

Washington State Litter Study



Volume Three – Focus Group Report



Washington State Department of Ecology
Solid Waste & Financial Assistance Program
February 1999
Publication No. 00-07-024

 *printed on recycled paper*

For additional copies of this document, contact:

Department of Ecology
Publications Distribution Center
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
Telephone: (360) 407-7472

The Department of Ecology is an equal opportunity agency and does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, disability, age, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, disabled veteran's status, Vietnam Era veteran's status or sexual orientation.

For more information or if you have special accommodation needs, please contact the Solid Waste and Financial Assistance Program at (360) 407-6900.

Ecology Headquarters telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) number is (360) 407-6006. Ecology Regional Office TDD numbers are as follows:

<i>SWRO (TDD)</i>	<i>(360) 407-6306</i>
<i>NWRO (TDD)</i>	<i>(360) 649-4259</i>
<i>CRO (TDD)</i>	<i>(509) 454-7673</i>
<i>ERO (TDD)</i>	<i>(509) 458-2055</i>

Washington State Litter Study



Volume Three – Focus Group Report

Report Prepared by:

Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc.
811 First Ave., Suite 480
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 343-9759

In Association with:

FBK Research

February 1999
Publication No. 00-07-024

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. Overview of the Litter Study	1
2. Objectives of the Focus Groups	1
3. Summary of Methodology	1
4. Summary of Results and Implications	1
MAIN BODY	3
1. Overview of the Litter Study	3
2. Objectives of the Focus Groups	3
3. Methodology	4
4. Limitations	5
5. Summary and Implications	5
6. Detailed Findings	6
6.1 Perceptions of Litter and Litterers	6
6.2 Learning About Litter	7
6.3 Personal Littering Experience and Behaviors	8
6.4 Strategies to Affect Litter Reduction	9
6.5 Reactions to Messages	9
Appendix A: Recruitment Screener	
Appendix B: Moderator's Guide	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. OVERVIEW OF THE LITTER STUDY

The goal of the Washington State Litter Study is to produce unbiased information about litter in Washington State and the people who generate it. Specifically, this study provides data on:

- The distribution, amount, and composition of litter;
- Who is most likely to generate litter;
- Why those Washington residents who litter engage in this behavior; and
- What prevention strategies could be employed to reduce the amount of litter.

The study relied on three different methods to gather data about littering:

- **Field research and sampling** to determine the generation rate and the composition of litter along roads and in selected public areas in Washington;
- **Focus groups** targeting admitted or potential litterers, designed to collect qualitative data regarding why Washington residents litter and to investigate prevention strategies; and
- **A telephone phone survey** of the general population to collect quantitative data regarding the types of people and situations that create littering behavior, and to test litter prevention messages.

This report summarizes the results obtained through the focus groups. The findings of the telephone survey are presented in another report, as are the results from the field research and sampling plan. The key findings from all three parts of the project (focus groups, telephone survey and field research) are presented in a separate final report.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE FOCUS GROUPS

The major goal of the focus group research was to examine the primary reasons residents might engage in littering behaviors and to explore various communication strategies and messages that might substantially contribute to a decrease in littering behavior. This qualitative research was the first phase of research being conducted to assess perceptions of littering. The results of this preliminary exploratory research aided in the design of the telephone survey.

There were three objectives for the focus groups:

- To find out why people litter by talking to confessed or potential litterers.
- To test some anti-litter slogans on people who admitted to littering.
- To develop topics for further investigation during the telephone survey.

3. SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

While litter sampling was in progress, focus groups were conducted in order to gain qualitative information about littering – who litters, why they litter, and how to prevent littering. FBK Research conducted two focus groups on February 9, 1999 in Tacoma, Washington. A total of 17 citizens, male and female, participated in the focus groups. To gain participation, potential candidates were contacted by telephone and were screened to determine whether they met the following qualifications:

- 18 to 30 years of age;
- No more than a 4-year college education;
- A personal income below \$75,000;
- Believed that litter was not a very important issue in the state; and
- Indicated some propensity to litter.

The moderator facilitated an exercise to examine perceptions of litter and the extent to which participants believed that littering is an important issue. Following this discussion, the moderator explored the participants' past learnings about litter. Lastly, the moderator explored what types of communications strategies might be most compelling to reduce the extent to which people litter.

4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The following points summarize the focus group findings and explain their possible implications for designing the upcoming telephone survey and an eventual litter prevention campaign:

- The term "litter" has negative connotations for most people. Given these negative emotions, consideration should be given to the context in which the word is used.
- People have a difficult time admitting that they have recently littered. It will be important to help people understand that littering behavior may either be deliberate or accidental. Accidental littering is considered far more acceptable than is deliberate littering.
- People have different perceptions of what constitutes "litter." Consideration should be given to defining clearly what constitutes litter. Survey questions should be worded clearly to communicate the exact intent.
- Public awareness campaigns and enforcement of fines were seen as effective means to curb littering. Consideration might be given to further testing these ideas in order to ascertain which (if either) has the greatest chance of long-term success.
- General consensus was that public awareness messages must be emotionally powerful. They should communicate that littering is not acceptable, show graphically what might happen if citizens did not take personal responsibility for proper trash disposal, and provide detailed information about the magnitude of the potential litter problem.
- None of the anti-litter slogans tested during the focus groups were well received. Therefore, it may be wise to develop new messages to test during the next phase of research.

MAIN BODY

1. OVERVIEW OF THE LITTER STUDY

The goal of the Washington State Litter Study is to produce unbiased information about litter in Washington State and the people who generate it. Specifically, this study provides data on:

- The distribution, amount, and composition of litter;
- Who is most likely to generate litter;
- Why those Washington residents who litter engage in this behavior; and
- What prevention strategies could be employed to reduce the amount of litter.

The study relied on three different methods to gather data about littering:

- **Field research and sampling** to determine the generation rate and the composition of litter along roads and in selected public areas in Washington;
- **Focus groups** targeting admitted or potential litterers, designed to collect qualitative data regarding why Washington residents litter and to investigate prevention strategies; and
- **A telephone phone survey** of the general population to collect quantitative data regarding the types of people and situations that create littering behavior, and to test litter prevention messages.

This report summarizes the results obtained through the focus groups. The findings of the telephone survey are presented in another report, as are the results from the field research and sampling plan. The key findings from all three parts of the project (focus groups, telephone survey and field research) are presented in a separate final report.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE FOCUS GROUPS

The major goal of the focus group research was to examine the primary reasons people might engage in littering behaviors and to explore various communication strategies and messages that might substantially contribute to a decrease in littering behavior. This qualitative research was the first phase of research being conducted to assess perceptions of littering. The results of this preliminary exploratory research will aid in the design of a statewide quantitative survey to accurately measure attitudes and perceptions among all Washington State citizens.

There were three objectives for the focus groups:

- To find out why people litter by talking to confessed or potential litterers.
- To test some anti-litter slogans on people who admit to littering.
- To develop topics for further investigation during the telephone survey.

The main idea was to conduct a qualitative evaluation of litter. The following sections explain the focus group methodology, limitations to the study, summary and implications, and detailed findings. The recruitment screener and moderator's guide are included as appendices.

3. METHODOLOGY

Two focus group discussions were conducted in Tacoma on February 9, 1999. Nine people participated in the first group and eight people participated in the second group.

To qualify for participation, all respondents had to meet the following demographic criteria:

- 18 to 30 years of age;
- No more than a 4-year college education; and,
- A personal income below \$75,000 (with most below \$50,000).

Respondents were further qualified based on their answers to a series of attitudinal questions. Respondents who reported the belief that litter was either an “extremely” or “very” important issue for elected officials to be working on were excluded from participation. Respondents were also read a series of five statements and, to qualify, had to respond in a fashion indicating some propensity to litter.

Both males and females in south King County and north Pierce County were contacted by telephone and screened to determine whether they met these qualifications. FBK Research developed the recruitment screener, and the recruitment process was managed by Consumer Opinion Services. A copy of the screener is available in Appendix A.

The moderator began each group with the standard introduction and warm-up. The participants were then asked to name the words or phrases that came to mind when they thought about the word “litter.” This exercise was conducted to examine perceptions of littering and the extent to which participants believed that littering is an important issue facing our state. After thinking about what litter is, respondents were asked to think about where they typically see litter and then asked to describe the type of person who might engage in littering behavior.

Following this discussion, participants were asked to recall the time when they first learned the meaning of “litter.” The moderator explored from whom the participants first learned about litter and the context behind that learning experience. The conversation then turned to personal littering attitudes and behaviors. Respondents were asked to explain their own reactions to observing other people litter and to comment on any circumstance under which they might have littered.

The moderator then explored what types of communications strategies might be most compelling in reducing the extent to which people litter. A series of seven communication messages were presented and respondents were asked for their reactions to each.

Each focus group session was video taped with the permission of all participants. A fifty-dollar honorarium was paid to focus group participants.

4. LIMITATIONS

A focus group is a qualitative interviewing technique, including a group of eight to ten participants, which encourages candid discussion of a particular topic. A trained moderator whose major goal is to direct the discussion toward relevant issues conducts this discussion. Focus group discussions are a useful technique for exploring specific issues in great detail. In evaluating the needs, attitudes, and dispositions of any target group, focus group discussions are an excellent technique for eliciting information. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results of this qualitative information. The results presented here should not be interpreted to represent the attitudes and opinions of all young citizens who might litter. A focus group is not designed to collect statistically significant information and the results presented in this report should be interpreted with this limitation in mind.

5. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

As part of its contract with the Department of Ecology to investigate the nature and extent of litter in Washington, Cascadia Consulting commissioned qualitative research to explore consumers' attitudes toward and perceptions of the litter problem. Two focus groups were conducted with 18 to 30 year old men and women in Tacoma on February 9, 1999. Participants were pre-screened to ensure that they exhibited some propensity to litter. The results of this research will be used to design a comprehensive quantitative survey about litter among Washington State citizens.

The following paragraphs provide a summary of the results.

- The term "litter" carries with it many negative connotations. Litter is considered something that is dirty, ugly, disgusting, gross and potentially dangerous. Litter typically is thought of as including beverage containers, fast food wrappers, candy wrappers and cigarette butts. Some of the participants mentioned that other items like tires, plastics, grass clippings and appliances also constitute litter. People who litter are thought to be lazy, careless, inconsiderate, disrespectful, and to lack social values and morals. Given the negative emotions associated with the term "litter," consideration should be given to the context in which the word is used.
- Clearly people have a difficult time admitting that they have recently littered. They do not wish to view themselves as a part of the group that would engage in such a socially inappropriate behavior. Gauging the extent to which the Washington State population has engaged in this behavior may be tricky. It will be important to help people understand that littering behavior may either be deliberate or accidental. Accidental littering is considered far more acceptable than is deliberate littering.
- Consideration should be given to clearly defining what constitutes litter. Some people believe that biodegradable products constitute litter and others do not. Some people do not think about cigarette butts as litter while others claim that it is a major source of litter. Some people think that appliances in a vacant lot constitute litter while others seem more likely to refer to this as "dumping." The telephone survey questions that are designed to poll a more general audience should be worded to clearly communicate the exact intent.

- ❑ The respondents in this research pointed to two approaches that might be effective in reducing littering behavior. Many seemed to believe that public awareness campaigns would be important in reminding the public that littering is not acceptable and a few believed that the enforcement of fines for littering might be most effective in reducing littering behavior. Consideration might be given to further testing these ideas in order to ascertain which (if either) has the greatest change of long term success.
- ❑ With regard to a public awareness campaign and the messages that might be sent, these respondents reported that it was imperative that the messages be very emotionally powerful. Most people agreed that the messages should be very strong, they should clearly communicate that littering is not acceptable, they should graphically show what might happen if citizens did not take personal responsibility for proper trash disposal, and they should provide detailed information about the magnitude of the potential litter problem.
- ❑ None of the messages tested during this research seemed well received. It may be wise to develop new strong, graphic, and emotionally powerful messages that can be tested during the next phase of research.

6. DETAILED FINDINGS

The following paragraphs highlight the detailed findings from this qualitative research.

6.1 PERCEPTIONS OF LITTER AND LITTERERS

Respondents were asked to name the words or phrases that came to mind when they thought about the word “litter.” The results of this exercise clearly indicate that younger citizens—even those who show some propensity to litter—have a very negative opinion toward litter and litterers. Participants mentioned the following words or phrases when asked about litter:

- Garbage
- Dirty
- Ugly
- Trash
- Nasty to pick up
- Pollution
- Junk
- Gross
- Disgusting
- Potentially dangerous

Participants were asked to name what types of items they most often see littered. The following list provides examples of what most people believe constitutes litter:

- Beer bottles
- Cigarette butts
- Fast food wrappers
- Soda cans
- Candy wrappers

While most respondents agreed that food and beverage containers and cigarette butts were primary sources of litter, a few reported that there are other items that also contribute to the litter problem. Items such as grass clippings, plastic containers, tires and even appliances were mentioned as constituting litter. A few participants mentioned that dirty needles and used condoms also contribute to the litter problem.

Participants were asked to think about the type of person who might be a litterer and then asked to name this person's characteristics. The following words were used to describe litterers:

- Careless
- Immature
- Inconsiderate
- Lazy
- Disrespectful
- Lack of morals
- Lack of ambition
- Lack of social values
- Drunks
- People who don't think before they act

Clearly, those who participated in this research have a very negative opinion of litter and litterers. They believe that litter is a dirty, disgusting eye sore and they believe that those who engage in the behavior of littering are not socially responsible citizens.

6.2 LEARNING ABOUT LITTER

Much can be learned about how people develop opinions by understanding how they first learned about the concept. Many of those who participated in this research reported that they first learned about littering through some negative experience they had as a child. A few people talked about being disciplined by their parents after having littered and a few people talked about being ridiculed by others after having littered. Those who reported stories involving this type of negative learning held very strong views about the appropriateness of littering. They remembered the early experience and it seems to have played an important role in how their views about litter were shaped.

Others who participated in this research reported more positive experiences when learning about litter. Many remembered learning about litter in school or camp and some reported that their parents made a special point of explaining that littering was wrong. Some of those who learned about litter in school could remember parts of the curriculum—particularly the catchy slogans or jingles that were used as teaching aids.

Whether the initial learning experience was positive or negative, it seems evident that schooling has played an important role in reinforcing the idea that littering is not a socially acceptable behavior. That said, there are indications that public awareness campaigns have also played an important role in reinforcing the notion that littering is harmful to the environment. Several participants reported that they remembered the “Give a hoot, don’t pollute” slogan and all were familiar with the term “litter bug.”

Whatever the initial learning experience, these participants have clearly learned that and remembered that littering is not a socially acceptable behavior. The combination of parents, schools, peers, and public awareness campaigns have been effective in getting across the littering message.

6.3 PERSONAL LITTERING EXPERIENCE AND BEHAVIORS

It is not surprising that most of the respondents who participated in this research did not consider themselves as someone who litters. After describing litter as ugly and those who litter as lacking social values, it would be very difficult to classify oneself in the same group of people. While most of these respondents would agree that it is never okay to litter, there are circumstances under which it may be possible to rationalize littering.

Throwing out biodegradable products—especially products that animals will eat—is typically thought of as an acceptable behavior. The consequences of disposing of biodegradable products outdoors does not seem severe—in fact, it may be beneficial to other species such as birds. However, even with biodegradable products, there were “rules” about where it was okay to throw them and where it was not okay to throw them. Biodegradable products do not belong on streets, highways or in public areas where other people might see them. However, it was typically considered okay to throw biodegradable products in places where other people wouldn’t see them—farms, fields, bushes, etc.

While most of these respondents would agree that it was not appropriate to throw out any type of non-biodegradable item, there were times when they admitted it might happen. A few respondents reported incidents where something had “accidentally” flown out of their vehicle. The efforts involved in stopping the vehicle and hunting down that item may involve more danger (with perhaps no success) than it’s worth—littering was less an offense than going back to get it. The same was true for accidentally dropping something on the street. One respondent talked about her “three effort” rule. If she couldn’t pick up something she dropped in three tries, then it was meant to be litter. Another example is the occasion where public trashcans are full and overflowing. It is not considered littering to place trash alongside the trashcans; it is easy to assume that the garbage will be picked up at the same time as the trashcan is emptied. A few respondents talked about throwing out cigarette butts. Those who smoke may not view cigarette butts as litter—it seems as if it’s not something they’ve ever considered as litter.

6.4 STRATEGIES TO AFFECT LITTER REDUCTION

Participants were asked to comment on the strategies they felt might be most effective in reducing littering behavior. There seem to be two schools of thought in this regard: 1) Public awareness campaigns to remind citizens of the negative impacts of litter, and 2) Enforcement of fines for littering.

Some of these participants reported that they would be more likely to think twice about littering if they were reminded of the negative consequences of this behavior. Public awareness campaigns aimed at all citizens and educational campaigns aimed at schools were mentioned as appropriate ways in which to communicate the ethic of proper disposal of garbage.

With regard to the public awareness campaign, most respondents agreed that the campaign needed to be startling and graphic in nature. It was felt that the campaign should send a strong message showing what would happen without citizen effort to reduce litter. Some respondents agreed that one very powerful image would be that of a playground heaped with trash. They also agreed that providing detailed information about how much litter is collected would be effective in helping people understand the magnitude of the littering problem.

Perhaps because many of these participants remembered learning about litter during their early school years, some felt it was very important to dedicate funds to the education of youngsters. Programs that talk about why it is important to properly dispose of trash, in addition to the importance of recycling, were thought to be strategies that would be effective in the long term.

Some of those who participated in this research reported the belief that people would be less likely to litter if they were fined for that activity. While several people understood that there were currently laws and fines governing littering behavior, none had ever received a fine for littering. While some thought that \$500 per offense might be a little stiff (unless it was for deliberate dumping), they generally felt that increasing the enforcement of our littering laws and making it publicly known that fines would be issued for littering would substantially contribute to a reduction in litter.

6.5 REACTIONS TO MESSAGES

Respondents were presented with seven communication messages and asked for their reactions. The communication messages were:

- Keep Washington Ever Clean and Ever Green.
- Keep Washington Clean.
- Washington, The Ever Clean State.
- Litter Sucks.
- Be Kind To Our Planet, Don't Litter.
- Litter Is A Trash Act.
- Got Litter? Can it.

Respondents lacked enthusiasm for the majority of these messages. They were considered rather mundane—not powerful, dramatic or catchy. When asked what they particularly liked or disliked about each, these participants brought forth a few salient points. It seems that any communication message for litter control should center on a neighborhood or community with which an individual can readily identify. Statements about “Washington” or the “Planet” were considered very broad and several of these respondents claimed that this made it hard for them

to identify with. For these people, messages that center on a specific community or neighborhood—a place they considered themselves to be a part of—were thought to be more personal and hence more powerful.

Another objection raised by some of these respondents was with statements that did not clearly communicate that the main point was about litter. Statements about keeping a place “green” did not necessarily communicate that the primary message was about litter. Still, others objected to statements that blatantly told them not to litter. These respondents felt that being told what not to do might encourage their rebellious side to engage in that behavior anyway.

The “Litter Sucks” message was considered humorous to several of those who participated in this research. However, even though it was catchy and to the point, many seemed to feel that the message was inappropriate for a broad demographic audience. Some thought that it was just too corny or even slightly arrogant—they didn’t think that a litter slogan should pretend to be that “hip.” Others felt that the slogan was offensive for children and objected to the idea that their kids might latch on to a saying like this. Apparently, the word “sucks” is one of those words that parents try to teach their children not to use.

The progressive highway message (Got Litter? Can it.) was well liked by some of these participants. They thought it was clear, simple, and concise. They also mentioned that having signs like this along the highways would do a good job reminding the public that trash should not be thrown out the car window onto the roadway.

APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT SCREENER

Litter Project Recruitment Screener

Interviewer Name: _____ I.D. # _____
Date: _____ Recruited to Group: _____
Home Number: _____
Work Number: _____
Respondent Name: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip _____

RECRUIT FOR A MINIMUM OF 3 TO SHOW PER GROUP -- Female ... 1
RECRUIT FOR A MINIMUM OF 3 TO SHOW PER GROUP -- Male 2

Hello, this is ____ with Consumer Opinion Services, an independent market research firm in Seattle. Today/Tonight we are conducting a very brief study regarding various issues facing Washington State. For this study, I need to speak with someone who lives in this household and who is 18 years of age or older. Would that be you?

1. Yes -- CONTINUE WITH THAT PERSON
2. No -- ASK TO SPEAK WITH THAT PERSON
9. DK/REF -- ASK FOR THAT PERSON/A CALL-BACK TIME --

Let me assure you that this is not a sales call. This study is being conducted for research purposes only. Your name and telephone number will not be placed on any sales list and no solicitation calls will occur as a result of your participation.

1. My first questions are for classification purposes only. We ask these questions only so that we can be sure to include a good cross-section of the population. What is your age please? Are you:
 1. Under 18 (THANK & TERMINATE)
 2. 18 – 24 (CONTINUE)
 3. 25 – 30 (CONTINUE)
 4. 31 – 39 (THANK & TERMINATE)
 5. 40 – 49 (THANK & TERMINATE)
 6. 50 or older (THANK & TERMINATE)
 9. DK/REF (THANK & TERMINATE)

2. What was the last grade in school you completed? READ ONLY IF RESPONDENT HESITATES.
 1. Some high school or less (CONTINUE)
 2. High school graduate (CONTINUE)
 3. Some college/Technical school/AA Degree (CONTINUE)
 4. 4-Year college degree (CONTINUE)

- 5. Post graduate work/degree (THANK & TERMINATE)
 - 9. DK/REF (THANK & TERMINATE)
3. Are you currently employed full-time, part-time, are you a student, a homemaker, are you unemployed but looking for work, or is there a better description?
- 1. Employed full-time (CONTINUE)
 - 2. Employed part-time (CONTINUE)
 - 3. Student (SKIP TO QU 5)
 - 4. Homemaker (SKIP TO QU 5)
 - 5. Unemployed but looking for work (SKIP TO QU 5)
 - 6. Other (specify) (SKIP TO QU 5)
- DK/REF (THANK & TERMINATE)

What is your occupation—that is, what do you do?

RECRUIT A GOOD MIX. THANK & TERMINATE IF ADVERTISING, RESEARCH, PUBLIC RELATIONS OR FOR WASHINGTON STATE.

4. Do you, or does anyone in your household or immediate family, work:

	Yes	No	DK
In Advertising	1	2	9
In Market Research	1	2	9
In Public Relations	1	2	9
For the state of Washington	1	2	9

THANK & TERMINATE IF “YES” TO ANY.

6. And just for classification purposes, into which of the following broad categories did your **personal** total annual income for 1998 fall? Was it under \$50,000 or was it \$50,000 or over? Would that be:
- 1. Under \$15,000 (CONTINUE)
 - 2. \$15,000 - \$25,000 (CONTINUE)
 - 3. \$25,000 - \$35,000 (CONTINUE)
 - 4. \$35,000 - \$50,000 (CONTINUE)
 - 5. \$50,000 - \$75,000 (RECRUIT NO MORE THAN 2 PER GROUP)
 - 6. \$75,000 or over (THANK & TERMINATE)
 - 9. DK/REF (THANK & TERMINATE)
7. My next questions are about issues facing Washington State. What would you say is the single most important issue that your elected officials should be working on?

THANK & TERMINATE IF LITTER. RECRUIT NO MORE THAN 3 PER GROUP WHO REPORT SOME ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE.

8. I am going to read you some issues and I'd like you to tell me how important you think it is that your elected officials work on these issues. Please use a five-point scale where 5 means you think the issue is "extremely important" for elected officials to work on and a 1 means it is "not at all important."

The first issue is _____. Would you rate this a 5, meaning it is extremely important for elected officials to work on, a 1, meaning it is not at all important, or would you rate it some number in between?

	Extremely			Not At All		DK
Traffic congestion	5	4	3	2	1	9
Creating jobs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Litter prevention	5	4	3	*2*	*1*	9
Education	5	4	3	2	1	9
Saving the wild salmon	5	4	*3*	*2*	*1*	9

**RESPONDENTS MUST RATE "LITTER" A "1" OR "2" TO QUALIFY.
THEY MUST ALSO RATE "WILD SALMON" A "1," "2," OR "3" TO QUALIFY.**

9. Next, I'd like to read you some statements about litter. For each one I read, please tell me how well that statement describes you.

How well does this statement describe you ____? Would you say that this statement describes you extremely well, moderately well, only a little, or not at all?

	Extremely	Moderately	A Little	Not At All	DK
When I see litter on the street I pick it up and put it in a trash can	4	3	*2*	*1*	9
If I accidentally drop something that I don't want on the street or highway, I always make every effort to retrieve it and dispose of it properly	4	3	*2*	*1*	9
If there isn't a trash can near me, I've occasionally thrown wrappers, food or other things I don't want along the street or highway	*4*	*3*	2	1	9
I don't think that throwing apple cores or other biodegradable products on the streets or highways is really littering	*4*	*3*	2	1	9
Sometimes the only way to get rid of something I don't want is to litter, so that's what I end up doing	*4*	*3*	2	1	9

TO QUALIFY, 2 OF THE 5 STATEMENTS MUST BE IN THE SHADED BOXES WITH *.

10. These next questions are about you. Do you personally have a car that you drive on a regular basis?
1. Yes (CONTINUE)
 2. No (SKIP TO QU 12)
 9. DK/REF (SKIP TO QU 12)
11. On average, about how many miles do you drive per day? READ LIST.
1. Fewer than 5 miles per day, on average
 2. About 5 to 10 miles per day
 3. About 10 to 20 miles per day
 4. About 20 to 30 miles per day
 5. More than 30 miles per day
 9. DK/REF
12. Do you ever eat at fast food restaurants?
1. Yes (CONTINUE)
 2. No (SKIP TO QU 14)
 9. DK/REF (SKIP TO QU 14)
13. About how many times a month do you stop at a fast food restaurant to get food?
1. Fewer than 5 times a month
 2. About 5 to 10 times a month
 3. About 10 to 20 times a month
 4. More than 20 times a month
 9. DK/REF
14. Have you ever participated in a discussion group for research purposes for which you were paid for your time?
1. Yes (CONTINUE)
 2. No (SKIP TO INVITATION)
 9. DK/REF (THANK & TERMINATE)
15. When was the last time you participated in a discussion group for research purposes?
1. Within the past 6 months (THANK & TERMINATE)
 2. 6 months to 1 year ago (SAVE)
 3. More than 1 year ago (CONTINUE)
 9. DK/REF (SAVE)
16. Have you ever participated in a discussion group for research purposes on the topic of:

	Yes	No	DK
Fast food restaurants	1	2	9
Litter	*1*	2	9
Automobiles	1	2	9

THANK & TERMINATE IF "YES" TO LITTER.

INVITATION

As a further part of our research we are inviting a group of people like you to participate in a focus group discussion. Let me assure you that absolutely no attempt will be made to sell you any types of products or services--these discussion groups are held for research purposes only. The group will be relaxed and informal and you will simply be involved in an exchange of ideas and opinions with about ten other people like yourself. We are looking for your open and honest ideas, opinions and perceptions--there is no homework or studying that needs to be done in preparation!

The discussion will be held at the offices of _____. The group will take place on Tuesday, February 9 at 5:30/7:30. The discussion group will last about 2 hours. Because we value your time and opinions we are offering a \$50 cash honorarium to those who participate.

Because only a limited number of people can be invited to attend, it is very important that we are able to count on you. Will you be available on Tuesday, February 9th at 5:30 / 7:30??

1. Yes (CONTINUE)
2. No (THANK & TERMINATE)
9. DK/REF (SAVE AS UNCOMMITTED)

We'll be sending you a letter to confirm this invitation, along with a map to the facility. May I please have the correct spelling of your name and address? (RECORD ON FRONT) For this project, it is very important that we are able to count on your attendance. If for any reason you find yourself unable to join us, please call us at (TEL #) as soon as possible so that we have time to find a replacement.

Groups 1 & 2: Tuesday, February 9th @ 5:30 and 7:30 p.m.

Recruit for 8-10 to show

Recruit a minimum of 3 males and a minimum of 3 females

All should be 18-30 years of age (with a good mix)

None should have a post graduate degree

Recruit mostly employed people

Recruit no more than 2 per group with incomes between \$50,000 and \$75,000 (none is fine), recruit a mix of those with lower incomes

All must rate "litter" a 1 or 2 and "wild salmon" a 1, 2, or 3 in Qu 8

2 of the 5 statements in Qu 9 must be in the shaded boxes

Standard security and past participation screens

APPENDIX B: MODERATOR'S GUIDE

Cascadia Consulting Group Litter Focus Group Protocol February 9, 1999

I. Introduction and Background

A. Introduction

1. Qualitative interviewing technique
2. No right or wrong answers
3. Taping
4. Importance of candid, honest responses

B. Background

1. Name
2. Where living and for how long
3. Occupation
4. Household composition

II. Perceptions of Litter and Litterers

A. What is litter?

1. What kinds of things constitute "litter?"
2. What can you throw out that isn't really litter?
3. Does size matter? If you saw a mattress along the roadside, would you consider that litter?

B. Where is it?

1. Where do you see litter?
2. Where do you see people littering?

C. What's the big deal?

1. Is litter a problem?
2. Why is it/Why isn't it?

D. Who litters?

1. Describe the type of person who litters.
2. Why do you think they litter?

III. *Perceptions of Littering*

A. History

1. When did you first learn what "litter" was?
2. How did you learn about litter?
3. What did you learn about litter?
4. When you first learned about litter, how would you have described the type of people who would be caught littering?

B. Current

1. How is your definition of "litter" different today?
2. Is litter a bigger deal today than it was when you first learned about it, about the same, or less of a deal?
3. What might change in your definition of the type of people who litter?

C. Future

1. Should we worry about litter prevention in the future?
2. Why / Why not?

IV. *Personal Behaviors*

A. Have you ever seen or been with someone who littered?

1. What were the circumstances?
2. Why do you think they did that?
3. What was your reaction?

B. Have you ever littered?

1. Under what circumstances?
2. Why do/did you litter?
3. Have you ever experienced a time when you wanted to litter, but didn't? What stopped you?
4. What does/would discourage you from littering?

V. *Washington's Zero Litter Policy*

- A. Why do you think we have a "zero" litter policy?
- B. Have we achieved zero litter?
- C. What are the benefits of a zero litter policy?
- D. What are the drawbacks?
- E. What do we need to do to achieve zero litter?

VI. *Communications / Public Relations*

I'm going to show you some slogans and I'd like to get your reactions to them.
SHOW (ABOUT 5) STATEMENTS ONE AT A TIME AND ASK:

- A. What is your first reaction?
- B. What is the main message this slogan is trying to get across?
- C. What do you like about this slogan?
- D. What do you dislike about this slogan?
- E. Would this slogan be effective in making you think twice before littering?

AFTER ALL STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN EVALUATED:

- F. Which of these slogans do you think is most effective in encouraging citizens not to litter?
- G. What about this statement makes it more effective than the others?
- H. Which of these slogans is least effective in encouraging citizens not to litter?
- I. What about this message makes it the least effective?

VII. *Summary/End*

Thank you very much for your time tonight. I have one last question I'd like to ask you. If you could send one suggestion to those who are trying to encourage citizens not to litter, what one suggestion would you send?