

MAG Litter Focus Group Report

Prepared for:



December 2008



Table of Contents

<u>Section:</u>	<u>Page #:</u>
Summary of Key Findings	ii
I. Introduction	1
A. Background	1
B. Demographic Profile of Participants.....	1
II. Attitudes about Litter	3
A. First Thought Regarding “Litter”	3
B. Littering Behavior	4
C. Perceptions of Littering and Getting Caught	6
III. Response to Radio Creative	8
A. Grandpa’s Pride	8
B. Commentary	11
IV. Response to Positioning Statements	14
A. Shame	14
B. Ridicule	16
V. Personal Arguments Against Littering	19
Moderator’s Guide	Appendix A

Summary of Key Findings

Two focus groups were conducted for the Maricopa Association of Governments, in conjunction with its consultant, RIESTER, on December 17, 2008, as part of the *Don't Trash Arizona* Litter Prevention and Education Program. The purpose of the groups was to provide insight into littering perspectives and behavior among the target littering group of males who are between the ages of 18 and 34. Kathryn DeBoer, Vice President of WestGroup Research, moderated both groups.

Attitudes about Litter

- Most participants classified the litter problem in Maricopa County as “big” or “pretty big.” These sentiments were reiterated when the participants reported the first thoughts that came to mind when hearing the word “litter” – people throwing trash out windows, being lazy, as well as the various types of trash that they have seen lying on the side of the road.
- Participants were most likely to admit that they or someone in their vehicle had thrown a cigarette butt out the window. The other most commonly experienced situations involved having items thrown or blown out of a vehicle they were riding in. When asked about this behavior, most indicated it was out of “habit” or convenience. Some participants readily admitted to tossing things out the window rather than messing up their own car, and really not caring or thinking about the impact of the litter.
- Participants indicated that, from their perspective, the biggest litter problems along roads and freeways were fast food wrappers and cups and tires or pieces of tires.
- Most participants indicated they do not like it when they see others litter and often think of them as “lazy” or they find it “annoying.” It makes them think less of the individual and wonder if others think that about them when they litter.
- Some participants indicated they have confronted others who litter around them, but most often it was another family member or close friend.
- Approximately half of the participants in each group were able to offer an amount as the current fine for littering and the most common amount listed was \$500. The source of this information was the signs along the road and freeways in the county.
- The biggest response to the effectiveness of a fine for littering was the question of how difficult it must be to enforce. Consequently, most did not see the fine as a deterrent to littering; they believed if they were careful not to litter in front of a police officer, they would not get caught. However, all agreed that if they were caught the fine would make them angry and would likely be a deterrent, at least in the short term.

- No one was able to cite a specific phone number or Web site to be used for reporting a littering infraction, however, most assumed there must be a hotline of some sort.

Response to Radio Creative

Grandpa's Pride

- There were two main messages that participants took away from the radio spot: first, do not litter and inform others as well, and second, take pride in yourself because you care about the environment and do not litter.
- Although all participants listed something they “liked best” about the radio spot, it was clear from their tone and body language that they did not feel the spot applied to and/or was targeted toward their demographic. Several felt that the ad was targeted toward a younger demographic, maybe pre-teens or teens but not toward 18 to 34 year olds.
- The average rating among the participants was 5.6 on the 10-point scale with 10 meaning they were “very motivated” to not litter by the radio spot.

Commentary

- The messages that clearly resounded with group participants were the amount of the fine for littering (\$500) and the fact that littering has consequences.
- The participants seemed to relate to the ad better than the first spot and found it interesting and humorous. It seemed as though they could see themselves in that situation if that happened to one of their friends.
- The average rating for the “Commentary” radio spot was notably higher than the rating for “Grandpa's Pride” (7.6 vs. 5.6). In fact, all but four of the participants gave a motivation rating of seven or higher and none of the participants gave a one to three rating.

Response to Positioning Statements

Shame Statement

- Most participants saw the statement as a call to action – littering is a problem and something needs to be done about it. Several saw it as placing the blame for littering on all residents, not just those who litter.
- The average motivation rating given by the participants to the “shame” positioning statement was 6.5, with 10 of the 19 participants giving a rating of at least seven on the 10-point scale.

- Participants in both groups did not feel this positioning statement was as effective as the “ridicule” statement. They felt this was more “preachy” and “aggressive” and possibly could be taken as litter is “everyone’s problem” and therefore no one will be motivated to do something as an individual.
- The average likeability rating for the “shame” statement was 6.1 on the 10-point scale.

Ridicule Statement

- Participants felt the “ridicule” positioning statement brought to mind the concept of individual responsibility/accountability and that it was time to enforce and punish those who litter.
- Interestingly, despite the more positive verbal response to the “ridicule” positioning statement, the motivation ratings were essentially the same, with an average rating of 6.5 on the 10-point scale.
- Again, surprisingly based on the verbal comments, the average likeability rating for the “ridicule” statement also was lower at 5.9 with 11 of the 19 participants giving a rating of six or lower.

Response to Positioning Statements

- When asked what would motivate them to stop littering, most participants talked about more visible enforcement as the primary deterrent. They did not hear or see reports about people being punished for littering, and as a result, they did not think of it as a big deal.
- Finally, each participant was asked to write down what they would tell a friend or peer in order to persuade that individual not to litter. The main themes of the messages written by participants were to reinforce the fine for littering and to emphasize the need for personal responsibility in taking care of the environment.

I. Introduction

A. Background and Methodology

Two focus groups were conducted for the Maricopa Association of Governments, in conjunction with its consultant, RIESTER, on December 17, 2008, as part of the *Don't Trash Arizona* Litter Prevention and Education Program. The purpose of the groups was to provide insight into littering perspectives and behavior among the target littering group of males who are between the ages of 18 and 34. Kathryn DeBoer, Vice President of WestGroup Research, moderated both groups.

It is important to keep in mind the relatively small sample size; summary comments are provided for reference and to give insight into the “flavor” of the attitudes and opinions of the participants and should be used for insights, but not as conclusive or statistically meaningful findings.

B. Demographic Profile of Participants

Table 1 shows the overall demographics of participants. The following criteria were used for recruiting focus groups participants:

- Males between the ages of 18 and 34.
- Admitted to littering in the past three months.
- Representatives from all areas of Maricopa County.

Table 1: Participant Demographics

Characteristic	Total (n=19)
Age	
18 to 24	10
25 to 34	9
Area of Residence	
East Valley	6
Phoenix	7
West Valley	6
Marital Status	
Single	12
Married	7
Employment	
Full-time	9
Part-time	3
Student/not employed	7
Income	
Under \$30,000	5
\$30,000 to \$40,000	5
\$40,000 to \$60,000	4
More than \$60,000	5

II. Attitudes about Litter

A. First Thought Regarding “Litter”

Participants began the group discussion by first indicating how big of a problem they felt litter was along the roads and highways in Maricopa County and then were asked to write down the first thing that came to their mind when they heard the word “litter.”

Most participants classified the litter problem in Maricopa County as “big” or “pretty big.” They felt that they see garbage “everywhere” along the roads – from paper to tires to furniture. Without prompting, most felt that residents just “don’t care” and are “lazy” when it comes to properly taking care of their garbage.

These sentiments were reiterated when the participants reported the first thoughts that came to mind when hearing the word “litter” – people throwing trash out windows, being lazy, as well as the various types of trash that they have seen laying on the side of the road.

- *Lazy*
- *Trash, fast food wrappers*
- *People throwing stuff out the window*
- *People throwing trash on the floor out in the open*
- *Trash, garbage, waste*
- *Trash, carelessness, keep clean*
- *Lazy, rubber tire shreds.*
- *Trash every where, messy*
- *Everyone*
- *Remember*
- *Cigarette butts*
- *Broken glass on the side of the road*
- *Cups*
- *Bottles and cans on roadside*
- *Trash, paper wrappers*
- *Lazy people*
- *Scraps, plastic, paper*
- *Trash*
- *Trash, dirty*

B. Littering Behavior

Prior to the start of the group discussions, participants completed a brief survey regarding various littering situations. They were asked to indicate which situations they had encountered in the past three months.

Participants were most likely to admit that they or someone in their vehicle had thrown a cigarette butt out the window (16 of 19). When asked about this behavior, most indicated it was out of “habit” or convenience. They flick the ashes out the window already and it just follows that when the cigarette was done, to flick it out the window as well. Most indicated they rationalize this behavior since cigarette butts are small. However, at least a few indicated that it was hypocritical to criticize others for tossing paper, cups, and other larger items out the window, while throwing out their own cigarette butts. A few members in both groups faulted the auto manufacturers for not putting ashtrays in cars anymore, “forcing” them to toss the butts out the window.

The other most commonly experienced situations involved having items thrown or blown out of a vehicle they were riding in. Some participants readily admitted to tossing things out the window rather than messing up their own car, and really not caring or thinking about the impact of the litter. It was a convenience issue. Others talked about having someone in their car throw things out the window, and the frustration and/or embarrassment that causes them. They saw it as careless or lazy behavior and indicated they would yell or confront the offending party. Others felt the situations were “accidental,” where the items simply blew out of the car or truck bed – the offense was not intentional.

Table 2: Littering Behavior

Littering Behavior	Total (n=19)
Rather than keep a cigarette butt in the car, you or someone in the vehicle you were in threw the cigarette butt out the window	16
You noticed that some trash fell out of a pick-up or other vehicle you were driving or riding in.	13
You threw out a small item from your vehicle, like a candy wrapper, scrap paper or something like that.	13
Someone in a vehicle you were in threw out a can, bottle, or other litter out onto the side of the road.	12
Someone in a vehicle you were in threw out trash in an area that already had lots of litter.	9
Rather than keep a beverage container in the car, you, or someone in a vehicle you were in, threw out a can or bottle.	7
You had problems with a vehicle and left debris like tire, part of a tire, or other stuff on the roadside.	4
You or someone you were with got a ticket or warning for littering.	0

Participants were asked to list the items they most often see along the roads and freeways in Maricopa County and then indicate which items are the biggest problems. **Items listed as the biggest problems by participants in both groups were fast food wrappers and cups and tires or pieces of tires.**

- *Fast food wrappers and cups***
- *Tires/pieces of tires***
- *Paper**
- *Bags – plastic**
- *Cigarette butts**
- *Glass bottles/glass**
- *Construction materials**
- *Beer cans*
- *Garbage bags*
- *Car pieces/accident stuff*
- *Furniture*
- *Trimnings/hay*
- *Flyers*
- *Clothes*
- *Screws*
- *Hub caps*

(**mentioned in both groups as big problems; *mentioned in one of the groups as big problem).

When asked to explain why people throw items out the windows rather than waiting and taking care of the trash in an appropriate manner, most cited reasons such as convenience, “it’s not a big deal,” not seeing litter as a big problem, or it’s “fun” to watch the cup explode when it hits the ground. A couple people in the first group indicated they litter because “it is giving someone a job;” this was particularly the case when at a movie theater or in a store parking lot. Others felt people litter because consequences were not readily apparent.

- *How it looks, fun, if it explodes or hits someone.*
- *I am giving someone a job. I feel that way at the movie theater.*
- *Consequences are a big part of it. If there is not a consequence for something, people will do it because there are no consequences. It’s hard to get caught, if no one is going to see you, you just don’t feel bad. The consequence will never occur – you are gone from the scene of the crime.*
- *If there is no ashtray in the car.*
- *Small pieces of paper, candy wrappers. You don’t want it in your car so you throw it out the window; it’s not that big of a deal.*
- *I have a friend, every time I get in her car, every time she buys a drink and her cup holders are full, she throws them out the window instead of on the floor.*
- *People don’t see it enough to think it’s a problem.*

C. Perceptions of Littering and Getting Caught

Most participants indicated they do not like it when they see others litter and often think of them as “lazy” or they find it “annoying.” It makes them think less of the individual and wonder if others think that about them when they litter.

- *I don't think very highly of them – “dirt bag.”*
- *Angry.*
- *I don't know how people live with themselves, they are just slobs.*
- *I wonder if I look like that when I throw out trash.*
- *It does not make me feel good. I hate it when they throw out cigarette butts. It's annoying, even though it does not affect me.*

Some participants indicated they have confronted others who litter around them, but most often it was another family member or close friend. Only one or two participants reported that someone had asked them not to litter. However, most admitted that they do “look around” or “over their shoulder” before throwing trash out. Virtually all participants did not believe they will get caught for littering and only one participant admitted late in the group that he had been fined for littering when he threw a chicken bone out a window and it landed on the windshield of a police car. Yet all admitted they would feel very embarrassed if they were ever caught or fined for littering.

Approximately half of the participants in each group were able to offer an amount as the current fine for littering and the most common amount listed was \$500. The primary source of this information was the signage along the road and freeways in the county. **The biggest response to the effectiveness of a fine for littering was the question of how difficult it must be to enforce.** Consequently, most did not see the fine as a deterrent to littering; they believed if they were careful not to litter in front of a police officer, they would not get caught. However, all agreed that if they were caught the fine would make them angry and would likely be a deterrent, at least in the short term. Most participants were unsure who was responsible for enforcing the anti-littering law other than the highway patrol.

- *On the highway, it's \$500. I see the signs.*
- *I have never seen anyone get a ticket from a cigarette. I don't know how they could prove that.*
- *I don't care about a fine, that does not make me litter.*
- *I don't know anyone who has ever been given a ticket.*
- *I see the fine on the freeways. You just don't think anything about it.*
- *I would feel pretty stupid actually; it's not something I would ever want to pay money for. It's one of the easiest things to avoid.*
- *If it was \$1000 I would be pretty [mad]. I would be [mad] while I was paying it off, but afterward I would not care.*

Finally, the first section of the group ended with a discussion of how to report littering and if they would ever make the effort to report a litterer. **No one was able to cite a specific phone number or Web site to be used for reporting a littering infraction, however, most assumed there must be a hotline of some sort.** When asked if they would ever call to report someone for littering, virtually all participants were “iffy” at best and those who said they might indicated it would only be for something that was a safety hazard – such as a large object in the middle of the road – or an obvious violation such as emptying a truck bed on the side of the road.

- *You can call and someone will send them a warning.*
- *Call a hot line – there is one.*
- *Call the non-emergency number, that’s the only thing you can do.*
- *The hotline would have to be easy to do. I would not go out and fill out a form and it [littering] would have to be substantial.*
- *Furniture falling out of a moving vehicle, that would make me find the number to call to report.*
- *Compromising someone else’s safety.*

III. Response to Radio Creative

The second portion of the focus groups was spent discussing reactions to two anti-litter radio spots already developed by MAG/RIESTER as well as two positioning statements to test the impact of “ridicule” and “shame” messages among the target audience.

A. Grandpa’s Pride

The first radio spot played for group participants involved a dialogue between a grandfather and grandson about having pride in oneself and the environment. Participants were asked to write down the main message they heard, what they liked most about the spot and then rate the degree to which the spot would motivate them not to litter.

1. Main Message

There were two main messages that participants took away from the radio spot: first, do not litter and inform others as well and, second, to take pride in yourself because you care about the environment and do not litter.

- *Don’t litter and tell others not to.*
- *Teaching people how to not litter and how to tie down stuff on a truck.*
- *Don’t trash Arizona. Keep roadways clean.*
- *To inform people not to litter and look out for the environment.*
- *Not to litter.*
- *Encouragement not to litter.*
- *Not to litter and influence others as well.*
- *Don’t litter the highways or roads.*
- *You can take pride in not littering. The grandpa approves.*
- *Take pride in yourself and the roadways.*
- *Having pride in the roadways and not to litter.*
- *Don’t litter. Take pride.*
- *Take pride in yourself by not littering – Preachy.*
- *Take pride where you live.*
- *Not littering can make you proud.*
- *To be able to take pride in yourself.*
- *Don’t litter. Show some respect and pride.*
- *Even people who want to be ___ know it’s foolish to litter. There is pride in standing up for the environment.*

2. *Like Best*

Although all participants listed something they “liked best” about the radio spot, it was clear from their tone and body language that they did not feel the spot applied to and/or was targeted toward their demographic. Several felt that the ad was targeted toward a younger demographic, maybe pre-teens or teens but not toward 18 to 34 year olds. The boy in the spot seemed too young.

The participants did feel that the spot was somewhat humorous, again to the right audience, and the voice of the grandfather was the element that drew most of the comments.

- *The mean grandpa*
- *The grandpa’s voice*
- *The grandpa-grandson dialogue*
- *Grandson/grandfather*
- *The old timer*
- *The grandfather’s voice*
- *It was upbeat – funny*
- *Had a little bit of humor to it*
- *Humorous, funny*
- *It had a kid taking pride in his state*
- *It was cheesy, but if the younger gentleman wasn’t so squeaky, it might be better. I liked the emotional appeal.*
- *It stands a chance at appealing to youth*
- *The humor*
- *Informative*
- *Not to litter*
- *The fact that they are trying to get the message out.*
- *Talk about pride*
- *Nothing*
- *I didn’t like it. It made me want to litter.*

3. *Motivation Rating*

The average rating among the participants was 5.6 on the 10-point scale with 10 meaning they were “very motivated” to not litter by the radio spot. The majority of the ratings were in the four to six range of the scale. Again, participants tended to clarify their answer, indicating it would be more motivating for younger men than it would be for them.

Table 3: Grandpa’s Pride – Motivation Rating

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	3
4 to 6	9
7 to 10	7
Average rating	5.6

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this spot motivate you not to litter?

B. Commentary

The second radio spot played for participants was a commentary by one roommate on the fact that his roommate just spent \$502 on a burger, because he was fined \$500 for throwing away the wrapper.

1. *Main Message*

The messages that clearly resounded with group participants were the amount of the fine for littering (\$500) and the fact that littering has consequences. Many participants indicated they appreciated the fact that this ad drew them into the spot right away because they were curious about the cost of the hamburger and then the fact that the message of the ad was clear right away. They compared it to the “Grandpa’s Pride” ad, which they felt took a while to get to the anti-littering message. This spot was interesting and straight to the point. They also felt it was “informative” and let them know the impact of littering on the taxpayer and local drivers.

Participants also felt this ad was more age-appropriate and targeted toward their demographic. It clearly was a better fit, and had a message that resonated better with this group.

- *\$500 litter fine.*
- *Fine is \$500; not to litter.*
- *If you litter you get a \$500 fine.*
- *Throwing trash out the window will get you fines up to \$500.*
- *Littering results in \$500 fine.*
- *Don’t be a goof - \$500 isn’t worth it.*
- *Litter and you will be fined \$500; littering is the cause of millions of dollars in clean up and accidents.*
- *You will be fined if you litter. It bothers people.*
- *Littering could cost you money.*
- *The fine for littering.*
- *Not to litter, it costs money.*
- *Don’t litter, it will cost you big.*
- *There is a consequence for littering.*
- *Not to litter because it will get you.*
- *Don’t litter or throw stuff out the window.*
- *Littering costs people money and creates accidents.*
- *Littering can cause a hefty fine and harassment.*
- *Not to litter because it’s hazardous and costs lots of money and danger.*
- *It was disturbing*

2. *Like Best*

As noted above, the participants seemed to relate to the ad better than the first spot and found it interesting and humorous. It seemed as though they could see themselves in that situation if that happened to one of their friends. They felt the spot not only communicated a clear message that littering can lead to a big fine, but also accomplished this through humor. Some appreciated the other information regarding the cost of the litter for the state and the potential safety hazard for drivers.

- *The \$502 burger joke.*
- *Revealing the price of littering with a \$502 burger.*
- *The \$500 fine joke.*
- *Reinforced \$500 fine.*
- *It was funny.*
- *Fun, humorous.*
- *It was funny.*
- *Comical dialogue.*
- *It got the point off strong and it was funny.*
- *Pretty funny; was clear about the point.*
- *It caught my attention before revealing the message.*
- *The teasing, facts.*
- *They tell you it will cost lots of money.*
- *To the point and it showed that it does cost me money.*
- *Litter = consequence.*
- *Consequences.*
- *They were blunt about the consequence.*
- *Details of what the fine is and website to report littering.*
- *Taking care of the environment is important.*

3. *Motivation Rating*

The average rating for the “Commentary” radio spot was notably higher than the rating for “Grandpa’s Pride” (7.6 vs. 5.6). In fact, all but four of the participants gave a motivation rating of seven or higher and none of the participants gave a one to three rating.

Table 4: Commentary – Motivation Rating

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	0
4 to 6	4
7 to 10	15
Average rating	7.6

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this spot motivate you not to litter?

IV. Response to Positioning Statements

A. Shame

Participants were asked to follow along as the moderator read the “shame” positioning statement listed below. They were then asked to write down their perception of the main message, followed by two ratings – degree to which it would motivate them not to litter and the level to which they liked the statement.

(Shame) Littering is not a victimless crime. It disgraces everyone who takes pride in where they live and respects their fellow citizens. Most of us realize it’s a major problem. But more than half of us do not even carry a litterbag in our cars. People still throw cigarette butts, cans and paper out the windows of our moving cars and trucks. This is just embarrassing. And now we need to let them know that when they litter it brings shame on themselves – and the rest of us for letting them get away with it.

1. Main Message

Most participants saw the statement as a call to action – littering is a problem and something needs to be done about it. Several saw it as placing the blame for littering on all residents, not just those who litter. Some appreciated that the statement offered the “solution” of carrying a bag for litter in personal vehicles.

- *We all pay for anyone’s litter.*
- *We should be cracking down on littering more and not doing it ourselves.*
- *We need to take more action in keeping litter down and asking the general public to take more pride in their surroundings.*
- *Littering is wrong. We need to get the word out.*
- *Someone is upset with people who litter and people who don’t do anything about those who litter.*
- *Littering is disgraceful and we need to take more pride in ourselves.*
- *People don’t care. Tell people not to litter.*
- *If someone litters you should be offended and tell them not to litter.*
- *Littering is shameful. That I should carry a plastic grocery bag in my car.*
- *You should be ashamed of yourself for littering. Our society is somewhat to blame as well.*
- *Littering is disgraceful.*
- *Litter is ugly.*
- *People’s pride is hurt by litterbugs.*
- *To take pride and not litter and speak up when someone does.*
- *The nonchalant attitude is going to change because we are going to repudiate those who litter.*
- *Littering is a major problem.*
- *Littering should be more penalized in the County.*

- *Too many people don't care that they litter.*
- *Littering has negative consequences on the community. We need to put shame on those who can't do this simple act of respect for the environment.*

2. *Motivation Rating*

The average motivation rating given by the participants to the “shame” positioning statement was 6.5, with 10 of the 19 participants giving a rating of at least seven on the 10-point scale. Participants in both groups did not feel this positioning statement was as effective as the “ridicule” statement. They felt this was more “preachy” and “aggressive” and possibly could be taken as litter is “everyone’s problem” and therefore no one will be motivated to do something as an individual.

**Table 5: “Shame” Positioning Statement
– Motivation Rating**

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	1
4 to 6	8
7 to 10	10
Average rating	6.5

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this statement motivate you not to litter?

3. *Likeability Rating*

The average likeability rating for the “shame” statement was 6.1 on the 10-point scale.

**Table 6: “Shame” Positioning Statement
– Likeability Rating**

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	2
4 to 6	6
7 to 10	11
Average rating	6.1

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much do you like this statement?

B. **Ridicule**

(Ridicule) Littering hurts us all. Two-thirds of us recognize littering is a big problem in Maricopa County. When we see people throwing gum, cigarette butts, cans and paper out of their cars all across the county, it’s hard to believe behavior like this still goes on today. They have no respect for the environment or their fellow citizens. We feel frustrated and angry. It’s time we did something. It’s time we held them up to the ridicule they deserve.

1. *Main Message*

Participants felt the “ridicule” positioning statement brought to mind the concept of individual responsibility/accountability and that it was time to enforce and punish those who litter. The statement was calling for change and trying to motivate people to stop littering. A few criticized the statement, however, because it clearly stated the problem but did not offer any solutions.

- *Littering hurts us all. It’s closer to home with the “Maricopa County” reference.*
- *To crack down and maybe enforce laws on littering more and stronger.*
- *Not so aggressive – recognizes frustration and anger from those who don’t litter as much – enforce the rules.*
- *Litter and get punished.*
- *People should be held more accountable for their littering.*
- *Encourage folks not to litter.*
- *Enforcement.*

- *People who litter aren't respectful – ridicule them.*
- *Littering hurts everyone. A lot of people litter.*
- *People are fed up by litterbugs. They're mad and aren't going to take it any more.*
- *Littering hurts everyone, even the environment.*
- *People need to take responsibility for their actions.*
- *People who litter should be punished.*
- *Its time to take action against littering.*
- *It's time that those who litter are made to take an honest look at themselves and the consequences of their actions.*
- *Upset about littering.*
- *It's important to not litter because of the laws and consequences.*
- *Littering bothers the majority of people, now something needs to be done.*
- *Littering is out of hand in Maricopa County. The problem needs to be solved at an individual level.*

2. *Motivation Rating*

Interestingly, despite the more positive verbal response to the “ridicule” positioning statement, the motivation ratings were essentially the same, with an average rating of 6.5 on the 10-point scale.

Table 7: “Ridicule” Positioning Statement – Motivation Rating

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	1
4 to 6	7
7 to 10	11
Average rating	6.5

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this statement motivate you not to litter?

3. *Likability Rating*

Again, surprisingly based on the verbal comments, the average likeability rating for the “ridicule” statement also was lower at 5.9, with 11 of the 19 participants giving a rating of six or lower.

Table 8: “Ridicule” Positioning Statement – Likeability Rating

Rating	Total (n=19)
1 to 3	2
4 to 6	9
7 to 10	8
Average rating	5.9

On a scale of one to 10, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much do you like this statement?

V. Personal Arguments Against Littering

At the conclusion of the groups, participants were asked what message would work to motivate people such as themselves to stop littering.

Most participants talked about more visible enforcement as the primary deterrent. They did not hear or see reports about people being punished for littering, and as a result, they did not think of it as a big deal. Some also suggested community service instead of a fine. They felt it would be easy to pay a fine and forget, but if they had to perform some community service in picking up trash, it would have a bigger impact. Finally, some participants felt there needed to be more awareness of litter as a problem, with more TV advertising such as the Native American Indian crying commercial.

- *Consequence of community service. They have to pick up other people's trash.*
- *Enforcement. The traffic cameras have caused me to slow down. If people got littering tickets, it would make me think twice.*
- *Have DPS enforce it.*
- *Reinforce the fine message.*
- *Fine people who have never been fined.*

Finally, each participant was asked to write down what they would tell a friend or peer in order to persuade that individual not to litter. **The main themes of the messages written by participants were to reinforce the fine for littering and to emphasize the need for personal responsibility in taking care of the environment.**

- *Dude, did you know you could get a \$500 ticket for that? Don't throw that out the window.*
- *Yo man, that's \$500 bucks. You need to be careful because you'll never know who is watching these days.*
- *Don't be a moron. Littering is selfish and it really could cost you big in terms of a large fine of \$500.*
- *It's harmful and hazardous to everyone. There's a \$500 fine for littering.*
- *You shouldn't litter. One, its bad for the environment and two, you could get a fine. Take pride in yourself and who you are.*
- *Hey man, don't throw that. I could get a fine. Look, can you not be a pig and wait until we get to a stop and throw your trash in a can?*
- *You shouldn't litter.*
- *Hey man, don't do that because if you think about it, this is where your kids will be living years from now and if that continues, imagine all the problems.*
- *Be responsible for your actions and don't litter. Have respect for your community and take care of it.*
- *We are all part of God's creation and we need to be stewards of God's creation. When we litter, we are polluting where we live and it's unhealthy, unsafe, and dirty.*

- *Maybe we don't have to worry in our lifetime about how we treat the environment... I just hope you and I don't indirectly kill our future families one day.*
- *Do not litter because it can be harmful to the society and if you do not litter then that will be good for all.*
- *Littering destroys the environment. C'mon man, this is where we live and we need to take care of it for ourselves, for our kids, and for our kids' kids.*
- *You shouldn't litter because it makes our surroundings look like crap. If you feel it doesn't then try throwing every piece of trash in your backyard.*
- *The whole world is your front yard. If someone gave you a house free of charge, would you spit in their face?*
- *Dude, you look foolish and lazy. This town is bad enough without you throwing your crap out the window. I'd laugh like crazy if you get a ticket.*
- *Dude, that's not cool. All the girls are going green and they'll think it's hot if you place your trash in a proper receptacle.*
- *That's nice... Do you throw trash on your floor at home?*
- *It's not healthy and I'll kick their _____.*

APPENDIX A

Moderator's Guide

**Litter Discussion Guide
December 2008**

INTRODUCTION: Timing 0:00 – 0:02

- *Purpose is to discuss your perceptions of littering*
- *Discussion of research methods*
- *Rules, moderator's role, one-way mirror, and taping*
- *Emphasize this is not a sales presentation*

TOUR: Timing 0:02 – 0:04

- *Microphones and audio taping*
- *One-way mirror*
- *Video taping*
- *Restroom*
- *Refreshments*

GROUND RULES: Timing 0:04– 0:06

- *Balanced participation*
- *Candor*
- *No right or wrong answers*
- *Talk to each other as well as to me*
- *Free participation*
- *Speak one at a time*
- *Dominators and listeners*
- *Please turn cell phones off for the session*

WARM UP: Timing 0:06 – 0:12

WRITE ON THE BOARD -- In about thirty seconds, tell us your:

- *Name*
- *What you do*
- *Family composition*
- *How long you have lived in the Valley*
- *How big of a problem do you think littering is along roads and freeways in Maricopa County and why?*

Attitudes about Litter: Timing 0:12– 0:40

- a. What is the first thought that comes to mind when you hear the word “litter”?
- b. I’m going to read through a series of littering situations, please tell me if this has happened to you in the past three months?
 - a. You noticed that some trash fell out of a pick-up or other vehicle you were driving or riding in.
 - b. Someone in a vehicle you were in threw out trash in an area that already had lots of litter
 - c. Someone in a vehicle you were in threw out a can, bottle, or other litter out onto the side of the road.
 - d. You had problems with a vehicle and left debris like tire, part of a tire, or other stuff on the roadside
 - e. Rather than keep a beverage container in the car, you, or someone in a vehicle you were in, threw out a can or bottle.
 - f. You threw out a small item from your vehicle, like a candy wrapper, scrap paper or something like that.
 - g. You or someone you were with got a ticket or warning for littering.
 - h. Rather than keep a cigarette butt in the car, you or someone in the vehicle you were in threw the cigarette butt out the window

What were the circumstances? (Didn’t want trash in the vehicle? Already a lot of trash along the road? Carelessness? Didn’t really think about it?)

Do you think of these types of events as “littering”? Why or why not? Do you think these are common occurrences? Why?

- c. What discarded materials do you think cause a big litter problem along freeways in Maricopa County? Why? LIST ON EASLE
- d. Why do you think people throw or lose litter from their vehicles? Are these valid reasons or just excuses? Explain.
- e. Do you ever see other people throwing things or losing things from their vehicles? People you know? What are your thoughts when you see someone litter? Does it affect your perception of that person? Why or why not?

2008 MAG Litter FG Report

Perceptions of Getting Caught: Timing 0:40– 1:00

- a. Has anyone ever tried to stop you from littering and/or told you that your littering bothers them? What was your reaction?
 - Have you ever said that to a friend/family member?
 - Do you worry about getting caught when you litter? Why or why not?
 - What would you do if someone caught you littering? How would you feel?
- b. Are you aware of any penalties or fines for littering?
 - Would a penalty of \$100 discourage you from littering? How about \$200? \$500? \$1,000?
- c. How likely do you think you are to be caught littering? How likely do you think you are to be fined for littering?
- d. Who do you think is responsible for enforcing litter laws?
- e. Do you know how to report someone you see littering? Would you ever report someone? Why or why not?

Testing Radio Creative: Timing 1:00 – 1:15

(Hand out rating sheet)

Now I am going to play for you two radio commercials, please listen carefully. I have provided you with a handout, please do not turn it over until you hear the first radio message.

Play first spot – Grandpa’s Pride.

Now please answer the questions on the first sheet of paper.

- a. What is the main message of the radio message you just heard?
- b. What did you like best about this radio message?
- c. On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this statement motivate you to not litter?

Not at all motivated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Very motivated

Discuss results.

Play second spot – Commentary.

Now please answer the questions on the second sheet of paper.

- d. What is the main message of the radio message you just heard?
- e. What did you like best about this radio message?
- f. On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this statement motivate you to not litter?

Not at all motivated

Very motivated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Discuss Results.

<i>Perceptions of Anti-littering messages: Timing 1:15 – 1:30</i>

Exercise-Positioning Statements

I am now going to pass out two sheets of paper, each containing a statement about littering. Each statement is followed by a series of questions. Please read each statement and answer the corresponding questions. We will discuss your responses to each statement before moving on to the next.

(Shame) Littering is not a victimless crime. It disgraces everyone who takes pride in where they live and respects their fellow citizens. Most of us realize it's a major problem. But more than half of us do not even carry a litterbag in our cars. People still throw cigarette butts, cans and paper out the windows of our moving cars and trucks. This is just embarrassing. And now we need to let them know that when they litter it brings shame on themselves – and the rest of us for letting them get away with it.

(Ridicule) Littering hurts us all. Two thirds of us recognize littering is a big problem in Maricopa County. When we see people throwing gum, cigarette butts, cans and paper out of their cars all across the county, it's hard to believe behavior like this still goes on today. They have no respect for the environment or their fellow citizens. We feel frustrated and angry. It's time we did something. It's time we held them up to the ridicule they deserve.

1. What is the main message? What do you understand?
2. On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the highest and one being the lowest, how much would this statement motivate you to not litter?

Not at all motivated

Very motivated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. Using the same scale of one to ten, how much do you like this statement?

Dislike statement

Very much like statement

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<i>Wrap Up: Timing 1:30 – 1:45</i>

In your own words, please tell me what would you say to someone to convince them to not litter?
– WRITE DOWN FIRST AND THEN GO AROUND AND HAVE THEM READ IT TO THE GROUPS