



**澳門大學**  
UNIVERSIDADE DE MACAU  
UNIVERSITY OF MACAU

# **REPORT on “A Survey of Responsible Gambling Knowledge 2023”**

**Commissioned by  
Social Welfare Bureau  
Macao Special Administrative Region**

**Institute for the Study of Commercial Gaming  
University of Macau**

**December 2023**

## Executive Summary

Commissioned by the Social Welfare Bureau of the Macao Special Administrative Region, the Institute for the Study of Commercial Gaming of the University of Macao conducted a survey to assess the residents' awareness and understanding of "Responsible Gambling" (RG) after years of promotion in Macao.

Unlike previous surveys in the same series that utilized computerized-random-digit-dialing method, this survey employed a street-intercept survey method. Samples were selected based on the gender, age groups, and proportion of residents aged 18 or above in each parish, using the 2021 population census data from the Government of Macao Special Administrative Region Statistics and Census Service Bureau. A total of 1,099 residents aged 18 or above were successfully interviewed. The summary of the survey results is as follows:

- The level of RG awareness among Macao residents<sup>1</sup> was 64.9%. Although the research method of this survey differed from previous surveys of the same series, making statistical comparisons inappropriate, the recorded awareness rate in the current survey is similar to that of the survey conducted in 2020. Furthermore, the analysis reveals that the level of RG awareness among females was about 60%, which was significantly lower than that of males (slightly over 70%). Additionally, over 60% of respondents aged 18 to 24 claimed to have never heard of RG. Meanwhile, among respondents aged 65 or above, about half also reported never having heard of it. The data reflects that the RG awareness rate was lower among younger and older residents compared to that of middle-aged residents.
- When it comes to the level of RG understanding, among the 713 respondents who were aware of RG<sup>2</sup>, the mean of their "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" was 15.65 (the scores ranged between 0 and 18). Meanwhile, the median of their "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" was 16.00, meaning that half of those who had heard of RG scored 16.00 or higher. Among these respondents, those who answered all items in the knowledge scale correctly accounted for 23.4% (n=167), making it the largest proportion in the sample. As for the rest of the scoring groups, the higher the scores, the larger the proportion in the sample, while the lower the scores, the smaller the proportion in the sample. Results show that those with awareness of RG generally had a higher level of

---

<sup>1</sup> The proportion of respondents who have heard of RG, and it is computed as:  $\text{RG awareness rate} = \frac{\text{number of respondents who have heard of RG}}{\text{sample size}} \times 100\%$ .

<sup>2</sup> Respondents who had heard of RG.

understanding of its content<sup>3</sup>. This implies that residents, upon learning about the term "RG", have also effectively received the messages and the contents of RG to some extent.

- As for the understanding of the individual items in the "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" scale among those who were aware of RG, "Roles of gamblers' family members and friends" (95.1%), "Do not borrow to finance gambling" (94.5%), "Excessive gambling can lead to adverse consequences" (93.3%), "Set a budget for gambling" (92.8%), "Set a time limit for gambling" (92.0%) were the top five items recording the highest percentages of correct responses. Conversely, "Do not predict gambling outcomes" (77.7%) and "Nature of gambling: No strategies to control the outcome" (72.8%) were the two items recording the lowest percentages of correct responses.
- Projected from the number of respondents who had a sufficient understanding of RG<sup>4</sup>, the percentage of Macao residents who had a sufficient understanding of RG<sup>5</sup> was 15.2%.
- A significant relationship was found between demographic characteristics and having a sufficient understanding of RG. Middle-aged, individuals with higher education levels, employment, and higher income levels showed significantly higher levels of sufficient understanding towards RG.
- No statistically significant difference was found between gamblers and non-gamblers in the level of awareness and understanding of RG.
- Among the respondents, gaming employees (95.5%) demonstrated a significantly higher level of awareness of RG compared to non-gaming employees (60.6%). In terms of the understanding of RG, gaming employees exhibited a significantly higher level of sufficient understanding of RG compared to non-gaming employees.
- Residents who had awareness of RG were significantly more likely to know that seeking help from professional counseling organizations or (and) applying "Self-Exclusion" was the responsible course of action when encountering gambling problems, compared to residents who had never heard of RG. Nevertheless, among those who were aware of RG, a minority of them still believed that no preparation was needed before gambling. Besides, when it comes to the appropriate RG behavior before and during gambling, they could hardly mention any proper behavior. When gambling problems arise, again they were not able to suggest any appropriate actions to handle them.

---

<sup>3</sup> Achieved a certain level of RG understanding which is reflected in the scores obtained from the "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" scale; the higher the score, the higher the level of RG knowledge.

<sup>4</sup> Answer all items in the "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" scale correctly, i.e., a maximum score on the "Responsible Gambling Knowledge" scale.

<sup>5</sup> The proportion of respondents who have a sufficient understanding of RG, and it is computed as: the number of respondents who have a sufficient understanding of RG /sample size\*100%.

- 37.4% of the respondents stated that they had heard of "Self-exclusion" and "Third-party exclusion" (both referred to as "Self-exclusion") programs introduced by the government. Unlike the exclusion programs, as high as 73.6% of the respondents claimed that they had heard of the "24-hour gambling counselling hotline". Meanwhile, 76.2% of the respondents correctly answered the minimum age required by law to enter a casino (21 years old). Nevertheless, whether it is "Self-exclusion", "24-hour gambling counselling hotline", or "Minimum legal age to enter a casino", respondents who had heard of RG were significantly more likely to be aware of these measures, understand their contents, and know the application procedures compared to those who had never heard of RG.