

***Focus Groups with Treatment
Personnel Problem Gamblers
and Families of Gamblers***

by

Robert Wilson, Jennifer Collins, and Patricia Powell

Slot machine gambling was legalized in Delaware in 1994. Two years later, the Delaware General Assembly requested the Department of Health and Social Services to study the need for augmented services to treat problem gambling. In response to this request, the Division of Alcoholism, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health developed a needs assessment consisting of four studies:

...Focus groups with problem gamblers, families of problem gamblers, and personnel involved with the treatment of problem gambling.

...A survey of Delaware residents to gauge the prevalence of compulsive gambling.

...A survey of problem gamblers to explore the clinical aspects of compulsive gambling.

...A study of social indicators, concentrating on gambling problems revealed through court records.

This report summarizes focus groups on problem gambling conducted in 1997 and 1998. Five focus groups were conducted at the University of Delaware in Newark. The first two focus groups consisted of treatment professionals who specialized in the treatment of compulsive gamblers. Participants were recruited from a list of treatment professionals provided by the Division of Health and Social Services. Respondents were advised that no names or identities would be revealed in this report. By guaranteeing anonymity, a climate was established that encouraged participants to speak as candidly as possible, without concern about possible negative reactions from fellow professionals or others with special relationships to either the treatment community or the gaming industry. The third and fourth focus groups consisted of problem gamblers. The fifth group was made up of families of problem gamblers. Problem gamblers and families of compulsive gamblers were recruited mainly from classified advertisements placed in the Wilmington News Journal. Potential participants were administered a brief screening questionnaire by telephone. Those who did not qualify as a problem gambler or as a family member of a problem gambler were thanked and excused from the focus groups.

The focus groups averaged two hours each and were made up of four to ten participants. The interviews were moderated by Robert Wilson, with the assistance of Jennifer Collins and Patricia Powell. The analysis, which follows, is based on audiotapes.

THE FOCUS GROUP CONCEPT

Focus group interviews employ a qualitative approach to interviewing as distinct from a standard questionnaire. What distinguished the qualitative approach from the quantitative is not primarily the use of statistics, but rather in that the qualitative research design is based on general set of hypotheses which are elaborated and retested throughout the research, whereas quantitative research tends to specify a set of hypotheses (research and null) before the data are collected and analyzed. The group interview allows for a series of mini hypotheses tests as the session unfolds. In contrast, the typical one-on-one survey relies on a single set of hypotheses that are either rejected or accepted after the survey is completed.

In the study the research questions concern the nature of problem gambling in the State of Delaware. These interviews are exploratory and serve to generate a model of how people perceive gambling problems. As the approach is refined over subsequent interviews, a series of predictable stages of group process and information processing may emerge. As the research is conducted, subsequent groups may test the model in a more highly structured group interview. The hypotheses, at this point, will be pre-specified with little room for deviation or serendipity. A focus group is hypothesized to progress through a series of specific stages. What differentiates this kind of group interview from those of the initial qualitative stages is that the emphasis at this later stage has now shifted from hypothesis generation (using descriptive data) to hypothesis testing, using the principles of statistical inference.

What distinguishes the typical focus group from other interviews is (Merton, Fiske, and Kendall, 1990, p.3):

The respondents have a very specific experience or characteristic in common. They belong to a very specific category of person that perceives a situation based on membership in that strata.

This stratification provides a set of plausible research assumptions for the analyst. Based on previous knowledge, the analyst can develop a number of research questions that form the basis for some general hypotheses that are translated into an interview guide.

The participants are presented with a series of preset prompts (questions or stimuli) contained in the interview guide.

The participants respond to these preset probes based on their own definition of the situation. The experiences, words, and personal context become the essence of the qualitative dimension of the research.

FOCUS GROUP 1: TREATMENT PROFESSIONAL GROUP

RECRUITMENT AND BRIEFING PROCEDURES

Focus groups rarely represent a random sample, which is why their results are not generalizable to the larger population. Taking this into account, the eight participants were chosen from both public and private organizations that provide health and social services to problem gamblers. Names of possible participants from the public sector were obtained from the State of Delaware, Division of Alcoholism, Drug Abuse and Mental Health. Participants from the private sector were obtained from a referral list provided by the Delaware Council on Gambling Problems. All persons referred by both organizations were invited to participate over the course of two focus groups. Many were unable to participate, or found their knowledge of compulsive gambling too limited. Participants from the private sector were obtained from a referral list provided by the Delaware Council on Gambling Problems. Therefore the remaining participants were split into two groups.

The participants were selected because they provide services or supervise service delivery to people with addictions. They are the service providers who would most likely encounter problem gamblers and have an expert knowledge of the treatment needs of problem gamblers. The participants were advised that the subject of the study was problem gambling in Delaware and that the purpose of the focus group was to assess the treatment needs of problem gamblers.

OBJECTIVES.

The objectives of this focus group were to:

- ...Determine the level of awareness of problem gambling issues among treatment and service professionals.
- ...Identify the treatment needs of compulsive gamblers.
- ...Investigate the extent of Delaware as seen by these professionals through their experiences with patients and clients.

The first task of this focus group was to initiate a discussion about gambling in general to determine the knowledge and attitudes that the participants held. In order for a treatment professional to gauge the needs of clients, they must have an adequate comprehension of the clinical dimensions of problem gambling and the social service needs of problem gamblers. If they provide therapy, they must have an understanding of the diagnostic techniques and treatment regimens that are appropriate for treating gambling problems. By assessing the general depth of knowledge regarding problem gambling, we gauged the readiness of the treatment community to treat an increasing number of persons with a variety of gambling-related problems.

The next part of the discussion focused on the treatment services that are currently available to problem gamblers in the State. The different treatment modalities and services mentioned by participants were noted. The different treatment modalities for pathological gambling were discussed with particular attention to gaps in the continuum of care. Finally, the most experienced professionals discussed barriers to effective service that compulsive gamblers encountered during the treatment process.

The third objective of the focus group discussion was to gain some perspective on the public dimensions of problem gambling in Delaware, as seen by treatment professionals. The group talked about the number of compulsive gamblers they had seen in the past, the number they were seeing currently, and the difference in the levels presenting for treatment from before and after advent of slot machines in Delaware.

SUMMARY.

What is the general experience of treatment professionals with compulsive gamblers?

The group had a moderate amount of experience with the treatment of gambling problems. Most of their experience with gamblers was directly related to their involvement with the Delaware Council on Gambling Problems and whether they were on the Council's list of preferred counselors.

Group members recognized a recent increase in gamblers presenting for treatment after the initiation of slot machine gambling in Delaware. Many had noticed an increase in the number of women gamblers as well.

"About six weeks after the slots opened here in Wilmington, I got my first referral. A woman who was a working, married mother, who had never gambled before in her life. She had gone through about \$7,000 in six weeks and her husband was about to kill her. They were in dire financial straits. Since then I have been getting maybe about one or two referrals every 6-8 weeks of that nature, prior to the slots opening that was not the case."

Some professionals related that women were more likely to be slot players, while men seemed more likely to sports bettors.

"I have about half and half. Half are slot players, half are sports bettors."

Several participants noted the absence of a quick and effective screening tool for alcohol abuse, drug abuse, and problem gambling. Another major problem is the amount of time diagnosis takes, thereby wasting time that could be better spent on treating the client. Finally, some who were in private practice felt their experience with treating problem gamblers was largely unrewarding. Gamblers rarely had the money or desire to stay in therapy or counseling. There were also co-occurring problems that rendered the treatment of pathological gamblers more difficult.

What are the associated social issues you have encountered in treating gamblers?

The focus group members identified many co-occurring problems that compulsive gamblers encounter. One member related that a majority of her gambling patients were involved with the criminal justice system at some level.

"We have the Drug Court portion (of patients) for Kent/Sussex County so, of all the clients that we see, probably 95% of them have some sort of history with the criminal justice system."

Another group member lamented that often by the time they saw gamblers for treatment, their clients' lives were usually in a shambles.

"There's such a level of chronicity, such damage. We are going to see more and more people ending up in corrections and again we're going to be paying out of pocket for these three strikes and your out, because they've had charges related to their gambling. And, I as a taxpayer don't want to see that. I'd rather prevent them, educate them, treat them before they even get there."

Others relayed that many of their male gamblers had started gambling as children. If this is so, prevention efforts should be targeted to the younger age groups. Group members related that many of their compulsive gamblers also has Access 1 or Access 2 diagnosis, such as depression, dysthymia, bipolar disorder, anti-social personality disorder or narcissistic personality disorder. Therefore, many compulsive gamblers require both therapy and medication, depending on the severity of their disorder. Additional issues raised by group members were:

Gambling appears to siphon consumer dollars away from other businesses, which is damaging to those surrounding businesses.

Many gamblers are apparently forced into treatment against their will. Are treatment professionals violating patient rights by treating them? Prevention and treatment are necessary. If the State is going to profit from this activity, than the State need to fund efforts to reduce the incidence of problem gambling.

CONCLUSION.

Treatment professionals are becoming more aware of compulsive gambling as a problem. While effective screening is difficult, the methodology is being spread to treatment professionals. According to this group, addictions counselors and addictions specialists are probably the best personnel to handle treatment of compulsive gambling until more specialized counselors can be made available. The State needs to educate the public, especially teens about what gambling can do to people's lives. Education and treatment will provide a greater understanding of compulsive gambling and possibly a decrease in the incidence of problem gambling.

FOCUS GROUP 2: TREATMENT PROFESSIONAL GROUP 2

Recruitment procedures and objectives for the second group of professional treatment providers were identical to those of the first focus group.

Are you seeing pathological gamblers in your treatment practice?

I have seen 10 gamblers. There all escape gamblers, not action, non-skilled gamblers. They play the slots, bingo, and pull-tabs. I haven't seen any horse gamblers or sports gamblers, and sports gambling is the largest form of gambling in the U.S.

All four of the group participants had treated compulsive gamblers. However, many of the gamblers had come in with gambling as a second (Access 2: diagnosis). They had presented for treatment due to some other Access 1 disorder.

The other group members had unusual demographics for compulsive gamblers because the majority were female (Compulsive gamblers are more likely to be male). Almost all of these women were escape, non-action, and non-skill gamblers. Women more frequently fall into this category, and the slots, unlike Black Jack or poker, are a non-skilled game. Thus, the mere availability of this game over other venues may be the reason for the preponderance of females.

What are some of the major problems that pathological gamblers face?

The most common problem, according to this group, is the co-occurring psychiatric problems of pathological gamblers. Many pathological gamblers who have come in for treatment have other Access 1 disorders. One treatment professional emphasized that all five of his compulsive gamblers were dually-diagnosed: Three bi-polar, one depressed, and one generalized anxiety. (As a side-note it was verified that those with bi-polar diagnoses were gambling in between manic episodes, so the diagnosis is correct). These five were all male, four skill gamblers, one luck gambler. Many also had serious Access 2 disorders, in addition to compulsive gambling. One has paranoid personality disorder and three are suspected of having anti-social personality disorder.

"I had two people come in with depression as well, no mania. Three or four with an Access 2 disorder; a high-probability of diagnosis of anti-social or avoidance. All were older, between 40-75. Eight of ten were women."

Group members noted that many gamblers in their winning phases seem to exhibit narcissism. This characteristic makes them very hard to treat, because they feel that they are in total control and do not require assistance.

"A lot of action gamblers have that. The illusion of control. I can pick that horse, I can pick that team."

Most of these treatment professionals felt that the best option for treatment professionals trying to help a pathological gambler in this state was to simply wait until they "crashed and burned" and then treat the depression. Put another way, gamblers are often difficult or even impossible to treat until they reach the losing or desperation phases of their illness.

What are treatment professionals' views on Delaware's public policies with respect to pathological gambling?

In general, the group members expressed concern about the need to educate both the public and treatment professionals about pathological gambling. Many treatment professionals are more concerned with other pressing mental health issues and may not pursue the gambling problem. Even among treatment professionals, it seems that problem gambling might be considered "a moral problem rather than a medical problem".

"I think there is interesting work to be done, surveying attitudes and biases of counselors; people in the mental health field. We are finding a lot of it in people. They view gambling through the moral model (like the old drug/alcohol model, gambling still comes under the moral model). I did an in-service and had people directly say 'It is a weakness of will; just quit, just say no'."

If this view predominates, then much work needs to be done to educate treatment professionals about the extent of pathological gambling and the negative consequences attached to it. It should be noted that the Delaware Council on Gambling Problems is working to extend the awareness of pathological gambling as an addiction. This organization has also begun to offer training for treatment professionals.

CONCLUSION.

This group was in total agreement that there is a great need to continue the effort to educate the public and treatment professionals about pathological gambling. Not only are many unaware of the negative potential problem gambling can have, they may also be unaware of any resources that are available to problem gamblers.

Finally, it appears, based on this group, that pathological gamblers are a population that has a multitude of social service needs. Treatment professionals emphasized that problem gambling troubled population with psychiatric and substance abuse problems.

FOCUS GROUP 3: SOCIAL/ACTIVE GAMBLERS

RECRUITMENT AND BRIEFING PROCEDURES.

The eight participants in this group were volunteers who had completed our clinical interview (which they also had to volunteer for) which is a larger, more formal interview procedure. From this population, we were able to schedule two focus groups. The groups were split for two reasons, the first being desired group size. Focus groups should not become so large that it is difficult for the participant to participate in the discussion. The second reason the groups were split was in an attempt to accommodate the two types of gamblers who volunteered to participate. The first group were those that were retired, non-working, or older persons. These people wanted to attend a day session. The second group was made up of younger or employed people. This group preferred to attend a night session. Since it seemed advantageous to represent both segments of the volunteer population, the respondents were assigned accordingly.

These gamblers were selected to participate because they were actively gambling on a weekly basis or more often. This group was composed of both social and more problematic gamblers. Both types would have an idea about the effects legalized gambling may be having on the community. Prior to attending the focus group discussions, participants were told that a study was being conducted on gambling in the State and that a discussion was being held among active gamblers to gain their opinions about gambling. No other discussion topics were mentioned in order to avoid biasing future responses.

OBJECTIVES.

The objectives of this focus group were to:

Determine the active gamblers' experiences and perceptions about gambling.

Analyze the gambling population's view of state-supported gambling.

Obtain the gambling population's opinion on what policies, if any, the State should modify or change.

The first task of the focus group was to initiate an informal discussion of gambling in order to ascertain the basic attitudes and level of knowledge that each participant possessed in the subject area. In order for the participants to be able to provide us with a picture of the active gambler's view of gambling. They had to be frequent gamblers and also be fluent in the gambling lingo. Without this basic qualification, they would have been unable to focus meaningfully as a focus group.

Also, the screening interview gave qualifying participants a sense that they were knowledgeable enough to contribute something of value. This greatly facilitated the

ensuring discussion. The initial discussion enabled us to identify two pathological gamblers among the participants, a few problem gamblers and the several frequent social gamblers that rounded out the group. With this commonality of experience and problem severity we were able to engage the group in an in-depth discussion of problem gambling from a very "inside" perspective.

The next part of the discussion focused around what was happening in the gambling "scene" currently. The group was asked about their experiences gambling and their opinions on having legalized gambling within the State. Their views on state supported gambling and the issue of the surplus revenue that the state was receiving were also addressed.

The next part of the discussion focused around what was happening in the gambling "scene" currently. The group was asked about their experiences gambling and their opinions on having legalized gambling within the State. Their views on state supported gambling and the issue of the surplus revenue that the state was receiving were also addressed.

The last part of the discussion focused on problems or side effects of gambling that the participants had noticed. They were asked to speak candidly about any concerns that they felt the State should be addressing. In this context they provided us with some surprising insights into situations that were transpiring in and around the three Delaware slots venues.

SUMMARY.

"It's too handy."

While many of the people in the focus group had gambled before, they had never done so to the extent that they do now that the slots exist in Delaware. Before the advent of slot machines in Delaware people went to Atlantic City, maybe once or twice a year, for a weekend. This was considered a vacation, not a weekly activity. People stated that they were receiving "comps" in the mail now from Atlantic city asking them to come back down, something usually reserved for high rollers. However, with the existence of the Delaware slots, Atlantic City casinos have lost much of their Delaware constituency. People from Delaware now go to the slots on their way home from work, when they want to get out of the house, or even to get away from their kids. Yet, the participants expressed that it was more like getting out of the house, than going on vacation. This attitude suggests that as with alcohol and cigarettes, availability does effect utilization. According to these gamblers, the more geographically accessible the game, the more Delawareans will gamble.

"You can get addicted. You just keep going back and going back."

While most of the participants in the group were social gamblers, there were two pathological gamblers. They spoke of the desperation and family problems that they

were encountering. They were also experiencing extreme financial hardship. Their families and loved ones were angry and threatening. One man reported suffering from Taisochs disorder and appeared to be severely depressed, however this is not a confirmed diagnosis as no proper screening occurred for the latter disorder. The pathological gamblers were both men and they were both on Social Security. One participant put it this way:

"The people who are hurting the most in Delaware with the gambling are those who can't afford it. Those on Social Security, welfare, the poor, and the retired."

If this perception is valid, this brings us to our next finding.

"The State should be worried."

Many in the group liked the slots, but agreed that they were now a little too convenient. All agreed that the State had major issues that were unaddressed. All expressed an interest in seeing more of the State's "surplus" of revenue be directed to education, treatment and making Gamblers Anonymous more readily available to those in need.

Pathological gambling brings with it many co-occurring problems: family relationships, finances, substance abuse and resulting mental illness to name a few. The State must be prepared to deal with these and other problems associated with legalized gambling. One suggestion made was to define problem gambling with recognizable symptoms that are universally recognizable to gamblers, owners, family members, and treatment professionals alike.

One experience as related by a participant, reveals the nature of such pathological behavior.

"My doctor was saying there is a new syndrome that is occurring. I was there, at the hospital when they brought two ladies in, one was 81, one was 89, and they actually had a fight, knocked each other down, and both of them have broken hips. He said this type of thing has become enough of a problem now, that they are calling it a syndrome. This is not a joke. This is happening to our senior citizens."

CONCLUSIONS.

The opinions and observations of the focus group provide some important insights into where we may need to direct further study. The slots are an enjoyable and relaxing activity for a great majority of Delawareans who participate. Slot machines have also provided the State with a source of revenue. However, there is a cost to the benefits the slots have brought to bear. The State must examine and understand these costs in order to offset adverse consequences that result from the legalization of gambling.

FOCUS GROUP NUMBER 4: SOCIAL/ACTIVE GAMBLERS

RECRUITMENT AND BRIEFING PROCEDURES.

This group was recruited and briefed with the same procedures as the previous group.

The purpose of this session was to gather the opinions and perceptions of problem gamblers about legalized gambling in the State. The approach was to recruit gamblers who participated in gaming activities at least once a week, in the hopes that they would be able to give us an accurate picture of what occurs within the gaming establishments. The participants were social, problem and pathological gamblers, but in no way do they represent a random sample. The panel shared their experiences and perceptions on the current state of legalized gambling, and its effect on those who gamble.

OBJECTIVES.

The focus group objectives were to:

Determine the active gamblers' experiences and perceptions about gambling.

Analyze the gambling population's view of state-supported gambling.

Obtain the gambling population's opinion on what, if anything, the State should be concerned about or working to change.

The first task of the focus group was to initiate an informal discussion of gambling in order to etch out the basic attitudes and level of knowledge that each participant possessed in the subject area. In order for the participant to be able to provide us with a picture of the active gamblers view of gambling, they must be fairly regular gamblers and also fluent in the gambling lingo. Without this basic discussion, their perceptions may be biases or skewed.

The next part of the discussion focused around what was happening in the gambling scene currently. The group was asked about their experiences gambling and their opinions on having legalized gambling within the State. Their views on state supported gambling and the issue of the surplus revenue that the state was receiving were addressed. With these opinions gathered, we moved on to the third part of our discussion.

CONCLUSIONS.

"I wasn't really an every day gambler, until the slots."

There are no prevalence estimates for compulsive/problem gambling for the period prior to the installation of the slots in Delaware. Thus, no definitive conclusions can be made

on whether legalization of slot machines has increased the prevalence of problem gambling. However, research shows that increased availability often leads to increased rates of problem/compulsive gambling. The above quote from a focus group member seems to reinforce the research findings. If true, than Delaware can expect to see increased rates of problem gamblers with the advent of legalized gambling. Another quote from a group member again hints at an increase in problem gambling among the state's citizenry.

"Two years ago, or whenever they opened the slots, I wasn't in this mess."

"I know two women who lost their houses. One late 50s, one early 60s, both widowed. They blew it all."

With problem gambling comes associated social problems. One of the most common problems tends to be financial difficulties or even financial ruin. The loss of life savings, a house or a car is not uncommon. Such losses may seem to be individual, the burden of which is born solely by the gambler, but they represent losses to society. The women providing the above quote may be forced to go on welfare and/or social security. These are increased costs born by both the state and by the federal government.

Such financial hardships can also cause extreme mental anguish for the problem gamblers.

"I'm at the breaking point. I've had to sell one of my cars, and I'm about to lose my house." This might lead to desperate acts, as pathological gamblers are more likely to turn to crime to support their habit.

"I still get the urges. I'll be driving by Delaware Park and the car's steering wheel wants to turn and I have to say: 'NO, NO, NO'."

Pathological gambling can be insidious. Many people who become pathological gamblers fail to recognize their gambling is problematic until it is too late. One reason for this is that many begin their careers gambling in what is termed the winning phase. The gambler rarely losses, and few, if asked would define winning money as a "problem". But, as the situation progresses, and more and more money is lost it is easy to be caught in a financial bind. The group members stated that they had all at one time or another traveled to the MAC machine in order to withdrawal more money. They were sure that if they played just ten more dollars, they had to win. This line of thinking is often known as the gambler's fallacy. This behavior can lead to uncontrolled expenditure, if unchecked by the participant or a loved one. Most people in the group, after receiving one outrageous credit card bill, restricted their gambling. This is the case with the group member who provided us with the above quote. But, many problem gamblers may not restrict their gambling until the situation is dire.

"I just want to get my money back. Its like 'as soon as I get my money back, than I'll go to GA."

"Legalized gambling is the crack for the white or middle class, blue-collar worker. People who aren't addicted to drugs."

While this may seem the case to the above pathological gambler, it is more than case that compulsive gambling can effect anyone: Young or old, male or female, and member of any race. While some groups are more likely to become pathological gamblers than others, it can happen to anyone. Gambling can have far-reaching consequence for those whose behavior is problematic, as the following quote illustrates:

Appendix I: The Delaware Assessment of Gambling Adapted from the south Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS) and Response Results

Assessment of Gambling (Adapted from the south Oaks Gambling Screen)

1. Please tell me which of the following types of activities you have participated in the last 18 months. If Yes: About how often?

If respondent participated in any of the above activities once per month or more frequently continue.

2. During the last 18 months did you ever gamble more than you intended to?
(South Oaks Item 7)

Yes

No

3. Please Estimate the AVERAGE amount of money that you spend on Gambling in and AVERAGE month. (South Oaks Item 2 - Not scored)

1 \$10 or less

2 \$11 up to \$50

3 \$51 to \$100

4 \$101 to \$250

5 \$251 up to \$500

6 More than \$500

7 Don't Know

8 Refused

4. When you gambled during the last 18 months, how often did you go back another day to win back money you lost (South Oaks Item 4)

1 Some of the time (less than half the time) I lost

2 Most of the time I lost

3 Every time I lost

4 Never

7 Don't Know

8 Refused

5. During the last 18 months have you ever claimed to be winning money gambling but weren't really? In fact, you lost? (South Oaks Item5)

- 1 Yes, less than half the time I lost
- 2 Yes, most of the time
- 3 Never
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

6. Do you feel you have had a problem with gambling at any time in the last 18 months? (South Oaks Item 6)

- 1 Yes
- 2 Yes, in the past (prior to the last 18 months but not now)
- 3 Never
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

7. Do (did) either of your parents have a gambling problem? (South Oaks Item 3 - Not Scored)

- 1 Both my father and mother gamble (or gambled) too much
- 2 My father gambles (or gambled) too much
- 3 My mother gambles (or gambled) too much
- 4 Neither one gambles (or gambled) too much
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

8. During the last 18 month have people criticized your gambling? (South Oaks Item 8)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

9. During the last 18 month have you ever felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens to you when you gamble? (South Oaks Item 9)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

10. Have you ever, during the last 18 months, felt like you would like to stop gambling but didn't think you could? (South Oaks Item 10)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

11. During the last 18 months have you ever hidden betting slips, lottery tickets, gambling money, or other signs of gambling from your spouse, children, or other important people in your life? (South Oaks Item 11)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

12. During the last 18 months have you ever argued with people you live with over how you handle money? (South Oaks Item 12)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

13. Have money arguments ever centered on gambling? (South Oaks Item 13)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Don't Know
- 8 Refused

14. during the last 18 months did you ever borrow money from any of the following sources to gamble with or to pay gambling debts? (South Oaks Item 16)

From your household money

From your spouse

From other relatives, in-laws, or friends

From banks, loan companies, or credit unions

From credit cards

From loan sharks

You cashed in stocks, bonds, or other securities

You sold personal or family property

You borrowed on your checking account (or passed bad checks)

*You have (had) a credit line with a bookie

*You have (Had) a credit line with a casino

15. During the last 18 months have you ever borrowed from someone and not paid them back as a result of your gambling? (South Oaks Item 14)

1 Yes

2 No

7 Don't Know

8 Refused

16. During the last 18 months have you ever lost time from work (or school) due to gambling? (South Oaks Item 15)

1 Yes

2 No

7 Don't Know

8 Refused

17. How old were you when you made your first real bet? (Not scored)

Scoring:

1 is scored for each item as noted:

4. Most of the time I lose or Every time I lose
5. Yes, less than half the time I lose or Yes, most of the time
6. Yes in the past, but not now or Yes

2. Yes
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. Yes
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. * Credit with a Bookie and Credit with a Casino not counted
15. Yes
16. Yes

0 = No Problem

3-4 = Problem

5 or More - Probable Pathological Gambler

Appendix II: Delaware Gambling Study Social Indicators

Gambling problems based on Delaware superior court Data, Uniform Crime report of the FEB, and Lexus-Nexus Search.

This phase of the study of gambling problems in Delaware is based on data from the criminal justice system. Both arrest data and court records are analyzed.

Delaware Superior court Cases, 1993-1997

Our search turned up only sixteen gambling-related charges (out of more than 30,000 cases). (Table 1) The charges for gambling that are shown in Figure 1 are pressed by the Delaware superior courts. The charge codes are listed below (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Delaware Superior Court Charge Codes for Gambling Offenses

Providing premises for gambling
Possessing gambling device
Engaging in a crap game
Unlawfully dealing with a child-child 18 enter remain place of unlw gambling
Advancing gambling, second degree
Advanced gambling, second degree-lottery ticket
Advanced gambling, second degree-numbers certificate
Advanced gambling, second degree-use employ device for provisions of sec 0001
Advanced gambling, second degree-concerned in interest in lottery or selling
Advanced gambling, second degree-use employ device for provisions of sec 0003
Foreign lotteries-Prima Facia evidence
Advancing gambling first degree
Advancing gambling first degree-maintain paraphernalia for bet wager sports
Advancing gambling first degree-maintain place with paraphernalia for bet sports
Advancing gambling first degree-record register anything of value to bet wager
Advancing gambling first degree-bet wager anything of value as provided sec 1
Provide premises for gambling prev conv
Provide premises for gambling
Providing premises for gambling-provide premise to another for gambling
Providing premises for gambling-prev 3 conv-provide premise to another for game
Providing premises for gambling-permit premise possessed controlled for gambling
Providing premises for gambling-prev conv-permit premises possessed control
Providing premises for gambling-contribute to support & maintenance of premise
Providing premises for gambling-prev conv-contrib support maint place gambling
Providing premises for gambling-keep maintain any place where gambling conduct

Providing premises for gambling-prev conv-keep maintain place of gambling
Possessing a gambling device
Keeping a gambling device
Keeping any gambling device-device for any game of chance for anything of value
Keeping any gambling device-buy sell or distribute device
Keeping any gambling device-partner concerned in keeping exhibiting game device
Unlawful dissemination of gambling information
Unlawfully disseminating gambling information-public until furnish priv wire
Unlawfully disseminating gambling information-private wire use
Unlawfully disseminating gambling information-engage business receive Compensation
Crap games prohibited
Gambling prohibited no person shall deal any device for any valuable thing
Gambling prohibited no shall permit gambling to be played in building
Gambling II
Gambling I
Providing premises for gambling
Crap games prohibited
Bets and wagers
Gaming tables or devices
Lotteries
Gambling with dice
Unlawful to operate any denomination or game played for money
Keeping a gambling device
Provide premises for gambling (prev conv)
Advanced gambling numbers certificate
Advanced gambling use employ device for provisions of sec 000A
Advanced gambling concerned in interest in lottery or selling
Advanced gambling use employ device for provisions of sec 000C
Advanced gambling, first degree
Gambling prohibited. No person shall operate games of cards, dice, slot machine
Gambling prohibited. No owner shall permit in his house or building
Crap games prohibited. No person will participate in the gambling form of craps
Crap games prohibited. Craps, where money is wagered upon by the chance of dice
Gambling in city park
Gambling violations
Gambling

...All sixteen defendants were males.

...Twelve of the sixteen were African Americans who were less than 25 years of age

TABLE 1: DELAWARE SUPERIOR COURT CASES INVOLVING GAMBLING CHARGES, 1993-1997

Year	Birth Yr.	Sex	Race	ZipCode (of residence)
93	1973	M	Af. Amer.	19963
93	1973	M	Af. Amer.	19963
93	1974	M	Af. Amer.	19901
93	1924	M		
93	1950	M		19707
93	1953	M	Hispanic	19802
93	1961	M	White	19809
94	1975	M	Af. Amer.	19702
95	1977	M	Af. Amer.	
95	1977	M	Af. Amer.	
95	1960	M	Af. Amer.	
95	1976	M	Af. Amer.	19720
96	1977	M	Af. Amer.	19805
96	1979	M	Af. Amer.	19805
96	1976	M	Af. Amer.	
97	1975	M	Af. Amer.	19802

Number of cases read: 16

Number of cases listed: 16

FBI Uniform Crime Report

We explored the FBI's web site for statistical data on five categories of reported crimes (1994-95): embezzlement, gambling-total, book marking=horse-and sport, numbers and lottery, gambling-all other. This search produced a total of 67 gambling-related crimes in these categories. (Table2)

The printout from the UCR search is contained in the appendix.

Lexus-Nexus is a data base that uses key words to seek court records that contain specific words or phrases. We searched all Delaware cases that were recorded on the Lexus-Nexus system for the word "gambling". This search produced 107 cases in the Delaware courts. (See appendix for case list).

...Fifty-three of the 107 cases fell within the jurisdiction of either the Delaware Supreme Court or the Delaware Court of Chancery. These cases included a range of civil actions as well as appeals of criminal convicting. There were also several cases involving the Delaware Alcoholic Beverage commission. The remaining 54 cases were heard in either the superior Court or Family court. The nine Family court cases involved divorce actions in which gambling was involved in some way. No cases from the court of common Pleas emerged through the Lexus-Nexus search. Many of the common Please cases involve misdemeanors. Cases involving these "lesser" crimes area frequently not captured by the Lexus-Nexus. Also absent were the criminal cases involving driving under the influence of alcohol.

Finally, we searched the records of the United States Bankruptcy Court for case records that contained the word gambling. The Bankruptcy Court search yielded 238 cases involving gambling nationwide. None of these cases involved a litigant from Delaware.

TABLE 2: FBI UNIFORM CRIME REPORT (1994-95) WITH GAMBLING RELATED ARRESTS

EMBEZZLEMENT

<u>County</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
Kent, DE	0	0
New Castle, DE	1	0
Sussex, DE	0	0

GAMBLING-TOTAL

<u>County</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
Kent, DE	5	0
New Castle, De	14	10
Sussex, DE	3	0

BOOKMAKING, HORSE, & SPORT

<u>County</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
Kent, De	0	0
New Castle, DE	1	0
Sussex, DE	0	0

NUMBERS & LOTTERY

<u>County</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
Kent, De	0	0
New Castle, DE	1	0
Sussex, DE	0	0

GAMBLING-ALL OTHER

<u>County</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
Kent, DE	5	0
New Castle, De	14	10
Sussex, DE	3	0

1. RED DOG v. STATE, No. 169,1992, SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE, 616 A.2d 298; 1992 Del. LEXIS 409, September 29, 1992, Submitted, November 5, 1992, Decided,
2. In re CLARK, No. 80,1992, SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE, 607 A.2d 1230; 1992 Del. LEXIS 228, May 27, 1992, Submitted, June 5, 1992, Decided, No Mandate June 5, 1992.
3. JOHNSON v. STATE, Nos. 219,1988, Supreme Court of Delaware, 587 A.2d 444; 1991 Del. LEXIS 80, September 9, 1989, Submitted, March 5, 1991, Decided, Rehearing En Banc May 15, 1990. Released for Publication March 21, 1991. Mandate.
4. TATE v. STATE, No. 293, 1988, Supreme Court of Delaware, 571 A.2d 788; 1990 Del. LEXIS 38, Submitted: May 5, 1989, January 31, 1990, Decided, Released for Publication February 16, 1990, Mandate
5. In re RESORTS INTL. SHAREHOLDERS LITIG. APPEALS, No. 428,1988, Supreme Court of Delaware, 570 A.2d 259; 1990 Del. LEXIS 42; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P95,408, Submitted: March 28, 1989, January 26, 1990, Decided, Released for Publication, February 13, 1990, Mandate
6. JOHNSON v. STATE, No. 219,1988, Supreme Court of Delaware, 1990 Del. LEXIS 22, Submitted: September 9, 1989, January 11, 1990, Decided, Withdrawn April 10, 1991; Substituted Opinion Reported at 1991 Del. LEXIS 80
7. BROCK v. STATE, No. 299,1985, Supreme Court of Delaware, 511 A.2d 1; 1986 Del. LEXIS 1142, May 13, 1986, Submitted, June 24, 1986, Decided
8. SANTINE v. STATE, No. 149,1985, Supreme Court of Delaware, 508 A.2d 73; 1986 Del. LEXIS 1080, February 25, 1986, Submitted, April 4, 1986
9. HILL v. STATE, No. 34, 1983, Supreme Court of Delaware, 474 A.2d 140; 1983 Del. LEXIS 468, Submitted on Briefs July 14, 1983, September 12, 1983, Decided
10. STATE v. MARINE, No. 308,1982, Supreme Court of Delaware, 464 A.2d 872; 1983 Del. LEXIS 462, May 9, 1983, Submitted, July 12, 1983, Decided
11. MOOR v. LICCIARDELLO, Nos. 322,1981, 335,1982, Supreme Court of Delaware, 463 A.2d 268; 1983 Del. LEXIS 457, April 18, 1983, Submitted, July 1, 1983, Decided
12. VOURAS v. STATE, No. 28,1982, Supreme Court of Delaware, 452 A.2d 1165; 1982 Del. LEXIS 470, September 17, 1982, Submitted, November 3, 1982, Decided
13. BOYER v. STATE, No. 227, 180, Supreme Court of Delaware, 436 A.2d 1118; 1981 Del. LEXIS 364, June 16, 1981, Submitted, October 1, 1981, Decided
14. OPINION OF THE JUSTICES, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 385 A.2d 695; 1978 Del. LEXIS 601, March 27,1978
15. SWIFT v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 338 A.2d 559; 1975 Del. LEXIS 630, April 14, 1975, Argued, April 29, 1975, Decided
16. STATE v. ROSSITTO, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 331

A.2d 385; 1974 Del. LEXIS 253, July 10, 1974, Argued, November 8, 1974, Decided

17. GARNER v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 314 A.2d 908; 1973 Del. LEXIS 292, September 14, 1973, Rehearing Denied December 18, 1973, Reported at: 314 A.2d 908 at 912.

18. HARE v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 3 10 A.2d 63 1; 1973 Del. LEXIS 243, June 29, 1973

19. ROSSITTO v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 298 A.2d 775; 1972 Del. LEXIS 327, November 9, 1972

20. ARTESIAN WATER CO. v. CYNWYD CLUB APTS., INC., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 297 A.2d 387; 1972 Del. LEXIS 314, October 13, 1972

21. DONLON v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 293 A.2d 575; 1972 Del. LEXIS 276, May 9, 1972

22. ROSSITTO v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 291 A.2d 290; 1972 Del. LEXIS 260, April 28, 1972

23. CLARK v. STATE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 287 A.2d 660; 1972 Del. LEXIS 337, January 14, 1972

24. STATE EX REL. BUCKSON v. MANCARI, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 223 A.2d 81; 1966 Del. LEXIS 164; 43 Del. Ch. 236, September 20, 1966

25. In re DELAWARE RACING ASSN., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 213 A.2d 203; 1965 Del. LEXIS 169; 42 Del. Ch. 406, August 2, 1965

26. OPINION OF JUSTICES, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Supreme Court of Delaware, 54 Del. 524; 181 A.2d 215; 1962 Del. LEXIS 117, May 21, 1962, Decided

27. DELAWARE v. ECKERD'S SUBURBAN, INC., No. 28, Supreme Court of Delaware, 53 Del. 103; 164 A.2d 873; 1960 Del. LEXIS 148, October 26, 1960, Decided

28. CLOUD v. DELAWARE, No. 35, Supreme Court of Delaware 52 Del. 182; 154 A.2d 680; 1959 Del. LEXIS 135; 78 A.L.R.2d 294, October 13, 1959, Decided

29. STEELE v. DELAWARE, No. 3 1, Supreme Court of Delaware, 52 Del. 5; 151 A.2d 127; 1959 Del. LEXIS 122, May 8, 1959, Decided

30. APRILE v. DELAWARE, No. 37, Supreme Court of Delaware, 51 Del. 364; 146 A.2d 180; 1958 Del. LEXIS 112, November 3, 1958, Decided

31. SIBBLEY v. DELAWARE, Nos. 28, 29, Supreme Court of Delaware, 48 Del. 289; 102 A.2d 702; 1954 Del. LEXIS 53, February 11, 1954, Decided

32. APPLE COMPUTER, INC. v. EXPONENTIAL TECH., C.A. No. 16315, COURT OF CHANCERY OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 9, September 23, 1998, Date Submitted, January 21, 1999, Date Decided, Released for Publication by the Court February 12, 1999.

33. STONE v. HUNGERFORD, C.A. No. 14494-NC COURT OF CHANCERY OF DELAWARE, KENT, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 119, March 19, 1997, Submitted, July 22, 1997, Decided, Released for Publication by the Court August 26, 1997.

34. In re RESORTS INTL. Shareholders Litig., Civil Action No. 9470 (Consolidated) Civil Action No. 9605, Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 167; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P96,013, July 14, 1990, Submitted, October 11, 1990, Decided

35. In re RESORTS INTL. SHAREHOLDERS LITIG., Civil Action Nos. 9470, 9605 (Consolidated), Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 1988 Del. Ch. LEXIS 130, Submitted: August 18, 1988, September 7, 1988, Decided

36. E. S. IANNI ASSOCS. v. STATE, No. 8111, Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 1985 Del. Ch. LEXIS 530, October 8, 1985 Submitted, November 18, 1985

37. LIPSTEIN v. DIAMOND STATE TEL. CO., No. 7763, Court of Chancery of Delaware, Wilmington, 1985 Del. Ch. LEXIS 479, July 1, 1985, August 7, 1985

38. LOWENSCHUSS v. OPTION CLEARING CORP., Civil Action No. 7972, Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle County, 1985 Del. Ch. LEXIS 408, March 26, 1985, Submitted, March 27, 1985

39. LASHER v. INTER-CONTINENTAL BIOLOGICS, INC., Civil Action No. 950, Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle County, 1984 Del. Ch. LEXIS 435, November 9, 1983, Submitted, June 14, 1984, Decided

40. LEWIS v. BLOOMFIELD, C.A. No. 2874, C.A. No. 3020, Court of Chancery of Delaware, 1983 Del. Ch. LEXIS 555, January 11, 1983

41. POMPEO v. HEFNER, Civil Action No. 6808, Court of Chancery of Delaware, 1982 Del. Ch. LEXIS 53 1, August 16, 1982, Submitted, August 18, 1982, Decided

42. WILMINGTON TRUST CO. v. MELVILLE, Civil Action No. 5077, COURT OF CHANCERY OF DELAWARE, 1978 Del. Ch. LEXIS 547, August 1, 1978, Submitted, August 3, 1978, Decided

43. WEBB v. DIAMOND STATE TEL. CO., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 43 Del. Ch. 472; 237 A.2d 143; 1967 Del. Ch. LEXIS 43, December 13, 1967

44. STATE EX REL. BUCKSON v. SPOSATO, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 43 Del. Ch. 443; 235 A.2d 841; 1967 Del. Ch. LEXIS 41, November 17, 1967

45. STATE EX REL. BUCKSON v. AMATO, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 42 Del. Ch. 387; 213 A.2d 53; 1965 Del. Ch. LEXIS 92, August 10, 1965
46. In re DELAWARE RACING ASSN., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 42 Del. Ch. 175; 206 A.2d 664; 1965 Del. Ch. LEXIS 109, January 20, 1965, Decided
47. DELAWARE v. ROSSITTO, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 41 Del. Ch. 216; 191 A.2d 642; 1963 Del. Ch. LEXIS 89, April 8, 1963, Decided
48. STATE v. AMATO, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 41 Del. Ch. 91; 188 A.2d 243; 1963 Del. Ch. LEXIS 80, February 6, 1963, Decided
49. TOLLIN v. DIAMOND STATE TEL. CO., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 39 Del. Ch. 350; 164 A.2d 254; 1960 Del. Ch. LEXIS 12 1, September 8, 1960, Decided
50. YOUNG v. NATIONAL ASS'N FOR ADVANCEMENT OF WHITE PEOPLE, INC " [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, Kent, 35 Del. Ch. 10; 109 A.2d 29; 1954 Del. Ch. LEXIS 110, November 8, 1954, Decided
51. STUART v. STUART, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 33 Del. Ch. 501; 106 A.2d 771; 1953 Del. Ch. LEXIS 155; 50 A.L.R.2d 56, April 22, 1953, Decided
52. JANNUZZIO v. HACKETT, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle, 32 Del. Ch. 163; 82 A.2d 730; 1951 Del. Ch. LEXIS 70, August 1, 1951, Decided
53. R. H. MCWILLIAMS, JR., CO. v. MISSOURI-KANSAS PIPE LINE CO., Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware, New Castle, 21 Del. Ch. 308; 190 A. 569; 1936 Del. Ch. LEXIS 19, Dec. 18, 1936.
54. DELAWARE SUR. CO. v. LAYTON, Court of Chancery of Delaware, 50 A. 378; 1901 Del. Ch. LEXIS 3, Nov. 16, 1901.
55. HUMPHREY v. BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS OF MENTAL HEALTH, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER 97A- 12-009-JOH, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1998 Del. Super. LEXIS 383, June 15, 1998, Submitted, September 25, 1998, Decided, Released for Publication by the Court October 19, 1998.
56. KIRPAT, INC. v. DELAWARE ALCOHOLIC BEV. CONTROL COMM'N, C.A. 97A-08-012-RRC, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1998 Del. Super. LEXIS 418, February 17, 1998, Submitted, March 31, 1998, Decided, Released for Publication by the Court.

57. STATE v. WILSON, Cr.A. No. 96-05-0987,0988, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1997 Del. Super. LEXIS 165, February 6,1997, Date Submitted, June 17, 1997, Date Decided, Released for Publication by the Court June 24, 1997.

58. STATE v. ROSS, K93-10-0281, K93-10-0282, K93-10-00284, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, KENT, 1997 Del. Super. LEXIS 154, February 28,1997, Submitted, May 29, 1997, Decided, Released for Publication by the Court June 24, 1997.

59. WHITE v. STATE, C.A. No. 95M-12-032-WTQ, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1996 Del. Super. LEXIS 146, March 12,1996, Date Argued, April 9,1996, Date Decided, THIS OPINION HAS NOT BEEN RELEASED FOR PUBLICATION. UNTIL RELEASED, IT IS SUBJECT TO REVISION OR WITHDRAWAL.

60. AARON v. LIDDICOAT CONSTR. CO., C.A. No. 92A-04-005, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1992 Del. Super. LEXIS 476, September 21, 1992, Submitted, November 6, 1992, Decided

61. STATE v. RED DOG, CR.A. NOS. IN91-02-1495, IN91-02-1496, IN91-02-1497, IN91-02-1498, IN91-02-1499, IN91-02-1500, IN91-02-1501, IN91-02-1502, IN91-021503, SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1992 Del. Super. LEXIS 175, March 30,1992, Hearing Commenced; April 15, 1992, Hearing Concluded, April 16,1992, Decided

62. STATE v. PERRY, Defendant ID. No. 8900-9465, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1990 Del. Super. LEXIS 203, May 14,1990

63. RAMADA INNS, INC. v. DOW JONES & CO., Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1988 Del. Super. LEXIS 105, Submitted: March 28, 1988, March 31, 1988, Decided

64. RAMADA INNS, INC. . DOW JONES & CO., Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1988 Del. Super. LEXIS 87, Submitted: March 10, 1988, March 10, 1988, Decided

65. DELMAR FIRE DEPT., INC. v. DELAWARE GAMING CONTROL BD., C.A. No. 87C-FE8, Superior Court of Delaware, Sussex, 1988 Del. Super. LEXIS 39, Submitted; January 5, 1988, February 12, 1988, Decided

66. RAMADA INNS, INC. v. DOW JONES & CO., Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1988 Del. Super. LEXIS 28, Submitted: February 2, 1988, February 8, 1988, Decided

67. RAMADA INNS, INC. . DOW JONES & CO., Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 543 A.2d 313; 1988 Del. Super. LEXIS 46, July 8, 1987, Submitted, February 8, 1988, Decided, Reported at: 543 A.2d 313 at 335. Order February 8, 1988, Reported at: 543 A.2d 313 at 337.

68. RAMADA INNS, INC. . DOW JONES & CO., Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 543 A.2d 313; 1987 Del. Super. LEXIS 1426, July 8, 1987, Submitted, September 30, 1987, Decided, Reported at: 543 A.2d 313 at 335. Reported at: 543 A.2d 313 at 337.

69. CERRONI v. WALLS, Civil Action No. 83C-MY-20, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1986 Del. Super, LEXIS 1233, May 8, 1986
70. RAMADA INNS, INC. v. DRINKHALL, Civil Action No. 83C-AU-56, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 490 A.2d 593; 1985 Del. Super. LEXIS 978, January 3, 1985, Submitted, January 23, 1985, Decided
71. STATE v. BLOUNT, Criminal Action Nos. IN83-03-1944 through 1947, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle County, 1984 Del. Super. LEXIS 770, September 19, 1983, Submitted, January 24, 1984, Decided
72. STATE v. HILL, No. N82-02-0320A, 0321A, Superior Court of Delaware, 1982 Del. Super. LEXIS 933, October 13, 1982, Submitted, October 22, 1982, Decided
73. MOOR-LAW, INC. v. STATE, No. 8 1 A-NO-4, Superior Court of Delaware, 1982 Del. Super. LEXIS 1039, August 16, 1982, Resubmitted, September 28, 1982, Decided
74. STATE v. MILLER, Civil Action Numbers N-80-11-0976 through 1019, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 449 A.2d 1065; 1982 Del. Super. LEXIS 751, May 7, 1982, Submitted, June 22, 1982, Decided
75. IN RE KENT & SUSSEX OIL PRODS., No. 8 1 M-DE- 18; No. 8 1 M-JA- 18, Superior Court of Delaware, 1981 Del. Super. LEXIS 610, April 3, 1981, Submitted, July 29, 1981, Decided
76. READ v. DELAWARE ACADEMY OF MED., No. 80C-JN-158, Superior Court of Delaware, 1981 Del. Super. LEXIS 787, May 4, 1981, Submitted, June 30, 1981, Decided
77. STATE v. WILLIAMS, Cr. A. Nos. IN-80-05-1073, et al., Superior Court of Delaware, 1981 Del. Super. LEXIS 698, January 12, 1981, Submitted, February 23, 1981, Decided
78. STATE v. HUDDLESTON, IN79-07-0841 thru IN79-07-0855 IN78-04-0357, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 412 A.2d 1148; 1980 Del. Super. LEXIS 101; 8 A.L.R.4th 113, December 19, 1979, Submitted, February 29, 1980, Decided
79. STATE v. PULGINI, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 366 A.2d 1198; 1976 Del. Super. LEXIS 113, October 8, 1976, Submitted, November 1, 1976, Decided
80. STATE v. RAMIREZ, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 351 A.2d 566; 1976 Del. Super. LEXIS 125, November 7, 1975, Submitted, February 6, 1976, Decided
- 8 1. STATE v. VOURAS, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 351 A.2d 869; 1976 Del. Super. LEXIS 127, October 3, 1975, Submitted, January 16, 1976, Decided
82. JOHNSTON v. TALLY HO, INC., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 303 A.2d 677; 1973 Del. Super. LEXIS 15 1, February 15, 1973

83. STATE v. WISE, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 284 A.2d292; 1971 Del. Super. LEXIS 144, July 14,1971
84. In re DELAWARE SPORTS SERV., No. 1321, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 196 A.2d 215; 1963 Del. Super. LEXIS 16 1; 57 Del. 1, August 6, 1963, Decided
85. WILMINGTON HOUS. AUTH. v. Nos. 312-314 East Eighth St., No. 1564, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 191 A.2d 5; 1963 Del. Super. LEXIS 138; 55 Del. 252, March 29, 1963, Decided
86. DELAWARE v. McGONIGAL, Nos. 333, 35 1, Superior Court of Delaware, 189 A.2d 670; 1963 Del. Super. LEXIS 133; 56 Del. 58, March 20,1963, Decided
87. DELAWARE v. HALKO, Nos. 637, 639, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 188 A.2d 100; 1962 Del. Super. LEXIS 101; 55 Del. 385, December 28, 1962, Decided
88. DELAWARE v. MEZZATESTA, Nos. 326, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 184 A.2d 618; 1962 Del. Super. LEXIS 95; 55 Del. 112, August 29, 1962, Decided
89. DELAWARE v. DI MAIO, No. 591, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 185 A.2d 269; 1962 Del. Super. LEXIS 97; 55 Del. 177, July 27, 1962, Decided
90. DELAWARE v. COFFIELD, No. 380, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 171 A.2d 62; 1961 Del. Super. LEXIS 96; 53 Del. 406, April 6,1961, Decided
91. APRILE v. DELAWARE, No. 1299, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 143 A.2d 739; 1958 Del. Super. LEXIS 54; 51 Del. 215, June 26, 1958, Decided
92. In re JESSUP, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 136 A.2d 207; 1957 Del. Super. LEXIS 86; 50 Del. 530, November 4,1957, Decided
93. DELAWARE v. FOSSETT, Nos. 49, 50, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 134 A.2d 272; 1957 Del. Super. LEXIS 81; 50 Del. 460, July 19,1957, Decided
94. DELAWARE v. CARBONE, No. 223, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 121 A.2d 909; 1956 Del. Super. LEXIS 8 1; 49 Del. 577, March 22, 1956, Decided
95. In re SPRING, No. 51, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 120 A.2d 558; 1956 Del. Super. LEXIS 74; 49 Del. 534, February 9, 1956, Decided
96. LIDO SOC. CLUB v. DELAWARE, No. 52, Superior Court of Delaware, New Castle, 86 A.2d 859; 1952 Del. Super. LEXIS 157; 46 Del. 582, February 15, 1952, Decided
97. TOLLIN v. DELAWARE, No. 70, Court of General Sessions of Delaware, New Castle, 78 A.2d 8 10; 1951 Del. Super. LEXIS 132; 46 Del. 120, January 31, 195 1, Decided
98. DELAWARE v. DELAWARE NOVELTY HOUSE, INC., No. 9, Court of General Sessions of Delaware, Sussex, 74 A.2d 83; 1950 Del. Super. LEXIS 143; 45 Del. 3 May 27, 1950, Decided

99. TAMBA v. TAMBA, File No. CN90-6513, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1991 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 47, August 16,1991, Submitted, September 26, 1991, Decided

100. MCWILLIAMS v. MCWILLIAMS, File No. CN90-6503, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1991 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 54, August 12,1991, Submitted, September 9, 1991, Decided

101. REED v. REED, File No. CN89-8524, Petition No. 1137-89, Family Court of Delaware, New Castle, 1991 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 6, January 31, 1991, Submitted, February 11, 1991, Decided

102. HRAB v. HRAB, File No. CN89-6193, Family Court of Delaware, New Castle, 580 A.2d 1253; 1989 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 1, February 8, 1989, Submitted, February 22, 1989, Decided

103. HARRIS v. HARRIS, File No. 1133,1986, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1987 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 153, October 26,1987, Submitted, November 16, 1987, Decided

104. MACCARI v. MACCARI, C.A. No. 155-86, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1987 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 164, August 12,1987, Submitted, September 24, 1987, Decided

105. HAUGHAY v. HAUGHAY, File No. 1417-1986, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1987 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 140, June 26,1987, Submitted, July 21, 1987, Decided

106. YUNG v. HOCKER, File No. 502,1986, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1986 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 200, November 18,1986, Submitted, November 26, 1986, Decided

107. LEWANDOWSKI v. LEWANDOWSKI, File No. CN97-06428, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1998 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 87, March 3 1, 1998, Submitted, April 14, 1998, Decided

108. BORDAS v. BORDAS, File No(s) CN95-09440, CPI No(s) 95-24315, FAMILY COURT OF DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE, 1997 Del. Fam. Ct. LEXIS 41, January 13, 1997, Date of Hearing, January 30, 1997, Decided