie machines being bad (9.1%). For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 10.

3.8.3 Current placement of pokie machine venues in Rotorua

Rotorua currently has 13 pokie machine venues in the city centre and another 13 in the suburbs. Respondents were invited to make any comments on this. Respondents were unprompted. All comments given were coded into categories for analysis by APR.

	Number	Percent
Targeted at low socio-economic suburban areas/remove from suburbs	134	27.0%
Have all centralised/at city centre/high standard facility	53	10.7%
Reduce the number of machines/venues	32	6.5%
Get rid of them/ban them totally	31	6.3%
Limit availability/accessibility	28	5.6%
Not an issue/maintain status quo	23	4.6%
Ban venues near schools/pubs/residential areas/shopping centres	15	3.0%
Limit numbers in town	9	1.8%
Monitoring and controlling required/help those with problems	9	1.8%
Distribute evenly/have a fair mix	8	1.6%
Machines located in wrong places/venues	7	1.4%
More tourist targeted/more in city	6	1.2%
Personal choice/people who want to play will	3	0.6%
Tidy venues up/look rough	2	0.4%
Don't know/no comment	26	5.2%
Other	4	0.8%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

The major issue identified was that venues are seen as being mainly in the suburbs and seem to be targeted at low socio-economic groups (27.0% of respondents). This was followed by having all machines centralised with the possibility of a high class facility (10.7% of respondents). For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 11.

3.8.4 Ability to move machines around venues in special circumstances

Respondents were informed that although the numbers of machines cannot increase, machines can be moved from one venue to another in special circumstances (ie, a venue closing). They were then asked if they support pokie machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	73	14.7%	15.5%
Neutral	113	22.8%	23.9%
Opposed	123	24.8%	26.1%
Strongly opposed	161	32.5%	34.1%
NA/Don't know	19	3.8%	
Not specified	5	1.0%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

A majority of respondents (60.2%) were opposed (26.1%) or strongly opposed (34.1%) to this. A further 23.9% were neutral with 15.9% supporting it (15.5% indicating support and 0.4% strongly supporting it).

	Number	Percent
Work to reduce overall numbers	181	36.5%
If a venue closes, the machines should go as well/don't allow them to be moved	115	23.2%
Don't have a problem with this	24	4.8%
Fine if overall numbers don't increase	18	3.6%
Get rid of all machines	11	2.2%
Only if moving them out of the suburbs	8	1.6%
Only in special circumstances/case by case	5	1.0%
Fine as long as new venue meets requirements	4	0.8%
Should only be in one Casino	3	0.6%
Needs to be monitored carefully	2	0.4%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	11	2.2%
Other	8	1.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Reasons included needing to work to reduce overall numbers (36.5% of respondents) and reducing numbers by removing machines if a venue closes (23.2% of respondents). For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 13.

3.8.5 Restrictions on pokie machine use

Respondents were asked if they feel any restrictions should be placed on pokie machines and what they should be. Respondents were unprompted. All comments given were coded into categories for analysis by APR.

	Number	Percent
Restriction on the amount that can be spent on the machines	67	13.5%
Impose an age limit in players	59	11.9%
Impose a time limit on players	37	7.5%
Strict monitoring/ID checks/entry by permit only/use token system	33	6.7%
Restrict those on a benefit/restrict drunks and problem gamblers	31	6.3%
Limit opening hours	25	5.0%
Reduce the number of machines and venues	24	4.8%
Current restrictions are enough/extra restrictions not required/hard to implement	21	4.2%
Limit/close all venues in poor socioeconomic/suburban areas	19	3.8%
Get rid of them	16	3.2%
Restrict pokie machines getting relocated from one venue to another	14	2.8%
Build a casino or keep all the machines at one place/only have in city	12	2.4%
Ban venues anywhere near school/youth facilities/churches/shopping centres	11	2.2%
Create more public awareness/offer support/education	11	2.2%
Children should not be allowed in/around the premises or to play them	9	1.8%
Shouldn't be able to play when drinking/drunken	5	1.0%
Restrictions on layout/look of venue	4	0.8%
Stop having big jackpots	2	0.4%
Don't know	34	6.9%
Other	5	1.0%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Respondents felt that there should be a restriction on the amount that can be spent on machines (13.5% of respondents) and that there should be an age limit on players (11.9%). These were followed by having time limit on players playing machines (7.5%), strict monitoring/entry by permit or having a token system (indicating only being able to play using tokens, and only a certain amount being available to purchase each day)(6.7%), restricting those on a benefit and problem gamblers (6.3%) and limiting opening hours (5.0%).

3.9 Reducing Pokie Machines in Rotorua

Respondents were read a summary of the current situation in Rotorua as laid out below and then asked questions relating to it.

The current Rotorua policy sets a cap on the number of machines, and this has been dropping over time.

- The number of machines in Rotorua has dropped from 518 (in 2004) to 389 (in 2016).
- Despite the drop, Rotorua has significantly more machines per population compared to the average throughout NZ. Including tourists, Rotorua has 5.4 machines per thousand people while the national average is 3.8 machines per thousand.
- If we had the same ratio as NZ, Rotorua would be limited to 247 machines, rather than the current 389.
- RLC has been reducing the number of machines over time. Over the past 6 years numbers have dropped by 6.5% (compared to a 15% reduction nationally).

Respondents were asked what action they felt RLC should take regarding the level of pokie machines in Rotorua. Whether they thought they should be reduced at a fast rate, reduced at a slow rate, left at current levels, increased at a slow rate or increased at a fast rate.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	239	48.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	183	36.9%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	58	11.7%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	1	0.2%	0.2%
NA/Don't know	10	2.0%	
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Most respondents indicated that numbers should be reduced (87.2% of respondents) with 49.4% indicating reduce numbers at a fast rate and 37.8% indicating that numbers should be reduced at a slow rate. A further 12.0% wanted numbers to remain at current levels. Only 0.8% of respondents wanted numbers increased at a slow rate (0.6%) or at a fast rate (0.2%).

	Number	Percent
Reduce at a slow rate/reasons for reducing at a slow rate	116	23.4%
Reduce at a faster rate/reasons for reducing at a faster rate	101	20.4%
Aim for the national average	94	19.0%
Get rid of machines totally	42	8.5%
Have machines for tourists/have establishments in the city only/Casino	23	4.6%
Leave at current level	15	3.0%
Need education/support for those with a problem/suggestions to address gambling problems	9	1.8%
Need to take businesses into account/revenue benefits the community	9	1.8%
Reduce as venues naturally close/don't allow machines to be moved/don't replace damaged ones	7	1.4%
Gambling is an enjoyable hobby for those with the money	5	1.0%
Haven't seen any issues	3	0.6%
Beneficiaries should not be able to gamble	2	0.4%
Make it harder to access	2	0.4%
Don't know	1	0.2%
Other	6	1.2%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Respondents were asked to outline any reasons for their views. The top four categories were all to do with lowering the number of pokie machines. The highest category were reasons why numbers

should be reduced at a slow rate (23.4% of respondents) followed by reasons for reducing at a fast rate (20.4%) and aiming for the national rate (19.0%). The fourth highest category was getting rid of machines totally (8.5%) followed by having machines targeted at tourists (4.6%). For more information about the breakdowns of comments, please refer to Appendix II, question 16.

3.9.1 Respondents who benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts

Respondents were asked if they or their family, or a community organisation they were involved with, benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts.

	Number	Percent
Yes	124	25.0%
No	312	62.9%
Don't know	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

A total of 25.0% of the sample indicated that they had benefited. A further 62.9% had not, 11.5% didn't know and 0.6% refused to answer.

3.10 Survey demographics

This survey was designed to be reflective of the makeup of Rotorua at the time of the 2013 Census. As a result, the target audience was targeted to try to get this mix as close as possible. Targeting became narrower as the research progressed. At the final stages, face to face surveying was used to target the demographics where we were short, mainly youth and Maori.

Although a sample of 400 respondents was targeted, APR managed to collect a total sample of 496 surveys.

The final survey received a relatively even mix of responses, with 51.6% of respondents identifying their gender as female and 48.4% as male. This was within 1% of the makeup of Rotorua at the time of the 2013 Census.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.	Census	difference
Male	240	48.4%	48.4%	48.3%	0.1%
Female	256	51.6%	51.6%	51.7%	-0.1%
Not specified	0	0.0%			
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Note: % ex non specified is the percentage with non specified responses removed

Responses were received from a range of age groups. Collecting the opinions of younger members of society is getting progressively more difficult. In order to increase the responses in this age range, APR undertook face to face and online surveying targeting these groups. The final breakdown is representative of Rotorua with the biggest discrepancy being in those aged between 25 to 34, but all ages are within 5.0% of Census results.

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.	Census	difference
15 to 24	74	14.9%	14.9%	16.8%	-1.9%
25 to 34	48	9.7%	9.7%	14.4%	-4.7%
35 to 44	76	15.3%	15.3%	16.7%	-1.4%
45 to 54	104	21.0%	21.0%	18.3%	2.7%
55 to 64	80	16.1%	16.1%	15.6%	0.5%
65 to 74	71	14.3%	14.3%	11.0%	3.3%
75+	43	8.7%	8.7%	7.2%	1.5%
Refused	0	0.0%			
Not specified	0	0.0%			
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Note: % ex non specified is the percentage with refused and non specified responses removed

A wide range of ethnicities were sampled for this research.

	Number	Percent	Census	difference
NZ Pakeha/European	330	66.5%	61.8%	4.7%
NZ Maori	149	30.0%	34.3%	-4.3%
Pacific Island	8	1.6%	4.6%	-3.0%
Asian	14	2.8%	5.8%	-2.9%
Other	43	8.7%	1.6%	7.1%
Refused	0	0.0%		
Not specified	1	0.2%		
Sample	496			

Note: Not additive as respondents could be multiple ethnicities

In order to provide additive comparisons for ethnic responses, the ethnicity of respondents was also calculated assuming respondents only had one ethnicity. To do this, respondents who identified with NZ Maori were coded to Maori, those who had other affiliations (included New Zealander) were coded to other ethnicity and anyone who identified as NZ European (but not have any other ethnicity affiliation) was coded as NZ European. The results are shown in the table below.

	Number	Percent
NZ Pakeha/European	289	58.3%
NZ Maori	149	30.0%
Other Ethnicity	56	11.3%
Not specified	2	0.4%
Total	496	100.0%

APPENDIX ONE: SURVEY FORM

Rotorua Residents Gambling Survey 2016

Phone no: ROTORUA RESIDENTS GAMBLING SURVEY 2017

Greetings

APR Research is undertaking a study on Gambling in Rotorua.

The purpose of this research is to find out what you think about gambling, and in turn, to let Rotorua Lakes Council (RLC) know what residents of Rotorua think. The results will be used to help Council update policies regarding the use of gambling machines in Rotorua.

Any information you give me will be strictly confidential, and will only be presented in a form combined with the results of others. No individual can be identified from participating in this study.

Information for respondents:

- All information you give is confidential within the provisions of the Privacy Act and the Research Association New Zealand Code of Ethics.
- Your responses will be grouped with others' before being released (Rotorua Lakes Council do not have access to individual responses).
- Your responses will be used only for the purpose of this research.
- You are welcome to ring Elvis at APR Consultants during working hours on 0800 277 937. He will be happy to confirm the purpose of the research and discuss any other matters further with you.

We would like to understand Rotorua residents' views on gambling and to do this we need to be able to profile gambling in Rotorua.

The first section is about your situation when it comes to gambling.

1. Have you undertaken any of these activities within the past six months (prompted)? If yes prompt for frequency of use and average spend per use.

Activity	Undertaken activity (please circle)	Frequency of use (ie, daily, weekly, fortnightly etc.)	Average spend (per time) \$
a) Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	Y / N		
b) Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	Y / N		
c) Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	Y / N		
d) Participated in a work bet	Y / N		
e) Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	Y / N		
f) Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) / gambled on home computer	Y / N		
g) Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	Y / N		
h) Played housie or bingo	Y / N		
i) Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	Y / N		
j) Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	Y / N		
k) Visited a Casino	Y / N		
l) Other (please specify)	Y		

APR Consultants Enquiry Line 0800 277 937

Page 1

2. Thinking about the activities above, to the best of your knowledge, how many people in your household (aged over 15), have participated in any of these within the past 12 months?

Number: _____

3. Including yourself, how much do you consider that the people in your household currently gamble?

- O1 Not at all
O2 A little
O3 A moderate amount
O4 A lot
O5 Refused/Not specified/live alone

4. Have you, or anyone in your household, been impacted by a problem gambler (at work, home, socially etc)?

- O1 Yes (go to Q4a)
O2 No (go to 5)
O3 Don't know (go to 5)
O4 Refused/not specified (go to 5)

- 4a If yes, how were you/they affected

5. Do you feel a need to reduce your current level of gambling?

- O1 Yes (go to Q6)
O2 No (go to Q7)
O3 Don't know (go to Q7)
O4 Refused/not specified (go to Q7)

6. Would you like me to post some information to you about where you can access support for problem gambling?

- O1 Yes (explain that we will pass this name on to an agency who can provide them with pamphlets detailing where they can get help)
O2 No

Name: _____ Address: _____

- O3 Don't know
O4 Refused/not specified

7. The second section is about gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua:

The current situation:

- Rotorua currently has 26 gambling venues which can have pokie machines.
- These venues are licenced to contain 389 machines between them.
- \$19.5 million was spent in these machines in the 2014/2015 year within the Rotorua District.
- For every \$1, roughly \$0.40 of the money goes to community purposes. This was approx. \$7.8 million going to the community in the 2014/2015 period.

7. With this in mind, what do you think should happen with the numbers of gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua? (using a five point scale from greatly increase to greatly decrease)

Greatly increase	Increase	Stay the same	Decrease	Greatly decrease	NA/Don't know
1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐

8. Please outline any reasons for your views?

9. Using the same five point scale, do you think the numbers of venues where these machines are located should change? (if no, tick stay the same).

Greatly increase	Increase	Stay the same/no change	Decrease	Greatly decrease	NA/Don't know
1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐

10. Please outline any reasons for your views?

11. There are currently 13 venues in the city centre and another 13 in the suburbs with machines. Do you have any comments about the current placement of the pokie machine venues in Rotorua?

12. Although the numbers of machines cannot increase, machines can be moved from one venue to another in special circumstances (ie, a venue closing). Do you support gambling (pokie) machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances?

Strongly support	Support	Neutral	Opposed	Strongly opposed	NA/Don't know
1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐

13. Please outline any reasons for your views?

14. Are there any restrictions that you feel should be placed and what are they?

15. The third section is regarding reduction in gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua:

The current Rotorua policy sets a cap on the number of machines, and this has been dropping over time.

- The number of machines in Rotorua has dropped from 518 (in 2004) to 389 (in 2016).
- Despite the drop, Rotorua has significantly more machines per population compared to the average throughout NZ. Including tourists, Rotorua has 5.4 machines per thousand people while the national average is 3.8 machines per thousand.
- If we had the same ratio as NZ, Rotorua would be limited to 247 machines, rather than the current 389.
- RLC has been reducing the number of machines over time. Over the past 6 years numbers have dropped by 6.5% (compared to a 15% reduction nationally).

15. What action do you think RLC should take regarding the level of gambling (pokie) machines? (using a five point scale from reduce numbers at a fast rate to increase numbers at a fast rate).

Reduce numbers at a fast rate	Reduce numbers at a slow rate	Leave number at current levels	Increase numbers at a slow rate	Increase numbers at a fast rate	NA/Don't know
1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐

16. Please outline any reasons for your views?

17. Have you or your family, or a community organisation you are involved with, benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
☐ Refused/not specified

Demographics:

18. What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

19. What is your age grouping?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ☐ 15-24 | ☐ 55-64 |
| ☐ 25-34 | ☐ 65-74 |
| ☐ 35-44 | ☐ 75+ |
| ☐ 45-54 | ☐ Refused |

20. Which of the following ethnic groups do you consider yourself a part of? (please tick all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ NZ Pakeha/European | ☐ Asian |
| ☐ NZ Maori | ☐ Other (please specify) |
| ☐ Pacific Island | ☐ Refused (do not read out) |

21. Which of the following best describes where you live?

OA Rotorua city (central city area)		
OB Rotorua suburbs (please tick ONE location below)		
☐ 1 Fairy Springs	☐ 10 Lynmore	☐ 19 Selwyn Heights
☐ 2 Fenton Park	☐ 11 Mangakakahi	☐ 20 Springfield
☐ 3 Fordlands	☐ 12 Matipo Heights	☐ 21 Sunnybrook
☐ 4 Glenholme	☐ 13 Ngapuna	☐ 22 Tihiotonga
☐ 5 Hannahs Bay	☐ 14 Ohinemutu	☐ 23 Utuhina
☐ 6 Hillcrest	☐ 15 Owhata	☐ 24 Westbrook
☐ 7 Holdens Bay	☐ 16 Pleasant Heights	☐ 25 Western Heights
☐ 8 Kawaha Point	☐ 17 Pomare	☐ 26 Whakarewarewa
☐ 9 Koutu	☐ 18 Pukehangi	☐ 27 Other (please specify)
OC Ngongotaha		
OD Lakeside settlement (please tick ONE location below)		
☐ 1 Lake Tarawera	☐ 4 Lake Okareka	☐ 7 Tikitere
☐ 2 Lake Rotoiti	☐ 5 Lake Rotoehu	☐ 8 Other (please specify).....
☐ 3 Lake Rotoma	☐ 6 Okere Falls	
OE Rural (please tick ONE location below)		
☐ 1 Atiamuri	☐ 8 Ngakuru	☐ 15 Waiotapu Village
☐ 2 Hamurana	☐ 9 Reporoa	☐ 16 Waiteti
☐ 3 Horohoro	☐ 10 Rerewhakaaitu	☐ 17 Other (please specify).....
☐ 4 Kaharoa	☐ 11 Tarukenga	
☐ 5 Kapenga	☐ 12 Tumunui	
☐ 6 Mamaku	☐ 13 Waikite Valley	
☐ 7 Mourea	☐ 14 Waimangu	

22. How many people over 15 live in your household?

Number: _____

23. Do you have any comments you would like to pass on to Council for them to consider before making rules related to gambling in Rotorua?

Finally, may I please ask your first name? This is just so my supervisor can do quality control checks on me if necessary.

First name:

Thank you for your participation. We appreciate your time.
If you have any queries, please feel free to contact Elvis at APR Consultants (0800 277 937).

APPENDIX TWO: RAW SURVEY RESULTS

This appendix shows all the tables and comments from Rotorua residents. The order of questions follows the order of the survey form.

Respondents situation when it comes to gambling:

1. Have you undertaken any of these activities within the past six months:

Summary table:

	Number	Percent	Rank
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	40	8.1%	6
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	193	38.9%	2
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	301	60.7%	1
Participated in a work bet	57	11.5%	5
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	150	30.2%	3
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	15	3.0%	11
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	27	5.4%	8
Played housie or bingo	17	3.4%	9
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	61	12.3%	4
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	17	3.4%	9
Visited a Casino	30	6.0%	7
Other	4	0.8%	12
Sample	496		

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Total gambling:

Out of the entire sample of 496 respondents, 389 (78.4%) undertook some form of gambling activities over a six month period.

Number of different gambling activities (six month period):

Sample	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1

Frequency of use of all gambling activities (six month period):

Sample	389
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	375
Total no. of uses for sample	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	20.80
Median frequency of use	9
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time over all gambling activities:

Sample	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average total spend over all gambling activities

Sample	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

Q1a Played a "pokie machine" (*outside a casino ie, at a pub, club*)?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	40	8.1%
No	456	91.9%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Frequency of use:

Sample	40
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	288
Total no. of uses for sample	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	31.81
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time:

Sample	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00

Q1b Entered a competition/bought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	193	38.9%
No	303	61.1%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Three respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	190
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	48
Total no. of uses for sample	718.5
Average frequency of use	3.78
Median frequency of use	2
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time:

Sample	190
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,546.50
Average spend (per time)	\$8.14
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	190
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$600.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$7,196.25
Average spend (over six month period)	\$37.88
Median spend (over six month period)	\$10.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Q1c Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	301	60.7%
No	195	39.3%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Three respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	298
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	132
Total no. of uses for sample	3,649.5
Average frequency of use	12.25
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	24

Average spend per time:

Sample	298
Minimum spend (per time)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$56.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$4,698.60
Average spend (per time)	\$15.77
Median spend (per time)	\$16.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	298
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,584.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$56,539.40
Average spend (over six month period)	\$189.73
Median spend (over six month period)	\$104.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

Q1d Participated in a work bet?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	57	11.5%
No	439	88.5%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: One respondent did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	56
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	93.0
Average frequency of use	1.66
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time:

Sample	56
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$50.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$449.50
Average spend (per time)	\$8.03
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$2.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	56
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$580.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$10.36
Median spend (over six month period)	\$2.50
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$2.00

Q1e Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	150	30.2%
No	346	69.8%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Eleven respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	139
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	1,132.5
Average frequency of use	8.15
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	6

Average spend per time:

Sample	139
Minimum spend (per time)	\$0.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$20.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$741.50
Average spend (per time)	\$5.33
Median spend (per time)	\$5.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	139
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$480.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$5,579.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$40.14
Median spend (over six month period)	\$18.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$30.00

Q1f Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	15	3.0%
No	481	97.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Four respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	10
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	283.0
Average frequency of use	28.30
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	6

Average spend per time:

Sample	10
Minimum spend (per time)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$295.00
Average spend (per time)	\$29.50
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	10
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$20.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$9,900.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$11,960.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$1,196.00
Median spend (over six month period)	\$180.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$120.00

Q1g Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	27	5.4%
No	469	94.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Three respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	24
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	183.0
Average frequency of use	7.63
Median frequency of use	4
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time:

Sample	24
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$100.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$517.00
Average spend (per time)	\$21.54
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	24
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,800.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$5,518.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$229.92
Median spend (over six month period)	\$35.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00

Q1h Played housie or bingo?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	17	3.4%
No	479	96.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Two respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	15
Minimum frequency of use	1
Maximum frequency of use	24
Total no. of uses for sample	162.0
Average frequency of use	10.80
Median frequency of use	6
Mode frequency of use	24

Average spend per time:

Sample	15
Minimum spend (per time)	\$2.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$70.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$397.00
Average spend (per time)	\$26.47
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$10.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	15
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$5.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,440.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$3,847.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$256.47
Median spend (over six month period)	\$100.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$240.00

Q1i Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	62	12.5%
No	434	87.5%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Frequency of use:

Sample	62
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	180
Total no. of uses for sample	429.8
Average frequency of use	6.93
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	0.5

Average spend per time:

Sample	62
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$120.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,567.00
Average spend (per time)	\$25.27
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	62
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$10,800.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$16,664.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$268.78
Median spend (over six month period)	\$21.25
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Q1j Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	17	3.4%
No	479	96.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Frequency of use:

Sample	17
Minimum frequency of use	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	10
Total no. of uses for sample	44.5
Average frequency of use	2.62
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	0.5

Average spend per time:

Sample	17
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$60.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$363.50
Average spend (per time)	\$21.38
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	17
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$0.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$120.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$738.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$43.41
Median spend (over six month period)	\$40.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$10.00

Q1k Visited a Casino?

Number undertaking activity:

	Number	Percent
Yes	30	6.0%
No	466	94.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Note: Seven respondents did not provide details of their activity

Frequency of use:

Sample	23
Minimum frequency of use	0.1
Maximum frequency of use	6
Total no. of uses for sample	32.1
Average frequency of use	1.40
Median frequency of use	1
Mode frequency of use	1

Average spend per time:

Sample	23
Minimum spend (per time)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$500.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$2,445.00
Average spend (per time)	\$106.30
Median spend (per time)	\$90.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$90.00

Average spend over a six month period:

Sample	23
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$10.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,000.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$4,230.00
Average spend (over six month period)	\$183.91
Median spend (over six month period)	\$50.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$90.00

2. Thinking about the activities above, to the best of your knowledge, how many people in your household (aged over 15), have participated in any of these within the past 12 months?

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Zero	145	29.2%	29.7%
One	198	39.9%	40.6%
Two	104	21.0%	21.3%
Three	27	5.4%	5.5%
Four	6	1.2%	1.2%
Five	4	0.8%	0.8%
Six	3	0.6%	0.6%
Seven	1	0.2%	0.2%
Eight	0	0.0%	0.0%
Nine	0	0.0%	0.0%
Ten or more	0	0.0%	0.0%
Not specified	8	1.6%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

3. Including yourself, how much do you consider that the people in your household currently gamble?

	Number	Percent
Not at all	183	36.9%
A little	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	25	5.0%
A lot	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

4. Have you, or anyone in your household, been impacted by a problem gambler (at work, home, socially etc)?

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Yes	81	16.3%	16.4%
No	407	82.1%	82.6%
Don't know	3	0.6%	0.6%
Refused/not specified	2	0.4%	0.4%
Not specified	3	0.6%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

4a. If yes, how were you/they affected?

Comments coded into categories:

	Number	Percent
Could not pay bills/rent/food	34	6.9%
Family affected/relationship break-ups/lost friends	25	5.0%
Addicted/wasting money on gambling	21	4.2%
Lost savings/house/bankruptcy	12	2.4%
Increased anti-social activities/stealing/domestic violence/lying	10	2.0%
Lost money gambling/having to borrow money to survive/relying on others	10	2.0%
Kids abandoned or neglected	5	1.0%
Undergone treatment/counselling/solutions to gambling found	4	0.8%
Emotional/physical breakdown	2	0.4%
Lost self respect/family/friends	2	0.4%
Other	3	0.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **could not pay bills/rent/food**:

- Two years ago I couldn't pay rent.
- Couldn't pay bills.
- Dad sacrifices food for keno. Pay more than you win.
- Debt. Son in mid 20's has played pokies instead of paying rent.
- Ex son-in-law was a gambler and I had to pay bills he couldn't afford to pay.
- Finding it hard to pay bills.
- Good friend (in past) had to stay with us and we had to feed them.
- I have an aunty and three first cousins who are heavily addicted to pokies and are seriously in debt. It has affected my family as my nephews and nieces have been neglected as a result of our pokie addicted whanau members not having enough money to buy kai, or leaving their tamariki at daycare for ridiculous hours (ie, 7am-7pm) because they have forgotten to pick them up while sitting playing the pokies.
- I have seen a lot of unhandiness. All the rent money got spent on gambling. Created tension in relationships.
- It was a family member; we were asked for money.
- Lack of money at home.
- Lots of people I know of have not been able to pay rent. Make ends meet.
- Me. Struggle to pay bills.
- My daughter-in-law gambled everything away. Had no food for the children and went through about six rentals because she didn't have the rent. We had to take the children and look after them. Naturally, the money was gone.
- My father gambled away our furniture when I was a child. It was very traumatic for mum and us kids, so I swore never to gamble. My sister is addicted to pokie machines.
- My husband's ex partner was a problem gambler. Ruined their relationship. I am a teacher at a low decile school and deal with children who come to school hungry. Last year in 5 to 6 year old class, four of them were homeless.
- My mother gambled. Money was short and we went without food on occasions.
- My mother lost too much money. She had to take out a mortgage on her house and she will leave us a debt rather than a freehold house.
- My mother. We went hungry because of that shit. That is why I never gamble.
- My mum used to gamble and couldn't pay bills.
- My son was a problem gambler and we had to bail him out. He lost two freehold houses.
- Nearly got kicked out of my house.
- Not in my family, but know of people who are addicted and lose all money and have no money for food and power.
- Partner gambled her pay and then said purse was stolen. We are no longer together.

- Relative bet on horses and all money gone.
- Relatives spend all their wages.
- See a lot of people get into strife because of gambling ie, missing loan payments, loan applications, big out goings. See spending on non essentials.
- Sister got into debt. Owed family money.
- Socially at Cobb and Co. Was feeding in \$20 notes. Fed \$100 in then realised that I could have spent that money on food.
- They couldn't pay their bills and we ended up paying them so that the kids involved would be ok. It damaged our relationships (mine with my partner and ours with the gambler) and ruined our ability to do cool stuff for our own whanau.
- They lost their house. It was a family member.
- They were a friend of ours. They lost their home and relationship. We had to support them for a while.
- Unable to pay rent.
- Whole house full of them. Get benefit and go down to pokies.

Comments coded to **family affected/relationship break-ups/lost friends:**

- An employee had a problem and I now manage his money. It caused huge problems for him and his family. Luckily, he realised he had a problem.
- Ex-partner. I hate it. Wish we never had them.
- Family affected badly.
- Family heavily involved. Lost self respect and wasted a lot of money.
- Family member embezzled money and lost it gambling. Went to jail. Tore the family apart.
- Friend of my sister always borrowing money because she lost all on the pokies. Lost friends and children. Had to be looked after by grandmother.
- Grandfather would get into trouble.
- Husband was a compulsive gambler and I had to leave him.
- I have an aunty and three first cousins who are heavily addicted to pokies and are seriously in debt. It has affected my family as my nephews and nieces have been neglected as a result of our pokie addicted whanau members not having enough money to buy kai, or leaving their tamariki at daycare for ridiculous hours (ie 7am-7pm) because they have forgotten to pick them up while sitting playing the pokies.
- I have seen a lot of unhandiness. All the rent money got spent on gambling. Created tension in relationships.
- It was a family member and it ruined their marriage.
- Just watching my friend waste her money, lie about it and the eventual breakdown of that family.
- Kids's father. Not with him because of his gambling. Whole life suffered. Robbed me and his own children (and beat me) to get money for pokies. Jailed for seven years for stealing to fund pokies.
- Lost their family. I have the children. Along with the gambling came the drugs, the lies, the excuses, the violence. Impacted me because my whole life has now changed. Too easy for her to get an overdraft using my son's account.
- Me, myself. Everyone has to pick up the slack due to my gambling habits.
- My dad was estranged from our family and lost all his money so had nothing to retire on. His gambling caused huge stress on the family.
- My daughter-in-law gambled everything away. Had no food for the children and went through about six rentals because she didn't have the rent. We had to take the children and look after them. Naturally, the money was gone.
- My father gambled away our furniture when I was a child. It was very traumatic for mum and us kids so I swore never to gamble. My sister is addicted to pokie machines.
- My father has had a gambling problem. Mostly horseracing, but then pokies. Went bankrupt. Affected the whole family.

- My husband's ex partner was a problem gambler. Ruined their relationship. I am a teacher at a low decile school and deal with children who come to school hungry. Last year in 5 to 6 year old class, four of them were homeless.
- Partner gambled her pay and then said purse was stolen. We are no longer together.
- The person got done for fraud and lost his job. He stole off me and lied to cover up his gambling. He is no longer in my life.
- They couldn't pay their bills and we ended up paying them so that the kids involved would be ok. It damaged our relationships (mine with my partner and ours with the gambler) and ruined our ability to do cool stuff for our own whanau.
- They were a friend of ours. They lost their home and relationship. We had to support them for a while.
- Uncle was a gambler, marriage break-up.

Comments coded to **addicted/wasting money on gambling**:

- An employee had a problem and I now manage his money. It caused huge problems for him and his family. Luckily, he realised he had a problem.
- Dad sacrifices food for keno. Pay more than you win.
- Family heavily involved. Lost self respect and wasted a lot of money.
- Gambling addiction.
- He would encourage me to gamble more than I would otherwise and now I am hooked on it. He found the lord and gave up gambling.
- I have an aunty and three first cousins who are heavily addicted to pokies and are seriously in debt. It has affected my family as my nephews and nieces have been neglected as a result of our pokie addicted whanau members not having enough money to buy kai, or leaving their tamariki at daycare for ridiculous hours (ie, 7am-7pm) because they have forgotten to pick them up while sitting playing the pokies.
- I have seen a lot of unhandiness. All the rent money got spent on gambling. Created tension in relationships.
- It was a workmate and we had to carry her at work because she was too tired to work after being on the pokies late at night. She was also a bit weird. Had an addictive personality.
- Just watching my friend waste her money, lie about it and the eventual breakdown of that family.
- Know of a family member who has this problem, but not so bad that they lost their home or anything.
- Me, myself. Everyone has to pick up the slack due to my gambling habits.
- My daughter was addicted to pokie machines and had counselling for a long time. I haven't played them for eight years.
- My father gambled away our furniture when I was a child. It was very traumatic for mum and us kids so I swore never to gamble. My sister is addicted to pokie machines.
- My father has had a gambling problem. Mostly horseracing, but then pokies. Went bankrupt. Affected the whole family.
- My first husband was a gambler (did not want to go into it any further).
- My mum was a hard out gambler. Didn't realise she was spending money on pokies until I was an adult, stopped since.
- My son has a gambling problem. He has a head injury and is gambling too much.
- Nan is addicted (lives in Australia). When she visits, she makes a trip to Hamilton. Plays pokie games on ipad quite often.
- Person in 70's has to keep working to fund his habit.
- Pub pokies and spending more than intended.
- Witnesses wasting of money. Seen people deal with unhappiness as they try to gamble to fulfill other needs.

Comments coded to **lost savings/house/bankruptcy**:

- Aunt had to sell house. Goods repossessed. Affected nana who previously owned house and now has to rent.

- My dad was estranged from our family and lost all his money so had nothing to retire on. His gambling caused huge stress on the family.
- My daughter-in-law gambled everything away. Had no food for the children and went through about six rentals because she didn't have the rent. We had to take the children and look after them. Naturally, the money was gone.
- My father has had a gambling problem. Mostly horseracing, but then pokies. Went bankrupt. Affected the whole family.
- My mother lost too much money. She had to take out a mortgage on her house and she will leave us a debt rather than a freehold house.
- My son was a problem gambler and we had to bail him out. He lost two freehold houses.
- Oldest brother gambled everything he had.
- Partner's previous boss nearly lost his business in Wellington.
- She lost her house.
- Son-in-law lost house deposit and savings.
- They lost their house. It was a family member.
- They were a friend of ours. They lost their home and relationship. We had to support them for a while.

Comments coded to **increased anti-social activities/stealing/domestic violence/lying**:

- Family member embezzled money and lost it gambling. Went to jail. Tore the family apart.
- Friend of mine had a business and one of the staff stole money for gambling on the pokies.
- Just watching my friend waste her money, lie about it and the eventual breakdown of that family.
- Kids's father. Not with him because of his gambling. Whole life suffered. Robbed me and his own children (and beat me) to get money for pokies. Jailed for seven years for stealing to fund pokies.
- Lost their family. I have the children. Along with the gambling came the drugs, the lies, the excuses, the violence. Impacted me because my whole life has now changed. Too easy for her to get an overdraft using my son's account.
- My sister in-law gambled \$40,000 of our father's money in the pokie machines without his knowledge.
- My wife's ex husband stole hundreds of thousands of dollars from her.
- Partner gambled her pay and then said purse was stolen. We are no longer together.
- The person got done for fraud and lost his job. He stole off me and lied to cover up his gambling. He is no longer in my life.
- They gambled money from a community organisation I was involved. All other branches of the organisation had to contribute to paying that money back.

Comments coded to **lost money gambling/having to borrow money to survive/relying on others**:

- \$1,000 of household money spent on a horse race.
- Friend of my sister always borrowing money because she lost all on the pokies. Lost friends and children. Had to be looked after by grandmother.
- Good friend (in past) had to stay with us and we had to feed them.
- I have an aunty and three first cousins who are heavily addicted to pokies and are seriously in debt. It has affected my family as my nephews and nieces have been neglected as a result of our pokie addicted whanau members not having enough money to buy kai, or leaving their tamariki at daycare for ridiculous hours (ie, 7am-7pm) because they have forgotten to pick them up while sitting playing the pokies.
- It was a family member; we were asked for money.
- Lost their family. I have the children. Along with the gambling came the drugs, the lies, the excuses, the violence. Impacted me because my whole life has now changed. Too easy for her to get an overdraft using my son's account.
- My mother lost too much money. She had to take out a mortgage on her house and she will leave us a debt rather than a freehold house.

- See a lot of people get into strife because of gambling ie, missing loan payments, loan applications, big out goings. See spending on non essentials.
- Sister got into debt. Owed family money.
- They were a friend of ours. They lost their home and relationship. We had to support them for a while.

Comments coded to **kids abandoned or neglected:**

- I have an aunty and three first cousins who are heavily addicted to pokies and are seriously in debt. It has affected my family as my nephews and nieces have been neglected as a result of our pokie addicted whanau members not having enough money to buy kai, or leaving their tamariki at daycare for ridiculous hours (ie, 7am-7pm) because they have forgotten to pick them up while sitting playing the pokies.
- Lost their family. I have the children. Along with the gambling came the drugs, the lies, the excuses, the violence. Impacted me because my whole life has now changed. Too easy for her to get an overdraft using my son's account.
- My daughter-in-law gambled everything away. Had no food for the children and went through about six rentals because she didn't have the rent. We had to take the children and look after them. Naturally, the money was gone.
- My husband's ex partner was a problem gambler. Ruined their relationship. I am a teacher at a low decile school and deal with children who come to school hungry. Last year in 5 to 6 year old class, four of them were homeless.
- They couldn't pay their bills and we ended up paying them so that the kids involved would be ok. It damaged our relationships (mine with my partner and ours with the gambler) and ruined our ability to do cool stuff for our own whanau.

Comments coded to **undergone treatment/counselling/solutions to gambling found:**

- An employee had a problem and I now manage his money. It caused huge problems for him and his family. Luckily, he realised he had a problem.
- He would encourage me to gamble more than I would otherwise and now I am hooked on it. He found the lord and gave up gambling.
- My daughter was addicted to pokie machines and had counselling for a long time. I haven't played them for eight years.
- My mum was a hard out gambler. Didn't realise she was spending money on pokies until I was an adult, stopped since.

Comments coded to **emotional/physical breakdown :**

- Emotionally frustrating and disappointing.
- It was a workmate and we had to carry her at work because she was too tired to work after being on the pokies late at night. She was also a bit weird. Had an addictive personality.

Comments coded to **lost self respect/family/friends:**

- Family heavily involved. Lost self respect and wasted a lot of money.
- Friend of my sister always borrowing money because she lost all on the pokies. Lost friends and children. Had to be looked after by grandmother.

Comments coded to **other:**

- Maybe once. A relative.
- My old man gambled everyday, since I was a kid (TAB). Good at it. Never lost.
- My son has a gambling problem. He has a head injury and is gambling too much.

5. Do you feel a need to reduce your current level of gambling?

	Number	Percent
Yes	18	3.6%
No	470	94.8%
Don't know	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

6. Would you like me to post some information to you about where you can access support for problem gambling?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0.0%
No	16	88.9%
Don't know	0	0.0%
Refused/not specified	2	11.1%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	18	100.0%

This section is about gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua:

The current situation:

- Rotorua currently has 26 gambling venues which can have pokie machines.
- These venues are licenced to contain 389 machines between them.
- \$19.5 million was spent in these machines in the 2014/2015 year within the Rotorua District.
- For every \$1, roughly \$0.40 of the money goes to community purposes. This was approximately \$7.8 million going to the community in the 2014/2015 period.

7. With this in mind, what do you think should happen with the numbers of gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua? (using a five point scale from greatly increase to greatly decrease)

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase	5	1.0%	1.0%
Stay the same	105	21.2%	21.3%
Decrease	162	32.7%	32.8%
Greatly decrease	193	38.9%	39.1%
NA/Don't know	26	5.2%	5.3%
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

8. Please outline any reasons for your views?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive	134	27.0%
Tend to target poor who cannot afford to play/remove from certain areas	103	20.8%
Too many machines in Rotorua/reduce numbers	43	8.7%
Good that they give back to the community	37	7.5%
Too much spent on gambling/waste of money	35	7.1%
Help for those with gambling problems/problem gamblers	30	6.0%
Don't agree with gambling	21	4.2%
People should be able to gamble if they want to/not aware of any issues	19	3.8%
It is a balancing act with good and bad sides	15	3.0%
Don't want to see any more machines	13	2.6%
Recipients of community money	11	2.2%
Have a casino in Rotorua/target tourists	10	2.0%
Increase the community contribution	7	1.4%
Don't want to encourage gambling	5	1.0%
Enforce standards/high class of dress/current venues attract shabby patrons	3	0.6%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	8	1.6%
Other	9	1.8%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive**:

- 26 way too many. We only need one or two places at the most. Bad habit.
- A lot of people struggle to pay bills when they gamble.
- A menace to society, especially for low income families.
- Abolish completely.
- Aiding and abetting a dreadful addiction that affects families.
- Anecdotally they cause a lot of domestic problems. The people who lose the most are the least able to afford.
- Bad impact on families.
- Based on the one I know, I saw people there at all times of the day.
- Because people get addicted to pokies and the money going back to the community comes from poor people.
- Because the amount returned to the community is low and is a lot for the people who use the machine.
- Because the people who frequent them can't afford it, so we need to help those who can't help themselves.
- Because there is a problem and everyone knows there is.
- Being a heavy gambler, it destroys a lot of lives and families.
- Causes a lot of problems for people.
- Causes too much hardship among poor families, not that I have any personal knowledge of this, but that's the impression I got.
- Children experience hardship as a result of parents playing the pokies.
- Children miss out when parents gamble.
- Children suffer because parents gamble.
- Comes back to the family. Families largely affected. Take temptation away.
- Could spend money on something else. The something else being their children.
- Cut all out of NZ.
- Desperate people play pokie machines so the less opportunity they have the better.
- Don't like them at all. Too addictive.
- Families suffer. People spend money they don't have.
- Gamblers will always find a way to gamble, unfortunately.

- *Gambling is a distracting, addictive behaviour. Within a very short time it changes from a bit of fun that stops you from thinking about your current problem to being bigger than your original problem. Creators of pokie machines use psychological warfare to lure you in to believing you are having a great time - music, lights, action. But you will always be spending money that you could use for your family or yourself. Take the music out, remove the features, make it as unattractive as smoking.*
- *Gambling is a family breaker. People lose all their money and get cranky and upset and this affects their relationships.*
- *Gambling is an addiction. People who can least afford it, appear to be the targets of gambling.*
- *Get rid of all of them.*
- *Get rid of all the dingy bars with pokie machines.*
- *Get rid of the lot of them, there is no skill in playing them.*
- *Get rid of the lot.*
- *Get rid of them cos that means all that money would have stayed within the community.*
- *Get rid of them for good. Lot more (unfortunate) poor than rich people play.*
- *Get rid of them (x3).*
- *Heard about people with gambling problems but don't know anyone personally.*
- *I am amazed at the amount of money going through the machines. I am aware of the problems this causes to children.*
- *I don't know how many suffer through the addictive nature of gambling.*
- *I have been approached by people asking for money outside these venues. Families get hurt by gambling on pokies.*
- *I have seen the damage.*
- *I see no reason why we should have them in Rotorua.*
- *I think they are immoral. It affects poor people greatly.*
- *I think this should be banned.*
- *I worked the bars and I saw the problems pokie machines cause.*
- *If they are not available then there will be less gambling by those who do so.*
- *Impacts on families too much. Too much poverty here and gambling is a big contributor.*
- *It encourages people to play with money they can't afford. Children suffer because there is no food for them.*
- *It is a blot in the community.*
- *It is too easy to get hooked on gambling on pokie machines. Very addictive.*
- *It's the people that use them, not the machines.*
- *It's the pokies. The worst lots are solo parents and widows. I'm told they live in them places, running themselves broke and the kids have to suffer.*
- *Makes people poor. If they didn't have machines, they would be better off and maybe contribute to the community more.*
- *My friend owned a bar with pokie machines and was so saddened by a mother using all their benefit on the pokies that he had the pokies taken out and now just has a bar.*
- *My neighbour's kid gamble. Seen suffering.*
- *My sister-in-law lost 40,000 of our money. Take the availability away.*
- *Negative aspects affect any benefit to community.*
- *No matter how much goes back into the community, they take more than they give.*
- *Not a good activity for Rotorua.*
- *Not affected by it, but see others wasting their money, chasing their loses.*
- *Not an admissible trait to have and not an admissible reputation for Rotorua.*
- *Not good for our people. People just need something to do.*
- *People are spending all their time gambling and the community has to raise their kids, eg, provide breakfast and lunches and take them to sporting events.*
- *People can get addicted to pokies.*
- *People can get hooked with devastating results. Although I have benefited from a grant, I don't think you can justify all that money going into machines.*
- *People do not realise how addictive gambling is. Feel wrong people gamble.*
- *People getting bad habits especially, the kids.*

- People lose too much money.
- People that spent most of their money on pokies would be better spending it on their families.
- People waste their money on pokies.
- People wasting their money. Easily addicted.
- Pokie gambling is addictive and ruins lives.
- Pokie machines are a curse.
- Pokie machines are a problem.
- Pokie machines are addictive and have a hugely negative impact on families and work places.
- Pokie machines are causing harm. People become addicted to playing them, often those who can't afford to lose the money.
- Pokie machines are harmful to the community.
- Pokie machines cause a lot of misery (x2).
- Pokies cause hardships in families. Money only goes to sports teams, not to the community in general.
- Pokies not a good thing. If it becomes a problem it can affect families.
- Problems caused for families.
- Profiting off peoples' sufferings. Wouldn't have problems if we didn't have pokie machines.
- Sad, a lot of kids will have missed out on things.
- Same people use them all the time and don't benefit from them.
- Social problems, poverty, homelessness. Family violence.
- Some people are unable to control their gambling. By taking the gambling machines away, this will remove this option.
- Some people struggle because of gambling problems.
- The problem is far greater than the supposed benefits.
- There are a lot of social issues around gambling. Pokies too accessible at all times of the day.
- There are too many and too much gambling problems.
- There are too many kids out there that miss out on food and not being looked after.
- There are too many of them and problem gambling destroys families.
- There is enough poverty around. Children go without food and clothing because parents gamble.
- There is nothing healthy about playing pokie machines. At least with Housie, people were socialising with others in the community and the money raised could be used for community initiatives. People sitting in front of a machine pumping money into it for corporate businesses is as bad as smoking. There is nothing good in it except money for companies with no morals or values. The dam things should be banned in NZ.
- There is too much social damage caused by gambling, to individuals, families and the community.
- They affect too many people negatively.
- They are a big problem for some people.
- They are a big problem in Rotorua.
- They are a nasty little trap.
- They are a scourge on society. Family members who use them have told me they would be happy for them to go and would much rather there was a proper casino. This casino would provide employment, have entertainment, security, policies and codes including dress. It would also monitor use, provide player support and also return a percentage of profit to the community. Tourists would also appreciate somewhere else to go other than hangi and concert (even though locally these are of the highest order).
- They are a scourge on the community. Beneficiaries see them as a way out of their trouble.
- They are addictive and cause heartache.
- They are addictive and money can be ill-afforded by many people who pay them.
- They are addictive and the families suffer.
- They are no good and it is the poor that suffer.
- They are not a necessity of life.
- They are pretty evil.
- They are unhealthy.

- They aren't good for the people using them. They can be very addictive.
- They aren't necessary and they are addictive.
- They cause damage with people who can't afford to gamble using them.
- They cause hardship in families.
- They cause problems for families of pokie users. They are addictive.
- They do too much harm to people who can't afford it.
- They don't need to be in the pubs. If there were no pokie machines, the whole amount could go back to community opposed to just 40c.
- They have a negative impact on people.
- Things to spend your money on. If they weren't around, you couldn't do it.
- Too many kids going without food due to gambling.
- Too many people are spending money on pokies instead of feeding their kids.
- Too many people live in poor socio-economic situations in Rotorua where gambling is an issue. Consequently the families suffer and people's lives are ruined.
- Too many people spending too much money on them.
- Too many people wasting money on machines.
- Too many people who play pokies can't afford to do so and their families suffer.
- Too many places and too many machines affecting people and families.
- Too many social problems associated with gambling machines.
- Too much money being spent and what comes back seems like blood money.
- Very addictive for the undisciplined person.
- Whānau need to spend more time and money on more important things like whānau.
- Will help people to stop gambling.
- Worked opposite a venue and saw people going there early in the morning and spending all day there.
- Wrong people who can't afford it use the machines. Take away the opportunity.
- You can't win on pokie machines and people are stupid to play them.

Comments coded to **tend to target poor who cannot afford to play/remove from certain areas:**

- A - it is gambling and B- peoples standard of living. People's pennies have to stretch. Maybe, a casino for tourists.
- A lot of people struggle to pay bills when they gamble.
- Anecdotally they cause a lot of domestic problems. The people who lose the most are the least able to afford.
- Because people get addicted to pokies and the money going back to the community comes from poor people.
- Because the amount returned to the community is low and is a lot for the people who use the machine.
- Because the people who frequent them can't afford it, so we need to help those who can't help themselves.
- Because they put them into the poorest areas. Don't see any in Springfield.
- Benefits go to small proportions of community. Impacts a lot of people in low socio-economic areas.
- Better off having the money in people's pockets to supply their families with food as opposed to 40 cents per 1 dollar coming back into community.
- Close down in areas where beneficiaries spend a lot of time. Decrease in certain places.
- Demographics. Can't afford to with low incomes.
- Far too many for a city dependent on WINZ.
- Gambler's money could be spent elsewhere. Use money for things they need.
- Gambling is an addiction. People who can least afford it, appear to be the targets of gambling.
- Gambling is often done by those who can't afford to lose money.
- Get all the pokie machines out of the suburbs and make a bylaw that they can only be within the CBD. Reduce pokie machines to zero (within bars) and lobby the government for a high end Casino that targets the tourists and restricts locals from playing. Gambling addiction breaks down our community as it impacts the most vulnerable - low income and children.

Whilst the income from pokies helps our community groups (including groups I am involved with), the social cost is not monitored or managed and I think the social cost is too high.

- *Get rid of them for good. Lot more (unfortunate) poor than rich people play.*
- *Good idea that money goes to charity, but don't like that poor people use pokie machines when they can't afford too.*
- *I feel that the availability of machines encourages their use. If it becomes more inconvenient to get to a gambling machine, people are less likely to use them. I feel that pokie machines cater more towards people who have time on their hands, ie, beneficiaries. These very same people are at the lowest socio-economic levels in our society. So if there is a wait time to use pokie machines, people might be inclined to leave the gambling facility and do something else.*
- *I have extended family who can't afford to gamble, but do and then deprive themselves of necessities such as food.*
- *I have seen family and friends gamble ridiculously, spending food and rent money.*
- *I haven't heard of any problems, but that don't want more in poorer areas.*
- *I live in one of the poorer areas and hate to see unemployed/ poor people of the area playing the pokies.*
- *I see so many poor people trying to win and losing.*
- *I think they are immoral. It affects poor people greatly.*
- *I would like to see one centralised gambling venue like a casino to help in the management of problem gambling. They need to be taken out of the pubs.*
- *If the amount spent on pokie machines was not gambled away, people would not need to ask for help from WINZ or charities.*
- *Impacts on families too much. Too much poverty here and gambling is a big contributor.*
- *It affects the Maori families greatly.*
- *It entices the wrong sort of people to play.*
- *It impacts on low socio-economic families.*
- *It is a waste of money and often those who play can't afford to do so.*
- *It is an addiction and often it is people who don't have money to lose who get addicted.*
- *It is an insidious vice. People get hooked and lose money they should use for other important things.*
- *It is causing trouble in some low income households.*
- *It might make less opportunity for people to use them.*
- *It takes a lot of money away from people who shouldn't be in those places because they don't have the money to lose.*
- *It's the pokies. The worst lots are solo parents and widows. I'm told they live in them places, running themselves broke and the kids have to suffer.*
- *Just making the poor poorer. Reduce temptation.*
- *Lot of people who can't afford it play the machines then we have to support them on benefits and handouts.*
- *Most people who play pokies don't have the money to spend and it impact families.*
- *Needs a casino. Not community bits and pieces.*
- *Not a good habit, affects family.*
- *Not a lot of people can afford to feed the machines.*
- *Not everyone who plays can afford to gamble.*
- *Often it is low income people playing.*
- *Often the people who can't afford to do so gamble.*
- *Outdoors lifestyle is better for people. Too much money is wasted on pokies especially, by people who can't afford to gamble.*
- *People are being robbed of their money.*
- *People are spending money they don't have.*
- *People do not realise how addictive gambling is. Feel wrong people gamble.*
- *People playing those machines are the ones that have no money. Can ill afford to due to their financial position.*
- *People spending who cannot afford to. Any money coming back into community does not go to the people spending it.*

- People that can ill afford gambling are part of those that spent 19.5 million.
- People who don't have much money play them to try to win.
- People who gamble deprive their families of the money they gamble and they are often low income families.
- People who haven't got the money use pokie machines as they think they will win big and solve their problems.
- People who play them can't afford to do so. It is often the poor people who play.
- Pokie machines affect the most vulnerable.
- Pokie machines are causing harm. People become addicted to playing them, often those who can't afford to lose the money.
- Pokie machines don't need to be in suburban pubs.
- Prey on unfortunate people that are addicted to them.
- Reduce amount of spending, probably in low socio-economic areas.
- Remove all gambling - for someone to win means that a lot of people have to lose (mostly the needy).
- Rotorua is one of the poorest communities, and we have too many people who can't afford to gamble, but do so.
- Seems a lot of money from a small city. A lot of employment and beneficiaries.
- Social cost is high.
- Taking money from many of the poorest sectors of our community and then giving SOME of it to community groups doesn't seem like a very good equation. I would be interested to know what happens to the other 60% of the take.
- The 7.8m dollars is often given to organisations that support the gambling venue. A hotel will give to a local rugby club because they buy their drinking supplies from that hotel. Often the money is not going to support the problem areas created by the issue of gambling. Support everyones right to gambling, but it is usually the lower income people that spend and suffer the most and are targeted with the placement of pokies etc.
- The majority of people putting money in, are the ones that can't afford it.
- The people that play these machines are the same people that can least afford it.
- The people who play pokies can't afford to lose. Apart from a few retirees with heaps of money, most are low income people playing pokies.
- The people who play the pokies often can't afford it and I don't feel the community benefits. The venues are also just seedy.
- The people who use them can't afford to gamble.
- The wrong people are using them. People who can least afford it play the machines.
- There is a problem for some, especially those who spend their benefit money.
- They are a scourge on society. Family members who use them have told me they would be happy for them to go and would much rather there was a proper casino. This casino would provide employment, have entertainment, security, policies and codes including dress. It would also monitor use, provide player support and also return a percentage of profit to the community. Tourists would also appreciate somewhere else to go other than hangi and concert (even though locally these are of the highest order).
- They are a scourge on the community. Beneficiaries see them as a way out of their trouble.
- They are addictive and money can be ill-afforded by many people who pay them.
- They are in the wrong places.
- They are no good and it is the poor that suffer.
- They cause damage with people who can't afford to gamble using them.
- They do too much harm to people who can't afford it.
- They don't need to be in the pubs. If there was no pokie machines, the whole amount could go back to community opposed to just 40c.
- They mainly affect Maori people.
- They normally are used by people who can least afford to gamble.
- They target the lower socio-economic areas. For that reason, if you lowered it, people would have to wait for machines and would be less likely to gamble if they are not available.
- Too many machines concentrated in poorer areas.

- Too many people have money problems and try to win to alleviate this but it just causes more problems.
- Too many people live in poor socio-economic situations in Rotorua where gambling is an issue. Consequently the families suffer and people's lives are ruined.
- Too many people spend money that they do not have.
- Too many people who play pokies can't afford to do so and their families suffer.
- Too many poor people gambling and going without food.
- Too many spending money they can't afford to lose.
- Too much money going through the machines from a city with so many social problems and poverty.
- Too much money is spent on gambling by people who can't afford to do so.
- Types of people using them shouldn't be (in general).
- We have a population of poor, unemployed people. Some are desperate and fall into the trap of a quick win.
- We have population that experience financial difficulties and pokie machines make it worse.
- Wrong people and who can least afford are the ones that spend the most.
- Wrong people play them.
- Wrong people who can't afford it use the machines. Take away the opportunity.
- Wrong types of people who don't work go in early in the mornings.

Comments coded to **too many machines in Rotorua/reduce numbers**:

- 26 way too many. We only need one or two places at the most. Bad habit.
- 389 is a lot of machines to waste money on. Don't put them where there is alcohol.
- 389 machines in Rotorua is far too many.
- 389 machines is a lot.
- Either decrease numbers or put more than 0.40 cents per dollar back into the community.
- Even though some money goes back to the community, the community has spent a huge amount on machines.
- Far too many for a city dependent on WINZ.
- I currently don't know how many machines there are in Rotorua, but I believe that their numbers should be restricted.
- I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.
- I feel that the availability of machines encourages their use. If it becomes more inconvenient to get to a gambling machine, people are less likely to use them. I feel that pokie machines cater more towards people who have time on their hands, ie, beneficiaries. These very same people are at the lowest socio-economic levels in our society. So if there is a wait time to use pokie machines, people might be inclined to leave the gambling facility and do something else.
- I see many people in these outlets who live and breathe playing these machines. With so many outlets from one end of town to the other, that makes the choice easier to stop and put that \$2 in a machine. The sounds, hearing coins coming from these machines is so tempting.
- I think the availability means more people use them.
- If it is a problem, it should decrease.
- If you want people to stop, you need to reduce machines.
- It makes me feel better to think they are reducing.
- Just making the poor poorer. Reduce temptation.
- Machines a waste of time.
- Must be too many machines.
- No need for them.
- Not good for the community in general. Only people making money are the ones that run them and love them on site.

- On one hand you need to reduce the harm to the problem gamblers. However, I also believe community groups rely on this money quite heavily. Decrease the numbers a little to help deter and assuming this will decrease the revenue, increase the \$0.40 portion to community groups.
- People concerned have to want to stop. I get angry about it, the impoverished children.
- People don't need to spend that much money on gambling machines. I don't think we should greatly decrease yet, but do a slow decrease so those affected can adjust to a life without gambling.
- Reduce amount of spending, probably in low socio-economic areas.
- Reduced access must reduce harm.
- Rotorua doesn't need 389 pokie machines.
- Shocked by numbers.
- There are a lot of social issues around gambling. Pokies too accessible at all times of the day.
- There are far too many machines in Rotorua.
- There are too many of them and problem gambling destroys families.
- There are way too many.
- There are too many pokie machines for Rotorua.
- They target the lower socio-economic areas. For that reason, if you lowered it, people would have to wait for machines and would be less likely to gamble if they are not available.
- Too many machines in Rotorua.
- Too many places and too many machines affecting people and families.
- Too many (x2).
- Way too many. Less than 100 would be better.
- We are not a big town, lots of pokies are not necessary.
- We don't need that much in Rotorua.
- We have more pokie machines here than we need.
- We have too many for a city this size.
- We need to reduce the availability of pokies.

Comments coded to **good that they give back to the community:**

- As money from the machines comes back into the community.
- Because of what goes back to the community.
- Because there is a lot of money going to the community.
- Big profits with a lot going into the community.
- Depends what it was spent on. If it was spent on health benefits then it should increase.
- Don't mind if there is money going to the community.
- Food advertising and support for problem gamblers so others should be able to play if they like and \$7.8 million going to the community is a bonus.
- Gambling can be an addiction that often affects their family's lifestyle. But also people can play gambling for their leisure and their money helps the community. These are not bad things. I don't know if it should be increased or decreased so my answer is stay the same.
- Get a proper casino and control it fully. Target it for visitors and ensure users are well dressed etc. Keep standards. The pokies are trashy, but there is some pay back to things like sports clubs through grants etc.
- Good idea that money goes to charity, but don't like that poor people use pokie machines when they can't afford too.
- Good that they give back to community.
- Good to see some money generated going back into the community.
- I am on a couple of committee's that benefit from gambling trusts.
- I don't lose by it and some money comes back into the community.
- I like the idea that some money goes back into the community.
- If money goes back into the community, that is good, but we don't need any more.
- If some of the money goes into the community that is a good thing, but have no more machines.
- Increase by a small amount because of money going back into the community.

- Increase, especially if money is going back to community.
- It is retaining the money in the community.
- Leave as is because the money coming back into the community does help some groups.
- Money goes back into community.
- Money going back is good, but some families destroyed by gambling.
- Money going into the community is a good thing, but grants should be published.
- More money for us non gamblers to get in grants.
- On one hand you need to reduce the harm to the problem gamblers. However, I also believe community groups rely on this money quite heavily. Decrease the numbers a little to help deter and assuming this will decrease the revenue, increase the \$0.40 portion to community groups.
- People like to have a bet. Doesn't affect me and at least something comes back to the community. Not like gambling on the computer.
- Positive side of having machines are people still gamble instead of other gambling methods where money doesn't come back into the community.
- Reasonable amount goes to the community.
- So long as the money is coming back into the community. Especially schools and fundraisers.
- Some communities rely on that money.
- That is a lot of money going to the community.
- That is because money is going back into community.
- The benefit to the community.
- The community does benefit.
- The return is good to the community.
- Would not like an increase. Good as long as money goes back to the community.

Comments coded to **too much spent on gambling/waste of money:**

- 19.5 million is a terrible amount to be spent when it could go back into families.
- A lot of money to be wasting.
- A ridiculous amount of money going into machines from a small population.
- Considering the size of Rotorua, I don't think the population can sustain such a huge amount going through the machines.
- Far too much spent.
- I am amazed at the amount of money going through the machines. I am aware of the problems this causes to children.
- I think it is disgusting that so much money is put through machines.
- It is a waste of money.
- It is insane that 19.5 million should be spent in Rotorua on pokie machines.
- Money wasted.
- Outdoors lifestyle is better for people. Too much money is wasted on pokies especially, by people who can't afford to gamble.
- People can get hooked with devastating results. Although I have benefitted from a grant, I don't think you can justify all that money going into machines.
- People spending far too much money on pokies, especially as we have high unemployment.
- People wasting a lot of money.
- Pokie machines affect the most vulnerable.
- Population too small to sustain that level of gambling.
- Quite a lot for a small city.
- Ratio for the proportion of people living here doesn't sound good.
- Reduce amount of spending, probably in low socio-economic areas.
- Seems a lot of money from a small city. A lot of employment and beneficiaries.
- Shocked by numbers.
- That is a huge amount of money taken out of the pockets of the poor people in Rotorua.
- They are a waste of money (x5).
- Too many people spending too much money on them.
- Too many people wasting money on machines.

- Too much money being spent and what comes back seems like blood money.
- Too much money being wasted (x2).
- Too much money going through machines which should be spent on other things.
- Too much money going through the machines from a city with so many social problems and poverty.
- Too much money spent.

Comments coded to **help for those with gambling problems/problem gamblers**:

- A lot of people struggle with gambling.
- Because of problem gamblers.
- Bringing money to the community to help those that lose it.
- Causes addiction and those people need to go through extensive therapy in the health care system.
- Food advertising and support for problem gamblers so others should be able to play if they like and \$7.8 million going to the community is a bonus.
- Gambling is a distracting, addictive behaviour. Within a very short time it changes from a bit of fun that stops you from thinking about your current problem to being bigger than your original problem. Creators of pokie machines use psychological warfare to lure you in to believing you are having a great time - music, lights, action. But you will always be spending money that you could use for your family or yourself. Take the music out, remove the features, make it as unattractive as smoking.
- Gambling problems in Rotorua.
- Having them around when I don't gamble seems ok, but I realise some people do have gambling problems.
- I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.
- I work where I am aware it can become a problem if left unchecked.
- It impacts many families with problem gamblers. More money leaves the community than comes in with pokies.
- It is an insidious vice. People get hooked and lose money they should use for other important things.
- It is causing trouble in some low income households.
- It may be giving money back into the community, but is it giving money back to the families that spend the money feeding the machines?.
- Lots of people who can't afford it play the machines then we have to support them on benefits and handouts.
- Not a good habit, affects family.
- On one hand you need to reduce the harm to the problem gamblers. However I also believe community groups rely on this money quite heavily. Decrease the numbers a little to help deter and assuming this will decrease the revenue, increase the \$0.40 portion to community groups.
- People can get addicted to pokies.
- People concerned have to want to stop. I get angry about it, the impoverished children.
- People spending who cannot afford to. Any money coming back into community does not go to the people spending it.
- People who are affected are not necessarily the ones that get it back.
- Pokie gambling is addictive and ruins lives.
- Problem gamblers use them and often lose all their money.
- Rotorua has a lot of problem gamblers.
- Some people have a huge problem.

- The 7.8m dollars is often given to organisations that support the gambling venue. A hotel will give to a local rugby club because they buy their drinking supplies from that hotel. Often the money is not going to support the problem areas created by the issue of gambling. Support everyone's right to gambling, but it is usually the lower income people that spend and suffer the most and are targeted with the placement of pokies etc.
- There are a lot of problem gamblers.
- They are a scourge on society. Family members who use them have told me they would be happy for them to go and would much rather there was a proper casino. This casino would provide employment, have entertainment, security, policies and codes including dress. It would also monitor use, provide player support and also return a percentage of profit to the community. Tourists would also appreciate somewhere else to go other than hangi and concert (even though locally these are of the highest order).
- They target the lower socio-economic areas. For that reason, if you lowered it, people would have to wait for machines and would be less likely to gamble if they are not available.
- Try to stop people losing too much.

Comments coded to **don't agree with gambling:**

- Don't agree with gambling and come from a family that doesn't agree with gambling.
- Don't like gambling.
- Don't see a lot of point. More of a problem than anything.
- Gambling is really bad.
- Gambling not necessary.
- Gambling of any form is a bad behaviour. Charity should not come off gambling.
- Gambling puts hardship on families.
- Gambling seems like an easy way to win money, but the machines are made to win. Puts temptation in people's way.
- I am strongly against gambling.
- I don't agree with gambling. It affects a lot of families who really suffer because of gambling here.
- I don't believe in gambling (x2).
- I don't see the point in them. I don't like gambling.
- I saw problem gamblers in my work situation. There is nothing positive about pokies.
- I think that the end does not justify the means.
- It is a waste of money and often those who play can't afford to do so.
- It is hard to earn money now, so we don't need the temptation of pokie machines.
- Remove all gambling - for someone to win means that a lot of people have to lose (mostly the needy).
- Should be banned altogether.
- Some people are unable to control their gambling. By taking the gambling machines away, this will remove this option.
- Wipe the lot of them. A waste of money.

Comments coded to **people should be able to gamble if they want to/not aware of any issues:**

- Can't punish all of Rotorua because a few can't play or are problem gamblers.
- Certain people like them.
- Don't hear much news about the use of them so it is not newsworthy, must be ok.
- Have not seen any issues. People will gamble if they want too.
- Having them around when I don't gamble seems ok, but I realise some people do have gambling problems.
- I don't see any real problems with pokie machines.
- I don't think machines should go just because some people are problem gamblers. People who can afford it enjoy the pokies.
- I don't want to stop other people gambling, but there is a link to poverty and gambling.
- I haven't heard of any problems, but that don't want more in poorer areas.
- Less pokie machines will have no positive impact.

- Lots of people who play are tourists. If people don't play here, they will go elsewhere. Keep business in Rotorua.
- Maybe, stay the same so that those who gamble responsibly can still do so, but don't increase numbers.
- People have the right to gamble.
- People like to have a bet. Doesn't affect me and at least something comes back to the community. Not like gambling on the computer.
- People will use them where ever they are. You can't stop people playing the pokies.
- Shouldn't pass any laws. People should be free to do as they please even though it is a dumb idea in my opinion.
- The 7.8m dollars is often given to organisations that support the gambling venue. A hotel will give to a local rugby club because they buy their drinking supplies from that hotel. Often the money is not going to support the problem areas created by the issue of gambling. Support everyone's right to gambling, but it is usually the lower income people that spend and suffer the most and are targeted with the placement of pokies etc.
- They are a legitimate form of entertainment. They shouldn't be encouraged, however.
- Those who play will always find a machine regardless of whether we reduce them.

Comments coded to **it is a balancing act with good and bad sides:**

- Can't support one activity to support another. Better ways to support the community.
- Catch 22, if I select increase then I support gambling and if I select decrease, then I am opposed to the grants.
- Gambling can be an addiction that often affects their family's lifestyle. But also people can play gambling for their leisure and their money helps the community. These are not bad things. I don't know if it should be increased or decreased so my answer is stay the same.
- I don't want to stop other people gambling but there is a link to poverty and gambling.
- I generally hold libertarian views. It's a personal action and clear options are available for people who may have an addiction problem, or people who may be affected by someone-else's choices and/or actions.
- I guess the catch 22 is that if gambling was greatly decreased - would the money saved in social agencies involved be invested back into the community? Would those that gamble then have more money to support their children and run their house holds or would they then fritter it away on more drugs, smokes alcohol leading to an increase in other issues ie, family violence etc.
- It is a double edged sword as pokie machines have a good and bad side.
- Money going back is good, but some families are destroyed by gambling.
- Negative aspects affect any benefit to community.
- No matter how much goes back into the community, they take more than they give.
- On one hand you need to reduce the harm to the problem gamblers. However, I also believe community groups rely on this money quite heavily. Decrease the numbers a little to help deter and assuming this will decrease the revenue, increase the \$0.40 portion to community groups.
- People push the money going back as a good thing, but it has come from the losses of the players.
- The negative impact is more substantial than the positive impact.
- Very difficult to reduce them. Too many people have a finger in the cash pie.
- What is the alternative, what will the people do?

Comments coded to **don't want to see any more machines:**

- Far too many for a city dependent on WINZ.
- If money goes back into the community, that is good, but we don't need any more.
- If some of the money goes into the community that is a good thing but have no more machines.
- If you decrease the machines, there will be more people per machines.
- Keep number same, but increase percentage going back to community.

- Keep same but pay out more. They know they are ripping us off. Tampered with machines. Set up so it pays them first.
- Maybe, stay the same, so that those who gamble responsibly can still do so, but don't increase numbers.
- No need to increase as plenty available.
- They are not a problem for me, but I don't want to see them increase.
- They shouldn't increase, but I don't know enough to say whether they should decrease.
- We don't need any more of them.
- We don't need anymore.
- Would not like an increase. Good as long as money goes back to the community.

Comments coded to **recipients of community money**:

- Benefits go to small proportions of community. Impacts a lot of people in low socio-economic areas.
- Community money is badly targeted.
- Depends on what the money goes on. More things to get youth off the streets.
- Depends what it was spent on. If it was spent on health benefits then it should increase.
- Gambling of any form is a bad behaviour. Charity should not come off gambling.
- How can I be sure that the money has actually gone to charities?
- Money going into the community is a good thing, but grants should be published.
- Pokie machine trust money is not being spread around town.
- Pokies cause hardships in families. Money only goes to sports teams, not to the community in general.
- Taking money from many of the poorest sectors of our community and then giving SOME of it to community groups doesn't seem like a very good equation. I would be interested to know what happens to the other 60% of the take.
- Use another avenue to apply for sports funding.

Comments coded to **have a casino in Rotorua/target tourists**:

- A - it is gambling and B - peoples standard of living. Peoples' pennies have to stretch. Maybe, a casino for tourists.
- Asian tourists like to gamble. Would they still come here if they couldn't do so?
- Get a proper casino and control it fully. Target it for visitors and ensure users are well dressed etc. Keep standards. The pokies are trashy, but there is some pay back to things like sports clubs through grants etc.
- Get all the pokie machines out of the suburbs and make a bylaw that they can only be within the CBD. Reduce pokie machines to zero (within bars) and lobby the government for a high end Casino that targets the tourists and restricts locals from playing. Gambling addiction breaks down our community as it impacts the most vulnerable - low income and children. Whilst the income from pokies helps our community groups (including groups I am involved with) the social cost is not monitored or managed and I think the social cost is too high.
- Have a casino with two pubs and gambling machines.
- I think all the pokie machines should be in a well run and controlled Casino.
- I would like to see one centralised gambling venue like a casino to help in the management of problem gambling. They need to be taken out of the pubs.
- Lots of people who play are tourists. If people don't play here, they will go elsewhere. Keep business in Rotorua.
- Needs a casino. Not community bits and pieces.
- They are a scourge on society. Family members who use them have told me they would be happy for them to go and would much rather there was a proper casino. This casino would provide employment, have entertainment, security, policies and codes including dress. It would also monitor use, provide player support and also return a percentage of profit to the community. Tourists would also appreciate somewhere else to go other than hangi and concert (even though locally these are of the highest order).

Comments coded to *increase the community contribution*:

- All the money from the pokie machines should go back into the community not just 0.40 cents.
- Either decrease numbers or put more than 0.40 cents per dollar back into the community.
- Keep number same, but increase percentage going back to community.
- Keep same, but pay out more. They know they are ripping us off. Tampered with machines. Set up so it pays them first.
- More money should go back to the community.
- On one hand you need to reduce the harm to the problem gamblers. However, I also believe community groups rely on this money quite heavily. Decrease the numbers a little to help deter and assuming this will decrease the revenue, increase the \$0.40 portion to community groups.
- Up the percentage that goes to charity.

Comments coded to *don't want to encourage gambling*:

- Don't want to encourage gambling.
- I don't want to see pokie machines increase.
- It encourages people to play with money they can't afford. Children suffer because there is no food for them.
- They are a legitimate form of entertainment. They shouldn't be encouraged, however.
- Unhealthy habit that shouldn't be encouraged.

Comments coded to *enforce standards/high class of dress/current venues attract shabby patrons*:

- Get a proper casino and control it fully. Target it for visitors and ensure users are well dressed etc. Keep standards. The pokies are trashy, but there is some pay back to things like sports clubs through grants etc.
- The people who play the pokies often can't afford it and I don't feel the community benefits. The venues are also just seedy.
- They are a scourge on society. Family members who use them have told me they would be happy for them to go and would much rather there was a proper casino. This casino would provide employment, have entertainment, security, policies and codes including dress. It would also monitor use, provide player support and also return a percentage of profit to the community. Tourists would also appreciate somewhere else to go other than hangi and concert (even though locally these are of the highest order).

Comments coded to *don't know/doesn't affect respondent*:

- Doesn't affect me.
- Don't know much about it, but seems excessive.
- Don't know much about them.
- I don't know as I don't play them, hardly at all.
- I have no interest in pokie machines.
- Neutral, doesn't affect me.
- Really don't know as we are not affected by them.
- We don't use them.

Comments coded to *other*:

- 389 is a lot of machines to waste money on. Don't put them where there is alcohol.
- Even with 40% going to community, that leaves a lot of money unaccounted for.
- Gambling and Lotto etc, is another form of taxation.
- If 19.5 million is spent on them, how much are the winnings?
- Money would still stay in the community even if people didn't gamble.
- Owners getting rich.
- Pokie machines are unfortunately a tax on people with no will power.
- There are much bigger problems than pokie machines as machines are monitored.

- *There are other ways to make money.*

9. Using the same five point scale, do you think the numbers of venues where these machines are located should change? *(if no, tick stay the same)*

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	8	1.6%	1.6%
Stay the same	102	20.6%	20.6%
Decrease	178	35.9%	36.0%
Greatly decrease	161	32.5%	32.6%
NA/Don't know	45	9.1%	9.1%
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

10. Please outline any reasons for your views?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Too many venues/lower number/make less accessible	150	30.2%
Lower number of machines	51	10.3%
Pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive	45	9.1%
Distribution/location of machines/Casino	43	8.7%
Leave numbers the same/don't increase numbers/have enough venues now	30	6.0%
People waste money on them/too much spent	14	2.8%
Don't like gambling	7	1.4%
Increase number of venues	6	1.2%
Suggested solutions for tackling problem gambling	6	1.2%
Machines are not the problem - just some of the people who play them	4	0.8%
Don't have any problems with gambling machines/people have a right to use	3	0.6%
Addictive to some people	2	0.4%
Some venues have unacceptable standards	2	0.4%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	14	2.8%
Other	8	1.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

*Comments coded to **too many venues/lower number/make less accessible**:*

- *\$19.5 million has been gambled away.*
- *A lot of people struggle with gambling. Less temptation for problem gamblers.*
- *All the bars with pokie machines operate around dairies that have gone broke due to supermarkets and make a profit out of people who can't afford it.*
- *Anything we can do to minimise harm to families, we need to do in Rotorua.*
- *Because less places would mean less gambling.*
- *Because we are a small place and don't need that money wasted on pokies.*
- *By decreasing the number of venues, you take away the opportunity.*
- *Close them all.*
- *Decrease or disappear altogether.*
- *Detrimental to the community. Too accessible to lower socio economic people.*
- *Don't have any in town and decreased in areas outside town.*
- *Don't know where they are, but probably it is better to have less.*
- *Don't like them everywhere you go.*

- *Don't see the point on having little bars that have pokie machines targeting low income people.*
- *Especially around the suburbs. They shouldn't be in there.*
- *Far too many.*
- *Fewer areas where you can gamble equates to fewer people gambling because of lack of access.*
- *For a small town, why do we need so many?*
- *Gambling can create problems so the less opportunity the better.*
- *Getting rid of pokies will reduce temptation.*
- *Hardly ever see any anyway. Situated out of the way anyway.*
- *Have less places available to go too.*
- *Having less venues, but having more in one place would be beneficial.*
- *I am not familiar enough to know where they are.*
- *I currently don't know how many machines there are in Rotorua, but I believe that their numbers should be restricted.*
- *I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.*
- *I don't think we should greatly decrease yet, but do a slow decrease so those affected can adjust to a life without gambling.*
- *I don't want to see them in Rototrua.*
- *I feel that the availability of machines encourages their use. If it becomes more inconvenient to get to a gambling machine, people are less likely to use them. I feel that pokie machines cater more towards people who have time on their hands, ie, beneficiaries. These very same people are at the lowest socio-economic levels in our society. So if public/private transport is required rather than walking to a machine, then it will make it more inconvenient.*
- *I think there should be only one, a proper casino.*
- *I think they are too accessible, should have much fewer.*
- *I think they should not be in local shopping centres.*
- *If there are less venues then there are less machines.*
- *If there are too many places, feel like you have to go and play.*
- *If there aren't as many places to gamble, less opportunity to walk in and be interested.*
- *If venues not accessible, people are less likely to go.*
- *If we decrease these places too much, it opens up a door for a casino.*
- *If you have area spread, you have a lot of people who are able to access the venue especially those without access to transport.*
- *In small communities, it is easy to pop along and waste money in pokie machines.*
- *It makes it more inconvenient.*
- *It makes them harder to access.*
- *Just making the poor poorer. Reduce temptation.*
- *Kids can see them.*
- *Knock it all down.*
- *Less availability means less usage.*
- *Less availability.*
- *Less chance to lose money.*
- *Less machines, less opportunity. Most people who lose on them can't afford it. Usually poor people.*
- *Less money would be spent.*
- *Less opportunity to play machines.*
- *Less opportunity to use them (x2).*
- *Less opportunity with less venues.*

- *Less opportunity (x7).*
- *Less opportunity. I think all the venues should be closed.*
- *Less places equates to less gambling.*
- *Less places for people to get tempted walking along the street.*
- *Less places means less opportunity.*
- *Less places to go equates to less gambling.*
- *Less places to go means less money being fed into them.*
- *Less places to lose money.*
- *Less places, less machines (x3).*
- *Less places, less opportunity (x2).*
- *Less temptation (x4).*
- *Less venues means less gambling. If there were no pokie machines, people wouldn't be able to afford to travel to Tauranga to play. I can't see a convoy of gamblers travelling.*
- *Less venues, less opportunity.*
- *Less venues, less pokies.*
- *Limit opportunity. Make it harder for people to play.*
- *Make one big one.*
- *Make the heavy gamblers frequent the places less often.*
- *Make the machines less accessible to people.*
- *Make them less accessible to the public.*
- *Many venues means more gambling.*
- *More control on them.*
- *Most are there as gambling houses under the guise of a bar. Machines are not monitored as they should be.*
- *No point in having lots when you can just go to one.*
- *Not a necessity.*
- *Not as many needed in Rotorua as the temptation is too much for some people.*
- *Not have as many and then you can't spend as much.*
- *Not sure where they are, but there are too many.*
- *Numbers need to reduce so close some venues.*
- *Obligated to go to certain places.*
- *Often a drawcard for increased drinking.*
- *Playing the pokie machines in my mind is an addiction and less places, less playing.*
- *Pokie machines are too accessible for people who can't afford to play them.*
- *Reduce temptation.*
- *Rotorua is a small town, we don't need that many venues.*
- *Rotorua is one of the poorest communities and we have too many people who can't afford to gamble, but do so.*
- *Seems a lot.*
- *So many people have easy access.*
- *So that they are not so easy to access.*
- *Take away the temptation.*
- *Temptation, people want a fun time and waste money.*
- *The less access the better to minimise addiction.*
- *The less there are, the less people will gamble.*
- *The less venues, the less use of the pokie machines.*
- *There are a lot of social issues around gambling. Pokies too accessible at all times of the day. No need to be near schools or open at 8am.*
- *There are far too many venues in Rotorua.*
- *There are no redeeming features about the venues that operate as pokie only. More jobs would be created and safety and community wellbeing improved if consolidated into a large casino.*
- *There are too many already.*
- *There are too many and too much gambling problems.*

- *There are too many of them in Rotorua.*
- *There are too many outlets.*
- *There are too many pokie outlets in Rotorua. It's too readily available.*
- *There are too many venues in Rotorua.*
- *These places are near poor areas, they are too accessible.*
- *They are exposed to people who might be tempted and they bring in the wrong crowd.*
- *They are largely placed in the poorer areas where people can least afford them and temptation is too great.*
- *They are really accessible.*
- *They're a scourge on society and reflect poorly on the image of our city.*
- *To help those with gambling problems by reducing temptations.*
- *To make it harder for people to play.*
- *To make it harder, to access pokie machines.*
- *To make it more difficult for people to access.*
- *To make them less accessible.*
- *To reduce access to pokies.*
- *To reduce gambling opportunities.*
- *To reduce temptation.*
- *To reduce the hardship on children.*
- *To reduce the temptation to gamble.*
- *To stop all that money being wasted.*
- *To stop people wasting their money.*
- *Too accessible to play pokies when they are in the suburbs.*
- *Too accessible.*
- *Too accessible. The more venues there are, the easier it is to gamble.*
- *Too easily accessible. If there were less venues they would not frequent as much.*
- *Too many in the suburbs/ too easy to get to.*
- *Too many options everywhere.*
- *Too many venues.*
- *Too many (x2).*
- *Too many. Too easy to access.*
- *Too much temptation (x2).*
- *Way too many venues.*
- *With so many venues, it is so easy to gamble.*
- *Wonder if the little pubs will lose custom as pokies keep them going.*
- *You can walk down just about every street in town and find a venue.*

Comments coded to **lower number of machines**:

- *26 fine, but less machines.*
- *Abolish whole lot. Rigged. Macron goes back to start.*
- *Because they are places of public get togethers. The pokie machines have made them more unsociable.*
- *Completely get rid of.*
- *Eliminate the machines completely. They cause more harm than good.*
- *Get rid of them (x3).*
- *I am a social worker and seen impact on families from these machines.*
- *I don't like them.*
- *I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.*
- *I don't want to see them in Rototrua.*

- *I think this should be banned.*
- *I want to see them gone. They cause so many problems and they don't benefit the community. There are other ways to do that.*
- *I would like to see pokies disappear completely.*
- *I would like to see them all go.*
- *I would like to see them disappear.*
- *I would like to see them gone. Children miss out on food because parents gamble.*
- *If there are less venues then there are less machines.*
- *If they are spending that kind of money, take them away so they can't do it.*
- *If they aren't there, they can't be used.*
- *It is too easy to access the pokie machines.*
- *It removes the temptation if these machines are not allowed.*
- *It would be nice to go out for a drink without having people playing on the pokie machines.*
- *Just get rid of them completely. Go to clubs to enjoy yourself, not to play on machines.*
- *Keep the places, but take out the machines. Have one place.*
- *Knock it all down.*
- *Less machines, less opportunity. Most people who lose on them can't afford it. Usually poor people.*
- *Less places, less machines (x3).*
- *Less venues means less gambling. If there were no pokie machines, people wouldn't be able to afford to travel to Tauranga to play. I can't see a convoy of gamblers travelling.*
- *Less venues, less pokies.*
- *More places, less machines in them.*
- *Should have none or pay out more to make it fair.*
- *Should have places where you can just have a beer after work and chat; and not be crowded out by pokie machines.*
- *Shouldn't be machines as kids go hungry and can't pay for school uniform.*
- *Strongly against pokie machines.*
- *Take away the temptation.*
- *Take them out of Rotorua.*
- *There are too many pokie machines.*
- *There is nothing healthy about playing pokie machines. At least with Housie, people were socialising with others in the community and the money raised could be used for community initiatives. People sitting in front of a machine pumping money into it for corporate businesses is as bad as smoking. There is nothing good in it except money for companies with no morals or values. The dam things should be banned in NZ.*
- *They aren't necessary and they are addictive.*
- *They're a scourge on society and reflect poorly on the image of our city.*
- *Too many machines for Rotorua.*
- *Too many machines. If you have a problem, every time you see one you need to have a go.*
- *Too many. Too easy to access.*
- *Used to own a bar and refused to have them on site. Thought of customer first before financial gain.*
- *Venues should stay the same, but decrease the number of machines in the venue.*
- *We don't need pokie machines here.*
- *We don't need them. If they are not here you can't play them, so you won't.*

Comments coded to **pokie machines are bad/affects families/addictive:**

- *Although, 26 outlets does not seem like much, it is probably too many.*
- *Because the people who frequent them can't afford it, so we need to help those who can't help themselves.*
- *Families suffer. People spend money they don't have.*
- *Gambling causes so many problems here with people not being able to afford to gamble.*
- *Gambling causes super addiction.*

- *Gambling is a distracting, addictive behaviour. Within a very short time it changes from a bit of fun that stops you from thinking about your current problem to being bigger than your original problem. Creators of pokie machines use psychological warfare to lure you in to believing you are having a great time - music, lights, action. But you will always be spending money that you could use for your family or yourself. Take the music out, remove the features, make it as unattractive as smoking. This is an addictive negative impacting behaviour that society should not be encouraging.*
- *Gambling is an addiction. People who can least afford it, appear to be the statistics of gambling.*
- *I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.*
- *I worry about the children who are greatly affected.*
- *I would like to see them all go.*
- *I would like to see them gone. Children miss out on food because parents gamble.*
- *It destroys lives.*
- *It is a problem anyway.*
- *It is the poor who suffer.*
- *It removes the temptation if these machines are not allowed.*
- *It would be nice to go out for a drink without having people playing on the pokie machines.*
- *Losing on the pokies affects a lot of families.*
- *People spend money they can't afford to lose in these machines.*
- *People who haven't got the money use pokie machines as they think they will win big and solve their problems.*
- *Playing the pokie machines in my mind is an addiction and less places, less playing.*
- *Pokies destroy families and people.*
- *Prey on unfortunate people that are addicted to them.*
- *Problems caused for families.*
- *Shouldn't be machines as kids go hungry and can't pay for school uniform.*
- *Social problems, poverty, homelessness. Family violence.*
- *Some people are unable to control their gambling. By taking the gambling machines away, this will remove this option. The funds raised "for the community" comes from people who can least afford it.*
- *There are a lot of social issues around gambling. Pokies too accessible at all times of the day. No need to be near schools or open at 8am.*
- *There are too many and too much gambling problems.*
- *There are too many kids out there that miss out on food and not being looked after.*
- *There is a problem with gambling in Rotorua.*
- *There is a problem with pokie machines here.*
- *There is nothing healthy about playing pokie machines. At least with Housie, people were socialising with others in the community and the money raised could be used for community initiatives. People sitting in front of a machine pumping money into it for corporate businesses is as bad as smoking. There is nothing good in it except money for companies with no morals or values. The dam things should be banned in NZ.*
- *They are a complete waste of money. Families suffer when people play these machines and get addicted.*
- *They are a scourge on the community. Beneficiaries see them as a way out of their trouble.*
- *They are an evil influence on society.*
- *They are largely placed in the poorer areas where people can least afford them and temptation is too great.*
- *They aren't good for the people using them. They can be very addictive.*

- They aren't necessary and they are addictive.
- They cause a lot of problems with Maori in Rotorua who are already poor.
- They do too much harm to people who can't afford it.
- To get rid of problem gamblers. Pokie playing puts people into financial difficulties.
- To reduce the hardship on children.
- Too many people live in socio-economic situations in Rotorua where gambling is an issue. Consequently the families suffer and people's lives are ruined. If people are to gamble, then limits should be set. People playing pokies should only be able to use the machine for limited time periods and they would have to buy a limited number of tokens (to put in the machines and to stop them spending more). Video surveillance could be used to identify and prevent abuse of this limitation.
- Too many people rely on the pokies and get addicted.
- We don't need them. If they are not here, you can't play them, so you won't.

Comments coded to **distribution/location of machines/Casino:**

- Always in poorest areas.
- Always target low socio- economic areas.
- Better to be placed in the city and less in the suburbs.
- Better to have venues spread around rather than a lot in one place.
- Build a small casino and keep them together.
- But they should be in the flash hotels in the city where the tourists are.
- Detrimental to the community. Too accessible to lower socio economic people.
- Difficult to answer as I don't know where they are. Probably better to have them spread around.
- Don't have any in town and decreased in areas outside town.
- Don't want a whole street of gambling places. Put benefits onto cards so money can only be spent on that.
- Especially around the suburbs. They shouldn't be in there.
- From lower decile areas.
- Get them out of the lower socio-economic areas and move them at a reduced rate into the higher economic area.
- Having less venues, but having more in one place would be beneficial.
- I think they should not be in local shopping centres.
- If you have area spread, you have a lot of people who are able to access the venue especially those without access to transport.
- In small communities, it is easy to pop along and waste money in pokie machines.
- It is too easy to access the pokie machines.
- Keep the places, but take out the machines. Have one place.
- Make one big one.
- No point in having lots when you can just go to one.
- None in taverns in local areas. Too easy to just walk in.
- One controlled place like a casino.
- Remove from lower income areas. I know people will find other places if they really want to but maybe it lowers the chance of newer younger people starting in the first place.
- Should be in one place so they could monitor everyone.
- Should be removed from the suburbs.
- Take them out of the areas where there is poverty.
- The places in the suburbs are in the wrong areas, can walk to four separate places from where I am.
- There are no redeeming features about the venues that operate as pokie only. More jobs would be created and safety and community wellbeing improved if consolidated into a large casino.
- These places are near poor areas, they are too accessible.
- They are in the low socio-economic areas.
- They are in the wrong areas. They are in poor areas which increases poverty.

- They are largely placed in the poorer areas where people can least afford them and temptation is too great.
- They are put in low socio-economic areas and prey upon these people.
- They are usually in poor areas where unemployed try to get a quick win.
- They need to be confined to an area, contain them.
- They should come out of housing areas (suburbs).
- Too accessible to play pokies when they are in the suburbs.
- Too many in the suburbs/ too easy to get to.
- Too many located too close together.
- We don't need them in the suburbs.
- We need to monitor the areas where they are going and not put them in lower socio-economic areas.
- Would rather see a casino.

Comments coded to **leave numbers the same/don't increase numbers/have enough venues now:**

- 26 fine but less machines.
- 26 is enough.
- At least the people know where they are and they are legal and not underground or illegal places.
- Because they are places of public get togethers. The pokie machines have made them more unsociable.
- Because they give money to the community.
- Decreasing the numbers wouldn't solve any problems.
- Don't fix what's not broken.
- Don't see any issue.
- Don't think there should be any more places or machines.
- Don't want a whole street of gambling places. Put benefits onto cards so money can only be spent on that.
- For benefit of tourists.
- Having them around when I don't have a gambling problem seems ok, but I realise some people do have gambling problems.
- I am on a couple of committee's that benefit from gambling trusts.
- I don't know where they are but less is better because less temptation.
- I guess the catch 22 is that if gambling was greatly decreased, would the money saved in social agencies involved be invested back into the community? Would those that gamble then have more money to support their children and run their households or would they then fritter it away on more drugs, smokes and alcohol leading to an increase in other issues, family violence etc.
- If it helps the community.
- If one closes, another will open.
- It is not the number of machines that is the problem, but the people who play them.
- Keep the places, but take out the machines. Have one place.
- Ok as is.
- People are 25 and mature and using for a bit of fun.
- People who have these businesses would be out of business if the pokies were taken away.
- Population is growing.
- Rotorua has got enough venues.
- There is a good mixture of nice venues (and not so nice). You can take your pick.
- They are there. They are set up and running a business.
- Up to the owners of the venues. If money is going back into community then not a bad thing as long as you are not addicted.
- Venues should stay the same, but decrease the number of machines in the venue.
- We don't need anymore, but it is a business. Someone is trying to make a buck.

- You can't ask the pubs to take them out.

Comments coded to **people waste money on them/too much spent:**

- Could spend money on something else, like their kids for example.
- Far too much spent.
- I don't mind the odd leisurely scratchy or lotto ticket, but I do believe that there are people out there who blow a lot of their money on pokies and are addicted to gambling. As a result people's families are going without food, losing their houses and jobs etc. I personally believe that the accessibility of gambling venues such as pubs with pokies, promote that behaviour. Therefore, I believe that substantial effort to go into reducing the number of pokie machines and stricter monitoring of these machines should be applied.
- It is facility for wastage of money.
- Moumou moni! (wastage/squander)
- People spending money that they don't necessarily have.
- People wasting a lot of money.
- Taking money from many of the poorest sectors of our community and then giving SOME of it to community groups doesn't seem like a very good equation. I would be interested to know what happens to the other 60% of the take.
- Temptation, people want a fun time and waste money.
- They are a waste of money.
- To get rid of problem gamblers. Pokie playing puts people into financial difficulties.
- To stop people wasting their money.
- Too many people gamble their money away.
- Too much money spend on them.

Comments coded to **don't like gambling:**

- Against gambling, causes a lot of problems.
- Don't like gambling.
- I am against gambling.
- I don't agree with gambling. It affects a lot of families who really suffer because of gambling here.
- I don't agree with gambling. It is a form of addiction.
- I don't believe in gambling (x2).

Comments coded to **increase number of venues:**

- I think there should be only one, a proper casino.
- More choice.
- More places, less machines in them.
- Need more people.
- Some people need the money.
- Spread them out so they don't get a chance to bond with other gamblers.

Comments coded to **suggested solutions for tackling problem gambling:**

- Don't want a whole street of gambling places. Put benefits onto cards so money can only be spent on that.
- Most are there as gambling houses under the guise of a bar. Machines are not monitored as they should be.
- Singapore has the best take on casinos. Tourists can go, but locals have to have a permit to enter.
- Too many people live in socio-economic situations in Rotorua where gambling is an issue. Consequently, the families suffer and people's lives are ruined. If people are to gamble, then limits should be set. People playing pokies should only be able to use the machine for a limited time period and they would have to buy a limited number of tokens (to put in the machines and to stop them spending more). Video surveillance could be used to identify and prevent abuse of this limitation.

- Use another avenue to apply for sports funding. Accounts and protection required to stop people becoming problem gamblers.
- Venues could be better "policed" and trained to support gamblers who need help to stop.

Comments coded to **machines are not the problem - just some of the people who play them:**

- It is not the number of machines that is the problem, but the people who play them.
- It is the people that use them and not the machines.
- Machines are not the problem, it is the people.
- Up to the owners of the venues. If money is going back into community then not a bad thing as long as you are not addicted.

Comments coded to **don't have any problems with gambling machines/people have a right to use:**

- I don't see any real problems with pokie machines.
- I don't think machines should go just because some people are problem gamblers. People who can afford it enjoy the pokies.
- People have the right to gamble.

Comments coded to **addictive to some people:**

- Gambling is a problem amongst some people.
- Too many machines. If you have a problem, every time you see one you need to have a go.

Comments coded to **some venues have unacceptable standards:**

- Some are disgusting places that are trashy and are just a haven for people with social issues. Needs more control and good dress standards. I would not go near any pokie machine in this city.
- They are not a nice environment to be in.

Comments coded to **don't know/doesn't affect respondent:**

- Difficult to answer as I don't know where they are. Probably better to have them spread around.
- Doesn't matter to me.
- Don't know where the venues are.
- Don't know where they are (x4).
- Don't know.
- I don't play pokie machines, don't know the venues where they are.
- I don't visit venues where there are gambling machines very frequently.
- It doesn't affect me.
- It doesn't affect us.
- No idea.
- Only know where one is off hand.

Comments coded to **other:**

- Gambling banned in Malaysia.
- I guess the catch 22 is that if gambling was greatly decreased, would the money saved in social agencies involved be invested back into the community? Would those that gamble then have more money to support their children and run their households or would they then fritter it away on more drugs, smokes and alcohol leading to an increase in other issues, family violence etc.
- Not enough money going back to the community.
- Now I know what the national average is compared to Rotorua.
- Often a drawcard for increased drinking.
- Should have none or pay out more to make it fair.

- *Taking money from many of the poorest sectors of our community and then giving SOME of it to community groups doesn't seem like a very good equation. I would be interested to know what happens to the other 60% of the take.*
- *Wonder if the little pubs will lose custom as pokies keep them going.*

11. There are currently 13 venues in the city centre and another 13 in the suburbs with machines. Do you have any comments about the current placement of the pokie machine venues in Rotorua?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Targeted at low socio-economic suburban areas/remove from suburbs	134	27.0%
Have all centralised/at city centre/high standard facility	53	10.7%
Reduce the number of machines/venues	32	6.5%
Get rid of them/ban them totally	31	6.3%
Limit availability/accessibility	28	5.6%
Not an issue/maintain status quo	23	4.6%
Ban venues near schools/pubs/residential areas/shopping centres	15	3.0%
Limit numbers in town	9	1.8%
Monitoring and controlling required/help those with problems	9	1.8%
Distribute evenly/have a fair mix	8	1.6%
Machines located in wrong places/venues	7	1.4%
More tourist targeted/more in city	6	1.2%
Personal choice/people who want to play will	3	0.6%
Tidy venues up/look rough	2	0.4%
Don't know/no comment	26	5.2%
Other	4	0.8%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **targeted at low socio-economic suburban areas/remove from suburbs**:

- *A lot are placed in lower socio economic areas which is very wrong and are targeted towards the people who cannot afford to use them.*
- *All good, lots of people broke.*
- *All machines should be removed from the suburbs so a worker can go and have a beer after work without pokie machines staring at them.*
- *Bad idea in suburbs as they are easy to get to.*
- *Being in suburbs gives all the wrong messages about what is normal to the kids who live there. Pokies and pubs don't belong in suburbs. Again if centralised, the reduced access might reduce harm.*
- *Cancel all pokie licences in the suburbs and make a by-law that no pokies allowed in the suburbs. Only pokies (if any and greatly reduced) in the CBD.*
- *Can't say as I don't know where they are. They shouldn't be in the suburbs.*
- *Close all the small venues in the suburbs.*
- *Decrease number of machines in the suburbs.*
- *Decrease numbers in low socio-economic areas.*
- *Devalues the area they are in.*
- *Do they target the poor area?*
- *Don't have any in the suburbs.*
- *Don't have them close to schools. People beg outside the one at Westend. Not a good look at all.*
- *Don't have them in the suburbs.*
- *Don't think they should be in suburbs. Too accessible to people who have nothing much to do.*
- *Don't think they should be in the suburbs.*
- *Don't think venues should be in the suburbs.*

- *Eliminate the suburbs and minimise the city centre ones.*
- *Fewer in suburbs and more in centre. Make it more difficult to slip out and do nightly pokie.*
- *Get rid of machines in the poorer area.*
- *Get rid of ones in suburbs like bottle shops. Bad for community and too close.*
- *Get them out of the suburbs and have them far from schools.*
- *Get them out of the suburbs!*
- *Having them in shopping centres is a bad idea in the suburbs. Tourists don't go to the suburbs, only locals.*
- *I am against them in the suburbs.*
- *I am opposed to them being in the suburbs. Should be in one place only.*
- *I don't like seeing the ones in the suburbs.*
- *I don't think there is a need to have them in the suburbs.*
- *I don't think they need to be in suburbs. They should just be in the city.*
- *I don't think they should be in the suburbs (x2).*
- *I don't think they should be in the suburbs. They should be in one central location of the city.*
- *I feel that all are dangerous, but that the most detrimental are the machines that are located closer to where people live, ie, the suburbs (especially, the lower socio economic suburbs). If there were to be a campaign/effort to reduce machines then I believe that it should be concentrated to the suburbs first, and then the central city.*
- *I want them out of the suburbs and limited in the city centre.*
- *I want them out of the suburbs and venues reduced across Rotorua.*
- *I would be inclined to locate in the city as opposed to having in suburbs.*
- *I would like to see the numbers in the suburbs decreased.*
- *If it is a problem in the suburbs, then there should be less there.*
- *If they are going to have them at all, have it in the city centre. Keep them out of suburbs.*
- *In wrong areas.*
- *It should be out of suburbs.*
- *Keep them out of the suburbs and in the city.*
- *Leave 13 in city and remove 13 from the suburbs. City centre, end up with the majority targeting tourists. Reduce amount people spend as they won't necessarily be able to get into town so often.*
- *Less in suburbs where it is easy access.*
- *Less in suburbs.*
- *Less in suburbs. Horrible little bars.*
- *Make them more difficult to access. Your local (tavern) is supposed to be where you can go for a drink, socialise and meet your neighbours. Not sit at a machine and put your money in.*
- *More in centre - less in suburbs. Keep temptation away.*
- *More in city than in suburbs. Those who aren't financially well off find it too easy just to get to places.*
- *More in city with less in suburbs (x2).*
- *Most gambling venues seem to be in areas that are low socio-economic areas.*
- *Most in the suburbs, as attracting unemployed people to play.*
- *Need places in the suburbs just to relax without pokie machines. Also, we should have a central casino run by the council as all the money stays in Rotorua.*
- *No more venues in the suburbs.*
- *No suburban venues with machines. Limit to CBD.*
- *None in suburbs. Just in one place in the city.*
- *None in suburbs. Too easy to access.*
- *None in tavern in local areas. Too easy to just walk in.*
- *None in the suburbs. That is your community. Restrict to town.*
- *None should be in the suburbs.*
- *Not good anywhere, perhaps just one venue. Seems to affect those who don't have the money.*

- *Not in residential areas.*
- *Not in shopping centre.*
- *Not in suburbs. Too accessible.*
- *Not in suburbs. Too close to schools and shops.*
- *Not in suburbs. Too easy access.*
- *Not in the suburbs, less access.*
- *Not in the suburbs, this is just targeting the unemployed.*
- *Not in the suburbs (x8).*
- *Not in the suburbs. Makes it look too normal if they are in a shopping centre.*
- *Not in the suburbs. Not in the poorer suburbs.*
- *Not sure where any of them are quite honestly. Keep out of the suburbs due to number of people who can't control their habits.*
- *Not sure where they are, but should not be in the suburb.*
- *Nothing in the suburbs, only one casino in the city.*
- *People who can least afford these are the ones that play them. Those people are targeted as they can't manage money.*
- *Placed in low decile areas. Do not think they should be there.*
- *Placed so close to the housing and work places. Should not be in any suburb. Makes access too easy.*
- *Please remove them from the suburbs.*
- *Pokie machines should not be in the suburbs.*
- *Prefer to see them out of the suburbs and more in the city - would attract tourists.*
- *Reduce numbers in suburbs and increase in city where tourists might go.*
- *Remove from suburbs.*
- *Remove from suburbs. 1 to 5 venues at the maximum.*
- *Seem to be placed in the low socio-economic areas in the suburbs. I don't know of any in Springfield or Tihiotonga.*
- *Shocking that there are so many in the suburbs. Should only be in the city.*
- *Should be less in the suburbs than the city.*
- *Should be none in the suburbs.*
- *Should not be in the suburbs where day to day living happens. Have them in places where tourists can use them.*
- *Should not be in the suburbs. Attracts the unemployed.*
- *Should not be out in the suburbs.*
- *Shouldn't be in poor suburbs.*
- *Shouldn't be in suburbs. Same for liquor. Keep out of community areas.*
- *Shouldn't be in the local suburbs.*
- *Shouldn't be in the suburbs, especially where there are children.*
- *Take out of suburbs (x2).*
- *Take out of suburbs. Keep in city.*
- *Take them out of the suburbs.*
- *The danger lies in the suburban areas.*
- *The ones in the suburbs should be decreased.*
- *There should be none in the suburbs.*
- *There shouldn't be any in the suburbs.*
- *There shouldn't be so many and they shouldn't be in the suburbs.*
- *These places are near poor areas, they are too accessible. They should not be in the suburbs.*
- *They are currently largely in the low socio-economic areas. Those areas housing people who can least afford it.*
- *They are hitting families when they are in suburbs, they should only be in town.*
- *They are in the lower socio-economic areas where people can't afford to play.*
- *They are in the wrong areas. That are in the wrong socio-economic demographic.*
- *They don't need to be in the suburbs at all.*

- They should be out of the residential area.
- They should have less in the suburbs.
- They should not be in the suburbs and in shopping centres. Too accessible for people to play them.
- They shouldn't be in the lower socio-economic areas to limit access by problem gamblers.
- They shouldn't be in the suburbs as it is too convenient to use pokie machines when close to home.
- They shouldn't be in the suburbs (x3).
- Too convenient in the suburbs.
- Too many are in low income areas and they shouldn't be.
- Too many in the suburbs. Mainly in the poorer areas.
- Town and city centre and none in the suburbs.
- Way too many back street pubs in the suburbs.
- When they are in the suburbs, it encourages more people to use them so don't want them in the suburbs.
- Would affect the availability of people to get there. More opportunities for that person to stay at home rather than walking a lot more if no car.
- Would rather they were all in the city centre rather than in the suburbs.

Comments coded to **have all centralised/at city centre/high standard facility:**

- All in city centre so easier to monitor.
- All in city centre. If they are easily accessible there is temptation.
- All in one place, in the city. Prevents people with problems from accessing the pokie machines too easily.
- Being in suburbs gives all the wrong messages about what is normal to the kids who live there. Pokies and pubs don't belong in suburbs. Again if centralised, the reduced access might reduce harm.
- Better in the city so that one has to make an effort to go there. Less accessibility.
- Better to be in the city. Not as easy to get to.
- Cancel all pokie licences in the suburbs and make a by-law that no pokies allowed in the suburbs. Only pokies (if any and greatly reduced) in the CBD.
- Contained in one area in the city.
- Decrease everywhere. Should only be in one place, then they can keep an eye on it.
- Family members who frequent them agree with me in that they would be happy for there to be no other venue than a proper high end casino.
- Fewer in suburbs and more in centre. Make it more difficult to slip out and do nightly pokie.
- I am opposed to them being in the suburbs. Should be in one place only.
- I don't think they need to be in suburbs. They should just be in the city.
- I don't think they should be in the suburbs. They should be in one central location of the city.
- I never use them or take notice of them. City centre could be better and easily supervised, especially with tourists.
- I think it would be better to have one casino with stringent dress rules and get rid of every other venue.
- I think more should be in the city.
- I would be inclined to locate in the city as opposed to having in suburbs.
- I would prefer them to be in one venue only eg, like a casino as it would control things better.
- If they are going to have them at all, have it in the city centre. Keep them out of suburbs.
- If they have to maintain a minimum amount of machines, it should be in a controlled environment in the city centre.
- In one spot instead of scattered everywhere.
- Keep in city.
- Keep them out of the suburbs and in the city.
- More in centre - less in suburbs. Keep temptation away.

- *More in city than in suburbs. Those who aren't financially well off find it too easy just to get to places.*
- *More in city with less in suburbs.*
- *More in city with less in suburbs.*
- *Need places in the suburbs just to relax without pokie machines. Also, we should have a central casino run by the council as all the money stays in Rotorua.*
- *No suburban venues with machines. Limit to CBD.*
- *None in suburbs. Just in one place in the city.*
- *None in the suburbs. That is your community. Restrict to town.*
- *Not good anywhere, perhaps just one venue. Seems to affect those who don't have the money.*
- *Nothing in the suburbs, only one casino in the city.*
- *One venue only in the city with dress code.*
- *Only be in city.*
- *Only in cities.*
- *Only in city.*
- *Pokie machines should be confined to gambling institutions in the world, that is casinos.*
- *Prefer to see them out of the suburbs and more in the city would attract tourists.*
- *Put them all in the city.*
- *Put them all in town to bring the money into town.*
- *Shocking that there are so many in the suburbs. Should only be in the city.*
- *Should be confined to the central city.*
- *Should be in one place so they can monitor everyone.*
- *Should be in the CBD only.*
- *Take out of suburbs. Keep in city.*
- *These should be reduced and only be in the city centre.*
- *They are hitting families when they are in suburbs, they should only be in town.*
- *They should be only in the city centre.*
- *Town and city centre and none in the suburbs.*
- *Would be best if all were in the city centre.*
- *Would rather they were all in the city centre rather than in the suburbs.*

Comments coded to **reduce the number of machines/venues:**

- *26 machines is too many.*
- *A lot for a small town.*
- *Decrease everywhere. Should only be in one place, then they can keep an eye on it.*
- *Decrease in both areas.*
- *Don't matter where they are. Need to decrease them.*
- *Eliminate the suburbs and minimise the city centre ones.*
- *I feel that all are dangerous, but that the most detrimental are the machines that are located closer to where people live, ie, the suburbs (especially, the lower socio economic suburbs). If there were to be a campaign/effort to reduce machines then I believe that it should be concentrated to the suburbs first, and then the central city.*
- *I just don't like seeing so many venues around Rotorua.*
- *I want them out of the suburbs and venues reduced across Rotorua.*
- *I wasn't aware there were so many venues.*
- *In general decrease numbers.*
- *Less in suburbs and city.*
- *Make less in each venue, eg, have 8 in town and 10 in suburbs then slowly decrease from there.*
- *Not good for customers.*
- *Not really. I don't know specific venues other than I know there are too many.*
- *Reduce half from each place.*
- *Reduce numbers to five per venue.*

- Reduce venues in both areas.
- Remove from suburbs. One to five venues at the maximum.
- Set a lower limit overall. As one closes don't renew until a selected predetermined number is reached.
- Should be less. No need to have so many. Get rid of them.
- Should not have as many machines.
- That is such a lot. Not good. No wonder we are called Rotovegas.
- That's too many.
- There are too many in Rotorua itself. Pokie machines are not a good thing.
- There are too many venues.
- There should be fewer locations in more controlled environments. Yes, let people have a flutter, but not lead to a gambling problem.
- There should be less of them.
- There shouldn't be so many and they shouldn't be in the suburbs.
- These should be reduced and only be in the city centre.
- They are a cancer. Have too many.
- Too close together and too many of them.

Comments coded to **get rid of them/ban them totally**:

- Close it all down. Every single venue.
- Get rid of all of the pokie machines.
- Get rid of the whole lot (x2).
- Get rid of them (x2).
- Have none at all. Don't gamble.
- Having seen the machines in operation, most of them are filled with Maori. Get rid of machines.
- I am against them.
- I don't like them.
- I have a strong aversion to them, they target the most vulnerable.
- I think it would be better to have one casino with stringent dress rules and get rid of every other venue.
- I think they should be all closed.
- Less poverty if they get rid of them.
- Like to see them totally reduced or banned.
- No comment, remove all.
- No, I just don't like them.
- Not good anywhere, perhaps just one venue. Seems to affect those who don't have the money.
- Pretty shit, especially for a struggling town. Try to get their money back, but they don't.
- Remove them all (x2).
- Should all go or have them so it is just for fun. No winning or losing.
- Should all go.
- Should be less. No need to have so many. Get rid of them.
- Should just get rid of them.
- Take machines out of venues.
- Take them away.
- There should be none at all.
- They should not be in Rotorua.
- Unacceptable.
- Would like to see them all removed.

Comments coded to **limit availability/accessibility**:

- All in one place, in the city. Prevents people with problems from accessing the pokie machines too easily.

- All machines should be removed from the suburbs so a worker can go and have a beer after work without pokie machines staring at them.
- Any venues where people can go to feed their addiction are bad. We need to find out why people are gambling and help them.
- Are they all situated in close proximity? If all in same area, some need to go.
- Bars popping up in areas with empty shops. Owners of the bars getting cheap rent and profit share with landlords. The machines can't be benefiting the public.
- Being in suburbs gives all the wrong messages about what is normal to the kids who live there. Pokies and pubs don't belong in suburbs. Again if centralised, the reduced access might reduce harm.
- Better in the city so that one has to make an effort to go there. Less accessibility.
- Better to be in the city. Not as easy to get to.
- Don't think they should be in suburbs. Too accessible to people who have nothing much to do.
- Fewer in suburbs and more in centre. Make it more difficult to slip out and do nightly pokie.
- Get rid of ones in suburbs like bottle shops. Bad for community and too close.
- Leave 13 in city and remove 13 from the suburbs. City centre, end up with the majority targeting tourists. Reduce amount people spend as they won't necessarily be able to get into town so often.
- Make them more difficult to access. Your local (tavern) is supposed to be where you can go for a drink, socialise and meet your neighbours. Not sit at a machine and plop your money in.
- More in centre - less in suburbs. Keep temptation away.
- More in city than in suburbs. Those who aren't financially well off find it too easy just to get to places.
- None in suburbs. Too easy to access.
- None in tavern in local areas. Too easy to just walk in.
- Not in suburbs. Too easy access.
- Not in the suburbs, less access.
- Personal choice as to whether you participate. Where they are placed will make a difference, but if they don't have a vehicle, it will makes it harder.
- Placed so close to the housing and work places. Should not be in any suburb. Makes access too easy.
- The less availability, the less chance of people who do not have the money doing this activity and using these machines.
- They are too accessible. It is hard not to stop on the way home from work.
- They should not be in the suburbs and in shopping centres. Too accessible for people to play them.
- They shouldn't be in the lower socio-economic areas to limit access by problem gamblers.
- Too easy to access. No monitoring of them. If you get barred, you move on to the next venue.
- Too much temptation. It is an addiction.
- Would affect the availability of people to get there. More opportunities for that person to stay at home rather than walking a lot more if no car.

Comments coded to **not an issue/maintain status quo**:

- About right.
- All good, lots of people broke.
- All good (x2).
- Alright.
- Doesn't matter.
- Good.
- If people are stupid enough to play them, then that is their problem.
- It is ok.
- Keep same but pay out more.

- No change in numbers.
- No more venues in the suburbs.
- No. It doesn't affect me.
- Ok (x2).
- Spread across city so seems ok.
- Spread out is good. Some people can't afford to come into town.
- Stay as is (x2).
- Stay the same (x3).
- They are very discreet.

Comments coded to **ban venues near schools/pubs/residential areas/shopping centres:**

- Don't have them close to schools. People beg outside the one at Westend. Not a good look at all.
- Get them out of the suburbs and have them far from schools.
- Not in shopping centre.
- Not in suburbs. Too close to schools and shops.
- Not near schools or in local shopping centers.
- Placed so close to the housing and work places. Should not be in any suburb. Makes access too easy.
- Remove the venues that are in the same block as schools.
- Shouldn't be in local shopping area.
- Shouldn't be in the suburbs, especially where there are children.
- Take them out of the pubs.
- They should be placed away from any venues that have kids hanging around. Due to alcohol being a part of the support system to gamble, kids should not have to see this.
- They should be restricted to clubs only, not bars or sports clubs.
- They should not be in the suburbs and in shopping centres. Too accessible for people to play them.
- They shouldn't be near anywhere that children go, eg, shopping centres like Brookland Rd and Westend shops.
- Very tempting to have them in local shopping centres.

Comments coded to **limit numbers in town:**

- City centre needs a few less.
- Decrease number in town.
- Eliminate the suburbs and minimise the city centre ones.
- I want them out of the suburbs and limited in the city centre.
- Less in city centre.
- Less in the city.
- Not in the CBD. Don't like passing them. Look very dark and dingy.
- Personally keep them outside the town area.
- Take them out of town.

Comments coded to **monitoring and controlling required/help those with problems:**

- Any venues where people can go to feed their addiction are bad. We need to find out why people are gambling and help them.
- Better controlled. If not, spread out.
- Decrease everywhere. Should only be in one place, then they can keep an eye on it.
- I would prefer them to be in one venue only eg, like a casino as it would control things better.
- Should be in one place so they can monitor everyone.
- There should be fewer locations in more controlled environments. Yes, let people have a flutter, but not lead to a gambling problem.
- They are closely monitored by council.
- They shouldn't be in the lower socio-economic areas to limit access by problem gamblers.

- Too easy to access. No monitoring of them. If you get barred, you move on to the next venue.

Comments coded to **distribute evenly/have a fair mix**:

- Better controlled. If not, spread out.
- Evenly distributed.
- Fair mix.
- Good balance.
- Good mixture (x3).
- Good position, evened out.

Comments coded to **machines located in wrong places/venues**:

- Have seen them at the Golf Club. Sporting places should not have them.
- I had a major issue when a family restaurant had pokie machines.
- Make them more difficult to access. Your local (tavern) is supposed to be where you can go for a drink, socialise and meet your neighbours. Not sit at a machine and plop your money in.
- Not happy with so many and where they are placed.
- Seem to be placed in the low socio-economic areas in the suburbs. I don't know of any in Springfield or Tihiotonga.
- They are in the wrong areas. That are in the wrong socio-economic demographic.
- They should be restricted to clubs only, not bars or sports clubs.

Comments coded to **more tourist targeted/more in city**:

- Leave 13 in city and remove 13 from the suburbs. City centre, end up with the majority targeting tourists. Reduce amount people spend as they won't necessarily be able to get into town so often.
- More in city.
- Need places in the suburbs just to relax without pokie machines. Also, we should have a central casino run by the council as all the money stays in Rotorua.
- Prefer to see them out of the suburbs and more in the city - would attract tourists.
- Reduce numbers in suburbs and increase in city where tourists might go.
- Should not be in the suburbs where day to day living happens. Have them in places where tourists can use them.

Comments coded to **personal choice/people who want to play will**:

- If people have got a problem, they will get to them anyway.
- No. If people want to play pokies they will find them.
- Personal choice as to whether you participate. Where they are placed will make a difference, but if they don't have a vehicle, it will make it harder.

Comments coded to **tidy venues up/look rough**:

- Not in the CBD. Don't like passing them. Look very dark and dingy.
- Some could do with a face lift.

Comments coded to **don't know/no comment**:

- Can't say as I don't know where they are. They shouldn't be in the suburbs.
- Don't go near them.
- Don't know where they are exactly.
- Don't know where they are in the suburbs.
- Don't know where they are (x8).
- Don't know. Have no idea where they are.
- I am not clear on where these places are.
- I don't know where they are (x4).
- I don't know where they go.

- No clue where any are.
- No idea.
- Not sure as don't know where they are.
- Not sure where any of them are quite honestly. Keep out of the suburbs due to number of people who can't control their habits.
- Not sure where they are, but should not be in the suburb.
- Not sure where they are.
- Not sure.

Comments coded to **other**:

- Bars popping up in areas with empty shops. Owners of the bars getting cheap rent and profit share with landlords. The machines can't be benefiting the public.
- Keep same but pay out more.
- None in Lynmore.
- Shouldn't be in suburbs. Same for liquor. Keep out of community areas.

12. Although the numbers of machines cannot increase, machines can be moved from one venue to another in special circumstances (ie, a venue closing). Do you support gambling (pokie) machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances?

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	73	14.7%	14.9%
Neutral	113	22.8%	23.0%
Opposed	123	24.8%	25.1%
Strongly opposed	161	32.5%	32.8%
NA/Don't know	19	3.8%	3.9%
Not specified	5	1.0%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

13. Please outline any reasons for your views?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Work to reduce overall numbers	181	36.5%
If a venue closes, the machines should go as well/don't allow them to be moved	115	23.2%
Don't have a problem with this	24	4.8%
Fine if overall numbers don't increase	18	3.6%
Get rid of all machines	11	2.2%
Only if moving them out of the suburbs	8	1.6%
Only in special circumstances/case by case	5	1.0%
Fine as long as new venue meets requirements	4	0.8%
Should only be in one Casino	3	0.6%
Needs to be monitored carefully	2	0.4%
Don't know/doesn't effect respondent	11	2.2%
Other	8	1.6%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **work to reduce overall numbers**:

- A sinking lid policy should be employed to reduce machines at every opportunity.
- Against pokie machines.
- All that does is redistribute gambling.
- Any action to reduce.

- *As long as they continue to decrease the numbers.*
- *Because if you move them around you still have the same number.*
- *Because often a venue closes, those machines should be considered "dead" and not used anywhere else.*
- *Being able to move pokie machines around results in pokie machines being moved around.*
- *By not moving them around, you have lost a perfect opportunity to reduce numbers.*
- *Close the machines down to reduce numbers.*
- *Close venues, shut down machines.*
- *Closed venues should mean the pokies go as well. It is a way to reduce the numbers.*
- *Closing a venue is an ideal opportunity to get rid of them.*
- *Complete waste of money. If a venue closes machines should go.*
- *Does it benefit our people and community?*
- *Doesn't need to happen.*
- *Don't like gambling*
- *Don't like pokie machines. Read too many stories about problems.*
- *Don't need to be there. Taking money from people that can't afford it.*
- *Don't support gambling at all.*
- *Don't want to encourage gambling.*
- *Easy way to reduce the machines.*
- *Enough in each area. Doubt they need more.*
- *Gambling, why do we need it?*
- *Get rid of them, when a venue closes.*
- *I haven't given pokies much thought, just feel they serve no good purpose and those that play them are wasting their money.*
- *I just want to see them reduced.*
- *I think the number should be reduced so that when a place closes, the machines are gone.*
- *I think the number should be reduced.*
- *I want numbers to decrease not spread around.*
- *I would rather see less machines so if venue closed, the machines should go.*
- *I would rather, when a venue closes, the machines should leave Rotorua.*
- *If a business closes, then the machines should close.*
- *If a business is relocating to a different venue, but if it is closing down for good, then get rid of the machines.*
- *If a venue closes, machines should just be removed.*
- *If a venue closes the pokies should go as well.*
- *If a venue closes down, the machines should expire with them.*
- *If a venue closes I agree machines should be moved, but not to another venue in Rotorua. Need to be moved outside the district.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should close as well.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should go too.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should just go.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokie machine should be removed from use as well. The moving of machines is further encouraging the addicted gambling behaviour that I have witnessed in others.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokie machines should go as well.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokies should leave Rotorua.*
- *If a venue closes, those machines should be gone for good.*
- *If a venue is closed down, then the machines should be scrapped.*
- *If a venue shuts, the pokies should go.*
- *If it closes down, machines should go with it.*
- *If it shuts, that's it - gone.*
- *If one venue closes, the machines should be gone out of Rotorua.*
- *If place closes, machines should go too.*
- *If places closes down, the pokies go too.*

- *If the business closes, the machines go too.*
- *If the venue closes, the machines go.*
- *If the venue closes, the machines should close as well.*
- *If under special circumstances. They should be reduced.*
- *If venue closes, the machine should go - not be moved to another venue.*
- *If venues close, the machines should go as well.*
- *If we are wanting to reduce numbers, isn't that a good way to get rid of them.*
- *If you closed your bar the city should lose the machines too.*
- *If you just move them around, you have lost the chance of reducing the numbers.*
- *If you spread them around, you will never reduce the numbers.*
- *It doesn't address any of the problems.*
- *It doesn't increase the numbers of machines, but it doesn't help to reduce numbers which I want to happen.*
- *It just goes from one to the other, but increasing at the place it ends up.*
- *It only encourages others in the different areas to gamble.*
- *It takes so much money out of the community.*
- *Just get rid of them. What is the point of moving them?*
- *Just makes a mockery of the licensing process.*
- *Just the same, not trying to reduce the numbers.*
- *Just to reduce the number of machines in use, not just spread them around.*
- *Keep decreasing the numbers and not increase.*
- *Less there are the better off we will be.*
- *Like to see the numbers go down.*
- *Machines should be removed once a venue closes.*
- *Machines should go when a venue closes so the numbers reduce quicker.*
- *Machines should go when a venue closes (x2).*
- *Machines shouldn't be able to be moved. They should go once a venue shuts.*
- *Make them less.*
- *Move them to the rubbish dump.*
- *Moving machines does not help, will just make some places bigger.*
- *Moving machines makes them more noticeable and therefore more likely to be used by people who may not have used them previously.*
- *Moving the machines around isn't going to lessen the amount of money going in.*
- *Moving them around does not reduce the numbers.*
- *Moving them around is not going to reduce the problems.*
- *Must take them out of the suburbs. Don't make it easy to play them.*
- *My preference would be to use such special circumstances as an opportunity to reduce the overall number of machines and venues.*
- *Need to decrease numbers, not move them around.*
- *Need to reduce the number of machines so pokies should go when a venue closes.*
- *Need to reduce the numbers.*
- *No issue apart from the fact that there are too many machines.*
- *No, should be reducing the number.*
- *Not being able to move from one place to another would be a good way of reducing the number in operation.*
- *Not helping the problem as they just get moved around.*
- *Not helping to reduce the number, is it?*
- *Not reducing if you spread them around.*
- *Number of machines should be reduced not moved around.*
- *Once a place closes, the machines should go too.*
- *Once a venue closes the pokies should go for good. They are too addictive.*
- *Once a venue closes, the machines should go to. If this happens, it would be a good way of reducing the number of machines.*
- *Once a venue closes, the pokie machines need to close permanently.*

- Once a venue has closed, all the machines from that venue should be disposed of and not moved to other venues.
- Once a venue is closed, the machines don't go elsewhere.
- Once it closes, it should go. Make it harder to get to places, ie, into towns.
- Once they are gone, they are gone.
- Once they close down, that should be it, they should go.
- Opportunity to get rid of them.
- People who use them the most, can't afford to do so.
- Problem gambling causes big issues within the community especially amongst the most vulnerable of the population.
- Problem gambling should be eliminated so access should be reduced or be gone.
- Reduce venues. Have one central location in the city with a dress code. This would encourage tourists.
- Set a lower limit overall. As one closes don't renew right until a selected pre-determined number is reached.
- Should be put out to pasture, not reused.
- Should not be relocated, if you lose them, then that is a good way to reduce.
- Should try to reduce.
- Shut them down.
- Sinking lid policy to the point where there are none at all is the best possible outcome.
- Some people are unable to control their gambling. By taking the gambling machines away, this will remove this option. The funds raised "for the community" comes from people who can least afford it.
- Spreading them around doesn't reduce the numbers.
- Surely we want to reduce the number, not just spread them around.
- That does not reduce the number of machines.
- That is just moving the problems around.
- That is keeping the number the same and not reducing them. Numbers should be reduced to nothing.
- That is one way to reduce them, reduce them that way.
- That would not reduce the number of machines.
- The less pokie machines, the better. It is usually the people who can least afford it who play the machines and lose.
- The machines from a closed venue should be scrapped.
- The machines should go when a venue closes.
- The machines should just go and not be moved to another venue.
- The machines should just go if a venue closes.
- The machines should leave Rotorua when a venue closes.
- The more that you shift around, the more people can gamble. I don't like gambling.
- The number of machines should decrease not just be moved around.
- The places that close, the machines should close too. How can you reduce the number of machines if you move them around?
- There should be fewer locations in more controlled environments. Yes, let people have a flutter, but not lead to a gambling problem.
- There should be no special license to move these machines at all.
- There should not be an expansion, there should be a decline. If the venue closes, the machines should disappear.
- They are addictive and evil.
- They attract the wrong crowd.
- They should be closed, if a venue closes.
- They should be moved on out of Rotorua.
- They should get rid of the machines if a venue closes.
- They should go when a venue closes.
- They shouldn't be allowed to move across venues.
- This is one way of natural reduction.

- This promotes the continuation of the number of machines and to move them to areas where profits can be maximised.
- To the dump.
- Too many machines already.
- Too many people affected by gaming addictions already.
- Want the number of machines reduced, not just moved around.
- Want them decreased as quickly as possible.
- We have to reduce the number of machines, not recycle them.
- We have too many at the moment.
- We have too many pokie machines in Rotorua already.
- We have too many so my preference would be that when the venue closes, the pokies should not be reallocated.
- We need to reduce numbers, not just move machines around.
- We should be getting rid of them, not moving them around.
- We should have less machines. Reduce the numbers.
- We want them to decline so when a venue closes they should go too.
- What a ridiculous situation! If a venue closes, surely, that is an opportunity to reduce the numbers.
- What the hell good does that do for anyone! It just moves the problem.
- When a venue closes the machines should be removed.
- When a venue closes the machines should go permanently.
- When a venue closes the machines should go to and not be moved.
- When a venue closes the machines should go (x2).
- When a venue closes the machines should just be removed.
- When a venue closes the machines should just go.
- When a venue closes, machines should go as well. Not be moved to another venue.
- When a venue closes, the machines should close with it. This helps to reduce the number of machines.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go and not be sent elsewhere.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go as well.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go to reduce numbers.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go. I would like to see only a couple of pokie machine venues here.
- When a venue closes, the machines should just go.
- When it closes, should get rid of them.
- When venues here closes, it is a proper opportunity for reduction.
- Work to reduce them.
- Would have to see them decrease.

Comments coded to **if a venue closes, the machines should go as well/don't allow them to be moved:**

- Because often a venue closes, those machines should be considered "dead" and not used anywhere else.
- Being able to move pokie machines around results in pokie machines being moved around.
- Close and get rid of machines.
- Close the machines down to reduce numbers.
- Close venues, shut down machines.
- Closed venues should mean the pokies go as well. It is a way to reduce the numbers.
- Closing a venue is an ideal opportunity to get rid of them.
- Complete waste of money. If a venue closes machines should go.
- Easy way to reduce the machines.
- Get rid of machines when a venue closes.
- Get rid of them, when a venue closes.

- *I prefer them to go once a venue closes.*
- *I think the number should be reduced so that when a place closes, the machines are gone.*
- *I would rather see less machines so if venue closed, the machines should go.*
- *I would rather, when a venue closes, the machines should leave Rotorua.*
- *If a business closes, then the machines should close.*
- *If a business is relocating to a different venue, but if it is closing down for good, then get rid of the machines.*
- *If a venue closes, machines should just be removed.*
- *If a venue closes the pokies should go as well.*
- *If a venue closes down, the machines should expire with them.*
- *If a venue closes down, the pokie machines go with it. It's a good way to reduce numbers.*
- *If a venue closes I agree machines should be moved, but not to another venue in Rotorua. Need to be moved outside the district.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should close as well.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should go to.*
- *If a venue closes, the machines should just go.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokie machine should be removed from use as well. The moving of machines is further encouraging the addicted gambling behaviour that I have witnessed in others.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokie machines should go as well.*
- *If a venue closes, the pokies should leave Rotorua.*
- *If a venue closes, those machines should be gone for good.*
- *If a venue is closed down, then the machines should be scrapped.*
- *If a venue shuts, the pokies should go.*
- *If it closes down, machines should go with it.*
- *If it shuts, that's it - gone.*
- *If one venue closes, the machines should be gone out of Rotorua.*
- *If place closes, machines should go too.*
- *If places closes down, the pokies go too.*
- *If the business closes, the machines go too.*
- *If the venue closes, the machines go.*
- *If the venue closes, the machines should close as well.*
- *If venue closes, the machine should go - not be moved to another venue.*
- *If venues close, the machines should go as well.*
- *If we are wanting to reduce numbers, isn't that a good way to get rid of them.*
- *If you closed your bar the city should lose the machines too.*
- *Just get rid of them. What is the point of moving them?*
- *Location of machines determines the level of demand.*
- *Machines should be removed once a venue closes.*
- *Machines should go when a venue closes so the numbers reduce quicker.*
- *Machines should go when a venue closes, not shift the problem to another venue.*
- *Machines should go when a venue closes (x3).*
- *Machines shouldn't be able to be moved. They should go once a venue shuts.*
- *Makes it easier to increase the number of pokie machines at any one time.*
- *My preference would be to use such special circumstances as an opportunity to reduce the overall number of machines and venues.*
- *Need to reduce the number of machines so pokies should go when a venue closes.*
- *Not being able to move from one place to another would be a good way of reducing the number in operation.*
- *Not necessary.*
- *Once a place closes, the machines should go too.*
- *Once a venue closes the pokies should go for good. They are too addictive.*
- *Once a venue closes, the machines should go too. If this happens, it would be a good way of reducing the number of machines.*

- Once a venue closes, the pokie machines need to close permanently.
- Once a venue has closed, all the machines from that venue should be disposed of and not moved to other venues.
- Once a venue is closed, the machines don't go elsewhere.
- Once it closes, it should go. Make it harder to get to places, ie, into towns.
- Once they are gone, they are gone.
- Once they close down, that should be it, they should go.
- Ridiculous idea, so does one place get bigger?
- Ridiculous.
- Seems a silly system.
- Should be closed and shouldn't pop up anywhere else.
- Should be end of that place.
- Should be put out to pasture, not reused.
- Should not be relocated, if you lose them, then that is a good way to reduce.
- Shouldn't happen.
- Shut them down.
- That's stupid, giving places more machines.
- The machines from a closed venue should be scrapped.
- The machines should go when a venue closes (x3).
- The machines should just go and not be moved to another venue.
- The machines should just go if a venue closes.
- The machines should leave Rotorua when a venue closes.
- The number of pokie machines should not be increased in any venues.
- The places that close, the machines should close too. How can you reduce the number of machines if you move them around?
- There should be a maximum number in each venue. No venues should be able to increase their number of total machines - even by one.
- There should not be an expansion, there should be a decline. If the venue closes, the machines should disappear.
- They should be closed, if a venue closes.
- They should get rid of the machines if a venue closes.
- They should go when a venue closes.
- This is one way of natural reduction.
- This should not be a right of the business. Rotorua's population should be consulted. Business could close due to protest from local residents or poor trading practises. The problem should not be moved from one location to another.
- To the dump.
- Too easy for operators to target high patronage areas.
- We have too many so my preference would be that when the venue closes, the pokies should not be reallocated.
- We want them to decline so when a venue closes they should go too.
- What a ridiculous situation! If a venue closes, surely, that is an opportunity to reduce the numbers.
- What the hell good does that do for anyone! It just moves the problem.
- When a venue closes the machines should be removed.
- When a venue closes the machines should go permanently.
- When a venue closes the machines should go to and not be moved.
- When a venue closes the machines should go (x2).
- When a venue closes the machines should just be removed.
- When a venue closes the machines should just go.
- When a venue closes, machines should go as well. Not be moved to another venue.
- When a venue closes, the machines should close with it. This helps to reduce the number of machines.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go and not be sent elsewhere.

- When a venue closes, the machines should go as well.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go to reduce numbers.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go.
- When a venue closes, the machines should go. I would like to see only a couple of pokie machine venues here.
- When a venue closes, the machines should just go.
- When it closes, should get rid of them.
- When venues here close, it is a proper opportunity for reduction.

Comments coded to **don't have a problem with this**:

- Can't see any problem in that.
- Do what they like. It's their machines.
- Doesn't worry me.
- I don't have a problem with this.
- I don't mind if they shift between venues.
- I don't see a problem with them.
- I have no particular view on this issue.
- If a place had 9 machines, going from 9 to 12 wouldn't make a huge difference.
- If it is still going to be there, it doesn't matter where the machine is.
- If licensed, it is ok.
- If machines moved, some people could follow that machine. Change is good, a mixed result.
- If they are going to gamble, they will regardless.
- It is just a business.
- It's fair and not increasing the numbers in Rotorua.
- Keeps money going around.
- Makes no difference to number in any one venue.
- No interest.
- No reason.
- Still good balance.
- Support, but monitor carefully.
- That is ok to do that.
- They are already there, so it doesn't matter if they move sideways.
- They don't bother me.
- They need to be redirected, if the demand is there for them.

Comments coded to **fine if overall numbers don't increase**:

- As long as numbers of machines does not increase.
- As long as numbers stay the same and are not increased.
- As long as the number of machines stays the same.
- As long as the number of pokie machines does not increase.
- Because the numbers are already there.
- Doesn't change the number of gamblers.
- If someone wants to buy the ones from other locations, that is fine if the numbers don't increase.
- If there are special circumstances, that's fine.
- If they are not increasing from the moves, then it is not making much of a difference.
- If they want to move them with a special license, that is fine.
- If they want to.
- If under special circumstances. They should be reduced.
- If you have a quota and you lose a machine when a venue closes, then that quota needs to be met by moving a machine to a different venue.
- It is better to keep them in Rotorua than have them go elsewhere.
- Just don't increase the numbers.

- Should not be increased, but they are a safe place to gamble and a safe environment for gambling machines.
- So that the number of machines stay the same.
- Still the same number of machines.

Comments coded to **get rid of all machines:**

- Get rid of all of them.
- Get rid of completely.
- Get rid of them (x2).
- Might as well get rid of them completely.
- That is keeping the number the same and not reducing them. Numbers should be reduced to nothing.
- The machines should go altogether.
- The machines should go.
- The machines should leave Rotorua.
- There should be none at all.
- We should not have them.

Comments coded to **only if moving them out of the suburbs:**

- Forget placing in low socio-economic areas.
- Gambling affects the community. Lower socio-economic communities are affected.
- I oppose pokie machines, full stop in low socio-economic areas.
- Move into the city centre and not into the suburbs.
- Must take them out of the suburbs. Don't make it easy to play them.
- Ok if moving them away from the suburbs.
- Scattered.
- Support provided there are restrictions on where they can be moved to ie, not suburbs, only a move into CBD. Would want to ensure that the restrictions include an analysis of the effect on the character of the new site (does the new venue align with that type of activity). Never around schools or where children are (daycare).

Comments coded to **only in special circumstances/case by case:**

- Because there are special circumstances.
- Depends on the situation, case by case scenario.
- In special circumstances.
- Only on a limited basis. Maybe once only.
- Support provided there are restrictions on where they can be moved to ie, not suburbs, only a move into CBD. Would want to ensure that the restrictions include an analysis of the effect on the character of the new site (does the new venue align with that type of activity). Never around schools or where children are (daycare).

Comments coded to **fine as long as new venue meets requirements:**

- As long the machines are in licensed premises.
- I can't see a problem if the venue has a license as it is a business.
- I don't mind them moving as long as the venue is a good one.
- Support provided there are restrictions on where they can be moved to ie, not suburbs, only a move into CBD. Would want to ensure that the restrictions include an analysis of the effect on the character of the new site (does the new venue align with that type of activity). Never around schools or where children are (daycare).

Comments coded to **should only be in one Casino:**

- Again, all machines in one casino in the city.
- Just to places that are far more savory than what we currently have. Most pokie venues in this city are rubbish. I would prefer all of them in one centrally run casino with real standards that had to invest some of profits back into community based initiatives.

- *Need casino.*

Comments coded to **needs to be monitored carefully**:

- *It should be made very public as to where the machines are going.*
- *Support, but monitor carefully.*

Comments coded to **don't know/doesn't affect respondent**:

- *Don't know enough about this topic.*
- *Don't know enough to say.*
- *Don't really understand why you would move machines?*
- *Get rid of them (x3).*
- *Get rid of.*
- *I am anti gambling.*
- *I don't gamble, but I don't judge others who gamble.*
- *I don't support any gambling machines.*
- *It doesn't impact on me.*

Comments coded to **other**:

- *As they are being used by tourists and are bringing money into the community.*
- *Because if they want to move change the license.*
- *Have them in a place where the money is.*
- *I don't think there should be more as long as it is not putting another person out of work.*
- *I have been involved in a club committee where that has happened.*
- *It would mean more business, but more people could become addicted and go there instead.*
- *Moving machines must be seen as natural attraction.*
- *On one hand, if a venue is closed, the machines don't have a right to be opened in another location, on the other hand, it would be hard to sell a business like that if you needed to.*

14. Are there any restrictions that you feel should be put in place and what are they?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Restriction on the amount that can be spent on the machines	67	13.5%
Impose an age limit in players	59	11.9%
Impose a time limit on players	37	7.5%
Strict monitoring/ID checks/entry by permit only/use token system	33	6.7%
Restrict those on a benefit/restrict drunks and problem gamblers	31	6.3%
Limit opening hours	25	5.0%
Reduce the number of machines and venues	24	4.8%
Current restrictions are enough/extra restrictions not required/hard to implement	21	4.2%
Limit/close all venues in poor socioeconomic/suburban areas	19	3.8%
Get rid of them	16	3.2%
Restrict pokie machines getting relocated from one venue to another	14	2.8%
Build a casino or keep all the machines at one place/only have in city	12	2.4%
Ban venues anywhere near school/youth facilities/churches/shopping centres	11	2.2%
Create more public awareness/offer support/education	11	2.2%
Children should not be allowed in/around the premises or to play them	9	1.8%
Shouldn't be able to play when drinking/drunken	5	1.0%
Restrictions on layout/look of venue	4	0.8%
Stop having big jackpots	2	0.4%
Don't know	34	6.9%
Other	5	1.0%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

*Comments coded to **restriction on the amount that can be spent on the machines**:*

- \$50 restriction per person per day.
- \$500 a day limit per person.
- A daily limit.
- A figure and when that figure is reached the machine should close down.
- A money limit of \$40.
- A money limit.
- A spending limit should be imposed.
- A spending limit.
- A time limit of half an hour a day and a maximum amount of \$30.
- Age and restriction on how much a person spends.
- Allocate a spending cap.
- Amount of money people spend.
- Cap on how much can be spent ie, \$100.
- Ensure they are not in the vicinity of under age people. Okay as long as users don't surpass a set limit.
- Have a dollar limit and if like a pub serving alcohol, be responsible and step in if you see someone gambling all day, every day. That is likely to be a problem gambler.
- Have a money limit.
- Have a time limit and a monetary limit.
- Have an age limit and a limit on the amount they spend.
- Have gambling limits.
- I heard an idea on TV from a gambling association. People enter an amount to gamble before starting and that can't be exceeded.
- I think that there should be a limit on how much cash you can get from EFTPOS (say \$200) in a bar. I see people going back a lot to get money.
- Identify those who come in regularly and limit what they spend. Get to know your customers.
- If we had a casino, staff could monitor the amount the regulars are spending and offer them help.

- Limit amount spent to \$50 per day.
- Limit how much you can lose on machines. Some people spend thousands.
- Limit of \$200 per machine (per individual).
- Limit the money people are able to spend.
- Limit time and amount spent on the machines, but I don't know how you would do this.
- Limit to \$20 per person.
- Limit what you are allowed to put in.
- Limits of how much money.
- Limits to amounts people are spending. Time limits on the machines.
- Lot of people spending last of their money and chasing their losers. In an ideal world, only those with surplus money should gamble. People choosing pokies over food for kids.
- Machines should have limits, cut off at certain stage. Monitor more closely. Especially by those owning the venues.
- Maximum of how much an individual can spend.
- Maximum spend of \$20 on a machine.
- Maybe a dollar limit on what people can feed into them.
- Maybe limit the time people are on them and the amount spent.
- Maybe, having to purchase up front the amount you are going to spend and once that is gone, you go through a cooling period where you can't purchase anymore for a set time.
- Money restriction. Maximum \$200 per person per day.
- Needs to be a restriction on how much a person can gamble on the pokies.
- Once they have spent a certain amount, they should stop. Hard to monitor.
- People not being able to gamble heavily.
- People should be monitored on how much they are spending. Cash should be changed into coupons so only a certain amount can be gambled.
- People spend too much money in a night. Spending should be capped.
- People who play usually can't afford it. Put their whole benefit through the machines. Maybe, the machines could have a device that limits the amount you can put in.
- Places should be monitored. Hours should be restricted as should spending.
- Possible limit of one player being able to spend x amount before being locked out of the machine.
- Prevent addiction by limiting number of times anyone can play.
- Restrict amount of money, especially on locals. Don't care about the tourists as they bring money into the community.
- Restrict how much money people can spend playing a machine. Not sure how you do this.
- Restrict how much you can spend.
- Restrict money, they need money to feed kids. Some are good, but some take risks.
- Restrict those who just spend every penny they have there or spend too much time there.
- Should be a restriction on the amount you can put into the pokie machines.
- Spend limit. Limit on how much can be put in at any one time.
- The amount of time and money spent on pokie machines should be restricted. I am not sure how this would be done.
- The amount of time playing and the amount of money that can be played.
- The amount people can spend on the pokies.
- The amount you can spend in one day should be limited.
- There should be a limit on the amount any one player can put into a machine.
- They need an age limit and you should only be able to spend a certain amount.
- They should be monitored to only allow people to spend a certain amount.
- Time limit and money limit.
- Timing on machine and the amount spent should both be restricted.
- You aren't able to put \$50 into machines now, which is good.
- You should have a limit on how much a person could spend on a machine to stop problem gambling but I am not sure what the limit should be.

Comments coded to **impose an age limit on players**:

- Age and restriction on how much a person spends.
- Age and self imposed.
- Age limit should be enforced.
- Age limit to go up.
- Age limit (x4).
- Age needs to go up. 18 too low.
- Age restriction of 18 years is a must.
- Age restriction of 21.
- Age restriction should be 21 if it isn't already.
- Age restriction.
- Age restrictions and not being able to play when drunk.
- Age restrictions enforced.
- Age restrictions should be increased.
- Age restrictions, ie, 21 plus.
- Age restrictions, over 20. Those under 20 don't have much income.
- Age restrictions (x2).
- Age restrictions. Adults only.
- Age restrictions. Should increase to over 25 years only being able to use the machines.
- Age should be higher. Level of income should be taken into consideration and those on a benefit shouldn't be allowed to gamble.
- Age to be 21 instead of 18.
- Age (x6).
- Age. Some form of control eg, a doorman who can see if children are left in the car, or who knows someone is gambling excessively so could stop them getting in.
- Already age restrictions.
- An age limit and no problem gamblers should be able to use the machines.
- An age limit. 21 at least.
- Can't see what restrictions you can have other than age.
- Don't know other than age.
- Don't know. Age I suppose.
- Have an age limit and a limit on the amount they spend.
- Have an age limit and give the owners of these machines the right to refuse people if they are known problem gamblers.
- Hours that places are open and an age limit.
- Increase the age limit.
- Know there is an age restriction.
- Need to be closely monitored in suburban outlets for age. Not as economically viable as the city ones.
- No one under age 18.
- No, not really. Maybe just age.
- Over 21 (x2).
- Over 25 to play pokies. No credit cards to be used on them.
- People over 25 only and using the machine for a bit of fun. Restrict time limits in gambling areas.
- Pokies should be restricted to those over 20 years and used as a fun thing. Younger people shouldn't be able to play them.
- Raise the age limit to 25 years.
- Restrict age to being at least 25 to gamble.
- Should not be able to gamble under the age of 21.
- The age limit should be 21 and not 18.
- There should be age restrictions of over 21 years to play.
- There should be an age limit of 18 years for use of a pokie machine.

- There should be an age restriction of 21 years with photo ID.
- There should be no underage gambling. They should be more closely monitored.
- They need an age limit and you should only be able to spend a certain amount.

Comments coded to **impose a time limit on players:**

- A time limit of half an hour a day and a maximum amount of \$30.
- A time limit on using the machines.
- A time limit.
- Further regulations around usage. A time limit is a must. Those on a benefit shouldn't be able to play.
- Have a time limit and a daily limit. Certain hours. Maybe 5pm-9pm, so people with kids at school aren't spending all day in front of machines.
- Have a time limit and a monetary limit.
- Have a time limit on playing.
- I don't know what restrictions are in place, but they should have a time restriction for playing on them.
- Limit time and amount spent on the machines, but I don't know how you would do this.
- Limit. Perhaps limit on how long you can play them.
- Limits to amounts people are spending. Time limits on the machines.
- Machines should have limits, cut off at certain stage. Monitor more closely. Especially by those owning the venues.
- Maybe limit the time people are on them and the amount spent.
- People not being able to gamble heavily.
- People over 25 only and using the machine for a bit of fun. Restrict time limits in gambling areas.
- Places should be monitored. Hours should be restricted as should spending.
- Prevent addiction by limiting number of times anyone can play.
- Restrict those who just spend every penny they have there or spend too much time there.
- Set time for individual play.
- Should have limits. Lower the amount of machines. Add a time limit like two hours. Makes more of a nuisance to go back and forwards. Up to owner to oversee otherwise would lose license or get a fine.
- Shouldn't gamble if you are under the influence or after a certain time.
- Suspension of the amount of time people play.
- The amount of time and money spent on pokie machines should be restricted. I am not sure how this would be done.
- The amount of time playing and the amount of money that can be played.
- There should be a maximum time limit of 3 hours.
- There should be a maximum time limit that they can play and at the end of that time the machine closes down, does a printout of what you have spent and what you have won. Half an hour would be a good time limit.
- There should be a time limit on the amount of time a person can play the pokies.
- They should be fitted with a time out device and then the machine should close so people can't sit on them all day.
- Time limit and money limit.
- Time limit should be put on them eg, 15 minutes playing time. Not sitting on them for hours on end as happens.
- Time limit.
- Time limit. Not sit there the whole day.
- Time limits. If you put lots of money in, would it come straight out?
- Time limits. People sit on machines for hours. Might reduce money wasted.
- Time restrictions.
- Time.
- Timing on machine and the amount spent should both be restricted.

Comments coded to **strict monitoring/ID checks/entry by permit only/use token system:**

- Age. Some form of control eg, a doorman who can see if children are left in the car, or who knows someone is gambling excessively so could stop them getting in.
- Associated with crime so we should monitor gambling.
- Don't leave the kids in car when you are gambling. Security to monitor cars.
- Gambling can lead to criminal activity if you lose.
- Have a dollar limit and if like a pub serving alcohol, be responsible and step in if you see someone gambling all day every day. That is likely to be a problem gambler.
- I hate it when kids hang around pokie outlets because their parents are inside palying.
- ID checks need to be enforced. Put all machines in a casino in one place.
- Identify those who come in regularly and limit what they spend. Get to know your customers.
- If problem gamblers are identified, they should be removed and barred from using machines.
- If same person is losing all the time, look further into it and not let it carry on.
- If they have pokie machines, there needs to be a place where patrons can go instead of out in the street. Premises need to be monitored more.
- If we had a casino, staff could monitor the amount the regulars are spending and offer them help.
- If you are going to play a pokie, you should have a registered card so your gambling can be checked. It is no different to needing a license to drive, or a passport.
- Into the CBD only. Not near schools, daycares or anywhere children can see them. All pokies to have CCTV outside their venue and inside premises also. Safety for the public and security measures. All pokies to have gambling addiction information and helplines with information clearly presented. More than is required by legislation etc. Rate these types of businesses with a surcharge.
- Locals need a permit to enter casinos/bars. Like in Singapore.
- Machines should have limits, cut off at certain stage. Monitor more closely. Especially by those owning the venues.
- Maybe, having to purchase up front the amount you are going to spend and once that is gone, you go through a cooling period where you can't purchase anymore for a set time.
- Monitor the regular gamblers.
- Monitor the way people behave and be more strict on who they let into premises with pokie machines.
- Need to be closely monitored in suburban outlets for age. Not as economically viable as the city ones.
- People should be monitored on how much they are spending. Cash should be changed into coupons so only a certain amount can be gambled.
- People who run the taverns should be able to offer help to those who are gambling too much.
- Places should be monitored. Hours should be restricted as should spending.
- Prevent addiction by limiting number of times anyone can play.
- Should be restricted for pokie machines. The people who have them should be aware of the problematic gamblers eg, those who come in every day and spend a lot.
- Should have limits. Lower the amount of machines. Add a time limit like two hours. Makes more of a nuisance to go back and forwards. Up to owner to oversee otherwise would lose license or get a fine.
- There should be an age restriction of 21 years with photo ID.
- There should be no underage gambling. They should be more closely monitored.
- There should be strict monitoring of the number of pokie machines each venue has.
- They should be monitored to only allow people to spend a certain amount.
- They should be put in more controlled environments to monitor what is put in each machine and how much people can gamble.
- Token system so you can be refused tokens.

- Venue managers should be able to stop problem gamblers playing. I am sure they know who they are.

Comments coded to **restrict those on a benefit/restrict drunks and problem gamblers**:

- Age restrictions and not being able to play when drunk.
- Age should be higher. Level of income should be taken into consideration and those on a benefit shouldn't be allowed to gamble.
- An age limit and no problem gamblers should be able to use the machines.
- Ban problem gamblers from palying.
- Beneficiaries shouldn't be able to play them.
- Close venues on benefit days.
- Feed kids first.
- Further regulations around usage. A time limit is a must. Those on a benefit shouldn't be able to play.
- Have an age limit and give the owners of these machines the right to refuse people if they are known problem gamblers.
- If problem gamblers are identified, they should be removed and barred from using machines.
- If same person is losing all the time, look further into it and not let it carry on.
- If you are on a benefit, you shouldn't be allowed to gamble.
- If you are on the dole you shouldn't be able to play pokies. Why should tax payers support your habit?
- If you haven't got the money you shouldn't gamble, it is as simple as that.
- Just for those who can afford it. Not for those who can't afford to put food on table.
- Know of people who have been banned. Should be ways of getting people to pay essentials first. Maybe WINZ should pay rent directly for problem gamblers.
- Lot of people spending last of their money and chasing their losers. In an ideal world, only those with surplus money should gamble. People chosing pokies over food for kids.
- No beneficiary should be allowed to play.
- Opening times should be 4pm onwards to closing. Not open 7 days a week. If on a benefit, you should not be allowed to enter the premises for gambling.
- People on a benefit should not be allowed to play.
- People on benefits shouldn't be allowed to gamble.
- People who play usually can't afford it. Put their whole benefit through the machines. Maybe, the machines could have a device that limits the amount you can put in.
- Problem gamblers shouldn't be able to use the machines.
- Restrict amount of money, especially on locals. Don't care about the tourists as they bring money into the community.
- Should be more help for problem gamblers.
- Should be restricted for pokie machines. The people who have them should be aware of the problematic gamblers eg, those who come in every day and spend a lot.
- Shouldn't gamble if you are under the influence or after a certain time.
- They are used by people that can't afford them.
- They shouldn't be used by anyone who has been drinking.
- WINZ/People on the benefit shouldn't be able to play pokie machines. If the benefit was not paid in cash, it would reduce the amount beneficiaries could gamble.
- Would love it to be means tested.

Comments coded to **limit opening hours**:

- Have a time limit and a daily limit. Certain hours. Maybe 5pm-9pm, so people with kids at school aren't spending all day in front of machines.
- Have a time limit on playing.
- Hours of opening should be reduced.
- Hours of opening should be restricted. Limit the hours.
- Hours that places are open and an age limit.

- If we had a casino we could regulate dress/times of opening. Create a pleasant atmosphere and get rid of all the dreary people around town.
- Limit time they are open and available. They shouldn't be open at 8 am.
- Limited to number of hours venues can be opened.
- Not close too late.
- Not enough familiarity of them. Maybe change the hours of availability.
- Open at certain hours.
- Opening time restrictions.
- Opening times should be 4pm onwards to closing. Not open 7 days a week. If on a benefit, you should not be allowed to enter the premises for gambling.
- Put a six o' clock end period daily.
- Reduce the hours. They open too early. Who needs to gamble at 8 am.
- Restrict the hours in which they are allowed to operate.
- Restrictions around schools and times.
- Restrictions placed on the hours of operation.
- Should have certain hours to be open. Not through the day - only in the evening.
- Time constraints ie, not during working hours. Then people have a responsibility to go home.
- Time issue. Close at certain times so people can't gamble all day. Restrict times and have fun for limited time. Will help families.
- Time limit venues are open for use of the pokies. Restrict to the city.
- Time of day that they are open. A few hours in the evening only eg, 6pm to 10pm and not on a Sunday.
- Time restrictions.
- Time.

Comments coded to **reduce the number of machines and venues**:

- Cap the number of machines now and number of venues. License the machines to the address and business. When businesses close or move, further reduce the cap.
- Decrease them.
- Don't know what could be in place. Maybe not granting a new license once one closes down. As licenses expire, they needn't be granted again. Attention should be taken of services that are linked to gambling in Rotorua.
- Give them five only.
- Have a maximum number of venues not in town.
- I strongly feel that they shouldn't be moved and should discontinue use.
- Just reduce the numbers of machines.
- Just the number of machines. Can limit access but not choices.
- Make it not so readily available in some places.
- Make them completely out of sight, eg, behind a closed door. Reduce numbers with an aim of getting rid of them completely.
- No venue should have more than 12.
- Not right to move. A good way of lowering the overall number.
- Numbers should not increase.
- Reduce the number of licenses.
- Reduce the number of machines.
- Restrictions on those who have a license.
- Sad to see more gambling machines than shops.
- Should have limits. Lower the amount of machines. Add a time limit like two hours. Makes more of a nuisance to go back and forwards. Up to owner to oversee otherwise would lose license or get a fine.
- Should reduce the number of machines.
- The amount of pokie machines should be restricted as too many people are gambling.
- The number of machines in each venue should be strictly regulated.
- The number of pokie machines in any one venue should never increase.

- There should be strict monitoring of the number of pokie machines each venue has.
- Waste of time and money. Makes manager rich.

Comments coded to **current restrictions are enough/extra restrictions not required/hard to implement**:

- Can't control.
- Can't impact on people's human rights.
- Hard to implement.
- Hard to legalise against the will of a person.
- If you put a time limit on, they will just go to another machine.
- It is already covered under the law.
- It's people's own choice to gamble. No one forcing them to gamble.
- Just the number of machines. Can limit access, but not choices.
- Maybe, but very hard to enforce.
- No point putting restrictions as they never work.
- No restrictions are necessary.
- No restrictions should be placed on them.
- No restrictions.
- None that could be readily monitored.
- None. You can't stop people if they want to gamble.
- Not too many in low socio-economic areas. Agree in principle, but do believe in personal choice.
- Policing gamblers is not the job of the proprietor.
- They are in place already.
- Too difficult to implement.
- Too hard to explore.
- You can't stop people playing, unless they agree to stop.

Comments coded to **limit/close all venues in poor socio economic/suburban areas**:

- Close all suburban venues.
- Have them only in the city, so that access is not so easy.
- Keep pokie machines away from as many people as possible.
- Keep them out of Maori and Pacific populated areas as the stats show they have the greatest problems with addiction.
- Keep them out of the poor suburbs.
- Less venues in the suburbs.
- Make it not so readily available in some places.
- New license process if the business wishes to relocate. Not allowed in the suburbs.
- None in the suburbs. Too easy access.
- Not in the suburbs.
- Not too many in low socio-economic areas. Agree in principle, but do believe in personal choice.
- Nowhere near kids or schools. Should not be in poorer areas.
- Pokie machines should be taken out of the suburbs.
- Pokie machines should not be placed in areas where there are high levels of social deprivation eg, unemployed, poor education and health outcomes, etc. Like alcohol and drugs, access to opportunities for gambling tends to worsen an already poor situation.
- Should close venues in shopping centres and in the suburbs.
- Shouldn't be in suburbs.
- That they don't go to vulnerable suburbs.
- The areas in which they are located.
- Time limit venues are open for use of the pokies. Restrict to the city.

Comments coded to **get rid of them:**

- Ban them.
- Get rid of the whole lot, bomb them.
- Get rid of them.
- I don't agree with them at all.
- I would sooner see them go.
- Just get rid of them (x2).
- Make them completely out of sight, eg, behind a closed door. Reduce numbers with an aim of getting rid of them completely.
- Move them all to the Casinos, we don't need them in Rotorua.
- No gambling. Ban pokie machines.
- They should be banned altogether.
- They should be gone.
- They should be wiped out completely.
- They should just be done away with.
- They shouldn't be in Rotorua at all. Too many people who use them can't afford to waste their money.
- Would like to see them all gone.

Comments coded to **restrict pokie machines getting relocated from one venue to another :**

- Don't know what could be in place. Maybe not granting a new license once one closes down. As licenses expire, they needn't be granted again. Attention should be taken of services that are linked to gambling in Rotorua.
- I don't think they should be allowed to be moved. Full stop.
- I strongly feel that they shouldn't be moved and should discontinue use.
- Moving machines should not be allowed.
- Moving should be restricted to a venue by strict licensing and heavy penalties imposed if breached.
- New license process if the business wishes to relocate. Not allowed in the suburbs.
- No moving at all. If a venue closes, remove the machines and don't relocate them.
- Not right to move. A good way of lowering the overall number.
- Not to be moved.
- Review permit with every move.
- That if you move the machines from one place to another, then the number of machines in that place should not increase.
- They should only be allowed to be moved to the rubbish dump or Recycling Centre for dismantling.
- Transfers must be individually considered by Council on a case by case basis taking into account possible social effects.
- When a venue closes the machine should go as well.

Comments coded to **build a casino or keep all the machines at one place/only have in city:**

- Have them only in the city, so that access is not so easy.
- Having a casino could help regulate the number of gamblers.
- I would prefer all of them in one centrally run casino with real standards that has to invest some of profits back into community based initiatives.
- ID checks need to be enforced. Put all machines in a casino in one place.
- If we had a casino we could regulate dress/times of opening. Create a pleasant atmosphere and get rid of all the dreary people around town.
- If we had a casino, staff could monitor the amount the regulars are spending and offer them help.
- Into the CBD only. Not near schools, daycares or anywhere children can see them. All pokies to have CCTV outside their venue and inside premises also. Safety for the public and security measures. All pokies to have gambling addiction information and helplines

with information clearly presented. More than is required by legislation etc. Rate these types of businesses with a surcharge.

- Keep machines in one place like a casino.
- Move them all to the Casinos, we don't need them in Rotorua.
- Should be restricted to casinos.
- Should not be in licensed premises, should only be in a casino.
- Time limit venues are open for use of the pokies. Restrict to the city.

Comments coded to **ban venues anywhere near schools/youth facilities/churches/shopping centres**:

- Away from high schools or anywhere where parents drop their kids off. Too much temptation if near a school.
- Away from school.
- Into the CBD only. Not near schools, daycares or anywhere children can see them. All pokies to have CCTV outside their venue and inside premises also. Safety for the public and security measures. All pokies to have gambling addiction information and helplines with information clearly presented. More than is required by legislation etc. Rate these types of businesses with a surcharge.
- It shouldn't be placed near to child/youth facilities.
- Not near schools or churches.
- Not near schools.
- Nowhere near kids or schools. Should not be in poorer areas.
- Restrictions around schools and times.
- Should close venues in shopping centres and in the suburbs.
- The venues should be out of sight of children.
- They should not be moved to venues near schools, ECE's or churches.

Comments coded to **create more public awareness/offer support/education**:

- Current restrictions are probably enough.
- Don't know what could be in place. Maybe not granting a new licence once one closes down. As licences expire, they needn't be granted again. Attention should be taken of services that are linked to gambling in Rotorua.
- Mandatory to have education around gambling. Especially for those who visit regularly.
- More forms of offering support to people.
- People who run the taverns should be able to offer help to those who are gambling too much.
- Place more emphasis on education. Not the machines that are the problem, but the people that use them.
- Recipient demonstrates transparency and good practice when dealing with takings.
- Restrictions are well covered already.
- Should be more help for problem gamblers.
- There should be a maximum time limit that they can play and at the end of that time the machine closes down, does a printout of what you have spent and what you have won. Half an hour would be a good time limit.
- Venue managers should be able to stop problem gamblers playing. I am sure they know who they are.

Comments coded to **children should not be allowed in/around the premises or to play them**:

- Children shouldn't be on the premises.
- Ensure they are not in the vicinity of under age people. Okay as long as users don't surpass a set limit.
- I hate it when kids hang around pokie outlets because their parents are inside playing.
- Into the CBD only. Not near schools, daycares or anywhere children can see them. All pokies to have CCTV outside their venue and inside premises also. Safety for the public and security measures. All pokies to have gambling addiction information and helplines

with information clearly presented. More than is required by legislation etc. Rate these types of businesses with a surcharge.

- It shouldn't be placed near to child/youth facilities.
- No children in sight of any pokie machines.
- Restrict their accessibility to minors.
- Restrictions around schools and times.
- The venues should be out of sight of children.

Comments coded to **shouldn't be able to play when drinking/drunk**:

- Age restrictions and not being able to play when drunk.
- I don't think people should be able to drink while playing the pokies.
- Should not be in licensed premises, should only be in a casino.
- Shouldn't gamble if you are under the influence or after a certain time.
- They shouldn't be used by anyone who has been drinking.

Comments coded to **restrictions on layout/look of venue**:

- Have natural sunlight and clocks visible.
- If they have pokie machines, there needs to be a place where patrons can go instead of out in the street. Premises need to be monitored more.
- Make sure venues are not just pokie machines. Have space to sit. Provide food and be more of a social place.
- Some overseas research shows environment where machines are placed in has an effect ie, is in a darkened room.

Comments coded to **stop having big jackpots**:

- Don't have big jackpots on the machines as this keeps people playing too long.
- People try to get the jackpots and keep playing. So I think the jackpots should be reduced.

Comments coded to **don't know**:

- Can't really say cos I don't gamble.
- Can't think off hand.
- Don't know.
- Don't know anything about pokies, so can't say.
- Don't know enough about them.
- Don't know enough about to comment on restrictions.
- Don't know enough to comment (x2).
- Don't know enough to say.
- Don't know how they could be restricted.
- Don't know other than age.
- Don't know what can be done.
- Don't know what restrictions are in place.
- Don't know (x8).
- I don't know enough about them to comment.
- I don't know enough to comment.
- I personally don't play and it doesn't affect me.
- No idea about restrictions.
- No view on this.
- Not really.
- Not sure as I don't know enough about them.
- Not sure as I don't know enough.
- Not sure (x3).
- Unknown.
- Unsure.

Comments coded to *other*:

- Age and self imposed.
- Just pay out more. Out of the 15 years that I have been playing, only rarely walked out with money (winnings).
- Only local gaming trusts should be used to ensure the money goes back to our community.
- Over 25 to play pokies. No credit cards to be used on them.
- They should just be in sports venues and the money should be going back to those same sports clubs and not to the gaming venues.

This section is regarding reducing gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua:

The current Rotorua policy sets a cap on the number of machines, and this has been dropping over time.

- The number of machines in Rotorua has dropped from 518 (in 2004) to 389 (in 2016).
- Despite the drop, Rotorua has significantly more machines per population compared to the average throughout NZ. Including tourists, Rotorua has 5.4 machines per thousand people while the national average is 3.8 machines per thousand.
- If we had the same ratio as NZ, Rotorua would be limited to 247 machines, rather than the current 389.
- RLC has been reducing the number of machines over time. Over the past 6 years numbers have dropped by 6.5% (compared to a 15% reduction nationally).

15. What action do you think RLC should take regarding the level of gambling (pokie) machines? (using a five point scale from reduce numbers at a fast rate to increase numbers at a fast rate).

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	235	47.4%	47.8%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	179	36.1%	36.4%
Leave number at current levels	57	11.5%	11.6%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	5	1.0%	1.0%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	6	1.2%	1.2%
NA/Don't know	10	2.0%	2.0%
Not specified	4	0.8%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

16. Please outline any reasons for your views?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Reduce at a slow rate/reasons for reducing at a slow rate	116	23.4%
Reduce at a faster rate/reasons for reducing at a faster rate	101	20.4%
Aim for the national average	94	19.0%
Get rid of machines totally	42	8.5%
Have machines for tourists/have establishments in the city only/Casino	23	4.6%
Leave at current level	15	3.0%
Need education/support for those with a problem/suggestions to address gambling problems	9	1.8%
Need to take businesses into account/revenue benefits the community	9	1.8%
Reduce as venues naturally close/don't allow machines to be moved/don't replace damaged ones	7	1.4%
Gambling is an enjoyable hobby for those with the money	5	1.0%
Haven't seen any issues	3	0.6%
Beneficiaries should not be able to gamble	2	0.4%
Make it harder to access	2	0.4%
Don't know	1	0.2%
Other	6	1.2%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **reduce at a slow rate/reasons for reducing at a slow rate**:

- A slow rate is not so antagonistic.
- Although I believe that they should greatly decrease, I feel that removing them too quickly could result in poor outcomes, particularly for the families of those who are addicted. With the removal should come an increase in support services and gradually phase them out as going cold turkey could prove harmful.
- At least money still keeps coming back into the community.
- At slow rate because the owners of the bar will need time to adjust.
- Because then people won't notice so much and complain about it.
- Because then people won't notice too much.
- Better to do it slowly so people won't notice so much.
- Cap at 247 immediately and then as venues close, remove those machines.
- Consider those who are addicted.
- Continue decreasing slowly.
- Costs money to reduce.
- Council might be accused of interfering if done quickly.
- Don't agree with them, but need to curb people's habit gradually. Hard for some people with addictions.
- Don't make it easy for people to gamble.
- Don't want too many options and need to be in specific places and not in sporting clubs.
- For the benefit of those who are addicted.
- Gamblers need time to adjust.
- Get people used to the idea that they are going to lose these machines over time.
- Give people time to get used to less machines.
- Good the way it is dropping slowly. Might reduce to nothing.
- Greatly reduce numbers at steady but slow rate. Like cigarette reduction and 2025 goals.
- Have less than the rest of NZ. Give people time to get used to less.
- Hopefully it will just fade out. Give people a chance to wear off them.
- I don't think you can get rid of them quickly as people need time to adjust.
- If it was done too quickly Council would get a backlash.
- If people don't use pokies, they will find another way to gamble.
- If reduced at a slow rate, there will be less of an outrage against the restriction.
- If you do it too fast, everyone would go crazy. People freak out when there are drastic changes.
- If you do it too quickly people will notice and might kick up a fuss.

- *If you do it too quickly, people will notice and be opposed.*
- *If you have a problem with gambling you can wear yourself off them slowly.*
- *If you made them disappear all at once, there would be an uproar.*
- *If you make people go cold turkey, they will be fighting over the few machines that are left or find another addiction.*
- *If you reduce the number slowly there will be less of a backlash.*
- *If you remove machines at a fast rate, people will just find somewhere else to gamble. They need time to adjust.*
- *If you remove them all at once, people will get angry. If you do it slowly, they will be less opposed.*
- *It is hard to stop these people wasting their money, but having less machines available might help.*
- *It is like a withdrawal symptom so needs to be done slowly.*
- *It makes sense to slowly wean people off them.*
- *It may be more acceptable by those using the machines to reduce at a slower pace. Just like you can't cut out smoking overnight.*
- *It takes time for people to get used to them going.*
- *Just continue to bring the numbers down.*
- *Just to get people used to it.*
- *Keep reducing slowly to match national quantity.*
- *Less gambling machines equals less money people will lose.*
- *Less opposition if gradually decreased.*
- *Let the system sort itself out and get people used to having less gambling.*
- *Like a habit, you can't jumb out of it quick.*
- *Might have to wean people off rather than cold turkey.*
- *More likely to get support than at a fast rate.*
- *More time for people to get used to lower numbers.*
- *Not to cause too much shock for charities who rely on the funding and to allow them to find other sources of funding.*
- *Numbers need to be decreased to 247 at the very least, but it needs to be done slowly so businesses aren't hurt.*
- *Numbers that have dropped are acceptable.*
- *People might get angry if a lot of machines go all at once.*
- *People save more money if there are less machines.*
- *People won't notice so much if they are slowly disappearing.*
- *Pokie machines should not be placed in areas where there are high levels of social deprivation eg, unemployment, poor education and health outcomes etc. Like alcohol and drugs, access to opportunities for gambling tends to worsen an already dire situation.*
- *Pokies are an addiction, but numbers do need to reduce.*
- *Probably most pragmatic way to go if casino option not possible.*
- *Reduce at any rate they can and provide counselling services.*
- *Reduce number and put them all in one casino.*
- *Reduce numbers and cap it per venue. Should be five machines per venue.*
- *Reduce numbers and open a casino so all machines are in one venue with good monitoring.*
- *Reduce the number of machines at a slow rate so businesses don't lose out.*
- *Restrictions placed on all business to have a maximum of 12 machines and as each business closes, no new licenses issued.*
- *Rotorua has too many.*
- *Rotorua should reduce at a slow rate so people don't complain. We should try to be below the national average as we are not a rich area.*
- *Safer and easier to reduce slowly.*
- *Set a target and don't let any more machines over that in Rotorua.*
- *Should be at least reduced to the national level, hopefully, get below it.*

- *Slowly but surely. Council's representatives should visit the venues and see first hand how many people frequent these places.*
- *Slowly decrease numbers as way too many machines per person.*
- *Slowly rather than all of a sudden.*
- *Slowly so there is not an outrage.*
- *So people aren't that aware of the number of machines decreasing over time, so there are no complaints.*
- *So people can adjust and if it happens slowly, people won't be able to object publicly.*
- *So people don't lose so much.*
- *So people get used to less. People will gamble if they want to. I have friends playing on-line.*
- *So people won't complain so much.*
- *So that it is not too noticeable.*
- *So that it wouldn't impact too quickly on the grants from the trusts.*
- *So that people don't complain. We should not be higher than the national average.*
- *So that people don't notice so much and complain.*
- *So that the reduction should not be too much of a shock to people.*
- *So the business has time to adjust to not having them.*
- *So the players can get used to the fact rather than being faced with a dramatic drop all at once.*
- *So there won't be an outcry.*
- *Some groups in Rotorua can't help themselves.*
- *Some people might get annoyed if it decreases too fast.*
- *Slowly get down.*
- *Stop people wasting money.*
- *Take away slowly.*
- *Taking away something that is addictive quickly can lead to anger and violence so better to wean people off at a slower rate.*
- *Taking time would work better.*
- *The community does benefit a bit. Tourists are used to having access to pokie machines in NZ.*
- *The customers will follow the pokie machines.*
- *The impact of reducing at a fast rate would be too much of a shock to problem gamblers.*
- *There are too many people that can't afford to do it.*
- *There will be other problems if you get rid of them all at once. Like any other addictions.*
- *They cause more harm than good.*
- *They need to continue to reduce them. They should be in a dedicated casino, not a bar/gambling house.*
- *To ease the problems of a gambling addiction.*
- *To give opportunity for adjustment.*
- *To give people time to adapt.*
- *To give people time to adjust as it is an addiction.*
- *To give people time to adjust.*
- *To give time for adjustment.*
- *Too much of an outrage if you reduced them quickly.*
- *Two phase: first = immediately cut down every license holder by an equitable % so Rotorua comes into line with the national ratio. Second = slowly reduce by natural attrition by not allowing transfer or sale of licenses (in Rotorua these licenses are not transferable).*
- *We are a tourist city. Blaming machines for people's problems is a waste of time. People will do it regardless.*
- *We don't want people to notice that they are being removed.*
- *We must at least get down to the national average. Should be less considering our socio economic situation.*
- *We should reduce down to the national average. Change can be hard, so needs to be done slowly.*

- You can just take people's livelihood away from them if you removed machines at a fast rate.
- You can't expect everyone to quit instantly. Need to offer guidance and support for those who are withdrawing.

Comments coded to **reduce at a faster rate/reasons for reducing at a faster rate:**

- Aim for the national average, find a way to get down to that figure. A business with excessive number of machines needs numbers to be reduced.
- At faster rate than they have been.
- At least on par with rest of NZ. Too slow for small place like Rotorua.
- Because it affects family.
- Because it is bizarre that Rotorua has a higher ratio of machines than the rest of NZ. Especially as we have as many social problems.
- Because of our population and demographics we are a risk for gamblers.
- Because of the high amount of money these machines take from those who use them.
- Because of the problems they cause in our community. If they reduce slowly the problem will still be there.
- Because there are lots of repercussions when people lose their money gambling and have no money for food. Anger at losing can lead to family violence.
- Better things to spend our money on.
- Can't see why they can't reduce them? Need to take into consideration the businesses.
- Cap all venues in low socio-economic areas so they can only have one machine and reduce numbers in all venues.
- Council could lead by example and become pokie free or significantly reduce them lower than 247.
- Council needs to make up their minds on how many machines they want to have in 2020 and work towards having those numbers. It will give people time to adjust.
- Council needs to pull their socks up and action this.
- Creeping reduction might not be noticed so much.
- Damage they cause far outweighs any benefit to the community.
- Decrease at whatever rate you can.
- Decrease down to 247 straight away.
- Decrease the number as many as possible.
- Decrease the poverty.
- Drop it down quickly.
- Everyone comes to Rotorua for the culture (vegas). Hurry up and take them away.
- Faster the better.
- Gambling is an addiction. Impact on communities and families is far reaching.
- Gambling with pokie machines is too big a problem to allow it to continue at the current rate.
- Get rid of them as quickly as possible.
- Going back to the one I know, It is not good for school children who pass it regularly to see people gambling all the time. It gives them the impression that this is the norm.
- Help addicts by doing this.
- I think mostly local people are gambling rather than tourists therefore it should be reduced at a fast rate.
- I think people in Rotorua are spending too much money.
- I think they should be reduced at a fast rate although it is probably more practical to reduce slowly.
- I want to see the numbers reduced as quickly as possible.
- If machines weren't there, people couldn't play them. For tourists, there could be pokie machines in the big hotels.
- Including tourists, Rotorua has 5.4 machines per thousand people while the national average is 3.8 machines per thousand. This figure reflects the fact that we are a tourist

destination. RLC have chosen to reduce at a slow ratio. Could reduce at a fast rate if they wanted.

- It is an unnecessary spending of money.
- It is disgusting seeing people sitting at machines gambling all their money away when it could be going back into the household, especially those with kids.
- It is too easy to get addicted and it causes havoc on family life.
- It needs to be done.
- It would be nice to have Rotorua not known as the gambling city of NZ.
- Just get rid of them as quickly as possible.
- Keep in line with NZ's overall policies. Rotorua has some unique socio-economic issues and lots of people are supported by the government in one form or another. If you get financial support from the government, in any form, then you should not be allowed to gamble with "this" money. Tourists, should they wish and they have funds they can "afford" to lose, could have a location or two to go to "donate" their money.
- Live in low socio-economic area so even more important to reduce the numbers.
- May be it would stop the people that can least afford to gamble.
- Might reduce gambling problems and grief.
- Need to take strong action if you want to deal with the social repercussions of problem gambling which affect everybody.
- No other reason for the pokie machines other than gambling which damages the community.
- People are targeted who can't afford them and who can't manage money.
- People get addicted and family and others suffer because of this.
- People playing them and not being able to afford it.
- People should not have so many machines to choose from.
- People want to get rich quick without working.
- People will notice if they close quickly and maybe address their gambling problems.
- Pokie machines are like drugs and alcohol. If people are unhappy they will gamble to numb their minds. More so in low socio-economic areas.
- Pokies are taking over the gamblers lives and the kids suffer the worst.
- Reduce as fast as they can with fewer venues and offer help to problem gamblers in caring way.
- Reduce temptation and the adverse effects on Rotorua families.
- Reduce the numbers or move to the rich areas and reduce numbers.
- Reduce the numbers. The faster the better.
- Rip the band aid off!
- Rotorua has far too many machines.
- Rotorua has far too many pokie machines.
- Should have less.
- So that all that money isn't lost from a small city. Get the money used for community from elsewhere.
- Solve the problem quickly.
- Some people gamble all their money away. We have many problem gamblers in Rotorua.
- Sooner the better.
- Sort the problem right out and fix it.
- The less machines, the less hardships.
- The negative impact of pokie machines on the community is well documented. RLC has an obligation to implement policies that reduce harm.
- The people using them are the ones that can least afford to use them.
- The sooner we reduce and get rid of them, the better for people in Rotorua.
- There are 249. Too many machines in Rotorua.
- There are far too many. We should only have 247 machines. Tourists aren't a reason to have more as they aren't in a casino situation which would draw in tourists who wished to gamble.
- There are just too many pokies in Rototrua.

- *There are too many problems that arise from gambling.*
- *They are a problem and I have changed my mind now listening to the facts. I now think we should have as few as possible.*
- *They are just money wasters and cause real hardship for the children of many pokie players.*
- *They are rubbish. They cause so much harm.*
- *They cause suffering in families, increase crime and are not a good look for tourists visiting our city.*
- *They do social harm. Of all forms of gambling, pokies are known to be the worst.*
- *They need to get down to 247 quickly as a maximum attempt at reducing numbers, but I would like to see them reduce further.*
- *They should bring the numbers to 247 machines quickly.*
- *To be more in line with the rest of NZ. At a fast rate so this happens sooner.*
- *To get rid of them as quickly as possible.*
- *To reduce numbers as quickly as possible.*
- *To solve the problems quicker.*
- *Too many easily accessible machines.*
- *Too many machines creates too many problems.*
- *Too many machines out there. Lead the way and be have the least.*
- *Too many opportunities to gamble. Have less machines. Leave some machines where tourists can play them.*
- *Too many problem gamblers here. Families are affected.*
- *Was thinking slow rate so it doesn't affect the businesses too much. But on reflection, reduce them at a fast rate as they cause harm to problem gamblers.*
- *We are a small population so should be able to decrease faster.*
- *We have a lot of poverty and low income families in Rotorua and the less temptation the better.*
- *We have too many for the population and too much negative impacts.*
- *We have too many here.*
- *Why not.*
- *Why should we be higher than the national average, reduce to 247 now.*
- *Will help people to stop gambling.*
- *Would imagine less is more.*

Comments coded to aim for the national average:

- *A place like Rotorua should not have more machines than the national average.*
- *Aim for the national average, find a way to get down to that figure. A business with excessive number of machines needs numbers to be reduced.*
- *Aim to have same numbers as rest of the country.*
- *Align to the national average. It shows the commitment of the RLC.*
- *At least get to the national average.*
- *At least on par with rest of NZ. Too slow for small place like Rotorua.*
- *At least tracking with the national average for density of machines seems defensible. Given that Rotorua also seems to lead national statistics for domestic violence, which is correlated with poverty, reducing access to gambling machines for those least likely to afford and most likely to use them would be smart.*
- *Because of the number of machines for the thousand people. We should have less than the average of NZ.*
- *Bring in to line with rest of the country.*
- *Bring numbers to a low level. At least to the national level or below.*
- *Bring the numbers quickly down to the national average.*
- *Bring us in line with the rest of NZ.*
- *Cap at 247 immediately and then as venues close, remove those machines.*
- *Council could lead by example and become pokie free or significantly reduce them lower than 247.*

- Get down to at least the national average, but we should be below the national average as we are a low income economic area.
- Given statistics just quoted, I think we shall at least be at the national level, not greater.
- Go to NZ standard of 3.8 machines per 1000.
- Have less than the rest of NZ. Give people time to get used to less.
- How come we have more machines than the national average?
- I am opposed to pokie machines and certainly opposed to Rotorua having more than the national average.
- I am surprised that we are above the average. We should be lower than average number of machines.
- I can't believe how many machines there are in Rotorua. We should drop to the national average as a starting point.
- I don't know why Rotorua should have more machines than the national average.
- I don't think we should have more than any other places.
- I would like to see Rotorua only have 247 pokie machines.
- It is ridiculous that we have more than the national average. Take this evil out of Rotorua.
- It is stupid that Rotorua has more than the national average. With our socio-economic market we could have far less.
- Keep in line with NZ's overall policies. Rotorua has some unique socio-economic issues and lots of people are supported by the government in one form or another. If you get financial support from the government, in any form, then you should not be allowed to gamble with "this" money. Tourists, should they wish and they have funds they can "afford" to lose, could have a location or two to go to "donate" their money.
- Keep on the same level as the national standard.
- Keep reducing slowly to match national quantity.
- Keep up with rest of country.
- Keep up with rest of NZ.
- Machines should be lower than the national average in Rotorua so less than 247.
- Numbers need to be decreased to 247 at the very least, but it needs to be done slowly so businesses aren't hurt.
- Numbers need to be in line with rest of NZ.
- Ratio for population and machines too high.
- Reduce numbers quickly to no more than 247.
- Reduce numbers to 247 immediately.
- Reduce numbers to be national average. Does not look good being over that number.
- Reduce so we are in line with national average.
- Reduce to 247 machines immediately and then continue to reduce the number of machines in Rotorua.
- Reduce to 247 machines.
- Reduce to 247 machines. We shouldn't be higher than national average in Rotorua.
- Reduce to national average (x2).
- Reduce to the average nationally.
- Reduced to national average.
- Remove to at least national average.
- Ridiculous that a small city should have more than the national average.
- Rotorua has far too many machines, we need to get down to 247 at least.
- Rotorua should be at least at the national average, not more.
- Rotorua should not be higher than the rest of NZ.
- Rotorua should not have more than the rest of NZ.
- Rotorua should reduce at a slow rate so people don't complain. We should try to be below the national average as we are not a rich area.
- Rotorua should reduce down to 247 machines as soon as possible.
- Rotorua shouldn't have so many machines. We should be at the national average or below.
- Set to the same number of machines as the rest of NZ.

- Should be at least reduced to the national level, hopefully, get below it.
- Should be at least the national average and not higher.
- Should be national average.
- Should be the same as the average of NZ.
- Should be the same as the national average.
- Shouldn't have more than anywhere else.
- So that people don't complain. We should not be higher than the national average.
- So we are the same as everywhere else in NZ.
- Sounds like action is needed to keep up with everyone else.
- They need to drop to 247 maximum and less if possible.
- They need to get down to 247 quickly as a maximum attempt at reducing numbers, but I would like to see them reduce further.
- They should bring the numbers to 247 machines quickly.
- They should reduce numbers to national average.
- To be less than the average in NZ considering the number of unemployed in the district.
- To be more in line with the rest of NZ. At a fast rate so this happens sooner.
- To bring Rotorua in line with the rest of NZ.
- To get us in line with the rest of NZ.
- To keep in line with other locations we should take the gambling machines away straight away.
- Two phase: first = immediately cut down every license holder by an equitable % so Rotorua comes into line with the national ratio. Second = slowly reduce by natural attrition by not allowing transfer or sale of licenses (in Rotorua these licences are not transferable).
- We must at least get down to the national average. Should be less considering our socio economic situation.
- We need to be at least on par with national level at 247 or lower. Don't see why Rotorua should have more.
- We need to get rid of them. Rotorua with low socio-economic population having more than the national average is obscene.
- We should at least be or at par with the national average.
- We should be in line with the rest of the country.
- We should be less than the national average, not more.
- We should be the same as other parts of NZ or lower; certainly not have more machines than other parts of NZ.
- We should not be higher than the national average and income is much lower than the national average.
- We should not be more than the national average. We should be less.
- We should not have more than the national average.
- We should reduce down to the national average. Change can be hard, so needs to be done slowly.
- We should try to be below the national average.
- We shouldn't be higher than the national average. We should be the same or even less.
- Why haven't they done it before hand? Why are we above the national average?
- Why should Rotorua be any different from elsewhere in NZ?
- Why should Rotorua have more than the rest of NZ. I think they are just taking advantage of a low socio-economic area.
- Why should we be higher than the national average, reduce to 247 now.
- Why should we have more than anywhere else?

Comments coded to **get rid of machines totally:**

- As said before they are an absolute scourge on society. They are a menace to the health and well being of our residents, none of whom would miss them if they weren't there. In fact they would prosper since they wouldn't be pouring funds they can ill afford into a black hole.
- Cut and closed.

- *Don't agree with gambling.*
- *Don't like gambling.*
- *Gambling is a sickness and I want it eradicated.*
- *Get over and done with.*
- *Get rid of all machines.*
- *Get rid of all of them.*
- *Get rid of completely or pay out more. Waste of community's time if they are not fair.*
- *Get rid of the bastards altogether.*
- *Get rid of them altogether.*
- *Get rid of them now. Linked to criminal activity.*
- *Get rid of them so it stops people putting money into them.*
- *Get rid of them (x2).*
- *Get rid of them. Social killers.*
- *I am just anti-gambling because of the misery families suffer.*
- *I don't see them as a positive thing at all. Even if some money goes back into the community.*
- *I don't think they are good for a community. We pay enough taxes to support the community. I don't think we need revenue from gambling.*
- *I just don't like them.*
- *I just want them gone. There is no benefit in them.*
- *I want to see them gone.*
- *I would like to see the machines gone completely.*
- *Just be done with them. Get rid of them. We don't need them.*
- *Let's clean up our city!*
- *No access, no use.*
- *Our population is on a low socio-economic level and we should have less than the NZ average, not more. I think we should have none. Tourists should not come here to gamble, but come for the culture.*
- *People need help. Pokie machines are real addictions.*
- *People on benefits should not be paid in cash. Ban pokies, tobacco and alcohol.*
- *Remove them all. We are too poor a city to have them.*
- *Rotorua doesn't need these machines. They create more problems than revenue.*
- *Should be outlawed.*
- *Sick disease.*
- *Some people are unable to control their gambling. By taking the gambling machines away, this will remove this option. The funds raised "for the community" comes from people who can least afford it.*
- *Sooner they are gone the better.*
- *Take the whole lot out.*
- *There is no need for them.*
- *They cause so much harm to many people. I don't think we need them here.*
- *They should just be done away with.*
- *To keep in line with other locations we should take the gambling machines away straight away.*
- *We need to get rid of them. Rotorua with low socio-economic population having more than the national average is obscene.*
- *Wrong people using the pokie machines, remove the availability.*

Comments coded to **have machines for tourists/have establishments in the city only/Casino:**

- *But concentrate on tourists, not locals. Have somewhere where Asians can gamble day and night as they do in Auckland, but restrict local areas.*
- *Good for tourists.*
- *Have a casino where there are pokie machines and also to create jobs in the community.*
- *I think tourists are increasing and we need the machines for them to play.*

- *If machines weren't there, people couldn't play them. For tourists, there could be pokie machines in the big hotels.*
- *It is a tourist town and tourist should be encouraged to come here and if they want to gamble, they should be able to do so.*
- *Keep in line with NZ's overall policies. Rotorua has some unique socio-economic issues and lots of people are supported by the government in one form or another. If you get financial support from the government, in any form, then you should not be allowed to gamble with "this" money. Tourists, should they wish and they have funds they can "afford" to lose, could have a location or two to go to "donate" their money.*
- *Money is going on the wrong things like gambling. Need to be putting the family first. Problem is in local pubs. Keep gambling in CBD where it can be policed.*
- *Only if put them all together in one place in the city.*
- *Probably most pragmatic way to go if casino option not possible.*
- *Reduce number and put them all in one casino.*
- *Reduce numbers and open a casino so all machines are in one venue with good monitoring.*
- *Rotorua is different than the norm. We have a lot of tourists coming into the region so they need to have access to pokie machines.*
- *Should not be open in mornings. Have a decent casino in town, being a tourist destination.*
- *Shut down pokie machines near houses and keep them in city.*
- *The community does benefit a bit. Tourists are used to having access to pokie machines in NZ.*
- *Too many opportunities to gamble. Have less machines. Leave some machines where tourists can play them.*
- *Tourists might need to use them.*
- *Tourists want to gamble so we have to provide machines for them. It is the problem gamblers that cause the problems.*
- *We are a tourism centre and a lot of these people come in and use the machines.*
- *We are a tourist city. Blaming machines for people's problems is a waste of time. People will do it regardless.*
- *We are a tourist town and if tourists want to gamble, we need to cater for this.*
- *We are going to get more tourists so keep the machines we have got.*

Comments coded to **leave at current level**:

- *Could well be influx of people ie, from Auckland. So if we reduce them, there might not be enough. Need to cater for big events ie, when there is a World Cup, Cranxworks and big conferences.*
- *Focus on discouraging from gambling and have more community activities.*
- *If it brings in money for a good cause, then stay the same.*
- *If you reduce the machines, people will still find somewhere to play. Better to increase age. Take a look at opening times. Only open after hours ie, evenings after people have finished work. People should be working during the day.*
- *Machine numbers shouldn't increase.*
- *Not allow any more.*
- *People will still gamble regardless of level of machines.*
- *Reducing machines won't solve gambling problems as some people are addicted.*
- *Shouldn't be any intervention.*
- *Stay the same because some money goes back to the community.*
- *There are positive and negative impacts.*
- *Unless there is a problem, leave as it is.*
- *We are going to get more tourists so keep the machines we have got.*
- *We have enough machines.*
- *Won't make any difference.*

Comments coded to **need education/support for those with a problem/suggestions to address gambling problems:**

- Although I believe that they should greatly decrease, I feel that removing them too quickly could result in poor outcomes, particularly for the families of those who are addicted. With the removal should come an increase in support services and gradually phase them out as going cold turkey could prove harmful.
- Awareness of negative effects should be made known. Council probably already provide helplines.
- Focus on discouraging from gambling and have more community activities.
- If you reduce the machines, people will still find somewhere to play. Better to increase age. Take a look at opening times. Only open after hours ie, evenings after people have finished work. People should be working during the day.
- Reduce as fast as they can with fewer venues and offer help to problem gamblers in caring way.
- Reduce at any rate they can and provide counselling services.
- Should not be open in mornings. Have a decent casino in town, being a tourist destination.
- Slowly but surely. Council's representatives should visit the venues and see first hand how many people frequent these places.
- You can't expect everyone to quit instantly. Need to offer guidance and support for those who are withdrawing.

Comments coded to **need to take businesses into account/revenue benefits the community:**

- At least money still keeps coming back into the community.
- Because the revenue benefits the community.
- Because they provide revenue for the community.
- Can't see why they can't reduce them? Need to take into consideration the businesses.
- Costs money to reduce.
- Only because money is going back into the community.
- Part of the money goes back to the community.
- Stay the same because some money goes back to the community.
- You can just take people's livelihood away from them if you removed machines at a fast rate.

Comments coded to **reduce as venues naturally close/don't allow machines to be moved/don't replace damaged ones:**

- As businesses close, don't replace the machines.
- Do it as licenses expires, this maybe a more managable way of controlling the withdrawal of machines and would reduce black market gambling.
- Once a venue goes, the machines should as well and if a machine breaks at a venue, it should be removed and not replaced and no new machines should be allowed into Rotorua.
- Restrictions placed on all businesses to have a maximum of 12 machines and as each business closes, no new licenses issued.
- Set a lower limit overall. As one closes don't renew right until a selected predetermined number is reached.
- Two phase: first = immediately cut down every licence holder by an equitable % so Rotorua comes into line with the national ratio. Second = slowly reduce by natural attrition by not allowing transfer or sale of licences (in Rotorua these licences are not transferable).
- When a venue closes, the machines shouldn't go to another venue, but should just close.

Comments coded to **gambling is an enjoyable hobby for those with the money:**

- A night out gambling can be very enjoyable if you have the money to spend.
- I think people should be able to gamble where they want to.
- If people want to do it, they should be able to do so.

- *If the numbers are reduced too much then there will be no machines left for people who just want to have occasional fun.*
- *Large Maori population here who are heavy gamblers so I am sure council won't want to remove them.*

Comments coded to **haven't seen any issues**:

- *Doesn't bother me because I don't gamble.*
- *It doesn't concern me.*
- *Not seen any issues.*

Comments coded to **beneficiaries should not be able to gamble**:

- *It annoys me that people on the dole play them.*
- *People on benefits should not be paid in cash. Ban pokies, tobacco and alcohol.*

Comments coded to **make it harder to access**:

- *Don't make it easy for people to gamble.*
- *Don't want too many options and need to be in specific places and not in sporting clubs.*

Comments coded to **don't know**:

- *Doesn't really involve me.*

Comments coded to **other**:

- *Compare apples with apples. Compare relatively.*
- *Get rid of completely or pay out more. Waste of community's time if they are not fair.*
- *Not a priority as not the biggest problem (contributes to problem).*
- *The council should be more worried about at lot more than pokie machines in Rotorua.*
- *There are positive and negative impacts.*
- *They poke their noses into things that don't concern them.*

17. Have you or your family, or a community organisation you are involved with, benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts?

	Number	Percent
Yes	124	25.0%
No	312	62.9%
Don't know	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Demographics:

18. What is your gender?

	Number	Percent
Male	240	48.4%
Female	256	51.6%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

19. What is your age grouping?

	Number	Percent
15 to 24	74	14.9%
25 to 34	48	9.7%
35 to 44	76	15.3%
45 to 54	104	21.0%
55 to 64	80	16.1%
65 to 74	71	14.3%
75+	43	8.7%
Refused	0	0.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

20. Which of the following ethnic groups do you consider yourself a part of? (please tick all that apply)

None additive:

	Number	Percent
NZ Pakeha/European	330	66.5%
NZ Maori	149	30.0%
Pacific Island	8	1.6%
Asian	14	2.8%
Other	43	8.7%
Refused	0	0.0%
Not specified	1	0.2%
Sample	496	

Note: Not additive as respondents could be multiple ethnicities

In order to provide additive comparisons for ethnic responses, the ethnicity of respondents was also calculated assuming respondents only had one ethnicity. To do this, respondents who identified with NZ Maori were coded to Maori, those who had other affiliations (included New Zealander) were coded to other ethnicity and anyone who identified as NZ European (but not have any other ethnicity affiliation) was coded as NZ European. The results are shown in the table below.

Additive:

	Number	Percent
NZ Pakeha/European	289	58.3%
NZ Maori	149	30.0%
Other Ethnicity	56	11.3%
Not specified	2	0.4%
Total	496	100.0%

21. Which of the following best describes where you live?

	Number	Percent
Rotorua city (central city area)	27	5.4%
Rotorua suburbs	347	70.0%
Ngongotaha	25	5.0%
Lakeside settlement	30	6.0%
Rural	67	13.5%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	496	100.0%

Rotorua suburbs specified:

	Number	Percent
Fairy Springs	13	3.7%
Fenton Park	12	3.5%
Fordlands	10	2.9%
Glenholme	32	9.2%
Hannahs Bay	2	0.6%
Hillcrest	10	2.9%
Holdens Bay	7	2.0%
Kawaha Point	15	4.3%
Koutu	22	6.3%
Lynmore	34	9.8%
Mangakakahi	18	5.2%
Matipo Heights	1	0.3%
Ngapuna	3	0.9%
Ohinemutu	5	1.4%
Owhata	30	8.6%
Pleasant Heights	2	0.6%
Pomare	5	1.4%
Pukehangi	19	5.5%
Selwyn Heights	9	2.6%
Springfield	45	13.0%
Sunnybrook	11	3.2%
Tihiotonga	2	0.6%
Utuhina	4	1.2%
Westbrook	7	2.0%
Western Heights	27	7.8%
Whakarewarewa	1	0.3%
Other	1	0.3%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	347	100.0%

Lakeside settlement specified:

	Number	Percent
Lake Tarawera	7	23.3%
Lake Rotoiti	5	16.7%
Lake Rotoma	3	10.0%
Lake Okareka	6	20.0%
Lake Rotoehu	0	0.0%
Okere Falls	1	3.3%
Tikitere	8	26.7%
Other	0	0.0%
Not specified	0	0.0%
Total	30	100.0%

Rural location specified:

	Number	Percent	% tot sample
Atiamuri	4	6.0%	6.1%
Hamurana	19	28.4%	28.8%
Horohoro	2	3.0%	3.0%
Kaharoa	5	7.5%	7.6%
Kapenga	0	0.0%	0.0%
Mamaku	10	14.9%	15.2%
Mourea	5	7.5%	7.6%
Ngakuru	2	3.0%	3.0%
Reporoa	1	1.5%	1.5%
Rerewhakaaitu	6	9.0%	9.1%
Tarukenga	0	0.0%	0.0%
Tumunui	0	0.0%	0.0%
Waikite Valley	7	10.4%	10.6%
Waimangu	0	0.0%	0.0%
Waiotapu Village	1	1.5%	1.5%
Waiteti	0	0.0%	0.0%
Other	4	6.0%	6.1%
Not specified	1	1.5%	
Total	67	100.0%	100.0%

Other rural location specified:

- Farmland on Tarawera Road.
- Rotokawa (near the airport).
- Rotorua.
- South of Rotorua.

22. How many people over 15 live in your household?

	Number	Percent	% ex non spec.
Zero	0	0.0%	0.0%
One	77	15.5%	15.6%
Two	231	46.6%	46.8%
Three	91	18.3%	18.4%
Four	57	11.5%	11.5%
Five	25	5.0%	5.1%
Six	9	1.8%	1.8%
Seven	2	0.4%	0.4%
Eight	1	0.2%	0.2%
Nine	0	0.0%	0.0%
Ten or more	1	0.2%	0.2%
Not specified	2	0.4%	
Total	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

23. Do you have any comments you would like to pass on to Council for them to consider before making rules related to gambling in Rotorua?

Comments coded:

	Number	Percent
Comments supporting not having pokie machines	72	14.5%
Reduce the number of venues and pokie machines in Rotorua	69	13.9%
Monitor and restrict problem gamblers and those on benefits	29	5.8%
Comments supporting on building a casino/upmarket venue/have machines in town	27	5.4%
Comments supporting having pokie machines	23	4.6%
More support for gambling addictions	22	4.4%
Move them away from suburbs/schools/pubs or bars/residential and low income areas	17	3.4%
Have pokie machines targetted at tourists	11	2.2%
Need alternative funding options to community groups/businesses	11	2.2%
Issues with revenue generated from gambling/suggested beneficiaries for funds	9	1.8%
More community consultation/survey is required for decision making/what has worked elsewhere	9	1.8%
Report and publish the amount spent vs returns to the community	9	1.8%
Strategies to address gambling effects	9	1.8%
Education/public awareness about negative aspects of gambling	8	1.6%
Don't have a casino in Rotorua	4	0.8%
Ban the name "Rotovegas"	3	0.6%
Don't know	3	0.6%
Other	36	7.3%
Sample	496	

Note: not additive as respondents comments could be coded to multiple categories

Comments coded to **comments supporting not having pokie machines**:

- 1) Only allow gambling for those who can afford to lose money without it affecting others, eg, tourists etc. 2) Stop marketing gambling in shop stores. 3) Stop saying that 40% goes to the community, this is misleading and a dishonest practice. If people had money to "spare" then set up a reward system to let them donate this to the community agency of their choice, thus, they have a say where this money goes. Currently they have little or no say. 4) Gambling is a business but an ill-conceived one. If people wish to gamble and "have fun" then provide them with real rewards and winnings that are realistic and will make people appreciate what they have won. Unfortunately, Lotto for example, preys on people's greed and tempts people into spending more than what they can afford by having large funds to win. WE need to stop this mentality. 5) If someone receives any financial help from the government, they should not be allowed to gamble with "this money". It needs to go where it was intended.

- Accept that it is harmful and addictive behaviour and the only beneficiaries are the machine owners, some community groups, the funds managers and Government via taxes. It is socially irresponsible to profit from the misery of others.
- Being a teacher, I see the problems it cause in families. Kids coming to school without lunch. Those families getting a benefit but wasting it on the pokies.
- Child poverty and social issues, no benefit at all and hence all shall go.
- Close it all down.
- Could you please use the intelligence we voted you in for and get rid of them as they are only hurting the poor.
- Council haven't served Rotorua people by allowing such high pokie machine numbers. It is a shame that community organisations have to rely on money from gambling.
- Council members need to be fully aware of the considerable harm caused by pokies to individuals, families and the community. Poor areas are targeted. Financial loss leads to social problems, family breakdowns, crime, to name a few outcomes.
- Council must be aware of the poverty in Rotorua and the association with poverty and gambling.
- Council needs to think about the impact pokie machines have on our image, social, health and vulnerable people. The harm far outweighs any money going back to the community. There should be better ways to fund.
- Council should publish a breakdown of money going into pokie machines; who gets what, what percentage goes to players, owner etc. to make players more aware of their stupidity.
- Cut it out altogether.
- Definite problem in Rotorua. Too accessible. People on streets asking for money as they have gambled it away.
- Do what you can. I work in the public health system and I see the outcomes from problem gambling.
- Don't like gambling as people end up with less than they started with.
- Everyone needs to give up gambling.
- Gambling is a big issue for some people and their families. There are too many machines in Rotorua.
- Gambling is a real problem for those involved in it. It is addictive and should be looked at as a health issue. I don't see it as a positive thing that money from these machines goes back into the community. There are better funding options. Rotorua would be better off without these machines. I think the paper should publish a monthly summary of what has been spent on pokies in Rotorua.
- Gambling not a good thing. Should be focussing on education about gambling rather than worrying about licenses.
- General consensus from people as opposed to small groups that make noise. That is the ones who make the money from it and don't care who they hurt along the way.
- Get it (gambling) sorted. Moved here 4 months from Wellington and more aware of it here. Only 3 places aware of in the city. Lots of places don't associate themselves with gambling in Wellington. Would have to go out of way to find them.
- Get rid of gambling. Any profits from gambling should be spent on cleaning up lake Rotorua.
- Get rid of pokie machines.
- Get rid of the machines as possible. Pokie machines are bad for the environment.
- Get rid of them all. They are not good for the community. All money spent on pokies should go back into the community to help those living in poverty or on the streets or in cars.
- Get rid of them. Don't need them. Not required.
- Greatly reduce the number of gambling machines in Rotorua. Have them in places for tourists and not in the suburbs.
- I am amazed at the number of machines and the amount of money spent in Rotorua on them. We must do something to stop this.

- *I can't understand why Rotorua has so many machines and they are so accessible. We are a low socio-economic area and gambling makes paying bills a real struggle.*
- *I consider any revenue they produce is dirty money. I want to see them gone.*
- *I really want to see them gone from Rotorua completely.*
- *I think council already knows the problems.*
- *I think Council should ban pokies all together.*
- *I think pokie machines are a cancer in Rotorua.*
- *I think the less gambling machines, the better.*
- *I think this survey is good but when is Council going to do something about the problem. We all know it exists and has existed for years but still we have all the pokie machines and the community goes on being damaged.*
- *I want to see pokie machines go completely from Rotorua.*
- *I would just like to see the pokie machines leave Rotorua.*
- *If Council realises there is a problem with gambling here, they need to do something about it regardless of the revenue it generates.*
- *If the Council's aim is to get rid of the pokie machines then get on and reduce at a faster rate.*
- *If there was less gambling in Rotorua, crime levels are likely to fall. I don't think there is anything good about Pokie machines and there are better ways to fund community organisations.*
- *It hurts families.*
- *It is a huge problem although I respect peoples' democratic rights. I think in Rotorua they should be banned.*
- *Just decrease, decrease, decrease. We don't need them here.*
- *Just get rid of them (pokie machines).*
- *Keep doing the mahi to get rid of them.*
- *Keep in mind most of the people that do gamble can't afford it and the trickle down effect is the children that don't have food or clothing and can't always participate in school activities. Budgeting needs to be addressed for these families.*
- *Life is not all about money. The health & wellbeing of the people in your community is important and effects everyone, including you and your children. If you want a good life and to live in a clean, healthy environment, uplift everyone around you. Get rid of poison like pokie machines, cigarettes, alcohol and drugs.*
- *Look at the logistics. Rotorua is targetted for pokie machines because it is a low income area with a lot of unemployed looking for a quick fix. It must be stopped.*
- *Lots of people get hassled for money in the gambling places. Not safe place to be.*
- *Make the hard decisions. Though love and help those who can't help themselves by getting rid of pokie machines.*
- *May be they should be in these venues and see for themselves the number of young people that frequent those, who can least afford it.*
- *Money could go towards much better things than pokie machines like health and education.*
- *People need to take responsibility for their own actions. Council can't be responsible for problem gamblers.*
- *People should spend their money elsewhere. Too easy for them in Rotorua.*
- *People shouldn't do it. Think about their responsibilities first.*
- *Please be brave about reducing access to pokie machines. We don't want them. We don't need them. Please also take the same approach with liquor licensing - we have too many bars and off-licenses in Rotorua. In some suburbs they are on every corner.*
- *Please consider the suffering gambling on pokies causes to the children in our community. Children come to school hungry.*
- *Please don't open a casino here. Gambling can be very addictive and causes headache in families. I hate to see women waiting outside pokie venues in the mornings for them to open.*
- *Pokie machines are highly addictive. Often those who play them can't afford to do so and they are placed in areas of low income groups.*

- Reduce all gambling machines over time to 0 machines.
- Remove the pokie machines completely from Rotorua. We are a low socio-economic area and people should spend their money on necessities and not on gambling.
- Sad people who gamble.
- Stop gambling. You will lose your money. Get a job. They are just lazy.
- Stop the pokie machines. The dollar benefit from it overshadows the problems it creates in the Rotorua community.
- Stop thinking about the money and think about the people.
- The Council should have focused on gambling before smoking as gambling kills families. I work in this area and see it happening.
- The machines cause more harm than good. I just want to see them gone.
- The problems caused outweigh the supposed benefit to the community.
- The sooner they get rid of them, the sooner there will be a lot less homeless people. As it is now they gamble their money away and can't afford to help a roof over themselves.
- Think carefully about the children who are impacted by problem gamblers. Schools have to feed them and sometimes cloth them.
- Undertake a survey of pokie machine users in Rotorua and find out how many are supported by WINZ, Salvation Army and other charities and then the Council will have a mandate to completely ban them in Rotorua.
- We are a low income economic area. We do not need pokie machines. Don't concentrate on the grants as in effect, this money is coming out of the pockets of Rotorua people. It is not a gift to the community.

Comments coded to **reduce the number of venues and pokie machines in Rotorua:**

- Close as many venues as quickly as possible.
- Council are doing a good job if they are reducing pokies in Rotorua.
- Council has all the information they need, they just need to act faster to reduce numbers.
- Council haven't served Rotorua people by allowing such high pokie machine numbers. It is a shame that community organisations have to rely on money from gambling.
- Council needs to continue reducing pokies as they are addictive. The small pubs that have pokies will suffer however, as it is really the pokies that keep them afloat but that isn't a good reason to keep them.
- Council needs to reduce pokie machines down to 247 as soon as possible. They cause so much headache for families when a person becomes addicted to playing them and it is often people who can ill afford to lose the money.
- Council should publish a breakdown of money going into pokie machines; who gets what, what percentage goes to players, owner etc. to make players more aware of their stupidity.
- Cut down the number of gamblers. Decrease outlets in Rotorua.
- Decrease the venues.
- Do what you can. I work in the public health system and I see the outcomes from problem gambling.
- Don't be stupid by removing too many machines too fast.
- For the sake of our city and it's residents, please initiate a sinking lid policy on pokie machines ASAP. In addition, please support the establishment of a proper high end casino where locals can be trained and employed to world class standard. Patrons would require to adhere to a dress policy. Entertainment would be provided. Security would be in place as would gambler support and a policy to return a % of profit to the local community. Tourists would really appreciate the opportunity to experience our world renowned manaakitanga.
- Gambling is a big issue for some people and their families. There are too many machines in Rotorua.
- Get involved and really address the gambling issues.
- Get on with it. Set a goal, get on with it and reduce the number of machines.
- Go ahead with what they are doing.

- Greatly reduce the number of gambling machines in Rotorua. Have them in places for tourists and not in the suburbs.
- Have only one venue where the pokies are so they can be monitored and people will have to wait to use them. I see too many poor people using them.
- Have to reduce gambling machines as fast as they can. Machines are too accessible in the suburbs, with too much of a temptaion for the problem gambles out there.
- I am amazed at the number of machines and the amount of money spend in Rotorua on them. We must do something to stop this.
- I am doing a Bachelor of health degree and we did touch on problem gambling. From the figures quoted in this survey, it seems there is a problem with gambling in Rotorua. It is good that Council is trying to do something about it.
- I just want them to reduce the number of machines here.
- I think council knows the misery pokies can cause, so reduce them to a minimum as fast as possible.
- I think Rotorua should try to have less machines than the national average, not more.
- I think the less gambling machines, the better.
- I would like to see only one venue for pokie machines so problem gamblers can be identified and restricted. I don't think all the seedy venues send a good message about Rotorua and I hate the name Rotovegas. I don't feel that the money that gets paid into the community goes into the right areas as they place so many restrictions on what they will fund.
- I would like to see the number of pokie machines reduce greatly. They don't benefit Rotorua and many children suffer because of their parents gambling habits.
- If the Council's aim is to get rid of the pokie machines then get on and reduce at a faster rate.
- If we are spending that much we must have a problem and that needs to be addressed. Why are people spending so much on pokies?
- Instead of 40c for every dollar, increase the amount that goes back into the community. In an ideal situation, decrease the numbers and increase the amount going back into the community.
- Just decrease, decrease, decrease. We don't need them here.
- Just keep decreasing the number of machines in Rotorua.
- Just that I think the number of machines should be reduced.
- Keep reducing and keep out of suburbs. I hate liquor outlets that have available pokie machines within walking distance of each other.
- Let's direct people towards other activities that will give them pleasure and hope. If they are doing it in the hope of a big win, maybe we can encourage them to get wins in other ways.
- Lower the machine numbers. Gambling is having a dreadful impact on the children of Rotorua. Take away easy access.
- Machines should be decreased and only in clubs or located in the central city.
- Need to reduce. People need help if they have a gambling problem.
- No, just to see less machines.
- No, just what I said. Too many pokie machines and too accessible especially, in poor areas.
- Numbers need to reduce in Rotorua.
- Please be resolute in your reduction of these harmful machines. You will receive submissions bemoaning the loss of money - but there are other sources of funding our community can access and the cost to our community of these machines is greater than the lost funding support.
- Please reduce the number of pokie machines in our city. They do not bring anything positive to our community.
- Reduce all gambling machines over time to 0 machines.
- Reduce the number of machines.
- Reduce the numbers as quickly as possible.

- Reduction would help the gambling problem.
- Reductions made have been comprehensively covered in the survey already.
- Restrict access to gambling around Rotorua as soon as possible.
- Should work on reducing the availability of machines.
- Significantly reduce the number of pokie machines. We have a high population of Maori and are a low socio-economic area with high unemployment.
- Take the machines out of the suburbs and reduce the numbers.
- The number of machines need to be reduced and definitely not increased.
- The number of machines needs to reduce. Rotorua doesn't need this many. I think there should be a few venues for tourists but they cause a lot of headache for local families.
- The number of pokie machines in Rotorua needs to drastically drop.
- There should be a significant reduction in machines. Venues should only be open for a few hours in the evenings so that people can't spend their day on the pokies. Council should take a lead role in this.
- They should be ashamed that they allow so many pokie machines in Rotorua.
- They should reduce the number of machines and they should police the machines so people aren't able to sit on them all day. Many people don't realise how addictive they are.
- Think about the community. Gambling impacts everyone.
- Think about the people who use these machines often. They spend all of their income on them in the hope that they will win enough to meet their financial commitments.
- Think carefully about the children who are impacted by problem gamblers. Schools have to feed them and sometimes cloth them.
- Think of the impact on families that pokie gambling has in Rotorua.
- This is a fraught area. I generally don't like this form of gambling as it tends to be marginal socially. Would prefer a centralised and highly controlled casino with real standards. I kind of feel that slowly goes is best but would not care myself if all current pokie operations were closed down in favour of a higher quality / maybe more centralised option.
- To look very carefully at the number of machines and venues with a view to reducing them.
- Unsure, not really but hope they are reduced. No idea how businesses qualify for pokie machines.
- We should do something about gambling in Rotorua. All people know it is not good. Council can't really take responsibility, up to the gambler.
- We should reduce the number of pokie machines as quickly as possible as I think the people who can least afford to lose money are the ones using them. I hate the term Rotovegas. I don't want my city to have the connotation of a gambling place. It is a ridiculous term anyway when you compare to the bright lights and all the shows in Los Vegas with dreary Rotorua.
- Would like to take a strong stand on reducing gambling machines and get rid of the word "ROTOVEGAS" as it has a strong connotation for Rotorua.
- You are on the right track.

Comments coded to **monitor and restrict problem gamblers and those on benefits:**

- 1) Only allow gambling for those who can afford to lose money without it affecting others, eg, tourists etc. 2) Stop marketing gambling in shop stores. 3) Stop saying that 40% goes to the community, this is misleading and a dishonest practice. If people had money to "spare" then set up a reward system to let them donate this to the community agency of their choice, thus, they have a say where this money goes. Currently they have little or no say. 4) Gambling is a business but an ill-conceived one. If people wish to gamble and "have fun" then provide them with real rewards and winnings that are realistic and will make people appreciate what they have won. Unfortunately, Lotto for example, preys on people's greed and tempts people into spending more than what they can afford by having large funds to win. WE need to stop this mentality. 5) If someone receives any financial help from the government, they should not be allowed to gamble with "this money". It needs to go where it was intended.
- Being a teacher, I see the problems it cause in families. Kids coming to school without lunch. Those families getting a benefit but wasting it on the pokies.

- Better communication with government agencies; eg, WINZ. Monitor people who receive Government assistance.
- Build a casino and remove all gambling machines from pubs and set up proper management structures for problem gambling. Being centralised, I believe it will benefit locals and we will still be able to make money for charities from our tourists.
- Closer monitoring, be more vigilant when making decisions. Council knows it is a big problem here in Rotorua.
- Concentrate on the people playing the machines and losing the money.
- Council needs to reduce pokie machines down to 247 as soon as possible. They cause so much headache for families when a person becomes addicted to playing them and it is often people who can ill afford to lose the money.
- Have a lot better system of support for problem gamblers so people don't feel bad about seeking help.
- Have only one venue where the pokies are so they can be monitored and people will have to wait to use them. I see too many poor people using them.
- I think people on a benefit should not gamble. In Australia they trialled a system where only 20% of the benefit was paid in cash. The taking of the pokie machines in that town reduced 70%.
- I think Rotorua should have a casino and have the pokie machines only at that venue as it would be easier to control.
- I would like to see only one venue for pokie machines so problem gamblers can be identified and restricted. I don't think all the seedy venues send a good message about Rotorua and I hate the name Rotovegas. I don't feel that the money that gets paid into the community goes into the right areas as they place so many restrictions on what they will fund.
- I would much prefer to see pokie machines in a casino only, so that the gambling can be monitored properly.
- Keep in mind most of the people that do gamble can't afford it and the trickle down effect is the children that don't have food or clothing and can't always participate in school activities. Budgeting needs to be addressed for these families.
- Look at the area (Fordlands) I am in. I assume its here because it's a lower-socio economic area. Don't have pubs with pokies in these areas.
- Maintaining and monitoring of the sub-urban outlets.
- Make gambling more expensive. Should be for those with more disposable income. Exclude those who have a problem ie, those who have taken a loan from the bank. Seen friends borrow money and then used loan money to gamble.
- Make sure venues are well out of sight of children and away from schools and monitor the use, making sure the most vulnerable are kept away eg, problem gamblers.
- Move all machines to one place (to monitor).
- Put gambling machines in one place to monitor the clientele. Usually poor people on benefits who are involved.
- Restrict gambling to the city and have up market venues, I think this may help control the problem gamblers.
- Should not allow any more pokie machines in Rotorua and there should be more people to look for problem gamblers and help them.
- The wrong type of people are doing this. They should be vetted before being allowed to do so.
- There are too many people here who have very little money, can't afford food or clothes and they think gambling is there way to better things. I wonder if some of the crime is to feed a gambling addiction.
- They should reduce the number of machines and they should police the machines so people aren't able to sit on them all day. Many people don't realise how addictive they are.
- Undertake a survey of pokie machine users in Rotorua and find out how many are supported by WINZ, Salvation Army and other charities and then the Council will have a mandate to completely ban them in Rotorua.

- Venues shouldn't be in low socio-economic areas as they are and I don't like the fact that beneficiaries use them eg, Dole and DPB recipients.
- We should do something about gambling in Rotorua. All people know it is not good. Council can't really take responsibility, up to the gambler.
- You need to have a close look at poverty in Rotorua. Concentrate on people on benefit and see where their money actually goes.

Comments coded to comments supporting on building a casino/upmarket venue/have machines in town:

- A nice 5 star hotel where dress code is stipulated. They know that's what they need.
- Bring the machines into the city centre. Make sure money is spent on family needs. Keep the money with local Government. Use tourists as the main revenue for pokie machines.
- Build a casino and remove all gambling machines from pubs and set up proper management structures for problem gambling. Being centralised, I believe it will benefit locals and we will still be able to make money for charities from our tourists.
- Build a casino.
- Chadwick concentrates on tourism so provide an upmarket place where we can rob them legally.
- Create a pleasant casino in the city where tourists and residents can go in; with a nice environment (not the dingy ones we have now). Such a place could be run by Council. No overseas investment and the money stays in Rotorua. Base the casino on the one in the Indian Reservation in USA where all the money goes to the community.
- Cut them out of suburbs and put in tourist areas.
- For the sake of our city and its residents, please initiate a sinking lid policy on pokie machines ASAP. In addition, please support the establishment of a proper high end casino where locals can be trained and employed to world class standard. Patrons would require to adhere to a dress policy. Entertainment would be provided. Security would be in place as would gambler support and a policy to return a % of profit to the local community. Tourists would really appreciate the opportunity to experience our world renowned manaakitanga.
- Generate money back into fun parks for kids. One casino like in Hamilton and Auckland.
- Greatly reduce the number of gambling machines in Rotorua. Have them in places for tourists and not in the suburbs.
- Have a decent casino with not just pokie machines but with entertainment. This would mean more jobs and more employment.
- Have only one venue where the pokies are so they can be monitored and people will have to wait to use them. I see too many poor people using them.
- Have them in one area in the city.
- I think it would be much better to have one gambling venue and I think it should be a casino which could be well run and have dress restrictions.
- I think Rotorua should have a casino and have the pokie machines only at that venue as it would be easier to control.
- I would like to see a break down of ethnic groups who play the pokies. If it is Asian or tourists then that is a good reason to have one big venue in the city.
- I would like to see only one venue for pokie machines so problem gamblers can be identified and restricted. I don't think all the seedy venues send a good message about Rotorua and I hate the name Rotovegas. I don't feel that the money that gets paid into the community goes into the right areas as they place so many restrictions on what they will fund.
- I would much prefer to see pokie machines in a casino only, so that the gambling can be monitored properly.
- If Council feels we need pokie machines for the tourists, then have a venue that is targeted to them.
- Look into the benefits for the community of the American Indian's Casino's, run by them and the profit goes to them.
- Machines should be decreased and only in clubs or located in the central city.

- Move all machines to one place (to monitor).
- One big casino.
- Put gambling machines in one place to monitor the clientele. Usually poor people on benefits who are involved.
- Restrict gambling to the city and have up market venues, I think this may help control the problem gamblers.
- They should consider a casino.
- This is a fraught area. I generally don't like this form of gambling as it tends to be marginal socially. Would prefer a centralised and highly controlled casino with real standards. I kind of feel that slowly goes is best but would not care myself if all current pokie operations were closed down in favour of a higher quality / maybe more centralised option.

Comments coded to **comments supporting having pokie machines:**

- Because of the money that goes to the community, I don't want all the machines to go.
- Generate money back into fun parks for kids. One casino like in Hamilton and Auckland.
- Hide them away so people don't know they are there.
- I think council is trying to take away all our freedom of choice, first it was smoking and now it is gambling.
- If you knock it out completely, then the people will look for it elsewhere.
- It is a persons choice. They are never going to stop. Reducing machines won't make difference. Will all line up at one place.
- It is up to the individual to limit their gambling, others can't be responsible.
- Leave things as they are.
- Leave things as they are. Rotorua is going to grow.
- Make gambling more expensive. Should be for those with more disposable income. Exclude those who have a problem ie, those who have taken a loan from the bank. Seen friends borrow money and then used loan money to gamble.
- Make sure venues are well out of sight of children and away from schools and monitor the use, making sure the most vulnerable are kept away eg, problem gamblers.
- More problems in Rotorua than gambling. Tackle the other major problems ie, kids out on streets and traffic congestion; before dealing with gambling.
- No. It is a bit like monitoring, you can't stop people from doing stupid things.
- Stop poking your noses into people's concerns that don't concern you.
- The focus needs to be on the gambler and not the type of gambling. More help needs to be available for problem gamblers.
- The number must not increase.
- The return to community groups is a positive. Perhaps those groups who help people with addiction issues should get the lion's share of the return.
- There must be a demand for pokie machines. It is better to have them and revenue from them returning to the community than getting rid of them and people turning to online gambling where revenue goes to overseas.
- They should be fairer when we are playing. Not paying out what they should. There is a payout rate and they turn it up and down. NZ only has 8% chance of winning anything (varies slightly between venues). Should be 50% to be fair. They say it is therefore, entertainment but not entertainment because pay out rate turned down to a minimum.
- To keep the community fundings the same or increase it.
- Yes, not license any more venues at all.
- You can't control people's choices but you can control access to the pokies and can place restrictions like; age limits, and no children on the premises.

Comments coded to **more support for gambling addictions:**

- Better communication with government agencies; eg, WINZ. Monitor people who receive Government assistance.
- Build a casino and remove all gambling machines from pubs and set up proper management structures for problem gambling. Being centralised, I believe it will benefit locals and we will still be able to make money for charities from our tourists.

- Concentrate on the people playing the machines and losing the money.
- Education regulating how to use them for a bit of fun but not go overload.
- Have a lot better system of support for problem gamblers so people don't feel bad about seeking help.
- I think Rotorua should have a casino and have the pokie machines only at that venue as it would be easier to control.
- I think there should be more help for addicted gamblers. Maybe face to face meetings like AA (Alcoholic Anonymous).
- Keep in mind most of the people that do gamble can't afford it and the trickle down effect is the children that don't have food or clothing and can't always participate in school activities. Budgeting needs to be addressed for these families.
- Make gambling more expensive. Should be for those with more disposable income. Exclude those who have a problem ie, those who have taken a loan from the bank. Seen friends borrow money and then used loan money to gamble.
- Make sure venues are well out of sight of children and away from schools and monitor the use, making sure the most vulnerable are kept away eg, problem gamblers.
- Need to reduce. People need help if they have a gambling problem.
- Offer help for addictions ie, Gambling Anonymous. When they had the ads on TV, that made my kid's father take more notice and face fact that he had a problem.
- Restrict gambling to the city and have up market venues, I think this may help control the problem gamblers.
- Should not allow any more pokie machines in Rotorua and there should be more people to look for problem gamblers and help them.
- That there is a support system for gamblers that need it.
- The focus needs to be on the gambler and not the type of gambling. More help needs to be available for problem gamblers.
- The more people gamble, the more the government needs to provide rehab. It is a government problem too. Should be higher tax on profits than the owner's math.
- The return to community groups is a positive. Perhaps those groups who help people with addiction issues should get the lion's share of the return.
- There are too many people here who have very little money, can't afford food or clothes and they think gambling is there way to better things. I wonder if some of the crime is to feed a gambling addiction.
- They should reduce the number of machines and they should police the machines so people aren't able to sit on them all day. Many people don't realise how addictive they are.
- We should do something about gambling in Rotorua. All people know it is not good. Council can't really take responsibility, up to the gambler.
- Whatever the outcome, end of the day you have yourselves to blame.

Comments coded to **move them away from suburbs/schools/pubs or bars/residential and low income areas:**

- Cut them out of suburbs and put in tourist areas.
- Have to reduce gambling machines as fast as they can. Machines are too accessible in the suburbs, with too much of a temptaion for the problem gambles out there.
- Keep reducing and keep out of suburbs. I hate liquor outlets that have available pokie machines within walking distance of each other.
- Look at the area (Fordlands) I am in. I assume its here because it's a lower-socio economic area. Don't have pubs with pokies in these areas.
- Lower the machine numbers. Gambling is having a dreadful impact on the children of Rotorua. Take away easy access.
- Machines should be decreased and only in clubs or located in the central city.
- Maintaining and monitoring of the sub-urban outlets.
- No, just what I said. Too many pokie machines and too accessible especially, in poor areas.
- Not a wealthy city and the temptation to win big appeals to those less well off.

- People should spend their money elsewhere. Too easy for them in Rotorua.
- Pokie machines are highly addictive. Often those who play them can't afford to do so and they are placed in areas of low income groups.
- Put gambling machines in one place to monitor the clientele. Usually poor people on benefits who are involved.
- Restrict gambling to the city and have up market venues, I think this may help control the problem gamblers.
- Take machines away from places where there is alcohol.
- Take out of residential areas.
- Take the machines out of the suburbs and reduce the numbers.
- Venues shouldn't be in low socio-economic areas as they are and I don't like the fact that beneficiaries use them eg, Dole and DPB recipients.

Comments coded to **have pokie machines targetted at tourists:**

- 1) Only allow gambling for those who can afford to lose money without it affecting others, eg, tourists etc. 2) Stop marketing gambling in shop stores. 3) Stop saying that 40% goes to the community, this is misleading and a dishonest practice. If people had money to "spare" then set up a reward system to let them donate this to the community agency of their choice, thus, they have a say where this money goes. Currently they have little or no say. 4) Gambling is a business but an ill-conceived one. If people wish to gamble and "have fun" then provide them with real rewards and winnings that are realistic and will make people appreciate what they have won. Unfortunately, Lotto for example, preys on people's greed and tempts people into spending more than what they can afford by having large funds to win. WE need to stop this mentality. 5) If someone receives any financial help from the government, they should not be allowed to gamble with "this money". It needs to go where it was intended.
- Bring the machines into the city centre. Make sure money is spent on family needs. Keep the money with local Government. Use tourists as the main revenue for pokie machines.
- Build a casino and remove all gambling machines from pubs and set up proper management structures for problem gambling. Being centralised, I believe it will benefit locals and we will still be able to make money for charities from our tourists.
- Chadwick concentrates on tourism so provide an upmarket place where we can rob them legally.
- Cut them out of suburbs and put in tourist areas.
- For the sake of our city and it's residents, please initiate a sinking lid policy on pokie machines ASAP. In addition, please support the establishment of a proper high end casino where locals can be trained and employed to world class standard. Patrons would require to adhere to a dress policy. Entertainment would be provided. Security would be in place as would gambler support and a policy to return a % of profit to the local community. Tourists would really appreciate the opportunity to experience our world renowned manaakitanga.
- Greatly reduce the number of gambling machines in Rotorua. Have them in places for tourists and not in the suburbs.
- I would like to see a break down of ethnic groups who play the pokies. If it is Asian or tourists then that is a good reason to have one big venue in the city.
- If Council feels we need pokie machines for the tourists, then have a venue that is targetted to them.
- Pokie machines should be in the motel, targetting tourists.
- The number of machines needs to reduce. Rotorua doesn't need this many. I think there should be a few venues for tourists but they cause a lot of headache for local families.

Comments coded to **need alternative funding options to community groups/businesses:**

- Council haven't served Rotorua people by allowing such high pokie machine numbers. It is a shame that community organisations have to rely on money from gambling.

- Council needs to continue reducing pokies as they are addictive. The small pubs that have pokies will suffer however, as it is really the pokies that keep them afloat but that isn't a good reason to keep them.
- Council needs to think about the impact pokie machines have on our image, social, health and vulnerable people. The harm far outweighs any money going back to the community. There should be better ways to fund.
- Gambling is a real problem for those involved in it. It is addictive and should be looked at as a health issue. I don't see it as a positive thing that money from these machines goes back into the community. There are better funding options. Rotorua would be better off without these machines. I think the paper should publish a monthly summary of what has been spent on pokies in Rotorua.
- If there was less gambling in Rotorua, crime levels are likely to fall. I don't think there is anything good about Pokie machines and there are better ways to fund community organisations.
- If you take funding away, where do you get community funding from?
- It concerns me that many community activities, especially sporting activities, rely on funding from gambling trusts. I feel it would be better if they paid for these activities themselves rather than being funded in this way.
- No point telling RDC anything. They don't listen and won't listen and while that pig headed cow, who couldn't make a go of it at national level leads. While she is still there, she will screw Rotorua at a district level.
- Please be resolute in your reduction of these harmful machines. You will receive submissions bemoaning the loss of money - but there are other sources of funding our community can access and the cost to our community of these machines is greater than the lost funding support.
- Stop the pokie machines. The dollar benefit from it overshadows the problems it creates in the Rotorua community.
- They need other trusts or funds to support the community to replace from gaming machine trusts.

Comments coded to **issues with revenue generated from gambling/suggested beneficiaries for funds:**

- Generate money back into fun parks for kids. One casino like in Hamilton and Auckland.
- Get rid of them all. They are not good for the community. All money spent on pokies should go back into the community to help those living in poverty or on the streets or in cars.
- I would like to see only one venue for pokie machines so problem gamblers can be identified and restricted. I don't think all the seedy venues send a good message about Rotorua and I hate the name Rotovegas. I don't feel that the money that gets paid into the community goes into the right areas as they place so many restrictions on what they will fund.
- If Council realises there is a problem with gambling here, they need to do something about it regardless of the revenue it generates.
- If there was less gambling in Rotorua, crime levels are likely to fall. I don't think there is anything good about Pokie machines and there are better ways to fund community organisations.
- Instead of 40c for every dollar, increase the amount that goes back into the community. In an ideal situation, decrease the numbers and increase the amount going back into the community.
- Please be resolute in your reduction of these harmful machines. You will receive submissions bemoaning the loss of money - but there are other sources of funding our community can access and the cost to our community of these machines is greater than the lost funding support.
- The return to community groups is a positive. Perhaps those groups who help people with addiction issues should get the lion's share of the return.
- Use money from gambling to benefit youth and kids.

Comments coded to **more community consultation/survey is required for decision making/what has worked elsewhere:**

- Community consultation is required and not just telephone interviews or a hundred surveys.
- Consult widely; consult with agencies and public consultation.
- Do more survey work before they implement a new policy into the community.
- General consensus from people as opposed to small groups that make noise. That is the ones who make the money from it and don't care who they hurt along the way.
- I would like to see a break down of ethnic groups who play the pokies. If it is Asian or tourists then that is a good reason to have one big venue in the city.
- Really look into the effect on Rotorua families that pokie machines have.
- Seriously, look at the social impact gambling is having on families.
- Undertake a survey of pokie machine users in Rotorua and find out how many are supported by WINZ, Salvation Army and other charities and then the Council will have a mandate to completely ban them in Rotorua.
- You need to check with associations involved with gambling on stats of problem gamblers and see the results. If higher here, consult with other associations around the country to see what worked for them.

Comments coded to **report and publish the amount spent vs returns to the community:**

- Council should publish a breakdown of money going into pokie machines; who gets what, what percentage goes to players, owner etc. to make players more aware of their stupidity.
- Gambling is a real problem for those involved in it. It is addictive and should be looked at as a health issue. I don't see it as a positive thing that money from these machines goes back into the community. There are better funding options. Rotorua would be better off without these machines. I think the paper should publish a monthly summary of what has been spent on pokies in Rotorua.
- Help by reporting the amounts spent. Keep it in the public eye.
- I think council should publish how much goes into the machines and how much comes out to players.
- I think if the information introduced in the survey was widely known, it would alter people's attitudes.
- Learning how much money goes through the machines. I think you should display how much pay monthly goes into their machines. How much is paid out to funders and where the rest goes.
- More awareness of gambling and on the impact of gambling.
- More reporting on the amounts spent and in what areas and where the money goes.
- Think about what they are doing at the time.

Comments coded to **strategies to address gambling effects:**

- 1) Only allow gambling for those who can afford to lose money without it affecting others, eg, tourists etc. 2) Stop marketing gambling in shop stores. 3) Stop saying that 40% goes to the community, this is misleading and a dishonest practice. If people had money to "spare" then set up a reward system to let them donate this to the community agency of their choice, thus, they have a say where this money goes. Currently they have little or no say. 4) Gambling is a business but an ill-conceived one. If people wish to gamble and "have fun" then provide them with real rewards and winnings that are realistic and will make people appreciate what they have won. Unfortunately, Lotto for example, preys on people's greed and tempts people into spending more than what they can afford by having large funds to win. WE need to stop this mentality. 5) If someone receives any financial help from the government, they should not be allowed to gamble with "this money". It needs to go where it was intended.
- Bring the machines into the city centre. Make sure money is spent on family needs. Keep the money with local Government. Use tourists as the main revenue for pokie machines.
- Put an eight hour daily time limit restriction on the use of pokie machines in all pokie places in Rotorua. Other places could follow as well maybe.

- Remove jackpots to reduce time people spend on machines.
- Restrict how much you spend. Use tokens. Have to go to the counter to exchange money although may be restrictions.
- The placement of pokie machines should be treated the same way as liquor licensing laws with lots of factors taken into account.
- There should be a significant reduction in machines. Venues should only be open for a few hours in the evenings so that people can't spend their day on the pokies. Council should take a lead role in this.
- There should be a time limit.
- You can't control people's choices but you can control access to the pokies and can place restrictions like; age limits, and no children on the premises.

Comments coded to **education/public awareness about negative aspects of gambling**:

- Education regulating how to use them for a bit of fun but not go overload.
- Gambling not a good thing. Should be focussing on education about gambling rather than worrying about licenses.
- I think if the information introduced in the survey was widely known, it would alter people's attitudes.
- Just get the public involved and keep them informed.
- Learning how much money goes through the machines. I think you should display how much pay monthly goes into their machines. How much is paid out to funders and where the rest goes.
- More awareness of gambling and on the impact of gambling.
- Offer help for addictions ie, Gambling Anonymous. When they had the ads on TV, that made my kid's father take more notice and face fact that he had a problem.
- Think about what they are doing at the time.

Comments coded to **don't have a casino in Rotorua**:

- Don't bring a casino into this town.
- I am glad Council decided not to have a casino. I think that would have been a disastrous move for Rotorua.
- Please don't open a casino here. Gambling can be very addictive and causes headache in families. I hate to see women waiting outside pokie venues in the mornings for them to open.
- We don't ever need a casino.

Comments coded to **ban the name "Rotovegas"**:

- Ban Rotovegas. Do not let that name to be used in any way associated with Rotorua.
- We should reduce the number of pokie machines as quickly as possible as I think the people who can least afford to lose money are the ones using them. I hate the term Rotovegas. I don't want my city to have the connotation of a gambling place. It is a ridiculous term anyway when you compare to the bright lights and all the shows in Los Vegas with dreary Rotorua.
- Would like to take a strong stand on reducing gambling machines and get rid of the word "ROTOVEGAS" as it has a strong connotation for Rotorua.

Comments coded to **don't know**:

- Don't know enough about it.
- Don't know much about it. Is it a problem? If it is a problem, it needs to be addressed. People begging, that is a problem. Often same people hanging outside TAB at Westend.
- My family is not affected (apart from my aunt who's fine now) so don't think about it too much.

Comments coded to **other**:

- Council doesn't listen to what residents have to say. The mayor does exactly what she wants to do.

- Council will do what they want to do.
- Council will do what they want. They won't listen to me.
- Council won't listen and they waste money.
- Don't get lost on the little issues. The big issues need more attention.
- Don't know much about it. Is it a problem? If it is a problem, it needs to be addressed. People begging, that is a problem. Often same people hanging outside TAB at Westend.
- Given me something to think about.
- Go back to the core problem ie, how it is managed.
- Good luck trying to reduce them.
- Good luck.
- I don't think council really listen to residents.
- I feel that the Council being involved at all is abhorrent. There should be a national policy and Councils should have nothing to do with it.
- I have a lot to say to the Council but not about the gambling.
- I think Council has to look into why people play the machines. If you reduce the number of machines and still have the same number of people playing them, then you have not achieved anything.
- Look at the submission.
- More problems in Rotorua than gambling. Tackle the other major problems ie, kids out on streets and traffic congestion; before dealing with gambling.
- No point in commenting as Council won't listen. They will have already decided on what action they are going to take.
- No point telling RDC anything. They don't listen and won't listen and while that pig headed cow, who couldn't make a go of it at national level leads. While she is still there, she will screw Rotorua at a district level.
- No, it will be part of a submission.
- Nothing the Council can do since our government controls gambling.
- Our Council doesn't listen to taxpayers so it is pointless me saying anything.
- Please be brave about reducing access to pokie machines. We don't want them. We don't need them. Please also take the same approach with liquor licensing - we have too many bars and off-licenses in Rotorua. In some suburbs they are on every corner.
- Really appreciate having my views sought. Wonder how many Councils consult their constituents?
- Should do another survey so I can talk to a lovey person like you.
- Started off as Lion Foundation and people donated \$2. All rigged (machines). Seen a lot of angry customers.
- Tell the mayor to listen to what the people want.
- The mayor has her own agenda and this survey is just a token. She will have already decided what she is going to do.
- There is no point in commenting. This Council doesn't listen to residents. They serve their own self interests and agenda.
- They need to have a future plan on how many pokie machines they want and work towards it. They need to weigh up the social harm with their addictive nature (pokies) and the suffering families experience.
- They need to make the decision as soon as possible.
- They should be fairer when we are playing. Not paying out what they should. There is a payout rate and they turn it up and down. NZ only has 8% chance of winning anything (varies slightly between venues). Should be 50% to be fair. They say it is therefore, entertainment but not entertainment because pay out rate turned down to a minimum.
- They should keep in mind the effects gambling has on people eg, families and children.
- Think about the social consequences. You have to help each other and not destroy each other by putting traps in the way.
- Trust them to use their judgement as what is good for the city.
- Where I went, they didn't ask for ID.

- *You need to have a close look at poverty in Rotorua. Concentrate on people on benefit and see where their money actually goes.*

APPENDIX THREE: CROSS-TABULATIONS

This appendix shows some of the major results split by the different demographics that make up Rotorua.

Q1 Rotorua residents gambling habits (number):

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Males	Females	Total	Percent	Rank
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	20	20	40	8.1%	6
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	79	114	193	38.9%	2
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	138	163	301	60.7%	1
Participated in a work bet	31	26	57	11.5%	5
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	57	93	150	30.2%	3
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	10	5	15	3.0%	11
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	15	12	27	5.4%	8
Played housie or bingo	5	12	17	3.4%	9
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	31	31	62	12.5%	4
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	15	2	17	3.4%	9
Visited a Casino	15	15	30	6.0%	7
Other	0	0	0	0.0%	12
Sample	240	256	496		

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Frequency tables show the numbers of responses received from each demographic group. This is used as the base for the percentage tables shown below. The percentages out of the entire sample work out the calculations from the entire sample (ie, 496 respondents), which the percentage of each variable calculates the percentages from the sample of each demographic variable (ie, 240 for Males and 256 for females).

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Males	Females	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	4.0%	4.0%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	15.9%	23.0%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	27.8%	32.9%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	6.3%	5.2%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	11.5%	18.8%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	2.0%	1.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	3.0%	2.4%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	1.0%	2.4%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	6.3%	6.3%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	3.0%	0.4%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	3.0%	3.0%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

This table shows the percentage out of the entire sample. The percentages shown are the percentages out of everyone who provided an answer to a particular question.

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	Males	Females	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	8.3%	7.8%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	32.9%	44.5%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	57.5%	63.7%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	12.9%	10.2%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	23.8%	36.3%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	4.2%	2.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	6.3%	4.7%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	2.1%	4.7%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	12.9%	12.1%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	6.3%	0.8%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	6.3%	5.9%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

This table shows the percentages using the total of each demographic factor as the base for the calculation - resulting in each area totalling 100%. This allows for the different demographic groups to be compared to each other.

Key findings:

- These percentages are out of the entire sample. Out of all people surveyed, only 8.1% played pokie machines.
- The split between the genders gambling was similar with 51.6% of females and 48.4% of males undertaking gambling activities.
- Although the numbers playing on gambling machines were relatively low, there was an even tendency between males and females to play on pokie machines.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	Rank
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	7	8	10	7	4	4	0	40	8.1%	6
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	21	16	37	39	32	31	17	193	38.9%	2
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	14	26	53	73	60	49	26	301	60.7%	1
Participated in a work bet	8	4	11	16	14	3	1	57	11.5%	5
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	31	17	25	30	20	15	12	150	30.2%	3
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	5	3	4	2	1	0	0	15	3.0%	11
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	12	6	3	2	0	4	0	27	5.4%	8
Played housie or bingo	4	3	3	0	5	2	0	17	3.4%	9
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	7	1	17	15	12	6	4	62	12.5%	4
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	8	1	6	1	1	0	0	17	3.4%	9
Visited a Casino	4	7	6	8	1	3	1	30	6.0%	7
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	12
Sample	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496		

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Results by Age (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	1.4%	1.6%	2.0%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	4.2%	3.2%	7.5%	7.9%	6.5%	6.3%	3.4%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	2.8%	5.2%	10.7%	14.7%	12.1%	9.9%	5.2%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	1.6%	0.8%	2.2%	3.2%	2.8%	0.6%	0.2%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	6.3%	3.4%	5.0%	6.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	2.4%	1.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	1.4%	0.2%	3.4%	3.0%	2.4%	1.2%	0.8%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	1.6%	0.2%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	0.8%	1.4%	1.2%	1.6%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	14.9%	9.7%	15.3%	21.0%	16.1%	14.3%	8.7%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	9.5%	16.7%	13.2%	6.7%	5.0%	5.6%	0.0%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	28.4%	33.3%	48.7%	37.5%	40.0%	43.7%	39.5%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	18.9%	54.2%	69.7%	70.2%	75.0%	69.0%	60.5%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	10.8%	8.3%	14.5%	15.4%	17.5%	4.2%	2.3%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	41.9%	35.4%	32.9%	28.8%	25.0%	21.1%	27.9%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	6.8%	6.3%	5.3%	1.9%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	16.2%	12.5%	3.9%	1.9%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	5.4%	6.3%	3.9%	0.0%	6.3%	2.8%	0.0%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	9.5%	2.1%	22.4%	14.4%	15.0%	8.5%	9.3%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	10.8%	2.1%	7.9%	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	5.4%	14.6%	7.9%	7.7%	1.3%	4.2%	2.3%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Key findings:

- People of all ages undertook some form of gambling activity.
- Pokies attracted a wide range of ages, from people aged between the 15 to 24 age bracket to those in the 65 to 74 age bracket.
- In general, around 10% of each age group played poker machines, with the most popular ages being 25 to 34 (16.7% playing) and 35 to 44 (13.2% playing).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	Rank
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	9	26	4	1	40	8.1%	6
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	117	59	17	0	193	38.9%	2
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	178	91	32	0	301	60.7%	1
Participated in a work bet	34	19	3	1	57	11.5%	5
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	88	49	13	0	150	30.2%	3
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	2	13	0	0	15	3.0%	11
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	4	17	6	0	27	5.4%	8
Played housie or bingo	2	13	2	0	17	3.4%	9
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	37	22	3	0	62	12.5%	4
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	5	10	2	0	17	3.4%	9
Visited a Casino	9	11	9	1	30	6.0%	7
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	12
Sample	289	149	56	2	496		

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	1.8%	5.2%	0.8%	0.2%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	23.6%	11.9%	3.4%	0.0%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	35.9%	18.3%	6.5%	0.0%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	6.9%	3.8%	0.6%	0.2%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	17.7%	9.9%	2.6%	0.0%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	0.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	0.8%	3.4%	1.2%	0.0%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	0.4%	2.6%	0.4%	0.0%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	7.5%	4.4%	0.6%	0.0%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	1.0%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	1.8%	2.2%	1.8%	0.2%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	58.3%	30.0%	11.3%	0.4%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	3.1%	17.4%	7.1%	50.0%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	40.5%	39.6%	30.4%	0.0%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	61.6%	61.1%	57.1%	0.0%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	11.8%	12.8%	5.4%	50.0%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	30.4%	32.9%	23.2%	0.0%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	0.7%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	1.4%	11.4%	10.7%	0.0%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	0.7%	8.7%	3.6%	0.0%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	12.8%	14.8%	5.4%	0.0%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	1.7%	6.7%	3.6%	0.0%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	3.1%	7.4%	16.1%	50.0%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Key findings:

- People of all ethnicities undertook some form of gambling activity.
- Most gamblers were NZ European, although NZ Europeans made up the largest proportion of the population of Rotorua.
- The highest group using Pokie machines identified as Maori.

Results by deprivation index 2013: Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	Rank
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	2	5	1	14	17	1	40	8.1%	6
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	17	40	7	58	69	2	193	38.9%	2
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	16	74	13	95	102	1	301	60.7%	1
Participated in a work bet	5	14	4	16	18	0	57	11.5%	5
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	10	32	8	45	54	1	150	30.2%	3
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	0	2	0	4	8	1	15	3.0%	11
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	2	3	1	7	13	1	27	5.4%	8
Played housie or bingo	0	2	0	4	10	1	17	3.4%	9
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	4	15	2	17	24	0	62	12.5%	4
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	0	3	0	3	9	2	17	3.4%	9
Visited a Casino	1	8	1	8	10	2	30	6.0%	7
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	12
Sample	34	108	24	148	179	3	496		

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Results by deprivation index 2013: Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	0.4%	1.0%	0.2%	2.8%	3.4%	0.2%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	3.4%	8.1%	1.4%	11.7%	13.9%	0.4%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	3.2%	14.9%	2.6%	19.2%	20.6%	0.2%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	1.0%	2.8%	0.8%	3.2%	3.6%	0.0%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	2.0%	6.5%	1.6%	9.1%	10.9%	0.2%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	1.6%	0.2%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	1.4%	2.6%	0.2%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	2.0%	0.2%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	0.8%	3.0%	0.4%	3.4%	4.8%	0.0%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	1.8%	0.4%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	0.2%	1.6%	0.2%	1.6%	2.0%	0.4%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	6.9%	21.8%	4.8%	29.8%	36.1%	0.6%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013: Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Played a "pokie machine" (outside a casino ie, at a pub, club)	5.9%	4.6%	4.2%	9.5%	9.5%	33.3%	8.1%
Entered a competition/brought a raffle ticket (for a club etc, to raise money)	50.0%	37.0%	29.2%	39.2%	38.5%	66.7%	38.9%
Entered a NZ raffle (ie, Lotto, Keno, Bullseye)	47.1%	68.5%	54.2%	64.2%	57.0%	33.3%	60.7%
Participated in a work bet	14.7%	13.0%	16.7%	10.8%	10.1%	0.0%	11.5%
Played a "scratch ticket" (ie, Instant Kiwi)	29.4%	29.6%	33.3%	30.4%	30.2%	33.3%	30.2%
Played at an online casino (eg, Pokerstars) /gambled on home computer	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	2.7%	4.5%	33.3%	3.0%
Played cards/games (for money) with friends/family	5.9%	2.8%	4.2%	4.7%	7.3%	33.3%	5.4%
Played housie or bingo	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	2.7%	5.6%	33.3%	3.4%
Bet on a horse/dog race (eg, TAB)	11.8%	13.9%	8.3%	11.5%	13.4%	0.0%	12.5%
Sports betting (eg, TAB bet on rugby, football, hockey etc.)	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	2.0%	5.0%	66.7%	3.4%
Visited a Casino	2.9%	7.4%	4.2%	5.4%	5.6%	66.7%	6.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify multiple forms of gambling

Key findings:

- Most gamblers were from less affluent areas.

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - number of gambling activities*Results by Gender (sample = 389):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	182	207	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1	1	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	8	6	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	400.0	474.0	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.20	2.29	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2	2	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1	2	1

Key findings:

- The split between the genders regarding the number of types of gambling undertaken were similar with females undertaking 2.3 types of activities and males 2.2 types.

Results by Age (sample = 389):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	48	36	63	84	68	58	32	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	8	8	6	5	5	6	4	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	114.0	90.0	163.0	187.0	146.0	116.0	58.0	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.38	2.50	2.59	2.23	2.15	2.00	1.81	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1

Key findings:

- People who undertook the most number of gambling activities were aged 35 to 44 (2.6 on average), followed by those aged between 25 to 34 (2.5) and 15 to 24 (2.4).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 389):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	227	122	39	1	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1	1	1	3	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	6	8	5	3	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	473.0	311.0	87.0	3.0	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.08	2.55	2.23	3.00	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2	2	2	3	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1	2	1	NA	1

Key findings:

- People who undertook the most number of gambling activities were Maori (2.6 activities on average), followed by other ethnicities (2.2) and NZ European (2.1).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	27	88	16	117	139	2	389
Minimum no. of activities undertaken	1	1	1	1	1	4	1
Maximum no. of activities undertaken	5	5	6	8	6	8	8
Total no. of activities undertaken	54.0	192.0	35.0	261.0	320.0	12.0	874.0
Average no. of activities undertaken	2.00	2.18	2.19	2.23	2.30	6.00	2.25
Median no. of activities undertaken	2	2	2	2	2	6	2
Mode no. of activities undertaken	1	1	2	2	2	NA	1

Key findings:

- The mixes of the numbers of gambling activities undertaken were relatively consistent amongst the different deprivation areas.

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Frequency of usage*Results by Gender (sample = 389):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	182	207	389
Minimum frequency of use	0.5	0.5	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	375	102	375
Total no. of uses for sample	4,681.9	3,411.3	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	25.72	16.48	20.80
Median frequency of use	12	8	9
Mode frequency of use	6	1	1

Key findings:

- Males tended to undertake gambling activities on average 25.7 times within the six month period of time covered in this study. Females reported undertaking 16.5 gambling activities over the same time period.

Results by Age (sample = 389):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	48	36	63	84	68	58	32	389
Minimum frequency of use	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	252.5	189	84	320.5	375	53.5	72	375
Total no. of uses for sample	802.5	968.1	1,098.0	1,746.3	1,808.8	1,171.5	498.0	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	16.72	26.89	17.43	20.79	26.60	20.20	15.56	20.80
Median frequency of use	6	7	9	9	12	14.5	10	9
Mode frequency of use	2	3	6	24	3	48	1	1

Key findings:

- People who undertook the highest frequency of gambling were aged 25 to 34 (26.9 times on average) followed by those aged 55 to 64 (26.6 on average).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 389):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	227	122	39	1	389
Minimum frequency of use	0.5	0.5	0.5	181.1	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	375	252.5	320.5	181.1	375
Total no. of uses for sample	4,176.5	2,939.0	796.5	181.1	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	18.40	24.09	20.42	181.10	20.80
Median frequency of use	10	12	6	181.1	9
Mode frequency of use	1	6	6	NA	1

Key findings:

- The highest frequency of gambling in the six month period covered in this research was by Maori (24.1 times on average), followed by those of other ethnic groups (20.4 times) and NZ Europeans (18.4 times).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	27	88	16	117	139	2	389
Minimum frequency of use	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	5	0.5
Maximum frequency of use	49	375	58	252.5	320.5	189	375
Total no. of uses for sample	329.0	2,065.8	220.0	2,399.0	2,885.4	194.0	8,093.1
Average frequency of use	12.19	23.47	13.75	20.50	20.76	97.00	20.80
Median frequency of use	7	12	6	12	8.5	97	9
Mode frequency of use	1	6	1	24	6	NA	1

Key findings:

- The highest frequency of gambling over the six months covered in this research were from areas with a deprivation index of 3 to 4 (23.5 times), followed by those in a deprivation area of 9 to 10 (20.8 times) and an area of deprivation of 7 to 8 (20.5 times).

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Average Spend per Time over all Gambling Activities*Results by Gender (sample = 389):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	182	207	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$580.00	\$365.00	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$7,759.80	\$7,033.30	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$42.64	\$33.98	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$16.00	\$20.00

Key findings:

- Males tended to spend more per time while undertaking gambling activities (\$42.64) compared to females (\$33.98).

Results by Age (sample = 389):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	48	36	63	84	68	58	32	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$402.00	\$580.00	\$365.00	\$276.00	\$210.00	\$264.00	\$58.50	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$1,969.50	\$2,173.50	\$3,240.50	\$2,725.70	\$2,250.20	\$1,815.20	\$618.50	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$41.03	\$60.38	\$51.44	\$32.45	\$33.09	\$31.30	\$19.33	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$16.00	\$26.00	\$23.00	\$21.00	\$20.50	\$16.10	\$15.75	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00	\$26.00	\$5.00	\$16.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$12.00	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The age group with the highest spend per time were respondents aged between 25 to 34 (\$60.38 on average), followed by respondents aged between 35 to 44 (\$51.44) and those aged in the 15 to 24 age bracket (\$41.03).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 389):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	227	122	39	1	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$221.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$240.00	\$402.00	\$580.00	\$221.00	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$5,969.70	\$5,985.10	\$2,617.30	\$221.00	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$26.30	\$49.06	\$67.11	\$221.00	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$25.00	\$21.50	\$221.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$16.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The highest average spend per time while gambling in the six month period covered in this research was by other ethnicities (\$67.11), followed by Maori (\$49.06) and NZ European (\$26.30).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	27	88	16	117	139	2	389
Minimum spend (per time)	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$1.00	\$132.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$264.00	\$175.00	\$235.00	\$402.00	\$580.00	\$142.00	\$580.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$730.10	\$2,808.20	\$542.00	\$5,054.90	\$5,383.90	\$274.00	\$14,793.10
Average spend (per time)	\$27.04	\$31.91	\$33.88	\$43.20	\$38.73	\$137.00	\$38.03
Median spend (per time)	\$16.00	\$20.00	\$17.00	\$21.00	\$21.60	\$137.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$2.00	\$20.00	\$16.00	\$16.00	\$10.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The highest average spend per time while gambling over the six months covered in this research was from areas with a deprivation index of 7 to 8 (\$43.20), followed by those in a deprivation area of 9 to 10 (\$38.73).

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Average Total Spend over all Gambling Activities*Results by Gender (sample = 389):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	182	207	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$20,870.00	\$14,573.00	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$101,273.20	\$68,091.45	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$556.45	\$328.94	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$136.00	\$108.00	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$72.00	\$5.00	\$120.00

Key findings:

- Males spent \$556.45 on average over the six months covered in this study compared to females \$328.94 average spend.

Results by Age (sample = 389):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	48	36	63	84	68	58	32	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$2,557.00	\$9,602.50	\$3,096.00	\$14,573.00	\$20,870.00	\$2,304.00	\$653.50	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$10,917.00	\$29,329.50	\$25,408.80	\$36,880.30	\$42,199.55	\$18,764.00	\$5,865.50	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$227.44	\$814.71	\$403.31	\$439.05	\$620.58	\$323.52	\$183.30	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$46.00	\$86.50	\$120.40	\$120.00	\$144.50	\$185.00	\$116.50	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$30.00	\$48.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$60.00	\$336.00	\$5.00	\$120.00

Key findings:

- The age group with the highest total spend was respondents aged between 25 to 34 (\$814.71), followed by respondents aged between 55 to 64 (\$620.58) and those aged 45 to 54 (\$439.05).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 389):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	227	122	39	1	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$1.00	\$3,620.50	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$20,870.00	\$14,573.00	\$2,985.00	\$3,620.50	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$73,606.25	\$77,848.60	\$14,289.30	\$3,620.50	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$324.26	\$638.10	\$366.39	\$3,620.50	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$115.00	\$145.75	\$96.00	\$3,620.50	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$5.00	\$20.00	\$120.00	NA	\$120.00

Key findings:

- The highest spend while gambling in the six month period covered in this research was by Maori (\$638.10), followed by other ethnicities (\$366.39) and NZ European (\$324.26).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	27	88	16	117	139	2	389
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$1.00	\$162.00	\$1.00
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$908.50	\$20,870.00	\$1,760.00	\$14,573.00	\$9,602.50	\$8,102.00	\$20,870.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$4,032.90	\$45,611.40	\$3,437.50	\$55,165.75	\$52,853.10	\$8,264.00	\$169,364.65
Average spend (over six month period)	\$149.37	\$518.31	\$214.84	\$471.50	\$380.24	\$4,132.00	\$435.38
Median spend (over six month period)	\$70.00	\$120.45	\$50.50	\$128.50	\$120.00	\$4,132.00	\$120.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$2.00	\$120.00	NA	\$10.00	\$120.00	NA	\$120.00

Key findings:

- The highest total spend while gambling over the six months covered in this research was from areas with a deprivation index of 3 to 4 (\$518.31), followed by 7 to 8 (\$471.50) and those in a deprivation area of 9 to 10 (\$380.24).
- Those in a deprivation area of 1 to 2, spent the least (\$149.37) on gambling over the six month period covered in this study.

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Frequency of use of Pokie Machines*Results by Gender (sample = 40):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	20	20	40
Minimum frequency of use	1	1	1
Maximum frequency of use	288	96	288
Total no. of uses for sample	936.0	336.3	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	46.80	16.81	31.81
Median frequency of use	6	6	6
Mode frequency of use	6	1	1

Key findings:

- Males used pokie machines 46.8 times in a six month period compared to females who used the machines 16.8 times.

Results by Age (sample = 40):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	7	8	10	7	4	4	0	40
Minimum frequency of use	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1
Maximum frequency of use	24	180	48	288	24	12	0	288
Total no. of uses for sample	36.0	497.0	171.0	505.3	37.0	26.0	0.0	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	5.14	62.13	17.10	72.18	9.25	6.50	NA	31.81
Median frequency of use	1	6	9	24	6	6	NA	6
Mode frequency of use	1	180	1	NA	6	6	NA	1

Key findings:

- The age group with the highest frequency of use of pokie machines was respondents aged between 45 to 54 (72.2 times), followed by respondents aged between 25 to 34 (62.1 times).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 40):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	9	26	4	1	40
Minimum frequency of use	1	1	2	180	1
Maximum frequency of use	12	180	288	180	288
Total no. of uses for sample	31.0	723.3	338.0	180.0	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	3.44	27.82	84.50	180.00	31.81
Median frequency of use	1	6	24	180	6
Mode frequency of use	1	6	24	NA	1

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify with multiple ethnicities

Key findings:

- The highest frequency of use of pokie machines in the six month period covered in this research was by other ethnicities (84.5 times), followed by Maori (27.8 times) and NZ European (3.4 times).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	2	5	1	14	17	1	40
Minimum frequency of use	1	1	1	1	1	120	1
Maximum frequency of use	6	91.25	1	96	288	120	288
Total no. of uses for sample	7.0	123.3	1.0	277.0	744.0	120.0	1,272.3
Average frequency of use	3.50	24.65	1.00	19.79	43.76	120.00	31.81
Median frequency of use	3.5	6	1	6	6	120	6
Mode frequency of use	NA	1	NA	6	1	NA	1

Key findings:

- The highest frequency of use while gambling on pokie machines over the six months covered in this research was from areas with a deprivation index of 9 to 10 (43.8 times), followed by 3 to 4 (24.7 times) and those in a deprivation area of 7 to 8 (19.8 times).

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Average Spend per Time while playing Pokie Machines*Results by Gender (sample = 40):*

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	20	20	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$882.50	\$890.00	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$44.13	\$44.50	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$30.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00

Key findings:

- Males spent \$44.13 each time while using pokie machines in a six month period compared to females who spent \$44.50 each time.

Results by Age (sample = 40):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	7	8	10	7	4	4	0	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$5.00	\$7.50	\$20.00	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$200.00	\$60.00	\$200.00	\$150.00	\$100.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$325.00	\$257.50	\$640.00	\$340.00	\$150.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$46.43	\$32.19	\$64.00	\$48.57	\$37.50	\$15.00	NA	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$30.00	\$50.00	\$20.00	\$22.50	\$15.00	NA	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The age group with the highest average spend per time while gambling on pokie machines was respondents aged between 35 to 44 (\$64.00), followed by respondents aged between 45 to 54 (\$48.57) and the age bracket between those aged 15 to 24 (\$46.43).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 40):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	9	26	4	1	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$7.50	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$20.00	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$60.00	\$200.00	\$100.00	\$20.00	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$202.50	\$1,380.00	\$170.00	\$20.00	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$22.50	\$53.08	\$42.50	\$20.00	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$30.00	NA	\$20.00

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify with multiple ethnicities

Key findings:

- The highest average spend per time while gambling on pokie machines in the six month period covered in this research was by Maori (\$53.08), followed by other ethnicities (\$42.50) and NZ European (\$22.50).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	2	5	1	14	17	1	40
Minimum spend (per time)	\$5.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$7.50	\$5.00	\$60.00	\$5.00
Maximum spend (per time)	\$20.00	\$30.00	\$20.00	\$200.00	\$100.00	\$60.00	\$200.00
Total spend (total sample)	\$25.00	\$115.00	\$20.00	\$967.50	\$585.00	\$60.00	\$1,772.50
Average spend (per time)	\$12.50	\$23.00	\$20.00	\$69.11	\$34.41	\$60.00	\$44.31
Median spend (per time)	\$12.50	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$30.00	\$20.00	\$60.00	\$20.00
Mode spend (per time)	NA	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The highest average spend per time while gambling on pokie machines over the six months covered in this research was from areas with a deprivation index of 7 to 8 (\$69.11), followed by 9 to 10 (\$34.41), 3 to 4 (\$23.00) and those in a deprivation area of 5 to 6 (\$20.00).

Q1 Number of Types of Gambling Undertaken Over a Six Month Period - Average Spend over a Six Month Period while playing Pokie Machines

Results by Gender (sample = 40):

	Male	Female	Total
Sample	20	20	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$7.50	\$10.00	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$9,000.00	\$14,400.00	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$30,637.50	\$25,875.00	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$1,531.88	\$1,293.75	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$510.00	\$100.00	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$720.00	\$20.00	\$20.00

Key findings:

- Males on average spent \$1,531.88 using pokie machines in a six month period compared to females who spent \$1,293.75.

Results by Age (sample = 40):

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Sample	7	8	10	7	4	4	0	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$10.00	\$7.50	\$20.00	\$10.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$1,200.00	\$9,000.00	\$2,880.00	\$14,400.00	\$2,400.00	\$120.00	\$0.00	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$2,250.00	\$20,247.50	\$10,860.00	\$20,175.00	\$2,600.00	\$380.00	\$0.00	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$321.43	\$2,530.94	\$1,086.00	\$2,882.14	\$650.00	\$95.00	NA	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$20.00	\$150.00	\$840.00	\$720.00	\$90.00	\$120.00	NA	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00	NA	NA	\$120.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The age group with the highest total average spend over a six month period while gambling on pokie machines was respondents aged between 45 to 54 (\$2,882.14), followed by respondents aged between 25 to 34 (\$2,530.94) and respondents aged between 35 to 44 (\$1,086.00).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 40):

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Sample	9	26	4	1	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$7.50	\$10.00	\$60.00	\$3,600.00	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$720.00	\$14,400.00	\$2,880.00	\$3,600.00	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$1,097.50	\$45,755.00	\$6,060.00	\$3,600.00	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$121.94	\$1,759.81	\$1,515.00	\$3,600.00	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$20.00	\$210.00	\$1,560.00	\$3,600.00	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	\$20.00	\$20.00	NA	NA	\$20.00

Note: Not additive as respondents could identify with multiple ethnicities

Key findings:

- The highest average spend while gambling on pokie machines in the six month period covered in this research was by Maori (\$1,759.81), followed by other ethnicities (\$1,515.00) and NZ European (\$121.94).

Results by deprivation index 2013:

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Sample	2	5	1	14	17	1	40
Minimum spend (over six month period)	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$7.50	\$10.00	\$7,200.00	\$7.50
Maximum spend (over six month period)	\$30.00	\$1,825.00	\$20.00	\$14,400.00	\$9,000.00	\$7,200.00	\$14,400.00
Total spend (over six month period)	\$50.00	\$2,735.00	\$20.00	\$25,947.50	\$20,560.00	\$7,200.00	\$56,512.50
Average spend (over six month period)	\$25.00	\$547.00	\$20.00	\$1,853.39	\$1,209.41	\$7,200.00	\$1,412.81
Median spend (over six month period)	\$25.00	\$150.00	\$20.00	\$540.00	\$180.00	\$7,200.00	\$135.00
Mode spend (over six month period)	NA	\$20.00	NA	\$120.00	\$20.00	NA	\$20.00

Key findings:

- The highest average spend while gambling on pokie machines over the six months covered in this research was from areas with a deprivation index of 7 to 8 (\$1,853.39), followed by 9 to 10 (\$1,209.41) and 3 to 4 (\$547.00).

Q3 Including yourself, how much respondent considers that the people in their household currently gamble*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent
Not at all	94	89	183	36.9%
A little	124	150	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	13	12	25	5.0%
A lot	5	4	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	4	1	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	240	256	496	100.0%

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Male	Female	Total
Not at all	19.1%	18.1%	37.3%
A little	25.3%	30.5%	55.8%
A moderate amount	2.6%	2.4%	5.1%
A lot	1.0%	0.8%	1.8%
Total	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation.

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total
Not at all	39.8%	34.9%	37.3%
A little	52.5%	58.8%	55.8%
A moderate amount	5.5%	4.7%	5.1%
A lot	2.1%	1.6%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation.

Key findings:

- Most respondents indicated that others in their households also gamble. A total of 19.1% of males indicating that others in their household didn't gamble at all while 18.1% of females thought the same.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent
Not at all	38	17	26	36	27	21	18	183	36.9%
A little	30	27	44	61	46	44	22	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	2	3	3	4	6	5	2	25	5.0%
A lot	4	1	2	1	0	1	0	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%

Results by Age (sample = 491): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Not at all	7.7%	3.5%	5.3%	7.3%	5.5%	4.3%	3.7%	37.3%
A little	6.1%	5.5%	9.0%	12.4%	9.4%	9.0%	4.5%	55.8%
A moderate amount	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	1.2%	1.0%	0.4%	5.1%
A lot	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	15.1%	9.8%	15.3%	20.8%	16.1%	14.5%	8.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 491): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Not at all	51.4%	35.4%	34.7%	35.3%	34.2%	29.6%	42.9%	37.3%
A little	40.5%	56.3%	58.7%	59.8%	58.2%	62.0%	52.4%	55.8%
A moderate amount	2.7%	6.3%	4.0%	3.9%	7.6%	7.0%	4.8%	5.1%
A lot	5.4%	2.1%	2.7%	1.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent
Not at all	115	47	21	0	183	36.9%
A little	159	85	28	2	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	11	10	4	0	25	5.0%
A lot	0	7	2	0	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	4	0	1	0	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%

Results by ethnicity (sample = 491): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Not at all	23.4%	9.6%	4.3%	0.0%	37.3%
A little	32.4%	17.3%	5.7%	0.4%	55.8%
A moderate amount	2.2%	2.0%	0.8%	0.0%	5.1%
A lot	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	58.0%	30.3%	11.2%	0.4%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 491): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Not at all	40.4%	31.5%	38.2%	0.0%	37.3%
A little	55.8%	57.0%	50.9%	100.0%	55.8%
A moderate amount	3.9%	6.7%	7.3%	0.0%	5.1%
A lot	0.0%	4.7%	3.6%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Most respondents indicated that others in their households also gamble. A total of 40.4% of NZ Europeans indicated that others in their household didn't gamble while 38.2% of other ethnicities indicated the same and 31.5% of Maori respondents indicated that others in their households didn't gamble.

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent
Not at all	14	39	10	50	70	0	183	36.9%
A little	19	64	13	86	90	2	274	55.2%
A moderate amount	1	5	0	6	12	1	25	5.0%
A lot	0	0	1	3	5	0	9	1.8%
Refused/not specified/live alone	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	1.0%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 491): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Not at all	2.9%	7.9%	2.0%	10.2%	14.3%	0.0%	37.3%
A little	3.9%	13.0%	2.6%	17.5%	18.3%	0.4%	55.8%
A moderate amount	0.2%	1.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.4%	0.2%	5.1%
A lot	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	6.9%	22.0%	4.9%	29.5%	36.0%	0.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 491): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Not at all	41.2%	36.1%	41.7%	34.5%	39.5%	0.0%	37.3%
A little	55.9%	59.3%	54.2%	59.3%	50.8%	66.7%	55.8%
A moderate amount	2.9%	4.6%	0.0%	4.1%	6.8%	33.3%	5.1%
A lot	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	2.1%	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Most respondents indicated that others in their households also gambled.

Q4 Has respondent, or anyone in their household been impacted by a problem gambler*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Yes	35	46	81	16.3%	16.5%
No	200	207	407	82.1%	82.9%
Don't know	2	1	3	0.6%	0.6%
Refused/not specified	2	0	2	0.4%	
Not specified	1	2	3	0.6%	
Total	240	256	496	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed**Results by Gender (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample*

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	7.2%	9.4%	16.6%
No	41.0%	42.4%	83.4%
Total	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation**Note: All percentages are out of the total sample**Results by Gender (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable*

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	14.9%	18.2%	16.6%
No	85.1%	81.8%	83.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation***Key findings:**

- A total of 18.2% of females, and 14.9% of males had been impacted by a problem gambler.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Yes	17	12	14	22	5	8	3	81	16.3%	16.5%
No	56	35	61	82	70	63	40	407	82.1%	82.9%
Don't know	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Refused/not specified	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0.4%	
Not specified	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0.6%	
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Age (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	3.5%	2.5%	2.9%	4.5%	1.0%	1.6%	0.6%	16.6%
No	11.5%	7.2%	12.5%	16.8%	14.3%	12.9%	8.2%	83.4%
Total	15.0%	9.6%	15.4%	21.3%	15.4%	14.5%	8.8%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	23.3%	25.5%	18.7%	21.2%	6.7%	11.3%	7.0%	16.6%
No	76.7%	74.5%	81.3%	78.8%	93.3%	88.7%	93.0%	83.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Those who had been impacted by problem gamblers were spread over all age groups, with the highest being those aged 25 to 34 (25.5%), 15 to 24 (23.3%), 45 to 54 (21.2%), followed by ages 35 to 44 (18.7%), 65 to 74 (11.3%), 75+ (7.0%) and 55 to 64 (6.7%).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Yes	32	41	8	0	81	16.3%	16.5%
No	254	105	46	2	407	82.1%	82.9%
Don't know	1	1	1	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Refused/not specified	1	0	1	0	2	0.4%	
Not specified	1	2	0	0	3	0.6%	
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by ethnicity (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	6.6%	8.4%	1.6%	0.0%	16.6%
No	52.0%	21.5%	9.4%	0.4%	83.4%
Total	58.6%	29.9%	11.1%	0.4%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	11.2%	28.1%	14.8%	0.0%	16.6%
No	88.8%	71.9%	85.2%	100.0%	83.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 28.1% of Maori respondents indicated that they had been impacted by problem gamblers. This was followed by 14.8% of other ethnicities and 11.2% of NZ Europeans.

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Yes	1	16	4	24	34	2	81	16.3%	16.5%
No	32	92	20	121	141	1	407	82.1%	82.9%
Don't know	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Refused/not specified	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0.4%	
Not specified	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	0.6%	
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	0.2%	3.3%	0.8%	4.9%	7.0%	0.4%	16.6%
No	6.6%	18.9%	4.1%	24.8%	28.9%	0.2%	83.4%
Total	6.8%	22.1%	4.9%	29.7%	35.9%	0.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	3.0%	14.8%	16.7%	16.6%	19.4%	66.7%	16.6%
No	97.0%	85.2%	83.3%	83.4%	80.6%	33.3%	83.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Most respondents impacted by problem gamblers were from deprivation 9 to 10 areas (7.0% of the total sample).

Q5 Do respondents feel a need to reduce their current levels of gambling

Only a very small proportion of respondents felt a need to reduce their overall levels of gambling (3.6%).

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Male	Female	Total	Percent
Yes	9	9	18	3.6%
No	227	243	470	94.8%
Don't know	1	0	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	3	4	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	240	256	496	100.0%

Results by Gender (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	1.8%	1.8%	3.7%
No	46.5%	49.8%	96.3%
Total	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Gender (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	3.8%	3.6%	3.7%
No	96.2%	96.4%	96.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 3.8% of males and 3.6% of females felt that they needed to reduce their current levels of gambling.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent
Yes	2	2	3	6	3	1	1	18	3.6%
No	71	46	69	97	77	69	41	470	94.8%
Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	1	0	4	0	0	1	1	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%

Results by Age (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	1.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	3.7%
No	14.5%	9.4%	14.1%	19.9%	15.8%	14.1%	8.4%	96.3%
Total	15.0%	9.8%	14.8%	21.1%	16.4%	14.3%	8.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	2.7%	4.2%	4.2%	5.8%	3.8%	1.4%	2.4%	3.7%
No	97.3%	95.8%	95.8%	94.2%	96.3%	98.6%	97.6%	96.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A small number of respondents from all ages wanted to reduce their levels of gambling. The highest age grouping was 45 to 54 (5.8%), followed by 25 to 34 (4.2%), 35 to 44 (4.2%), 55 to 64 (3.8%) and 15 to 24 (2.7%).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent
Yes	6	11	1	0	18	3.6%
No	279	137	52	2	470	94.8%
Don't know	1	0	0	0	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	3	1	3	0	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%

Results by ethnicity (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	1.2%	2.3%	0.2%	0.0%	3.7%
No	57.2%	28.1%	10.7%	0.4%	96.3%
Total	58.4%	30.3%	10.9%	0.4%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	2.1%	7.4%	1.9%	0.0%	3.7%
No	97.9%	92.6%	98.1%	100.0%	96.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 7.4% of Maori indicated a desire to reduce their levels of gambling. This was followed by 2.1% of NZ Europeans and 1.9% of other ethnicities.

Results by deprivation index 2013(sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent
Yes	0	4	1	9	4	0	18	3.6%
No	34	103	22	134	174	3	470	94.8%
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.2%
Refused/not specified	0	0	1	5	1	0	7	1.4%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 488): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%	1.8%	0.8%	0.0%	3.7%
No	7.0%	21.1%	4.5%	27.5%	35.7%	0.6%	96.3%
Total	7.0%	21.9%	4.7%	29.3%	36.5%	0.6%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 488): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	0.0%	3.7%	4.3%	6.3%	2.2%	0.0%	3.7%
No	100.0%	96.3%	95.7%	93.7%	97.8%	100.0%	96.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Q7 What should happen with the numbers of gambling (pokie) machines in Rotorua

Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	3	2	5	1.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	71	34	105	21.2%	22.4%
Decrease	69	93	162	32.7%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	83	113	196	39.5%	41.9%
NA/Don't know	14	12	26	5.2%	
Not specified	0	2	2	0.4%	
Total	240	256	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Gender (sample = 468): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Increase	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%	0.6%	0.4% Increase
Stay the same	15.2%	7.3%	22.4%	15.2%	7.3% Stay the same
Decrease	14.7%	19.9%	34.6%	32.5%	44.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	17.7%	24.1%	41.9%		
Total	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%		

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Gender (sample = 468): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Increase	1.3%	0.8%	1.1%	1.3%	0.8% Increase
Stay the same	31.4%	14.0%	22.4%	31.4%	14.0% Stay the same
Decrease	30.5%	38.4%	34.6%	67.3%	85.1% Decrease
Greatly decrease	36.7%	46.7%	41.9%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 85.1% of females and 67.3% of males wanted the numbers of pokie machines in Rotorua to decrease.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	1.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	25	7	19	15	19	10	10	105	21.2%	22.4%
Decrease	24	18	25	33	24	28	10	162	32.7%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	18	18	27	51	31	30	21	196	39.5%	41.9%
NA/Don't know	5	2	4	5	5	3	2	26	5.2%	
Not specified	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Age (sample = 468): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	5.3%	1.5%	4.1%	3.2%	4.1%	2.1%	2.1%	22.4%
Decrease	5.1%	3.8%	5.3%	7.1%	5.1%	6.0%	2.1%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	3.8%	3.8%	5.8%	10.9%	6.6%	6.4%	4.5%	41.9%
Total	14.7%	9.6%	15.2%	21.2%	16.0%	14.5%	8.8%	100.0%

15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------

0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	Increase
5.3%	1.5%	4.1%	3.2%	4.1%	2.1%	2.1%	Stay the same
9.0%	7.7%	11.1%	17.9%	11.8%	12.4%	6.6%	Decrease

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 468): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	2.9%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	36.2%	15.6%	26.8%	15.2%	25.3%	14.7%	24.4%	22.4%
Decrease	34.8%	40.0%	35.2%	33.3%	32.0%	41.2%	24.4%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	26.1%	40.0%	38.0%	51.5%	41.3%	44.1%	51.2%	41.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------

2.9%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	Increase
36.2%	15.6%	26.8%	15.2%	25.3%	14.7%	24.4%	Stay the same
60.9%	80.0%	73.2%	84.8%	73.3%	85.3%	75.6%	Decrease

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All age groups indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machines reduced. The highest age grouping was 65 to 74 (85.3% wanted a reduction in numbers), followed by 45 to 54 (84.8%) and 25 to 34 (80.0%).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0	2	2	1	5	1.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	60	34	11	0	105	21.2%	22.4%
Decrease	103	44	15	0	162	32.7%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	112	59	24	1	196	39.5%	41.9%
NA/Don't know	12	10	4	0	26	5.2%	
Not specified	2	0	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by ethnicity (sample = 468): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total			
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Increase	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4% Increase
Stay the same	12.8%	7.3%	2.4%	0.0%	22.4%	12.8%	7.3%	2.4% Stay the same
Decrease	22.0%	9.4%	3.2%	0.0%	34.6%	45.9%	22.0%	8.3% Decrease
Greatly decrease	23.9%	12.6%	5.1%	0.2%	41.9%			
Total	58.8%	29.7%	11.1%	0.4%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 468): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Increase	0.0%	1.4%	3.8%	50.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%	3.8% Increase
Stay the same	21.8%	24.5%	21.2%	0.0%	22.4%	21.8%	24.5%	21.2% Stay the same
Decrease	37.5%	31.7%	28.8%	0.0%	34.6%	78.2%	74.1%	75.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	40.7%	42.4%	46.2%	50.0%	41.9%			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All ethnicities indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machines reduced. The highest grouping was from NZ Europeans (78.2% wanted a reduction in numbers), followed by other ethnicities (75.0%) and Maori (74.1%).

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	1.0%	1.1%
Stay the same	8	20	4	36	37	0	105	21.2%	22.4%
Decrease	12	37	8	50	54	1	162	32.7%	34.6%
Greatly decrease	13	41	12	53	76	1	196	39.5%	41.9%
NA/Don't know	1	9	0	5	10	1	26	5.2%	
Not specified	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0.4%	
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 468): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%						
Increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0% Increase
Stay the same	1.7%	4.3%	0.9%	7.7%	7.9%	0.0%	22.4%	1.7%	4.3%	0.9%	7.7%	7.9%	0.0% Stay the same
Decrease	2.6%	7.9%	1.7%	10.7%	11.5%	0.2%	34.6%	5.3%	16.7%	4.3%	22.0%	27.8%	0.4% Decrease
Greatly decrease	2.8%	8.8%	2.6%	11.3%	16.2%	0.2%	41.9%						
Total	7.1%	20.9%	5.1%	30.6%	35.9%	0.4%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 468): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%						
Increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.6%	0.0% Increase
Stay the same	24.2%	20.4%	16.7%	25.2%	22.0%	0.0%	22.4%	24.2%	20.4%	16.7%	25.2%	22.0%	0.0% Stay the same
Decrease	36.4%	37.8%	33.3%	35.0%	32.1%	50.0%	34.6%	75.8%	79.6%	83.3%	72.0%	77.4%	100.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	39.4%	41.8%	50.0%	37.1%	45.2%	50.0%	41.9%						
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All areas indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machines reduced.

Q9 Do you think the numbers of venues where these machines are located should change*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	7	1	8	1.6%	1.8%
Stay the same	62	40	102	20.6%	22.7%
Decrease	81	97	178	35.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	65	96	161	32.5%	35.9%
NA/Don't know	24	21	45	9.1%	
Not specified	1	1	2	0.4%	
Total	240	256	496	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed**Results by Gender (sample = 449): Percentage out of the entire sample*

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Increase	1.6%	0.2%	1.8%	1.6%	0.2% Increase
Stay the same	13.8%	8.9%	22.7%	13.8%	8.9% Stay the same
Decrease	18.0%	21.6%	39.6%	32.5%	43.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	14.5%	21.4%	35.9%		
Total	47.9%	52.1%	100.0%		

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation**Note: All percentages are out of the total sample*

Results by Gender (sample = 449): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Increase	3.3%	0.4%	1.8%	3.3%	0.4% Increase
Stay the same	28.8%	17.1%	22.7%	28.8%	17.1% Stay the same
Decrease	37.7%	41.5%	39.6%	67.9%	82.5% Decrease
Greatly decrease	30.2%	41.0%	35.9%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 82.5% of females and 67.9% of males want the numbers of pokie machine venues in Rotorua to decrease.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	8	1.6%	1.8%
Stay the same	24	13	17	14	17	9	8	102	20.6%	22.7%
Decrease	31	17	32	34	27	23	14	178	35.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	13	15	18	49	26	27	13	161	32.5%	35.9%
NA/Don't know	1	0	8	7	10	12	7	45	9.1%	
Not specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Age (sample = 449): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.8%
Stay the same	5.3%	2.9%	3.8%	3.1%	3.8%	2.0%	1.8%	22.7%
Decrease	6.9%	3.8%	7.1%	7.6%	6.0%	5.1%	3.1%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	2.9%	3.3%	4.0%	10.9%	5.8%	6.0%	2.9%	35.9%
Total	15.8%	10.7%	15.1%	21.6%	15.6%	13.1%	8.0%	100.0%

15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------

0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	Increase
5.3%	2.9%	3.8%	3.1%	3.8%	2.0%	1.8%	Stay the same
9.8%	7.1%	11.1%	18.5%	11.8%	11.1%	6.0%	Decrease

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 449): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	4.2%	6.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	1.8%
Stay the same	33.8%	27.1%	25.0%	14.4%	24.3%	15.3%	22.2%	22.7%
Decrease	43.7%	35.4%	47.1%	35.1%	38.6%	39.0%	38.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	18.3%	31.3%	26.5%	50.5%	37.1%	45.8%	36.1%	35.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------

4.2%	6.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	Increase
33.8%	27.1%	25.0%	14.4%	24.3%	15.3%	22.2%	Stay the same
62.0%	66.7%	73.5%	85.6%	75.7%	84.7%	75.0%	Decrease

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All age groups indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machine venues reduced. The highest age grouping was 45 to 54 (85.6%) followed by 65 to 74 (84.7%) and 55 to 64 (75.7%).

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0	4	3	1	8	1.6%	1.8%
Stay the same	52	39	11	0	102	20.6%	22.7%
Decrease	125	37	16	0	178	35.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	80	59	21	1	161	32.5%	35.9%
NA/Don't know	31	9	5	0	45	9.1%	
Not specified	1	1	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by ethnicity (sample = 449): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total			
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Increase	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.7% Increase
Stay the same	11.6%	8.7%	2.4%	0.0%	22.7%	11.6%	8.7%	2.4% Stay the same
Decrease	27.8%	8.2%	3.6%	0.0%	39.6%	45.7%	21.4%	8.2% Decrease
Greatly decrease	17.8%	13.1%	4.7%	0.2%	35.9%			
Total	57.2%	31.0%	11.4%	0.4%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 449): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Increase	0.0%	2.9%	5.9%	50.0%	1.8%	0.0%	2.9%	5.9% Increase
Stay the same	20.2%	28.1%	21.6%	0.0%	22.7%	20.2%	28.1%	21.6% Stay the same
Decrease	48.6%	26.6%	31.4%	0.0%	39.6%	79.8%	69.1%	72.5% Decrease
Greatly decrease	31.1%	42.4%	41.2%	50.0%	35.9%			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All ethnicities indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machine venues reduced. The highest grouping was from NZ Europeans (79.8% wanted a reduction in the number of venues), followed by other ethnicities (72.5%) and Maori (69.1%).

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Greatly increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Increase	0	0	0	4	3	1	8	1.6%	1.8%
Stay the same	4	20	5	27	45	1	102	20.6%	22.7%
Decrease	11	43	9	56	59	0	178	35.9%	39.6%
Greatly decrease	13	34	9	45	60	0	161	32.5%	35.9%
NA/Don't know	5	11	1	16	11	1	45	9.1%	
Not specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0.4%	
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 449): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%						
Increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.2% Increase
Stay the same	0.9%	4.5%	1.1%	6.0%	10.0%	0.2%	22.7%	0.9%	4.5%	1.1%	6.0%	10.0%	0.2% Stay the same
Decrease	2.4%	9.6%	2.0%	12.5%	13.1%	0.0%	39.6%	5.3%	17.1%	4.0%	22.5%	26.5%	0.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	2.9%	7.6%	2.0%	10.0%	13.4%	0.0%	35.9%						
Total	6.2%	21.6%	5.1%	29.4%	37.2%	0.4%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 449): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Greatly increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%						
Increase	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	1.8%	50.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	1.8%	50.0% Increase
Stay the same	14.3%	20.6%	21.7%	20.5%	26.9%	50.0%	22.7%	14.3%	20.6%	21.7%	20.5%	26.9%	50.0% Stay the same
Decrease	39.3%	44.3%	39.1%	42.4%	35.3%	0.0%	39.6%	85.7%	79.4%	78.3%	76.5%	71.3%	0.0% Decrease
Greatly decrease	46.4%	35.1%	39.1%	34.1%	35.9%	0.0%	35.9%						
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All areas indicated a desire to see the numbers of pokie machine venues reduced.

Q12 Do you support pokie machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	2	0	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	38	35	73	14.7%	15.5%
Neutral	64	49	113	22.8%	23.9%
Opposed	54	69	123	24.8%	26.1%
Strongly opposed	69	92	161	32.5%	34.1%
NA/Don't know	9	10	19	3.8%	
Not specified	4	1	5	1.0%	
Total	240	256	496	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed**Results by Gender (sample = 472): Percentage out of the entire sample*

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Strongly support	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%		
Support	8.1%	7.4%	15.5%	8.5%	7.4% Support
Neutral	13.6%	10.4%	23.9%	13.6%	10.4% Neutral
Opposed	11.4%	14.6%	26.1%	26.1%	34.1% Opposed
Strongly opposed	14.6%	19.5%	34.1%		
Total	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%		

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation**Note: All percentages are out of the total sample*

Results by Gender (sample = 472): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Strongly support	0.9%	0.0%	0.4%		
Support	16.7%	14.3%	15.5%	17.6%	14.3% Support
Neutral	28.2%	20.0%	23.9%	28.2%	20.0% Neutral
Opposed	23.8%	28.2%	26.1%	54.2%	65.7% Opposed
Strongly opposed	30.4%	37.6%	34.1%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 65.7% of females and 54.2% of males where opposed pokie machines being able to be moved amongst venues with a licence in special circumstances.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	17	8	17	12	9	8	2	73	14.7%	15.5%
Neutral	23	16	16	18	19	12	9	113	22.8%	23.9%
Opposed	13	11	24	21	19	20	15	123	24.8%	26.1%
Strongly opposed	16	12	15	48	30	26	14	161	32.5%	34.1%
NA/Don't know	4	0	3	2	3	4	3	19	3.8%	
Not specified	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5	1.0%	
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Age (sample = 472): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
Strongly support	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%							
Support	3.6%	1.7%	3.6%	2.5%	1.9%	1.7%	0.4%	15.5%	3.6%	1.7%	3.6%	3.0%	1.9%	1.7%	0.4% Support
Neutral	4.9%	3.4%	3.4%	3.8%	4.0%	2.5%	1.9%	23.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.4%	3.8%	4.0%	2.5%	1.9% Neutral
Opposed	2.8%	2.3%	5.1%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%	3.2%	26.1%	6.1%	4.9%	8.3%	14.6%	10.4%	9.7%	6.1% Opposed
Strongly opposed	3.4%	2.5%	3.2%	10.2%	6.4%	5.5%	3.0%	34.1%							
Total	14.6%	10.0%	15.3%	21.4%	16.3%	14.0%	8.5%	100.0%							

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 472): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
Strongly support	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%							
Support	24.6%	17.0%	23.6%	11.9%	11.7%	12.1%	5.0%	15.5%	24.6%	17.0%	23.6%	13.9%	11.7%	12.1%	5.0% Support
Neutral	33.3%	34.0%	22.2%	17.8%	24.7%	18.2%	22.5%	23.9%	33.3%	34.0%	22.2%	17.8%	24.7%	18.2%	22.5% Neutral
Opposed	18.8%	23.4%	33.3%	20.8%	24.7%	30.3%	37.5%	26.1%	42.0%	48.9%	54.2%	68.3%	63.6%	69.7%	72.5% Opposed
Strongly opposed	23.2%	25.5%	20.8%	47.5%	39.0%	39.4%	35.0%	34.1%							
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%							

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Most age groups were opposed to machines being able to be moved between venues. Generally the older the respondent, the higher the level of opposition. For respondents aged under 35, opposition dropped to below 50%.

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	2	0	0	0	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	41	22	9	1	73	14.7%	15.5%
Neutral	68	37	8	0	113	22.8%	23.9%
Opposed	69	39	15	0	123	24.8%	26.1%
Strongly opposed	93	46	21	1	161	32.5%	34.1%
NA/Don't know	13	4	2	0	19	3.8%	
Not specified	3	1	1	0	5	1.0%	
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total			
Strongly support	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%			
Support	8.7%	4.7%	1.9%	0.2%	15.5%	9.1%	4.7%	1.9% Support
Neutral	14.4%	7.8%	1.7%	0.0%	23.9%	14.4%	7.8%	1.7% Neutral
Opposed	14.6%	8.3%	3.2%	0.0%	26.1%	34.3%	18.0%	7.6% Opposed
Strongly opposed	19.7%	9.7%	4.4%	0.2%	34.1%			
Total	57.8%	30.5%	11.2%	0.4%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity
Strongly support	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%			
Support	15.0%	15.3%	17.0%	50.0%	15.5%	15.8%	15.3%	17.0% Support
Neutral	24.9%	25.7%	15.1%	0.0%	23.9%	24.9%	25.7%	15.1% Neutral
Opposed	25.3%	27.1%	28.3%	0.0%	26.1%	59.3%	59.0%	67.9% Opposed
Strongly opposed	34.1%	31.9%	39.6%	50.0%	34.1%			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All ethnicities were opposed to machines being moved with 67.9% of other ethnicities being opposed, 59.3% of NZ Europeans and 59.0% of Maori.

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Strongly support	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0.4%	0.4%
Support	6	14	3	21	27	2	73	14.7%	15.5%
Neutral	4	22	5	35	47	0	113	22.8%	23.9%
Opposed	11	29	8	34	41	0	123	24.8%	26.1%
Strongly opposed	10	36	7	49	58	1	161	32.5%	34.1%
NA/Don't know	2	5	1	5	6	0	19	3.8%	
Not specified	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	1.0%	
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 472): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Strongly support	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%						
Support	1.3%	3.0%	0.6%	4.4%	5.7%	0.4%	15.5%	1.3%	3.0%	0.6%	4.9%	5.7%	0.4% Support
Neutral	0.8%	4.7%	1.1%	7.4%	10.0%	0.0%	23.9%	0.8%	4.7%	1.1%	7.4%	10.0%	0.0% Neutral
Opposed	2.3%	6.1%	1.7%	7.2%	8.7%	0.0%	26.1%	4.4%	13.8%	3.2%	17.6%	21.0%	0.2% Opposed
Strongly opposed	2.1%	7.6%	1.5%	10.4%	12.3%	0.2%	34.1%						
Total	6.6%	21.4%	4.9%	29.9%	36.7%	0.6%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 472): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Strongly support	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%						
Support	19.4%	13.9%	13.0%	14.9%	15.6%	66.7%	15.5%	19.4%	13.9%	13.0%	16.3%	15.6%	66.7% Support
Neutral	12.9%	21.8%	21.7%	24.8%	27.2%	0.0%	23.9%	12.9%	21.8%	21.7%	24.8%	27.2%	0.0% Neutral
Opposed	35.5%	28.7%	34.8%	24.1%	23.7%	0.0%	26.1%	67.7%	64.4%	65.2%	58.9%	57.2%	33.3% Opposed
Strongly opposed	32.3%	35.6%	30.4%	34.8%	33.5%	33.3%	34.1%						
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All areas indicated being opposed to machines being able to be moved amongst facilities.

Q15 What action do you think RLC should take regarding the level of gambling machines*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	106	133	239	48.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	87	96	183	36.9%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	38	20	58	11.7%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	3	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0	1	1	0.2%	0.2%
NA/Don't know	5	5	10	2.0%	
Not specified	1	1	2	0.4%	
Total	240	256	496	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed**Results by Gender (sample = 484): Percentage out of the entire sample*

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	21.9%	27.5%	49.4%		
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	18.0%	19.8%	37.8%	39.9%	47.3% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	7.9%	4.1%	12.0%	7.9%	4.1% Leave at current levels
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.2% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%		
Total	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%		

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation**Note: All percentages are out of the total sample*

Results by Gender (sample = 484): Percentage out of each variable

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	45.3%	53.2%	49.4%		
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	37.2%	38.4%	37.8%	82.5%	91.6%
Leave number at current levels	16.2%	8.0%	12.0%	16.2%	8.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	1.3%	0.0%	0.6%	1.3%	0.4%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- A total of 91.6% of females and 82.5% of males want RLC to reduce the numbers of pokie machines.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	26	27	31	63	39	39	14	239	48.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	33	14	34	33	27	21	21	183	36.9%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	13	7	8	6	10	9	5	58	11.7%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.2%	0.2%
NA/Don't know	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	10	2.0%	
Not specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by Age (sample = 484): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	5.4%	5.6%	6.4%	13.0%	8.1%	8.1%	2.9%	49.4%							
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	6.8%	2.9%	7.0%	6.8%	5.6%	4.3%	4.3%	37.8%	12.2%	8.5%	13.4%	19.8%	13.6%	12.4%	7.2% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	2.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.0%	12.0%	2.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.0% Stay the same
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%							
Total	14.9%	9.9%	15.3%	21.3%	15.9%	14.3%	8.5%	100.0%							

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 484): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	36.1%	56.3%	41.9%	61.2%	50.6%	56.5%	34.1%	49.4%							
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	45.8%	29.2%	45.9%	32.0%	35.1%	30.4%	51.2%	37.8%	81.9%	85.4%	87.8%	93.2%	85.7%	87.0%	85.4% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	18.1%	14.6%	10.8%	5.8%	13.0%	13.0%	12.2%	12.0%	18.1%	14.6%	10.8%	5.8%	13.0%	13.0%	12.2% Stay the same
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.4% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%							
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%							

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All age groups indicated that they felt RLC should work to reduce the numbers of pokie machines in Rotorua.

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	139	68	31	1	239	48.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	113	55	15	0	183	36.9%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	30	18	9	1	58	11.7%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	2	1	0	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	1	0	0	0	1	0.2%	0.2%
NA/Don't know	3	6	1	0	10	2.0%	
Not specified	1	1	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	28.7%	14.0%	6.4%	0.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	23.3%	11.4%	3.1%	0.0%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	6.2%	3.7%	1.9%	0.2%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	58.9%	29.3%	11.4%	0.4%	100.0%

NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity
52.1%	25.4%	9.5% Reduce numbers
6.2%	3.7%	1.9% Stay the same
0.6%	0.2%	0.0% Increase numbers

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	48.8%	47.9%	56.4%	50.0%	49.4%			
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	39.6%	38.7%	27.3%	0.0%	37.8%	88.4%	86.6%	83.6% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	10.5%	12.7%	16.4%	50.0%	12.0%	10.5%	12.7%	16.4% Stay the same
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%	0.0% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All ethnicities wanted RLC to reduce the number of pokie machines with 88.4% of NZ Europeans, 86.6% of Maori and 83.6% of other ethnicities wanting a reduction.

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent	% ex non spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	16	56	11	63	90	3	239	48.2%	49.4%
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	12	32	12	63	64	0	183	36.9%	37.8%
Leave number at current levels	3	16	1	18	20	0	58	11.7%	12.0%
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	0.6%	0.6%
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.2%	0.2%
NA/Don't know	1	2	0	2	5	0	10	2.0%	
Not specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4%	
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%	100.0%

Note: % ex non spec. is the percentage with non specified answers removed

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 484): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	3.3%	11.6%	2.3%	13.0%	18.6%	0.6%	49.4%						
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	2.5%	6.6%	2.5%	13.0%	13.2%	0.0%	37.8%	5.8%	18.2%	4.8%	26.0%	31.8%	0.6% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	0.6%	3.3%	0.2%	3.7%	4.1%	0.0%	12.0%	0.6%	3.3%	0.2%	3.7%	4.1%	0.0% Stay the same
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%						
Total	6.4%	21.9%	5.0%	30.2%	36.0%	0.6%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 484): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.
Reduce numbers at a fast rate	51.6%	52.8%	45.8%	43.2%	51.7%	100.0%	49.4%						
Reduce numbers at a slow rate	38.7%	30.2%	50.0%	43.2%	36.8%	0.0%	37.8%	90.3%	83.0%	95.8%	86.3%	88.5%	100.0% Reduce numbers
Leave number at current levels	9.7%	15.1%	4.2%	12.3%	11.5%	0.0%	12.0%	9.7%	15.1%	4.2%	12.3%	11.5%	0.0% Stay the same
Increase numbers at a slow rate	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0% Increase numbers
Increase numbers at a fast rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%						
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%						

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- All areas indicated a desire to have RLC reduce the numbers of pokie machines.

Q17 Have you or your family, or a community organisation you are involved with, benefited from grants from Gambling Trusts*Results by Gender (sample = 496): Frequency table*

	Male	Female	Total	Percent
Yes	59	65	124	25.0%
No	159	153	312	62.9%
Don't know	22	35	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	0	3	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	240	256	496	100.0%

Results by Gender (sample = 436): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	13.5%	14.9%	28.4%
No	36.5%	35.1%	71.6%
Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation**Results by Gender (sample = 436): Percentage out of each variable*

	Male	Female	Total
Yes	27.1%	29.8%	28.4%
No	72.9%	70.2%	71.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation***Key findings:**

- A total of 29.8% of females and 27.1% of males had benefited from Gambling Trusts.

Results by Age (sample = 496): Frequency table

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total	Percent
Yes	2	8	23	38	24	19	10	124	25.0%
No	64	36	42	49	47	46	28	312	62.9%
Don't know	8	3	11	17	9	5	4	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	74	48	76	104	80	71	43	496	100.0%

Results by Age (sample = 436): Percentage out of the entire sample

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	0.5%	1.8%	5.3%	8.7%	5.5%	4.4%	2.3%	28.4%
No	14.7%	8.3%	9.6%	11.2%	10.8%	10.6%	6.4%	71.6%
Total	15.1%	10.1%	14.9%	20.0%	16.3%	14.9%	8.7%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by Age (sample = 436): Percentage out of each variable

	15 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 +	Total
Yes	3.0%	18.2%	35.4%	43.7%	33.8%	29.2%	26.3%	28.4%
No	97.0%	81.8%	64.6%	56.3%	66.2%	70.8%	73.7%	71.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- Of all age groups, 43.7% of respondents aged between 45 to 54 had benefited from Gambling Trusts, followed by 35.4% of those aged 35 to 44 and 33.8% of those aged between 55 to 64.

Results by ethnicity (sample = 496): Frequency table

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total	Percent
Yes	74	43	7	0	124	25.0%
No	179	87	44	2	312	62.9%
Don't know	35	18	4	0	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	1	1	1	0	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	289	149	56	2	496	100.0%

Results by ethnicity (sample = 436): Percentage out of the entire sample

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	17.0%	9.9%	1.6%	0.0%	28.4%
No	41.1%	20.0%	10.1%	0.5%	71.6%
Total	58.0%	29.8%	11.7%	0.5%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by ethnicity (sample = 436): Percentage out of each variable

	NZ European	Maori	Other ethnicity	Not specified	Total
Yes	29.2%	33.1%	13.7%	0.0%	28.4%
No	70.8%	66.9%	86.3%	100.0%	71.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Key findings:

- For Maori respondents, 33.1% had benefited from Gambling Trusts. This was followed by 29.2% of NZ Europeans and 13.7% of other ethnicities.

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 496): Frequency table

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total	Percent
Yes	7	38	4	42	32	1	124	25.0%
No	22	57	18	89	124	2	312	62.9%
Don't know	5	13	1	16	22	0	57	11.5%
Refused/not specified	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	0.6%
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	34	108	24	148	179	3	496	100.0%

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 436): Percentage out of the entire sample

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	1.6%	8.7%	0.9%	9.6%	7.3%	0.2%	28.4%
No	5.0%	13.1%	4.1%	20.4%	28.4%	0.5%	71.6%
Total	6.7%	21.8%	5.0%	30.0%	35.8%	0.7%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation

Note: All percentages are out of the total sample

Results by deprivation index 2013 (sample = 436): Percentage out of each variable

	Dep 1-2	Dep 3-4	Dep 5-6	Dep 7-8	Dep 9-10	Not spec.	Total
Yes	24.1%	40.0%	18.2%	32.1%	20.5%	33.3%	28.4%
No	75.9%	60.0%	81.8%	67.9%	79.5%	66.7%	71.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: All refused, don't know or not specified answers have been removed from the calculation