

Relationships between socio-economic status and lottery gambling across lottery types: neighborhood-level evidence from a large city

Hin-Ngai Fu¹, Eva Monson²  & A. Ross Otto¹ 

Department of Psychology, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada¹ and Department of Community Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke, Longueuil, QC, Canada²

ABSTRACT

Background and aims Lottery gambling participation tends to be higher among lower socio-economic status (SES) individuals, but it is unclear how this relationship differs as a function of lottery type. We estimated how the relationship between SES and lottery gambling rates varies across different types of lottery gambling: fixed-prize, progressive-prize (jackpot) and instant-win (scratch card) lottery tickets in a large Canadian city. **Design** Neighborhood-level lottery purchase data obtained from the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Commission were analysed in conjunction with demographic data. Mixed-effects regression was used to assess simultaneously how neighborhood-level SES predicts per-person lottery gambling rates across fixed-prize, progressive-prize lottery and instant-win lotteries. **Setting and participants** Neighborhoods in Toronto, Ontario, Canada in the years 2012–15. **Measurements** Per-capita sales in dollars (CAD) of fixed-prize lottery, progressive-prize lottery and instant-win tickets in Toronto postal codes. SES was estimated as a composite of income, years of education and white-collar employment. **Findings** Lower-SES neighborhoods engaged in higher rates of lottery gambling overall [$\beta = -0.084$, standard error (SE) = 0.24, $P = 0.0007$]. The predictive effect of SES varied significantly by lottery type (fixed-prize: $\beta = -0.105$, SE = 0.004, $P < 0.0001$, instant-win: $\beta = -0.054$, SE = 0.004, $P < 0.0001$; relative to progressive-prize). The predictive effect of SES was strongest for fixed-prize lotteries and weakest for progressive-prize lotteries, such that we did not observe a significant predictive effect of SES for progressive-prize lotteries ($\beta = -0.031$, SE = 0.024, $P = 0.198$). **Conclusions** People in lower socio-economic status neighborhoods in Toronto, Canada appear to engage in more lottery gambling than those in higher socio-economic status neighborhoods, with the difference being largest for fixed prize lotteries followed by instant win lotteries, and no clear difference for progressive prize lotteries.

Keywords fixed-prize, gambling, instant games, lottery, progressive-prize, socio-economic status.

Correspondence to: A. Ross Otto, Department of Psychology, 2001 McGill College College Ave. Montréal, QC, H3A 1G1, Canada.

E-mail: ross.otto@mcgill.ca

Submitted 25 March 2020; initial review completed 17 June 2020; final version accepted 9 September 2020

INTRODUCTION

Lottery gambling has enjoyed world-wide appeal, owing to the low cost of participation and compelling prize sizes [1]—for example, in Canada, lottery gambling is the most popular form of legal gambling [2–4]. Despite that fact that it is known that increased gambling participation is associated with an increased risk of gambling-related problems [5], the existing gambling literature suggests that lottery is not a high-risk activity for problem gambling [6–8]. However, studies rarely differentiate between lottery subtypes (e.g. progressive-prize versus ‘instant-win’), and

recent empirical evidence suggests that grouping different categories of gambling/gamblers may mask the effects of more harmful forms of gambling. For example, Costes *et al.* [7] found that grouping exclusive lottery gamblers and non-exclusive lottery gamblers may bias data and dilute the gambling associated problems measured by surveys. When considering specific forms of lottery gambling, recent survey-based research has found that the frequency of instant-win gambling predicted problem gambling severity and number of gambling activities, whereas lottery (i.e. progressive-prize) gambling does not [9]. Together, these studies suggest that progressive-prize,

fixed-prized and instant-win lottery gambling might be better examined as separate forms of gambling and, accordingly, might have different socio-demographic correlates.

Lottery gambling encompasses several forms, including the most pervasive and well-known progressive-prize lotteries (e.g. 'Lotto 649' in Ontario, Canada), which is relatively inexpensive to participate in, and offer potentially large jackpot prizes (e.g. ranging from \$5000000 to \$64 000000 CAD) but very small chances of winning (e.g. 1 : 13983816). These lotteries are defined by a jackpot that accumulates over time, with winning numbers being drawn at weekly or biweekly intervals. Also included in the category of lottery gambling is the 'fixed-prize lottery' (e.g. daily lottery, 'Pick 2', 'Pick 4', 'Daily Keno'). In contrast to progressive-prize lotteries, fixed-prize lotteries offer smaller jackpots, but a larger probability of winning the top prize (e.g. 1 : 10000 for Pick 4), and winning combinations are drawn more frequently (e.g. once or twice per day). In fixed-prize lotteries, unlike progressive-prize lotteries, winners do not share prize money with other participants who chose the same winning numbers. Finally, instant-win tickets (also known as scratchcards; e.g. 'Bingo') have highly variable payout amounts and odds; the key features unique to instant-win tickets are that—as payouts are provided instantly at the point of sale—there are no subsequent drawings for winning combinations, and the ticket's effective payout is predetermined rather than dependent on the gambler's choice of numbers.

Interestingly, survey-based studies consistently find that low-socio-economic status (SES) individuals engage in higher rates of lottery gambling than higher-SES individuals [10–12]. As variable-prize versus instant-win lottery gambling rates are differentially associated with problem gambling rates [9,13], one might also expect that the relationship between SES and lottery gambling rates differ as a function of lottery form (i.e. variable-payout, fixed-payout and instant-win). To our knowledge, little work has addressed this question directly. Here we examine data sets of neighborhood-level lottery purchase rates of these three classes of lottery products—obtained from the Ontario lottery commission—across diverse and demographically well-characterized neighborhoods of a large Canadian city (Toronto; population: ~3 million). Taking this approach to examine lottery gambling in New York City, we recently demonstrated that neighborhood SES negatively predicted per-capita purchase rates of fixed-prize lottery tickets [14]. In light of this work, and other survey-based studies examining lottery participation more broadly [10,11], we hypothesized that overall lottery gambling rates—irrespective of game type—should be higher in lower-SES neighborhoods. As variable-payout, fixed-payout and instant-win games differ considerably in payouts, playing experience and risk profiles associated with frequent players [1,9,15], we might expect to see salient

differences in the relationships between neighborhood SES and rates of lottery play across these forms of lottery gambling. Accordingly, here we estimate (1) the effect of SES on each of the three lottery types and examine (2) whether the effects of SES differ as a function of lottery type.

METHODS

Ontario lottery and gaming corporation (OLG) data

We acquired data for lottery products (three progressive-prize, nine fixed-prize and 124 instant-win) purchases from the years 2012 to 2015 in the city of Toronto and immediate surrounding areas (including, for example, Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke), sorted by forward sortation area (FSA) from the OLG via an Access to Information Act request. FSAs are geographical regions defined by the first three digits of a postal code (e.g. M1C), roughly corresponding to city neighborhoods. These data contained daily sales data among all Toronto FSAs for fixed-prize lottery products (e.g. 'Daily Keno', 'Pick2', 'Pick4') and progressive-prize lottery products ('Lotto 649', 'Lotto Max', 'Lottario'), and instant-win tickets (e.g. 'Cashingo', 'Crossword', 'Bingo'). OLG does not record daily sales for instant-win tickets, but rather 'activations', which represents the sale price of a package of a particular instant-win product made available for purchase each day. Thus, aggregated over time, these activations can be taken as customer sales [16]. We excluded sales data for 'Pick 3' and 'Ontario 49', as 'Pick 3' had the draw schedule of a fixed-prize lottery but a pay-off structure of a progressive prize lottery, whereas 'Ontario 49' had the draw schedule of a progressive prize lottery, but a fixed payout.

Demographic data

From the Statistics Canada 2011 Census Profile [17], we obtained the number of adult residents, per-capita income levels, highest completed level of education for the population 25 years and over and the proportion of residents aged 15 years or older with white-collar employment. White-collar employment was defined by the proportion of residents aged more than 15 years employed in management, business finance and administration, health, education, law, social community and government services, art, culture, recreation and sport, natural and applied sciences and related occupations, according to the National Occupational Classification [18]. Each FSA's composite SES was computed as the sum of the Z-scores of its per-capita income, years of education and proportion of white-collar workers, following prior work [19].

Data analysis approach

To mitigate the possibility of analyzing purchasing behavior of FSAs being comprised of mainly industrial or

commercial properties—whose lottery purchase rates primarily reflect the behavior of non-residents—we excluded FSAs with fewer than 1000 adult residents, according to the Statistics Canada 2011 Census Profile [17], which left 95 FSAs for analysis. Our data set also included sales for ‘add-on gambles’, which are optional gambles for which the consumer can pay extra to participate (e.g. ‘Poker Lotto All in’, ‘Spiel Lotto Max’, ‘Spiel Daily Keno’). We removed these ‘add-on gambles’ from our analysis, as they were of no particular interest to our research question.

For each FSA we aggregated the dollar sales value of the three types of lottery over each of the 4 years of interest (2012–15), then divided this aggregate value by the number of adult residents in each FSA to normalize for population differences across FSAs [14,20,21]. This composite measure was then (natural) log-transformed to yield our dependent measure, log purchase rate.

We computed mixed-effect linear regressions using ‘lmerTest’ package for the R programming language [22], with each FSA’s purchase rate taken as the outcome variable in the four years of interest (four observations per FSA), and taking each FSA’s SES as a predictor variable. In all models, we took random intercepts over FSAs. In an initial regression model, we estimated the main effects of two lottery types (fixed-prize and instant-win) with respect to progressive-prize lotteries, as well as the main effect of SES (coefficient estimates reported in Table 1). A subsequent model considered the interactions between lottery type and SES (Table 2). A final model considered each lottery type separately, with dummy variables corresponding to each of the three lottery types (progressive-prize, fixed-prize and instant-win) using the following syntax:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{purchase} = & 0 + \text{instant_win} + \text{fluctuating_prize} \\ & + \text{fixed_prize} + \text{instant_win:SES} \\ & + \text{fluctuating_prize:SES} \\ & + \text{fixed_prize:SES} + (1|\text{FSA}) \end{aligned}$$

Table 1 Regression coefficients for model estimating main effects of SES and lottery type upon sales, with progressive-prize purchase rates taken as the intercept.

<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Progressive-prize (intercept)	5.143	0.068	< 0.0001
Fixed-prize	−1.247	0.015	< 0.0001
Instant-win	−0.504	0.015	< 0.0001
SES	−0.084	0.024	0.0007

SES = socio-economic status; SE = standard error.

Table 2 Regression coefficients for model including the interaction effects of SES upon lottery tickets, with progressive-prize as intercept.

<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Progressive-prize (intercept)	5.145	0.068	< 0.0001
Fixed-prize	−1.252	0.012	< 0.0001
Instant-win	−0.506	0.012	< 0.0001
SES	−0.031	0.024	0.198
Fixed-prize × SES	−0.105	0.004	< 0.0001
Instant-win × SES	−0.054	0.004	< 0.0001

SES = socio-economic status; SE = standard error.

We took linear contrasts directly between the three interaction terms—representing the strength of the SES-purchasing rate relationship for each lottery type—and adjusted the *P*-values for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini–Hochberg [23] procedure. We note that because this analysis was not pre-registered, the results reported below should be considered exploratory.

RESULTS

Throughout the 95 socio-economically diverse neighborhoods examined in the Greater Toronto Area, we examined how the per-capita purchase rates of the three classes of lottery products vary with SES. Figure 1 depicts the purchase rate of each FSA for each lottery type. As can be seen from the overall purchase rates (i.e. the intercept of each of the regression lines), progressive-prize lotteries were purchased at the overall highest rate, followed by instant-win, followed by fixed-prize. In a model predicting taking sales per-capita per year in dollars instead of log purchase rates, the intercept terms for progressive-prize, fixed-prize and instant-win lottery products were estimated to be 215.98, 62.06 and 126.00, respectively.

More interestingly, the strength of the negative relationship between SES and lottery participation rates (represented by the slopes of the regression lines) appeared to differ dramatically between the three classes of gambles, echoing the overall purchase rates. In particular, the predictive relationship between SES and lottery participant appears strongest for fixed-prize lotteries and the least strong for progressive-prize lottery, with instant-win occupying the intermediate.

An initial mixed-effects linear regression revealed that SES exerted a significant negative predictive effect on lottery ticket sales overall (Table 1), and that fixed-prize and instant-win lottery products were purchased at significantly lower rates than progressive prize products. A subsequent model considering the interaction between lottery type and SES (Table 2) revealed that the relationships between fixed-prize and instant-win lottery purchase rates




Figure 1 At the neighborhood [forward sortation area (FSA)] level, socio-economic status (SES) negatively predicted overall lottery gambling. Each FSA's computed SES and log per-capita lottery purchase rate is plotted for the three lottery types. Among all lottery types, lower-SES neighborhoods exhibit higher per-capita lottery gambling than higher-SES neighborhoods, as measured in dollars per day per adult resident. The negative predictive effect of SES upon per-capita lottery purchase rates is the strongest for fixed-prize lottery games and least strong for progressive-prize lottery games. Regression lines are computed from the fixed-effect of SES for each lottery game type (see Table 1).

and SES were significantly stronger than the relationship between progressive-prize lottery purchases and SES (evidenced by the 'fixed-prize \times SES' and 'instant-win \times SES' terms, P s $<$ 0.0001). In the final model (Table 3), we directly compared the predictive effect of SES across the three types of lotteries, finding that the predictive effect of SES was significantly stronger for fixed-prize than for progressive-prize (linear contrast, $P <$ 0.0001) or instant-win lottery purchase rates ($P <$ 0.0001). Finally, the predictive effect of SES was stronger for instant-win than for variable-prize lotteries ($P <$ 0.0001; all contrast P -values corrected for false discovery rate).

Table 3 Regression coefficients for model including the interaction effects of SES upon lottery tickets for each lottery type considered separately.

Coefficient	Estimate	SE	P-value
Progressive-prize	5.145	0.068	$<$ 0.0001
Fixed-prize	3.893	0.068	$<$ 0.0001
Instant-win	4.639	0.068	$<$ 0.0001
Progressive-prize \times SES	-0.031	0.024	0.1982
Fixed-prize \times SES	-0.136	0.024	$<$ 0.0001
Instant-win \times SES	-0.086	0.024	0.0006

SES = socio-economic status; SE = standard error.

DISCUSSION

Our results demonstrate that the relationship between SES and lottery gambling rates varies considerably across the three forms of lottery gambling considered here (i.e. instant-win, fixed-prize and progressive-prize lottery). Current literature suggests that participation in traditional lottery gambling—fixed-payout and progressive-prize payouts—is a relatively harmless form of gambling, but instant-win ticket gambling is related to problem gambling [7,9]. Our finding that instant-win, progressive-prize and fixed-prize lottery participation rates are differentially predicted by SES implies that these categories of lottery gambling might be best studied separately.

Moving forward, it would be beneficial to use this neighborhood-level approach to examine other demographic factors whose relationships with lottery gambling may also differ across lottery forms. For example, different age groups prefer different forms of gambling; adults aged 18–24 years have the highest participation rate in instant win tickets at 35.5%, while lottery ticket gambling was most popular with the 45–64 age group at 70.2%. In addition, people aged 65+ report higher overall gambling rates [3,24]. Further, achieving a fine-grained understanding of these predictive relationships longitudinally may yield important insights for targeted prevention. For example,

combined with existing evidence that gambling participation rates are also associated with other social and health issues [25,26], our findings may be helpful when developing government policy/intervention to help combat problem gambling in low SES neighborhoods.

Lotteries are thought to provide a rare opportunity for lower-SES individuals to radically increase their wealth [27,28]. Moreover, the prospect of more immediate rewards—as in fixed-prize lotteries, whose drawings occur at least daily—might be more appealing to those experiencing socio-economic deprivation [29], as even the smaller prizes tied to instant-win lotteries might exert a greater impact on wealth. Another potential explanation for the relationship between SES and fixed-prize lottery gambling might be that lower-SES individuals misrepresent the odds of winning as being higher for fixed-prize lotteries compared to progressive-prize lotteries, which itself might be attributable to the heightened influence of lottery advertising in these communities, possibly owing to greater exposure [30,31]. Nevertheless, we observed that progressive-prize lotteries are, by and large, the most popular form of lottery gambling across the SES spectrum, and accordingly could exert disproportionately large effects on poorer lottery participants, as these expenditures make up a larger portion of their income, although these purchase rates are also observed to be dependent on the prize amounts [20,32].

Finally, analyzing neighborhood-level purchasing data as a direct indicator of gambling behavior, rather than relying on self-report, may yield important advantages, as gamblers have been found to over-report gambling expenditures [33], perhaps due in part to ambiguities surrounding the survey questions used to estimate individuals' gambling-related expenditures [34]. Further, examination of prize draws for the lottery products investigated here could afford assessment of erroneous beliefs about random chance that are held by gamblers [35]. At the same time, a potential limitation of this approach is that aggregated purchase rates do not afford examination of whether neighborhood-level gambling rates are driven by the behavior of a small number of habitual individuals gambling extremely heavily versus a large number of gamblers making smaller and more occasional expenditures.

Declaration of interests

None.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by an award from Fonds de Recherche du Québec-Société et Culture (grant number: 2018-BJ-206884) to E.M. and a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Insight

Development Grant (grant number: 430-2018-1114) awarded to A.R.O.

Author contributions

Hin-Ngai Fu: Formal analysis; investigation; methodology; software; visualization. **Eva Monson:** Conceptualization; methodology. **A. Ross Otto:** Formal analysis; investigation; methodology; software; Conceptualization; methodology.

References

1. Ariyabuddhipongs V. Lottery gambling: a review. *J Gambl Stud* 2011; **27**: 15–33.
2. Ladouceur R. The prevalence of pathological gambling in Canada. *J Gambl Stud* 1996; **12**: 129–42.
3. Marshall K., Wynne H. Fighting the odds. *Pers Labour Income* 2004; **16**: 7.
4. Planinac L. C., Cohen J. E., Reynolds J., Robinson D. J., Lavack A., Korn D. Lottery promotions at the point-of-sale in Ontario, Canada. *J Gambl Stud* 2011; **27**: 345–54.
5. Binde P. Selling dreams-causing nightmares? *J Gambl Issue* 2007; **20**: 167–92.
6. Binde P. What are the most harmful forms of gambling? Analyzing problem gambling prevalence surveys. CEPOS Working Paper 12. Gothenburg, Sweden: Center for Public Sector Research, University of Gothenburg; 2011 [cited 2020 Sept. 4]; Available at: <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/26165> (accessed 21 September 2020).
7. Costes J.-M., Kairouz S., Monson E., Eroukmanoff V. Where lies the harm in lottery gambling? A portrait of gambling practices and associated problems. *J Gambl Stud* 2018; **34**: 1293–311.
8. Monson E., Kairouz S., Perks M., Arsenault N. Are general and activity-specific PGSI scores consistent? *J Gambl Issue* 2019; **41**.
9. Short M. M., Penney A. M., Mazmanian D., Jamieson J. Lottery ticket and instant win ticket gambling: exploring the distinctions. *J Gambl Issue* 2015; **30**: 5–21.
10. Barnes G. M., Welte J. W., Tidwell M.-C. O., Hoffman J. H. Gambling on the lottery: sociodemographic correlates across the lifespan. *J Gambl Stud* 2011; **27**: 575–86.
11. Rubenstein R., Scafidi B., Rubinstein R. Who pays and who benefits? Examining the distributional consequences of the Georgia lottery for education. *Natl Tax J* 2002; **55**: 223–38.
12. Welte J. W., Wieczorek W. F., Barnes G. M., Tidwell M.-C., Hoffman J. H. The relationship of ecological and geographic factors to gambling behavior and pathology. *J Gambl Stud* 2004; **20**: 405–23.
13. Papoff K. M., Norris J. E. Instant ticket purchasing by Ontario baby boomers: increasing risk for problem gamblers. *J Gambl Stud* 2009; **25**: 185–99.
14. Otto A. R., Fleming S. M., Glimcher P. W. Unexpected but incidental positive outcomes predict real-world gambling. *Psychol Sci* 2016; **27**: 299–311.
15. Wood R. T. A., Griffiths M. D. The acquisition, development and maintenance of lottery and scratchcard gambling in adolescence. *J Adolesc* 1998; **21**: 265–73.
16. Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation 2017–18 OLG Annual Report [internet]. Sault Ste. Marie, ON: Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation; 2018 Available at: <https://about.olg.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/OLGAnnualReport-2017-18-en.pdf> (accessed 21 September 2020).

17. Statistics Canada. 2011 National Household Survey, Forward Sortation Area (FSA) Level [custom tabulation] [internet]. Scholars Portal Dataverse; 2018 [cited 2020 Sept. 4]. Available at: <https://dataverse.scholarsportal.info/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:10864/10517> (accessed 21 September 2020).
18. Statistics Canada. National Occupational Classification for Statistics, 2011 [internet]. Ottawa; 2011. Available at: <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/subjects/standard/noc/2011/>
19. Roberts E. M. Neighborhood social environments and the distribution of low birthweight in Chicago. *Am J Public Health* 1997; **87**: 597–603.
20. Oster E. Are all lotteries regressive? Evidence from the Powerball. *Natl Tax J* 2004; **57**: 179–87.
21. Otto A. R., Eichstaedt J. C. Real-world unexpected outcomes predict city-level mood states and risk-taking behavior. *PLOS ONE* 2018; **13**: e0206923.
22. Kuznetsova A., Brockhoff P. B., Christensen R. H. B. lmerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models. *J Stat Softw* 2017; **82**(13). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
23. Benjamini Y., Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc B Methodol* 1995; **57**: 289–300.
24. Williams RJ, Volberg RA. Gambling and problem gambling in Ontario [internet]. Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre and The Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care; 2013 [cited 2017 Nov 7]. Available at: <https://www.uleth.ca/dspace/handle/10133/3378>
25. Gupta R., Derevensky J. L. Adolescents with gambling problems: from research to treatment. *J Gambl Stud* 2000; **16**: 315–42.
26. Williams RJ, Rehm J, Stevens RMG. The Social and Economic Impacts of Gambling. 2011. 11 [cited 2017 Nov 30]; Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/10133/1286> (accessed 21 September 2020).
27. Blalock G., Just D. R., Simon D. H. Hitting the jackpot or hitting the skids: entertainment, poverty, and the demand for state lotteries. *Am J Econ Sociol* 2007; **66**: 545–70.
28. Haisley E., Mostafa R., Loewenstein G. Subjective relative income and lottery ticket purchases. *J Behav Decis Mak* 2008; **21**: 283–95.
29. Callan M. J., Shead N. W., Olson J. M. Personal relative deprivation, delay discounting, and gambling. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2011; **101**: 955–73.
30. Lee Y.-K., Chang C.-T. A social landslide: social inequalities of lottery advertising in Taiwan. *Soc Behav Pers Int J* 2008; **36**: 1423–37.
31. Papineau E., Lemétayer F., Barry A. D., Biron J.-F. Lottery marketing in Québec and social deprivation: excessive exposure, insufficient protection? *Int Gambl Stud* 2015; **15**: 88–107.
32. Turner N. E., Ferentzy P. L. The natural life history of a lottery: the importance of large wins in the establishment and survival of a lottery. *Int Gambl Stud* 2010; **10**: 19–30.
33. Kairouz S., Fiedler I., Monson E., Arseneault N. Exploring the effects of introducing a state monopoly operator to an unregulated online gambling market. *J Gambl Issue* 2017; **37**.
34. Blaszczyński A., Dumlao V., Lange M. 'How much do you spend gambling?' ambiguities in survey questionnaire items. *J Gambl Stud* 1997; **13**: 237–52.
35. Turner N. E. Lottery ticket preferences as indicated by the variation in the number of winners. *J Gambl Stud* 2010; **26**: 421–39.