



McGivern, P., & Mierzwinski, M. (2024). A comparison of gambling behaviours among sport-based and non-sport-based students in the UK. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-07-2024-0112>

Document version

Peer reviewed version

Licence

CC BY-NC

Copyright information

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

Takedown policy

Any individual, whether within or external to the University, has the right to request the removal of content from the Leeds Trinity University Repository, on the grounds that it breaches copyright, is in any other way unlawful, or represents research misconduct.

Complaints can be submitted via the Repository Complaints Form at <https://www.leedstrinity.ac.uk/media/site-assets/documents/key-documents/pdfs/repository-complaints-form.pdf>



**A Comparison of Gambling Behaviours Among Sport-Based
and Non-Sport-Based Students in the UK**

Journal:	<i>Mental Health and Social Inclusion</i>
Manuscript ID	MHSI-07-2024-0112
Manuscript Type:	Research article (for editor review)
Keywords:	Gambling, Students, University, Sports, Student Athletes, Responsible Gambling

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

A Comparison of Gambling Behaviours Among Sport-Based and Non-Sport-Based Students in the UK

Abstract

Purpose: In recent years, gambling among university students has received significant focus as it may be viewed as an attractive and exciting form of income whilst studying. Given this, stakeholders in protection from gambling-related harm need to better understand student gambling behaviours. This understanding should include students on sports-based programmes given their closer connection to sporting events, and a heightened sense of competition among such often gendered cohorts.

Design/methodology/approach: The present pilot study comprised 210 university students on sports-based and non-sport-based programmes. Participants self-reported frequencies of gambling activity and expenditure via an online survey.

Findings: Results showed a significantly greater frequency of female student non-gamblers on non-sports-based degree programmes and a high frequency of male student gamblers on sports-based degree programmes ($p = 0.02$). Sports-based students also reported significantly higher scores on the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) than non-sports students ($p < 0.01$). Finally, gambling expenditure ($p < 0.01$) and regularity ($p < 0.01$) was significantly lower among students studying non-sports degree programmes.

Originality/value: The findings of the present study provide evidence to warrant further investigation into gambling perceptions and behaviours among students on sports-based programmes, with a view to assessing the potential need for targeted awareness, tailored support, and how both can most effectively be provided.

Keywords: Gambling, Students, University, Sports, Student Athletes, Responsible Gambling

Introduction

Recent reports detail how many students gamble whilst attending UK universities. Data from the Gambling Commission (2019a) reported that approximately 1.2 million students gamble, equating to two in every three students. Similarly, the Young Gamers and Gamblers Education Trust (2019) found that 47% of students had gambled in the past month, with 16% of those being at-risk or problem gamblers. Whilst insightful, these figures may be modest given the self-report nature underpinning such statistics, and they lack demographic variances. Understanding such variances is important given evidence that gambling among students studying sport and/or sport-related topics may be more pervasive and problematic than those students on non-sport-related degree programmes (Ellenbogen *et al.*, 2008; Martin *et al.*, 2016; St-Pierre *et al.*, 2014). There is a need to explore this variance in a UK context to better equip key stakeholders regarding protection from gambling-related harm.

Students' propensity to gamble can be partly explained by the lifestyle, financial circumstances and greater independence commonly associated with university life. For many students, going to university involves having greater financial independence and managing greater levels of money via student loan payments, part-time employment and/or living costs. However, poor budgeting has been identified as an issue amongst students (Vien, 2015). Therefore, one of the three key reasons students opt for gambling as a particular pastime is to seek an alternative source of income, along with boredom busting and conformity to social norms (Švegar *et al.*, 2017; Neighbors and Lostutter, 2002; NUS, 2019). The Young Gamers and Gamblers Education Trust (2019) report found that over half of students (52%) stated winning money as one of the main reasons for gambling. This primary reason can be more amplified for those 81% of students reporting as being affected by the UK's current cost of living crisis (Russell Group Cost-of-Living Survey, 2023).

Student access to gambling can also partly be explained by the UK's liberal attitudes towards gambling laws, and technological advances in online gambling and e-banking (Drakeford, 2015; Roshler, 2022;

1
2
3 The House of Lords, 2021). Already owning a smartphone, for many students, entering university
4 coincides with reaching the legal age to gamble and set-up a betting account. As often young adults,
5 students can be enticed by the free bets offer when registering a betting account, one of many targeted
6 advertising betting companies aim at young people (Guillou-Landreat *et al.* 2021; Killick and Griffiths,
7 2022; Oduor, Mberia and Ndavula, 2023). However, the UK government's attitude and approach
8 towards gambling is not fixed and has been informed by many gambling awareness lobby groups, such
9 as Bet No More UK, Gamble Aware and The Betting and Gaming Council. Therefore, it is necessary to
10 note that student gambling currently takes place in the context of emerging stricter policy and legislation
11 regarding gambling products, the rise of Responsible Gambling (RG) devices, and the development of
12 data-tracking systems (Chagas and Gomes, 2017; Gainsbury *et al.*, 2014; The Gambling Commission,
13 2019b).

14
15 Despite these regulatory and technological developments, many young people suffer from unaffordable
16 monetary losses and gambling-related psychological issues that detrimentally effects their mental
17 health and well-being, as well as those close to them (Holdsworth *et al.*, 2013; Messerlian and Byrne,
18 2004). This can subsequently impact students' university experiences, achievements, and engagement.
19 Whilst over the last few decades many universities have expanded their focus on student well-being,
20 study support and health services (Laws and Fiedler, 2012), there have been calls for universities to be
21 more proactive in addressing students gambling-related issues through specific policies and support
22 (Moore *et al.*, 2013; Sherba and Gersper, 2017, McGivern *et al.* 2023). However, online gambling is
23 more difficult for peers and university staff to detect compared to other issues such as drug or alcohol
24 misuse (Hing and Nuske, 2012; Ladouceur, 2004). Given these circumstances, there is a growing need
25 to continue research concerning students' gambling behaviours at UK universities.

26
27 Positive correlations have been found amongst student-athletes increased gambling behaviour and
28 other high-risk health behaviours, such as unprotected sex and substance misuse (Huang *et al.*, 2007b;
29 Stuhldreher *et al.*, 2007). This correlation may be due to subjective norms, the prevalence and ease to
30 bet on sports, and the social elements involved in student gambling behaviours (Huang *et al.*, 2007a;
31 Lafferty *et al.*, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2021). This correlation may also be due to the gendered student-
32 athlete cohort in the UK. Male gamblers have been found to be more risky gamblers (Wong *et al.*, 2013),
33 and more likely than females to gamble online, for longer periods and develop gambling-related
34 problems, whilst feeling less guilt or shame from their gambling activities (McCormack *et al.* 2014).
35 Student male athletes are also more likely to gamble than female athletes (Vinberg *et al.*, 2023), though
36 gambling among females generally is more prevalent than ever before (Gambling Commission, 2023).
37 However, precise data concerning student populations is lacking (Baggio *et al.*, 2018), and much of this
38 research has been conducted either in the United States (US) or Australia, highlighting a paucity of
39 research among UK university samples.

40
41 Given the preceding findings, this study aimed to further explore gambling behaviours of students on
42 sports-based and non-sport students in the UK universities. This knowledge could prove beneficial for
43 universities proactively seeking to provide more targeted gambling-related advice, support, and
44 campaigning.

45 46 47 48 **Methods**

49 *Design & Materials*

50
51 A survey was designed and administered to gather data for this study. The survey explored student
52 gambling perceptions and behaviours, which included the 9-item Problem Gambling Severity Index
53 (PGSI) (Ferris and Wynne, 2001). To establish the gambling-status of each participant, the survey
54 comprised 14 questions focused on gambling expenditure, frequency, and general gambling behaviours
55 (i.e., Preferred modes of gambling, forms of gambling). To be eligible to take part in the study,
56 participants had to be aged 18 years or over, be an active student at a UK university, and have an
57 interest in the topic of student gambling. The study was approved by the local university ethics
58 committee.

Participants

A total of 210 university students studying in the UK participated in the study (male, $n = 78$, female, $n = 129$, $n = 2$ did not wish to state their gender, $n = 1$ identified as non-binary). The mean age of participants was 22.69 years, with a standard deviation of 6.33. Participants self-identified as White British ($n = 184$), Other White background ($n = 3$), Black ($n = 2$), Caribbean ($n = 2$), African ($n = 1$), White and Black African ($n = 2$), White and Asian ($n = 2$), Indian ($n = 4$), Bangladeshi ($n = 1$), Chinese ($n = 1$), Arabian ($n = 1$), Other Black Background ($n = 1$), Other Asian Background ($n = 1$), Any Mixed Background ($n = 2$), Other Ethnic Group or Background ($n = 2$), Did not specify ($n = 1$). This sample size is similar to other studies in this area (e.g., Mateo-Flor, *et al.*, 2020).

Procedure

Each participant received a URL weblink to access the survey, which took approximately ten minutes to complete. URLs were made available via university channels of communication to ensure that participants were active UK university students. The opening screen of the survey explained the aims of the study and practical aspects of taking part. Participants were informed that their involvement in the study was voluntary, and that all data would be anonymised. Participants were able to withdraw from the study at any time and up to two weeks after taking part (zero participants met this criterion). Consent was obtained electronically. After providing consent, each participant responded to a series of questions pertaining to gambling. At the end of the study, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Data Analysis Strategy

H1: There will be a significant association between students on sports-based degree programmes who gamble compared to non-gamblers, when grouped by gender and degree programme. Given low participation rates of non-binary participants, it was not possible to include these data in the analysis. A 2x4 Chi-Square test was used to examine if there was an association between Gambler Status (Yes/No) and Degree programme by gender (Male sport, Male Non-sport, Female Sport, Female non-sport). Criteria to run this test were met, in accordance with Yates *et al.* (1999).

H2: There will be a significant association between gambling regularity across student gamblers on sports and non-based degree programmes. A 2x2 Chi-Square test was used to examine if there was an association between Degree Programme (Sports-based, non-sports-based) and Gambling regularity (More than once a week, less than once a week).

H3: There will be a significant association between gambling expenditure categories among student gamblers on sports and non-based degree programmes. A conservative threshold of five pounds per week was deemed suitable based on previous findings among UK university students (YGam and GAMSTOP, 2023). A 2x2 Chi-Square test was used to examine if there was an association between Degree Programme (Sports-based, non-sports-based) and Gambling Expenditure (Less than £5 per week, Greater than £5 per week).

H4: Student gamblers on sports-based degree programmes will be higher risk gamblers than student gamblers on non-sports-based degree programmes. An independent samples t-test was used. The independent variable was Degree Programme (Sports-based, non-sports-based). The dependent variable of Risk was based on overall PGSI scores.

Results

The survey achieved a 94.31% response rate. The sample comprised 128 non-gamblers and 82 gamblers. A total of 199 participants completed the PGSI. Frequencies were recorded for each of the following categories: No risk = 142, Low Risk = 32, Moderate Risk = 19, High Risk = 6.

H1: Table 1 shows the proportion of gamblers and non-gamblers when grouped by gender and degree programme (Sports-based, non-sports-based). A 2x4 chi-square test examined associations between these categories. The relation between these variables was significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 207) 9.240, p .026$.

Results showed a high frequency of female student non-gamblers on non-sports-based degree programmes and a high frequency of male student gamblers on sports-based degree programmes.

[Table I here]

H2: Table 2 shows gambling regularity by degree programme. A 2x2 chi-square test examined associations between these categories, the relation between these variables was significant $\chi^2 (1, N = 81) 8.457, p .004$. Results showed a significantly lower proportion of students studying non-sports degree programmes gambling more than once per week.

[Table II here]

H3: Table 3 shows gambling expenditure by degree programme. A 2x2 chi-square test examined associations between these categories, the relation between these variables was significant $\chi^2 (1, N = 79) 8.463, p .004$. Results showed a significantly lower proportion of students studying non-sports degree programmes spending more than £5 per week.

[Table III here]

H4: Scores on the PGSI were analysed between gamblers studying sport-based degree programmes ($M = 2.78, SD = 2.98$) and participants studying non-sports-based degree programmes ($M = 0.55, SD = 0.18$). The data were within skew and kurtosis thresholds but did not meet the homogeneity of variance assumption. Therefore, an independent samples t-test (equal variances not assumed) was used. The t-test revealed a significant result $t(62) = 4.85, p = <0.01$, with gamblers studying sports-based degree programme scoring higher on the PGSI than gamblers on non-sports degree programmes.

Discussion

The present study explored gambling behaviours and preferences among university students on sports-based and non-sports-based programmes of study. For hypothesis one, the null hypothesis was rejected as results showed a preference for gambling among males on sports-based degree programmes, and a distinct lack of gambling uptake among females on non-sports-based degree programmes. This finding resonates with findings of Vinberg *et al.* (2023) highlighting how gambling likelihood is greater among males on sports-based programmes. This likelihood was not the case for females, whose proportionality was similar regardless of programme of study.

For hypothesis two, the null hypothesis was rejected as results showed a lower proportion of students studying non-sports degree programmes gambling more than once per week. This finding aligns with both Huang (2007a) and Vinberg *et al.* (2023) whereby gambling regularity was shown to be more common among students on sports-based programmes (i.e., gambling was prevalent to some extent with 50% gambling either more or less than once a week). However, this was not shown to be the case for non-sport students where very few gambling more than once a week, providing evidence for increased gambling activity among students on sports-based programmes.

For hypothesis three, the null hypothesis was rejected as results showed significantly lower frequency of students on non-sports-based degrees spending more than five pounds per week. This finding reflects a similar pattern regarding the previously mentioned gambling regularity and that found by St-Pierre *et al.* (2014), providing further evidence for greater gambling intensity in this cohort.

1
2
3 For hypothesis four, the null hypothesis was rejected as student gamblers on sports-based degree
4 programmes scored higher on the PGSI than students on non-sports-based degree programmes.
5 Overall, PGSI scores among gamblers were similar to other UK samples (e.g., YGAM and GAMSTOP,
6 2023) insofar as the majority fell into the 'no risk' category. However, the sample in the present study
7 comprised more 'low risk' and fewer 'moderate risk' by comparison to the YGAM and GAMSTOP report.
8 Taken together, these add to a growing body of evidence pointing to the need for a greater awareness
9 and sensitivity among universities and their staff regarding the potential for gambling-related harms
10 among students on sports-based programmes of study, and the need for signposted support.

11 *Limitations*

12
13 The authors acknowledge that the findings do not provide a breakdown of gambling behaviours across
14 year/level groups, or which specific sports student-athletes play or gamble on. Future research to
15 address this would provide an additional perspective and further refine our understanding gambling
16 across UK universities.

17 *Conclusion*

18
19 Students, particularly males, studying on sports-based programmes at university may engage in more
20 intense gambling behaviours than their peers on non-sports-based programmes. They may also be at
21 greater risk of experiencing gambling related harm. These findings may further aid universities, staff,
22 and stakeholders to provide more targeted gambling-related support and advice

23 **References**

- 24
25
26
27
28 Chagas, B.T. and Gomes, J.F., 2017. "Internet gambling: A critical review of behavioural tracking
29 research", *Journal of Gambling Issues*, Vol 36 No. 1, pp.1-27.
- 30
31 Drakeford, B.P. and Hudson-Smith (2015), "Mobile gambling: implications of accessibility", *Journal of*
32 *Research Studies in Business and Management*, Vol 1, pp. 1-26
- 33
34 Ellenbogen, S., Jacobs, D., Derevensky, J., Gupta, R. and Paskus, T. (2008), "Gambling behavior
35 among college student-athletes", *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, Vol 20 No. 3, pp. 349-362, doi:
36 10.1080/ 10413200802056685.
- 37
38
39 Ferris, J. and Wynne, H. (2001), "The Canadian gambling index: final report", Prepared for the
40 Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, Ottawa
- 41
42 Gainsbury, S.M., Blankers, M., Wilkinson, C., Schelleman-Offermans, K. and Cousijn, J. (2014),
43 "Recommendations for international gambling harm-minimisation guidelines: comparison with
44 effective public health policy", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, Vol 30 No. 4, pp. 771-788, doi:
45 10.1007/s10899-013-9389-2.
- 46
47 Gambling Commission (2019a), "Commission raises awareness of potential risks for students who
48 gamble", available at: [www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/News/commissionraises-awareness-of-potential-risks-for-students-who-gamble)
49 [statistics/News/commissionraises-awareness-of-potential-risks-for-students-who-gamble](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/News/commissionraises-awareness-of-potential-risks-for-students-who-gamble) (accessed 3
50 June 2024)
- 51
52 Gambling Commission (2019b), "Regulator warns gambling industry not to circumvent FOBT stake
53 cut", available at: [www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/News/regulatorwarns-](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/News/regulatorwarns-gambling-industry-not-to-circumvent-fobt-stake-cut)
54 [gambling-industry-not-to-circumvent-fobt-stake-cut](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/News/regulatorwarns-gambling-industry-not-to-circumvent-fobt-stake-cut) (accessed 3 June 2024)
- 55
56 Gambling Commission. (2020), "Taking a more in-depth look at online gambling", available at:
57 [https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/statistics-and-research/publication/taking-a-more-in-depth-](https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/statistics-and-research/publication/taking-a-more-in-depth-look-at-online-gambling)
58 [look-at-online-gambling](https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/statistics-and-research/publication/taking-a-more-in-depth-look-at-online-gambling) (accessed 4 June 2024)
- 59
60

1
2
3 Gambling Commission. (2023), "Women and Gambling: making the invisible visible", available at:
4 [Blog - Women and gambling: Making the invisible visible \(gamblingcommission.gov.uk\)](https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/blog/women-and-gambling-making-the-invisible-visible) (accessed 11
5 June 2024)

6
7 Guillou-Landreat, M., Gallopel-Morvan, K., Lever, D., Le Goff, D., and Le Reste, J. Y. (2021),
8 "Gambling marketing strategies and the internet: What do we know? A systematic review", *Frontiers in*
9 *Psychiatry*, Vol 12, 583817.

10
11 Herring, H (2023), "Gambling statistics UK: How do Brits Gamble?", *Finder*, (accessed 4 June 2024)
12 <https://www.finder.com/uk/gambling-statistics#how-much-money-is-spent-on-gambling-in-the-uk>

13
14 Huang, J.-H., Jacobs, D. F., Derevensky, J. L., Gupta, R., and Paskus, T. S. (2007a), "A National
15 Study on Gambling Among US College Student-Athletes", *Journal of American College Health*, Vol 56
16 No. 2, pp.93–99. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.56.2.93-100>

17
18 Huang, J.-H., Jacobs, D. F., Derevensky, J. L., Gupta, R., and Paskus, T. S. (2007b), "Gambling and
19 Health Risk Behaviors Among U.S. College Student-Athletes: Findings from a National Study",
20 *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol 40 No. 5, pp.390–397.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.146>

22
23 Lafferty, M. E., Wakefield, C., and Brown, H. (2017), "'We do it for the team' – Student-athletes'
24 initiation practices and their impact on group cohesion", *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*
25 *Psychology*, Vol 15 No. 4, pp.438–446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2015.1121507>

26
27 Killick, E. A., and Griffiths, M. D. (2022), "A thematic analysis of sports bettors' perceptions of sports
28 betting marketing strategies in the UK", *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, Vol 20
29 No. 2, pp.800-818.

30
31 Martin, R. J., Nelson, S. E., and Gallucci, A. R. (2016), "Game On: Past Year Gambling, Gambling-
32 Related Problems, and Fantasy Sports Gambling Among College Athletes and Non-athletes", *Journal*
33 *of Gambling Studies*, Vol 32 No. 2, pp.567–579. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-015-9561-y>

34
35 Mateo-Flor, J., Alguacil, M., and González-Serrano, M. H. (2020), "Gambling and sports betting by
36 teenagers", *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, Vol 20 No. 2, pp.605-614.

37
38 McGivern, P., Mierzwinski, M. and Stuppel, E. (2023), "A brief report on student gambling and how
39 UK universities can support students", *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*, Vol. ahead-of-print No.
40 ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-05-2023-0061>

41
42 Moore, S. M., Thomas, A. C., Kalé, S., Spence, M., Zlatevska, N., Staiger, P. K., Graffam, J., and
43 Kyrios, M. (2013), "Problem Gambling Among International and Domestic University Students in
44 Australia: Who is at Risk?", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, Vol 29 No. 2, pp.217–230.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9309-x>

46
47 Neighbors, C. and Lostutter, T.W. (2002), "Exploring college student gambling motivation", *Journal of*
48 *Gambling Studies*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 361-370.

49
50 NUS (2019), "Launch of NUS student gambling research", available at:
51 www.nus.org.uk/articles/launchof-nus-student-gambling-research-1586 (accessed 12 May 2024).

52
53 Oduor, N., Mberia, H., and Ndavula, J. (2023), "Betting Menace: Riddle of Television Advertising and
54 University Students Betting Behaviour", *International Journal of Communication and Public*
55 *Relation*, Vol 8 No. 2, pp.55-66.

56
57 Rohsler, C. (2022), "The gambling law review: United Kingdom", available at:
58 <https://thelawreviews.co.uk/title/the-gambling-law-review/united-kingdom> (accessed 12 May 2024).

59
60 Russell Group Student Union. (2023), Student cost of living report. Russell Group Student Union.
61 <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/63f4ed73056f42572785c28e/t/640b4a3d20fc6122160c275e/1678461513650/Cost+of+Living+Report+-+March+2023.pdf> (accessed 18 May 2024)

Russell, A. M. T., Hing, N., Li, E., and Vitartas, P. (2019), "Gambling Risk Groups are Not All the Same: Risk Factors Amongst Sports Bettors", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, Vol 35 No.1, pp.225–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-018-9765-z>

Stuhldreher, W. L., Stuhldreher, T. J., and Forrest, K.Y.Z. (2007), "Gambling as an Emerging Health Problem on Campus", *Journal of American College Health*, Vol 56 No. 1, pp.75–88. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.56.1.75-88>

St-Pierre, R. A., Temcheff, C. E., Gupta, R., Derevensky, J., and Paskus, T. S. (2014), "Predicting Gambling Problems from Gambling Outcome Expectancies in College Student-Athletes", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, Vol 30 No. 1, pp.47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9355-4>

Švegar, Domagoj ; Roguljić, Domagoj and Anić, Petra (2017), "What do students do in their free time and why?", *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, Vol 48 No. 4 pp.504-515.

The House of Lords (2021), "Gambling harm – time for action", available at: <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/1700/documents/16622/default/> (accessed 12 May 2024).

Vien, C. (2015), "College students think they manage money well, but they don't, survey finds", *Journal of Accountancy*, available at: www.journalofaccountancy.com/news/2015/sep/financial-literacy-skills-201512981 (accessed 20 May 2023).

Vinberg, M., Durbeej, N. and Rosendahl, I. (2023), "Young male athletes at risk for problem gambling: Findings from a cross-sectional study in Sweden", *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol 64 No. (6), pp.766-775.

Wang, X., Won, D., and Jeon, H. S. (2021), "Predictors of Sports Gambling among College Students: The Role of the Theory of Planned Behavior and Problem Gambling Severity", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol 18 No. 4, pp.1803. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041803>

Wong, G., Zane, N., Saw, A., and Chan, A. K. K. (2013), "Examining gender differences for gambling engagement and gambling problems among emerging adults", *Journal of Gambling Studies*, Vol 29 No. 2, pp.171–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9305-1>

Starnes, D.S., Tabor, J., Yates, D.S. and Moore, D.S. (2015), "*The practice of statistics*", WH Freeman/BFW.

YGam and GAMSTOP (2023). "Annual Student Gambling Survey" available at: <https://www.ygam.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Annual-Student-Gambling-Survey-Feb-2023.pdf> (accessed 23 June 2024)

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the reviewers and the participants who took part in the study.

Research Funding: No funding was received for this study.

Ethics: This study received ethical approval from the university ethics committee

Table I: Gambler status frequencies by gender and degree programme

		Degree Programme by Gender				Total
		Male Sport Student	Female Sport Student	Male Non-sport Student	Female Non-sport Student	
Gambler Status	Gambler	35	17	4	24	80
	Non-Gambler	30	37	9	51	127
	Total	65	54	13	75	207

Table II: Gambling regularity by degree programme

		Study Topic		
		Sport	Non-Sport	Total
Gambling regularity	More than once a week	26	5	31
	Less than once a week	26	24	50
	Total	52	29	81

Table III: Gambling expenditure by degree programme

		Degree Programme		
		Sport	Non-Sport	Total
Gambling expenditure	Less than £5 per week	27	25	52
	Greater than £5 per week	23	4	27
	Total	50	29	79