



Ohio Lottery: Innovative Research Design Drives Winning

>Abstract

The Ohio Lottery was originally developed as an additional source of public school funding. Today proceeds from lottery games annually provide approximately 7% of the public educational budget. This research was originally undertaken because the lottery director wanted a deeper understanding of lottery players and insight into nonplayers. The research design described in this case is multistage and incorporates the use of both qualitative and quantitative research. This case reveals the research that guides the current Ohio Lottery promotional program that encourages play of its various games.

>The Research

When the Ohio Lottery was first conceived, it was presented to the voters of Ohio as a way to provide supplemental funding for Ohio schools.¹ The Ohio Lottery sold its first ticket in 1974. Currently, all profits go to the Ohio Lottery Education fund, which supplies about 7 % of the current education budget. Although Ohioans annually spend about \$200 per capita on lottery tickets, in recent years the Ohio Lottery has suffered stagnant sales. The Ohio Lottery is interested in stimulating more play of lottery games.²

The process started in early January 2005 when the Ohio Lottery approached Marcus Thomas, LLC³ an agency that had worked with them before on media and research projects.

“Rod Ingram (lottery director) basically wanted a deeper understanding of lottery players and insight into nonplayers,” explained Jennifer Hirt-Marchand, vice president of research for Marcus Thomas.⁴ “Rod had extensive demographic data on players, but it was obvious that what he needed was behavioral and psychographic information on both players and nonplayers.”

“I had read extensively about the metaphor elicitation technique (MET) developed by Gerald Zaltman (professor, Harvard University),” said Hirt-Marchand. Because most human communication is nonverbal and metaphors are a key bridge between direct verbal communication and more impressionistic thoughts and feelings, the metaphor elicitation technique showed promise to unlock true motivations.⁵ “We didn’t have experience at that time with MET, but MRSI⁶ did. I asked them to provide a video of a MET interview and, after seeing it, I was convinced of its potential.” Thus, Marcus Thomas partnered with MRSI to determine “why players purchase tickets and other emotional factors that motivate consumers to purchase games.”⁷

Used with permission
of Pamela S. Schindler.
© 2006.



Phase I—Qualitative—MET

Early in the research process, two additional agencies the Ohio Lottery had been using for creative development were called in. Because their work was also meant to stimulate demand for lottery tickets, input from these agencies was deemed critical to the overall success of the research project.

“We wanted to get buy-in from them from the beginning,” explained Hirt-Marchand. It also helped that Ingram considered engagement with the research vitally important for each of its agencies. And each agency had numerous questions, among them: What is the understanding of the pay-out or odds and how relevant is this understanding to making a purchase? Are purchases of lottery tickets routine or impulsive? Are purchases perceived as recreation or gambling? What motivates play? How is winning defined? What is the influence of in-store promotion and signage? Is playing perceived as chance or skill? What is the significance of the dollar value of the ticket?

“MET interviews are long, often 90 minutes or more,” said Hirt-Marchand. “Lottery staffers and agency personnel were behind the one-way mirror at every session.” During April through June, a total of 25 interviews were conducted in three Ohio cities (Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati) to understand motivations for playing lottery games, to determine obstacles to playing or playing more often, and to provide guidance for the quantitative segmentation study to follow.⁸ MRSI provided the interviewer for most of the sessions, but Hirt-Marchand wanted Marcus Thomas to develop the expertise. She was trained by the moderator, and, after observing the process unfold for 20 interviews, Hirt-Marchand conducted the final five interviews personally. “The interviewing technique is similar to a depth interview. But the moderator spends most of his or her time listening, encouraging a deeper dialog, with head nods, answer rephrasing, and constant requests for the participant to elaborate.”

Participants represented all four groups of interest: heavy player (at least twice a week), occasional player (at least once in three months), rare player (less than twice a year); and nonplayers. When using MET, participants are assigned a task to complete before the interview: They bring photos or other images (e.g., images cut from magazines or packages) that represent their feelings and emotions about the topic. In this case, participants were asked to choose images that reflected how they feel about playing the lottery, or in the case of nonplayers, images that help express how they feel about the lottery. The interview focuses on the images and what each image represents to the participant. At the end of the interview, participants are asked to create a collage of their images, writing phrases or notes near each image to capture what each image meant to them as it related to the lottery.

“In some ways,” said Hirt-Marchand, “the collage is for the participant—a means of debriefing them. Those of us that are observing the interview are taking detailed



notes, so we have already summarized the learning from the exercise by this time.” (See Exhibit OL 1-1 on the MET discussion process used for these interviews.)

“Because three to five Lottery staffers were present at each session, as well as representatives from each agency, we had very constructive discussions following the interviews, often well into the evening,” described Hirt-Marchand. These debriefing sessions were part knowledge capture and part brainstorm. “It was inevitable that we would discuss strategy—how we could use this piece or that piece of information.”

Findings. From the direction provided by the MET interviews, Marcus Thomas formed a preliminary recommendation that the Ohio Lottery focus on getting more play from all player categories as well as encouraging nonplayers to play. A preliminary strategy was formulated based on the fact that in buying a ticket, players buy the opportunity to dream. While “winning money was a reason to believe [in the dream] and a critical rationalization for playing, it was not the primary motivation for playing.”⁹ In dreaming, lottery players could see themselves as successful and thereby feel special and in control of their lives.

The interviews also revealed that to encourage more frequent play, or any play by a nonplayer, the concept of winning needed to be redefined. A win was currently defined as “hitting the jackpot,” when in reality players perceived this as unrealistic. In fact, a win meant winning *anything*, from \$1 on up. Also, significant negative misconceptions surfaced among rare players or nonplayers about heavy players. They were described as addicted, out-of-control, irresponsible, and unintelligent. These misperceptions needed to be addressed by advertising. Marcus Thomas developed a preliminary strategy for rare and nonplayers that positioned lottery play as a small indulgence, via games with simple rules, and that offered social reasons for buying lottery game tickets.

Phase II—Quantitative Survey

“The qualitative study provided us with significant insights, and was always intended to be the foundation for a quantitative segmentation study,” said Hirt-Marchand. Marcus Thomas wanted to validate purchase motivations and obstacles revealed by the MET interviews and determine if player segmentation could be refined beyond the use of *frequency of play*. An online study was chosen to validate possible messages, explore media usage, and understand actual purchase behavior.

Sampling MRSI e-mailed invitations to a subset of Ohioans from their extensive online panel. Invitees who responded were further screened for qualification. The sample chosen was demographically proportional to the state’s population based on residence, age, gender, and race. Participants needed to be Ohio residents between 18 and 65 years of age with an annual household income of at least \$20,000, with no moral or religious objection to playing the lottery. All



1,505 (1,305 players and 200 nonplayers) participants completed the survey by accessing a secure website between July 22 and July 31, 2005.

Survey and Instrument The 39-minute study covered game and advertising awareness, game involvement, frequency of play, lottery importance, lottery perceptions and attitudes, as well as numerous other demographic or behavioral variables that might be used in segmentation.

The survey went through four extensive revisions, two within Marcus Thomas and one each with the involvement of the client and MRSI. “The most challenging questions to develop were those on Lottery Importance Ratings (question 25), and Lottery Attitudinal Ratings (question 29),” shared Hirt-Marchand. “The MET findings were critical to developing these questions.” And because the study was so long, Marcus Thomas wanted to be sure that participants were focused, paying attention, and not just going through the motions. To address this, it included alternatives to three or four questions that the serious, attentive, lottery-playing participant would know were wrong or inappropriate to choose (question 6A is an example; the highlighted alternative is not available in a scratch-off ticket). In all, the data from six participants were suspect, and Marcus Thomas removed them before analysis.

Data Analysis To verify the validity of the survey, data from a 2004 phone study were used for comparison. This previous study measured demographics of who was playing the lottery, how frequently they played, and how much they were spending, but did not address motivations for playing or obstacles that kept subjects from playing. A post hoc cluster analysis was used to place participants in four natural divisions or segments, where individuals within a segment held similar attitudes about playing and similar playing behavior, but when compared across segments, their motivations for playing and their actual behavior differed.

Reporting Marcus Thomas, along with MRSI, presented results in detail to the lottery staff (November 2005) and later to the Ohio Lottery commissioners. The detailed PowerPoint slide deck used graphic data depictions to cover the extensive data. (see Sample Slides from Ohio Lottery Presentation Deck). Creative agencies were directed initially to emphasize the social reasons for playing (gift giving for birthdays, graduation, etc.) that were appropriate across all segments. Ads were developed using lottery study insights in early 2006 and started appearing 1st and 2nd quarters of 2007.

What were some of the most enlightening findings? The quantitative study verified the lessons from the MET analysis—that messaging should emphasize fun, the rush experienced while learning whether the dream of the win will come true, and the low-risk nature of the entertainment. One participant clarified the risk by comparing a \$1 purchase of bottled water to a \$1 lottery ticket—“Only the lottery ticket has the power to change your life; not bad for a dollar.” Additionally,



the study findings emphasized how important it was to be up-front about the odds of winning and the pay-out percentages. Lottery players are savvy and honesty also has the opportunity to chip away at the resistance among nonplayers.¹⁰

Effectiveness Tracking During three weeks in February and March 2007, Marcus Thomas and MRSI again sampled the MRSI online panel to determine the effectiveness of the advertising. Although increasing sales is one possible measure, deeper understanding of lottery play motivations makes it impossible to link sales increases solely to advertising. Recent advances in brain studies have revealed that subjects are not always able to remember that they have seen ads or that they have been influenced by ads—either those they remember seeing or those they don't recall at all.¹¹ So Marcus Thomas wanted to be sure that uppressed *ad recognition* was a metric that was evaluated during the tracking study. Among other metrics this second online study will include ad recognition of selected outdoor, radio, and TV ads (see ads available from the text Online Learning Center) developed and used since the first quantitative study was completed.

>Discussion Questions

1. Detail the overall research design in the Ohio Lottery case (See Exhibit OL-1). What are the advantages and disadvantages of this design?
2. Evaluate the MET process (Exhibit OL-2). What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the MET technique?
3. What measurement scales are used in the sample questions provided (Exhibit OL-3)? Why might the lottery attitude and lottery importance questions have presented the most challenge to the professional researchers?
4. Using text Exhibit 13-4, map out the likely quantitative instrument content.
5. The survey contained several questions that would alert the researchers that the participant was not taking the research process seriously (see case exhibit OL-3). Is this a good or a poor idea? Why?
6. Evaluate the MET discussion guide for the Ohio Lottery Research.

>URLs

www.marcusthomasllc.com
www.mrsi.com;
www.ohiolottery.com

>Video Resources (Text Online Learning Center)

MET Interview...four segments

Segment 1: Establishing Rapport with Participant

Segment 2: Explaining the MET Task

Segment 3: Extracting Meaning from an Image

Segment 4: Building a Collage

Ohio Lottery Ads developed from the research in this case.



>Footnotes

- 1 Currently 41 states offer online or scratch-off games and lotteries. Roughly 94% of the population resides in such a state. “Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal years ended June 30, 2006, and June 30, 2005,” The Ohio Lottery Commission: An Enterprise Fund of the State of Ohio. Accessed February 19, 2007 (http://www.ohiolottery.com/pdf/2006_CAFR.pdf).
- 2 “Ohio Lottery, *Lottery Insider*. Accessed February 17, 2007 (<http://thelotteryinsider.com.au/lottery/ohio.htm>).
- 3 Marcus Thomas LLC is an integrated marketing communications agency that offers full service advertising, public relations, interactive and research for business-to-business, business-to-consumer and nonprofit organizations (<http://www.marcusthomasllc.com/>).
- 4 Jennifer Hirt-Marchand, vice president and director of research, Marcus Thomas LLC; interviewed February 23, 2007.
- 5 MET was developed by Harvard professor Gerald Zaltman. “What we are doing is using metaphors, idiomatic expressions of consumers, as vehicles for them to transport what may exist below their level of awareness into a domain of awareness.” Doug Gavel, “Mighty Metaphors—Zaltman’s method opens the ‘Windows of Consciousness,’” *Harvard University Gazette*, May 4, 2000. Accessed February 9, 2007 (<http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2000/05.04/zalt.html>).
- 6 Cincinnati-based Marketing Research Services Inc. (MRSI), established in 1973, is a full service research firm offering quantitative and qualitative business-to-business and business-to-consumer research that supports strategic planning, product development, advertising and promotion, and more. “History,” MRSI, accessed February 19, 2007 (<http://www.mrsi.com/history.html>).
- 7 “Ohio Lottery Segmentation Study, Final Report,” Marcus Thomas LLC and MRSI, October 2005.
- 8 “Strategic Motivational Qualitative Research Highlights: Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations,” Marcus Thomas LLC, October 2005.
- 9 “Strategic Motivational Qualitative Research Highlights: Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations,” Marcus Thomas LLC, October 2005.
- 10 “The Ohio Lottery: Quantitative Segmentation Key Learnings and Implications,” Marcus Thomas LLC, October 2005.
- 11 Rex Briggs and Greg Stuart, *What Sticks: Why Most Advertising Fails and How to Guarantee Yours Succeeds*, Kaplan Business, 2006, p. 125.

Exhibit OL-2 The MET Process, An Overview

In the MET exercise, the participant is pretasked to find pictures that represent their feelings and emotions about “playing the lottery.” The participant comes to the interview with a stack of pictures, magazines, etc. The interview is divided into phases.

Phase I: The interviewer talks with the participant in detail about each picture brought, using the following questions. The interviewer uses several probes following each question to extract as much understanding about each picture as is possible. In the DVD example, the participant is asked to select the six most important pictures brought.

- *Please describe the picture you brought.*
- *How does the picture express your thoughts and feelings about playing the lottery?*
- *Think about what this picture means in terms of your thoughts and feelings about playing the lottery. What is the title or theme of this picture (in a word or two)?*

Phase II: The interviewer determines if any images were desired but not found.

Phase III: Using three pictures at a time, the interviewer attempts to identify the different constructs or themes across pictures. This process is continued until all pictures have been discussed in multiple triads.

- *How are two pictures similar and yet different from the third as they relate to how you think and feel about playing the lottery?*

Phase IV: The interviewer asks the participant to identify the most important or representative picture, then uses it to discuss how the participant relates to the picture, using a series of questions and multiple probes.

- *If you could widen the frame of the picture, what might enter the picture that might help me understand your thoughts and feelings about playing the lottery?*
- *Thinking still of playing the lottery, if you were to put yourself in the picture, where would you be, what would you be doing, thinking or saying?*
- *If you could invite someone or something to join you in this picture that would help me understand your thoughts and feelings about “playing the lottery,” who or what would it be?*

Phase V: The interviewer, using the emotions and feelings revealed in the interview thus far, asks the participant to rank order these feelings in order of importance.

- *What would you say are the five most important things to you about playing the lottery?*

Phase VI: The interviewer leaves the participant to create a collage of the images on paper, labeling these as desired, arranging them as desired. The participant is provided with paper, glue, scissors, and multiple markers. Once the participant is finished, the interviewer returns and asks the participant to relate the story of the collage.

Exhibit OL-3 Ohio Lottery Study Sample Questions.

The Ohio Lottery quantitative study was conducted online and took approximately 39 minutes to complete. Below are three questions from this extensive study. The header indicates the section of the study from which the question was extracted. The question layout has been modified to fit on paper.

PAST 12 MONTH GAMING USAGE

6A. You mentioned playing Instant Games (Scratch Offs) in the ***past 12 months***. Which of the following dollar amounts of Ohio Lottery Instant Games (Scratch Offs) have you played in the past 12 months? *(Please select all that apply.)*

- \$1 - 1
 - \$2 - 2
 - \$3 - 3
 - \$5 - 4
 - \$10 - 5
 - \$15 - 6**
 - \$20 - 7
 - Other *(Please specify)* - 8
-

LOTTERY IMPORTANCE RATINGS

25. Now please rate the following attributes according to how important they are in deciding if you participate in lottery games.

Using a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 means the attribute is “Not At All Important” and 7 means the attribute is “Extremely Important” in deciding if you participate in lottery games, how important are the following attributes to you? *(Please select only one response per row.)*

(RANDOMIZE)	<u>Extremely Important</u>					<u>Not At All Important</u>	
<u>'Win' Importance</u>							
There is a chance to win big money	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The jackpot is big	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
There is a good chance to win	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing allows me to dream of changing my life/my family's life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Winning big would change my life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>General Game Importance</u>							
Provides the rush of the chance to win	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The number of different ways to win per ticket is high	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I have the ability to participate without having complicated rules to follow	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
There are convenient places to play	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The odds of winning are good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Price of the ticket	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Is a new game/ticket	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Physical size of the ticket	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
General appearance of the ticket	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

(Question 25—continued)

(RANDOMIZE)	Extremely Important					Not At All Important	
Recreational Importance							
Is a worthwhile way to spend my money	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The money I spend helps a good cause	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery is fun	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

LOTTERY ATTITUDINAL RATINGS

TEXT SCREEN:

*Now please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your **thoughts and feelings about the Ohio Lottery.***

29. Please use a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 means “Disagree Strongly” and 7 means “Agree Strongly”. And remember, there are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in your opinions. *(Please select only one response per row.)*

(RANDOMIZE)	Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly	
REASONS NOT TO PLAY							
Confusion/Intimidation							
I would play more lottery games if they weren't so confusing	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I'm intimidated by the games I don't know how to play	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I don't feel knowledgeable on how to play lottery games	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
False Hope							
I do not expect to win the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery gives false hope	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Winning the lottery is only an illusion	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Low Interest							
I am just not interested in the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I don't think about playing the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Control (Skill vs. Luck)							
Lottery games are boring	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer spending money at games that involve more strategy	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I like to play games where my performance determines whether I win or lose	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Odds							
I don't play the lottery more because of poor odds	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Chances of winning the lottery are lower when the payout increases and more people play	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Myth							
The first few or last few tickets on a roll of Scratch Offs are more likely to contain winners than the middle tickets	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The odds of all Scratch Off tickets are the same regardless of price	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Image/Stigma							
Playing the lottery is the same as gambling	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery makes me feel guilty	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery is selfish	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
People who play the lottery are greedy	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
People who play the lottery have a problem	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery is addictive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
People who play the lottery are lazy	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Exhibit OL 1-3 Sample Questions (cont.)

(Question 29—continued)

	<u>Agree</u>					<u>Disagree</u>	
	<u>Strongly</u>					<u>Strongly</u>	
(RANDOMIZE)							
<u>Bad Financially</u>							
Playing the lottery is a waste of money	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
There is little chance of return on your investment with the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery is spending money that needs to be spent on more important things	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>REASONS TO PLAY</u>							
<u>Fun And Excitement</u>							
Playing the lottery gives me a positive feeling even if I don't win	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I enjoy a sense of anticipation when I play the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery mostly for the entertainment	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery is fun	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
When I'm playing the lottery, I get the feeling that this one is a winner	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Hopes And Dreams</u>							
I play the lottery for the chance to change my life/my family's life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I believe I can win big in the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery solely to win	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery gives me a sense of euphoria	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
If I won the lottery, I would never work again	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
With the lottery, the risk is low given the chance to win big	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
All it takes is \$1 and a dream to change my life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Impulse vs. Planned</u>							
I'm more motivated to play the lottery when I see others win	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery mostly when I receive tickets as gifts	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I only play when the jackpot is high	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Signs and advertising remind me to play the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Control (Skill vs. Luck)</u>							
I play the lottery whenever I feel lucky	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play numbers that are meaningful to me such as birthdays, anniversaries, etc.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Myth</u>							
I spend more money on the lottery the higher the jackpot gets	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery so my regular numbers aren't missed	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The chances of winning the lottery are better when the jackpot is low	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Social</u>							
I buy lottery tickets at a certain place because I know them and they know me	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
If I won the lottery, I would use the money to help others as well as myself	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery is a form of social activity for me	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Playing the lottery helps me connect with other people	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
My friends and/or family play the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery in a work-pool	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Exhibit OL 1-3 Sample Questions (cont.)

(Question 29—continued)

	<u>Agree</u>					<u>Disagree</u>	
	<u>Strongly</u>					<u>Strongly</u>	
(RANDOMIZE)							
<u>Miscellaneous</u>							
I play the lottery because I need more money	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Winning anything in the lottery makes me feel like I'm somebody	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
With the lottery, I would win more if I played more	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery just for the chance to win extra cash	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery is like a charity raffle	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>GENERAL LOTTERY ATTITUDE</u>							
<u>Financial</u>							
If I had more money to spend, I would play the lottery more	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I consider the lottery a type of investment	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I play the lottery when I have extra money	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Impulse vs. Planned</u>							
When I play the lottery, I usually go to where I buy my ticket(s) with buying lottery tickets as the main reason for going	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
When I play the lottery, it's usually because I happen to be there with an extra buck or two	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Buying lottery tickets is part of a routine for me	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
When I play the lottery, it is a spontaneous decision	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
When I play the lottery, it is a planned purchase	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Control (Skill vs. Luck)</u>							
I have a strategy when I play the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I have to consciously stop myself from playing the lottery more	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery is fair	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Every player has an equal chance to win the lottery	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The chances of winning increase when more tickets are purchased	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I limit what I spend on lottery games	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Certain numbers are lucky and are more likely to come up as winners	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Image/Stigma</u>							
Lottery is a "vice" or a bad habit	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery is a recreational activity	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I don't feel bad spending \$10 on lottery tickets	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Personal Preference/Feelings</u>							
I prefer some lottery games over others	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer to play lottery games with better odds	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
The lottery is easy to play	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I only play what I am used to playing - not new games	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Giving \$10 in lottery tickets is more valuable than another \$10 gift	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Receiving \$10 in lottery tickets is more valuable than another \$10 gift	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Lottery MET IDI'S
DISCUSSION GUIDE
Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati

Research Objective for the Qualitative Phase:

- Identify the emotional reasons/drivers why players buy tickets and what motivates their decision
- Identify the perceived obstacles or barriers (rational and emotional) that, if removed, would potentially increase playership

Part I: Introduction

(10 minutes)

Section Objective: Create rapport with the consumer, explain the general structure of the discussion

- Introduce self
- We are interested in your thoughts and feelings. All the answers you will be giving me today will always be right!
- Ask for permission to ask lots of questions—they are intended to clarify. Some of the questions may seem repetitive, some may even seem silly, but please bear with me.
- Explain audiotaping, confidentiality, and back room.
- Tell me about you:
 - Where are you from?
 - What do you do?
 - Family composition
- Verify participant understanding of the assignment.
 - *“Before we begin, could you tell me what you understood your assignment to be as you set about gathering pictures?”*
 - *How many pictures did you bring?*
 - *OK, let's look at your pictures one at a time, you can decide the order.*

Probes

Probe as/when they come up through the whole Interview:

- What does “winning” mean rationally? Is it about the money or is it about the notion of a “prize”? Is it bigger prizes? Is it more opportunities to win?
- What does “winning” mean “emotionally”? What is the value proposition in terms of how it makes them feel to “play” vs. how it makes them feel to “win”?
- What does “luck”/“feel lucky” mean? How does it make them feel? How does this relate to the “odds”? Do they know? Do they care?
- What does “fun” mean? What do they get out of it (i.e., value proposition)?

Part II: MET Interview

(90 minutes)

Step 1. Storytelling (for up to 6 pictures!)—30 minutes

Section Objective: Using the pictures as a “spring board,” understand the “value proposition” playing the lottery offers consumers by identifying the different associations consumers make with the behavior of “playing the lottery” and exploring these further by identifying the “rational” thoughts and the underlying emotions linked to the thoughts.

*How does this picture express your thoughts and feelings about playing the lottery?
(Use this opening prompt for EVERY picture)*

(FOR EACH PICTURE)

#___ Description:

Story:

Thinking about what this picture means in terms of your thoughts and feelings about “playing the lottery,” what is the title or theme of this picture (in a word or two)?

Title/Label? _____

Step 2. Missed Images—5 minutes

Section Objective: Provide the consumer the opportunity to express any additional thought or feeling regarding playing the lottery and for which a picture is not available.

Prompt: Were there any issues or ideas for which you were unable to find a visual image? Or, were you looking for a picture that you couldn't find?

If yes, ask to describe the issue or what the image would have had.

Step 3. Kelly Grid/Laddering Constructs—10 minutes

Section Objective: From the consumer's perspective, identify the different constructs or themes for the associations (how they group their thoughts/feelings about playing the lottery) as well as what are the "end points" or "poles" (e.g., good/not good, winning/losing, lucky/unlucky, etc.)

Do this process two to three times. Select three pictures randomly.

Prompt: How are any two similar and yet different from the third as they relate to how you think and feel about "playing the lottery"?

(1)

Triad Picture #'s ____, ____

Picture #____(This one is different? How/why?)

(2)

Triad Picture #'s ____, ____

Picture #____(This one is different? How/why?)

(3)

Triad Picture #'s ____, ____

Picture #____(This one is different? How/why?)

Step 4. Most important or representative picture/Photo Probe—10 minutes

Section Objective: Elicit any additional information about the topic and assess how consumers relate to the situation.

Ask participant to select the most representative image.

Introduction: "Let's think differently about this picture."

Image # ___ Description _____

Prompt A: If you could widen the frame of the picture, what might enter the picture that might help me understand your thoughts and feelings about "*playing the lottery*"?

Prompt B: Thinking still of "*paying the lottery*," if you were to place yourself in the picture where would you be?

What would you be doing?

What would you be doing or thinking or saying?

Prompt C: If you could invite someone or something to join you in this picture that would help me understand your thoughts and feelings about "*playing the lottery*" who or what would it be?

How would it react to you?

What would it be doing?

What would it notice about you?

How would it react to you?

What would it say to you?

What would you be thinking?

What would you be feeling?

Step 5: Hierarchies—20 minutes

Section Objective: Understand the different emotions and values associated with playing the lottery and how they ultimately relate to the consumer's ego/self-esteem

You have talked about several things regarding your thoughts and feelings about “*playing the lottery*.” What would you say are the 5 most important things to you? (write them on a piece of paper & show respondent). As participant to rank order them from 1 to end

What's important to you about each?

'What does this do for you?' / 'For what purpose' / 'So that: until they start repeating then ask: 'How do you know... (insert the highest level response)?'

Step 6. Digital Imaging/Collage - Get Images Out—10 minutes

Section Objective: Allow the consumer to provide closure to the emotions discussed.

Prompt: Please reflect upon the important ideas you have expressed today. Thinking about “*playing the lottery*,” I'd like for you to create a single collage, with these X images, that summarizes your thinking and feeling about “*playing the lottery*” by arranging them on this paper. Arrange the pictures so they tell your story. Have them ‘title’ their story and write the ‘title’ on the paper.

Once finished, tell me the story...

The trigger... (quickly, as the driving forces would have been discussed “ad nauseam” through the metaphor elicitation process)

- Thinking about the lottery... is this about entertainment/recreation?, gambling? Does it make a difference? Why?

- How do you decide you are going to play?
 - Is it part of a routine? Do you have a set budget?
 - What triggers (functional) you going to get a ticket? Probes:
 - How much does the “pay-out”/jackpot influence whether you play or not? How much does it influence how much you are going to play?
 - Extra cash?
 - Chances/odds?
 - Word-of-mouth/hears someone won?

The Place...

- Where do you typically purchase your tickets? Why?

- How do you decide where to go? (PROBE: are some places “luckier” than others? Do you seek those where people have won?)

- Do you interact with the clerk? If so... what do you talk about? Do you ask for advice of what to play?

The Games...

Speaking of what to play...

- How do you know which games are available? How much does advertising help with that?

- What are the different games you play? Just one? How many? Why?

- How do you decide which one to play? Based on what? (PROBE for the amount, the type, do they think a new game has winners”front-loaded”?)

- Are there games you do not play? Why? (PROBE for game complexity: if a game is believed to be complicated or simply do not know the game well... do they play or not?)

- How do you decide how much you are going to spend? Based on what? (PROBE for size of prize/jackpot, part of a routine, etc.)

(FOR EVERYONE, BUT ESPECIALLY FOR RARE/NON PLAYERS)

- What would it take for you to play more often? You would play more often if...
 - PROBE for each
 - Meaning?
 - What do you think would need to happen to ____?
 - How would you know that you got it?
 - What if the opposite is true?

(ONLY WHEN APPLICABLE)

“What if” scenarios

For each scenario:

- What do you think of this information?
- Does it change anything for you? Why?
- What would be the best way for you to get this information?

Possible Scenarios	Rebuttal
Odds are bad	Odds are good
Money is supposed for education but it does not	\$648 million was given to schools in Ohio in 2004 Profits support public education
No one wins	11 million winners in March 2005 \$111 million were paid in March 2005 \$ 1.2 billion distributed in 2004

NOTE: OTHER SCENARIOS MAY BE ADDED WITH OHIO LOTTERY’S INPUT.

Part IV: Wrap-up
