


Please cite the Published Version

Roper, Stuart and Parker, Cathy  (2006) How (and Where) The Mighty Have Fallen: Branded Litter. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22 (5-6). pp. 473-487. ISSN 0267-257X

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725706777978659>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/85800/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Journal of Marketing Management*, published by and copyright Taylor & Francis.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

How (and Where) The Mighty Have Fallen: Branded Litter

Stuart Roper¹ and Cathy Parker²

Abstract

Packaging has been described as 'the silent salesman' playing an important role in communicating with the consumer at the point of sale. Because of its importance in building recognition and encouraging repeat purchase, the marketing literature focuses upon packaging primarily at the pre-consumption stage. This article reviews this packaging literature and also identifies those studies that have researched packaging post-consumption. The majority of these articles have focussed upon the problems of waste disposal and macro environmental concerns. This paper, however, established the occurrence of packaging as litter in a specific micro-environment, a city centre. Its interest is in contributing to a new stream of research concerned with post-consumption activity. From this study, the brands most likely to be found as litter in a number of categories were identified. The worst offender was Walker's crisps. With 292 packets being found during 352 visits, in other words a visitor to this particular city centre location has likelihood of 83 per cent of seeing a Walker's crisp packet – but is this good or bad for Walker's? This paper discusses the wider social impacts of 'brands as litter' and identifies some interesting areas for future research.

Keywords: brands, packaging, litter, post consumption

¹ *Correspondence:* Dr Stuart Roper, Manchester Business School, Booth Street East, Manchester, England, M15 6PB, Tel: +44 161 306 3475, Fax: +44 161 306 3167, e-mail: Stuart.roper@manchester.ac.uk

² Ms Cathy Parker, Manchester Metropolitan University Business School, Aytoun Street, Manchester, M1 3GH, Tel: +44 161 247 6056, Fax: +44 161 247 4690, e-mail: c.parker@mmu.ac.uk

Introduction

Modern marketing relies heavily on packaging as it helps to sell the product both to intermediaries within the distribution channel and to the end consumer. Packaging allows the brand to develop its message to the consumer and to act as a valuable form of promotion of the brand name and values. However, whilst the brand owner and intermediaries can control the context of the brand message and reinforce its positive values pre-consumption (whilst the product sits on a supermarket shelf, for example) what of the brand message and values post-consumption? Do the positive messages of marketing communications through packaging remain as such or do they become negative messages once the packaging becomes litter on the streets? This paper considers the improper disposal of branded packaging by consumers, post-consumption from three perspectives. Firstly, it examines existing literature on the topic. Secondly, through exploratory research, it establishes the occurrence of brands as litter and finally, it discusses the potential impact of brands as litter, from both a marketing and societal viewpoint.

The Purpose of Packaging

Packaging is a part of the overall product offering. Its importance is such that it is often called the fifth 'P' of the marketing mix (for example, see Kotler et al. 1999), having both a physical and psychological function. Packaging allows the product to be protected and preserved and stored until used; helps to facilitate use of the product (for example, pump dispenser toothpaste tubes); helps to inform customers (for example, by listing the calorific content of food items); satisfies legal obligations of the manufacturer (for example, sell by or use by dates) as well as conveying important brand messages to consumers (Blyth 2001). As consumer choice has widened, marketers are increasingly interested in the latter function and in the case of fast moving consumer goods (fmcg) the marketing communications aspect of packaging is now often an important differentiator (Fill 2002).

Kornblau (1961) discusses the move towards self-service by consumers and the dramatic impact this has had on packaging. Packaging uses visual communication to get the attention of the consumer; to act as the "silent salesman" (p. 296). Low involvement purchases and repeat purchases require the consumer to build awareness through recognition. The consistent design, colour scheme, lettering font, shape and size of packaging will help to build and nurture the type of recognition in consumers that is vital for repeat purchase and therefore brand loyalty. Think Coca-Cola with its recognisable bottle shape, red colour and distinctive font facilitating instant

brand recognition amongst the masses of carbonated soft drinks available to the consumer. The analogy of the silent salesman is a good one as it conjures up the many sales tasks that packaging is charged with, from attracting the attention of the consumer to describing the product through to making the sale. Many purchases are unplanned or impulse decisions (as many as 53% of all purchases according to Kotler et al. 1999) and packaging in such instances will be key to sales success. Packaging designers talk of the value of “shelf impact” (Keller 1998). Much advertising now features the product package as a central theme thus building acceptance and recognition.

Warlop, Ratneshwar and Osselar (2005) discuss the importance of packaging to perception of product quality amongst customers. Their research demonstrates that differentiation in packaging can enhance memory-based quality judgements and is therefore an important source of brand equity. Keller (1998) states that one of the strongest associations a consumer can have with a brand is with its packaging. Packaging is a very important tool in building and reinforcing valuable brand associations.

Packaging often helps to reinforce the brand heritage and traditional values of the brand (Kotler et al. 1999). Orangina, Jack Daniels and Perrier are examples of brands that have used innovative packaging design to help differentiate themselves. de Rouffignac (1990) suggested that packaging typically represented 10% of the cost of a retail item and that for luxury goods this could rise to as much as 40% of the cost.

Underwood (1999) states that consumers may engage with the product, via packaging alone, without actually purchasing it, simply because of the display of the product in the shops. Awareness of packaging starts very early with a median age of 24 months for recognition of marketplace objects (McNeal and Yeh 1993). McNeal and Ji (2003) conducted research whereby children were asked to draw cereal boxes. They report that 97% of children spontaneously drew a cereal box with a brand name and other brand related symbols included.

The packaging may say something to the consumer about the quality of the product and this can be an aspect of differentiation for a brand over rivals (Hall 1991). Southgate (1994) discusses passive and active packaging. Passive packaging relies on a great deal of advertising to create interest whereas active packaging works more closely with the other areas of the marketing communications mix and can be seen as an integral part of the overall brand. Also, in today's global marketplace the role of packaging becomes ever more important. The visual clues associated with a product can remain the same irrespective of language differences when selling the product across different countries and cultures. An integrated approach to marketing strategy means that the packaging used must be consistent with the product's advertising, pricing and distribution. Packaging design is regularly updated by brands in

order to maintain freshness and a contemporary feel for well-established products. Even where a brand may have been in existence for over 100 years and the packaging is predominantly the same as the original, subtle changes in font, colour or typeset can help to maintain a modern feel. Sprite regularly updates its graffiti-style packaging, which is relevant to its urban positioning and its efforts to connect with a young target audience.

Marketers continue to develop packaging as a means of engaging the consumer with their brand. Buxton (2004) reports that as there is now a closer relationship between advertising and packaging design the latter has become more tactical. With this in mind a more recent innovation is the use of special edition packaging to assist with brand promotion. This assists packaging to become more of a primary medium. Indeed the fragmentation of mainstream media escalates the role of packaging. The sheer number of brand extensions currently in the marketplace also increases the pressure on packaging to sell itself to the wholesaler with limited shelf-space as well as to the end user. Special occasions such as the millennium are deemed appropriate for limited edition packaging designs such as Budweiser's millennium-edition black glass champagne-style bottle. To reinforce the heritage of the brand, special edition brand anniversary packaging is another example of the increased marketing effort devoted to selling the brand via packaging. In addition to specific occasions or brand anniversaries, a seasonal opportunity to capitalise on a rise in consumption is another opportunity to introduce special packaging e.g. Valentine's Day or Christmas. Initiatives outlined above are key to encouraging and maintaining brand engagement.

Packaging Post-Consumption

As has been demonstrated, packaging is a very important element of the marketing mix. The pristine packaging, colour-coded and designed by professionals to be the silent salesman of the brand undoubtedly has considerable impact on the purchase decision. However, what happens to this carefully constructed message once the contents of the package have been consumed? What of the potentially negative brand messages that are displayed when packaging is not properly disposed of and ends up as litter on the streets? The use of colour, font, shape, size etc. used by the brand to encourage the consumer to purchase is still attracting attention, not of potential consumers but of all passers-by. Has the impact of such potentially negative brand messages been considered by brand owners and the packaging industry? Marketers have been interested in packaging from the perspective of micro consumer behaviour i.e. the effects of the marketing mix on consumer decision making, whereas this paper develops a macro

consumer behaviour perspective, i.e. examining the impact of consumer choices, behaviour and marketing activities on culture and human well-being (Belk et al. 1996) as the improper disposal of packaging and the problem of litter is a big problem in many of our towns and cities.

ENCAMS (Environmental Campaigns, previously known as “Keep Britain Tidy”) states that for many the problem of litter is one of the most serious concerns facing citizens in their local environment, being the most widespread blight on said environment. ENCAMS claims that there is a direct link between the quality of life in communities and cleaner, safer, greener public spaces. If there is no improvement and no attempt to tackle such problems the perception of the local community declines which can lead to anti-social behaviour and even serious crime. 80,000 complaints per annum regarding litter are recorded in Wales alone and the problems of littering are compounded by the fact that the UK has the worst record of recycling in Europe. Only 25% of glass and metal is recycled compared to 63% in Denmark and 93% in Switzerland (www.keepwalestidy.org).

Harrell and McConocha (1992) discuss the disposal tendencies of consumers and the increasing importance of this area of study within the consumer behaviour literature. They talk about disposition options of keeping, throwing away, selling, donating or passing on items after use. Their study, however, is concerned with durable goods rather than fmcg's and litter is not discussed. Similarly Gregson and Crewe (2003) deal with disposal but chiefly regarding clothing in their study of second hand cultures.

Packaging manufacturers have been forced by law to consider the environmental effect of their work. Kassaye and Verma (1992) discuss the difficulties of increasing exhaustion of landfill sites. The average consumer in the United States creates 3.5 lbs of refuse per day; approximately half of this is packaging-related. The solution proposed to this landfill mountain is the application of the four Rs, which are to reduce, recycle, reuse and redesign packaging. These authors discuss the strategic advantages and disadvantages of adopting the 4 Rs. They also state that the American public favours a more environmentally friendly approach to packaging. However, the arguments presented do not run to dealing with an environmental concern faced by anyone who sets foot outside their front door – the concern of packaging-related litter.

Olney and Bryce (1991) remark that companies have often used environmental claims about their products e.g. that they are recyclable, reusable, ozone friendly, environmentally friendly or biodegradable. They are cynical about these claims, however, pointing out that many such claims cannot be proved and that they have more to do with marketers recognising a need within consumers (i.e. concern for the environment) and providing a

solution to this need rather than any genuine attempt to solve problems related to manufacture, distribution and/or consumption.

Kassaye (2001) again discusses the "green dilemma" from the perspective of the organisation. An insight into the minds of manufacturers is gained when the author comments that "most critical in this respect is whether green makes economic sense for a company and, subsequently, whether those who are interested in green products constitute the top 10-20% who typically buy some 80-90% of a company's products" (p444). Kassaye points out that some 60% of U.S. firms are taking some green action. However, litter again is not mentioned other than as an objective of smaller firms to reduce their own garbage, not as an environmental concern but so as to reduce their garbage collection charges from their local authority. He also emphasises the positioning advantages that may accrue to an organisation perceived by consumers to be green but no evidence is presented regarding post-consumption problems of fmcg's. Similarly in the United Kingdom businesses are happy to join in the trial of greener packaging when there is an obvious advantage to them. Barnes (2005) describes how Tesco, Argos, the Co-op and Asda have signed up to receive grants from an £8 million UK government initiative to cut the amount of waste caused by food packaging.

Sjolander (1996) discusses the increase in household waste since the Second World War and specifically mentions the non-refillable beverage container as being a symbol of the negative externalities associated with increased affluence. Sjolander does mention that solid waste generated by such containers has increased exponentially and that probably the litter from them must also have done so. He comments on small social marketing campaigns funded in Washington D.C. by a minimal environmental tax imposed upon the producers of articles commonly found in litter. The gist of the article is the shift away from disposable to refillable packaging by manufacturers in order to avoid an environmental tax. Thøgersen (1996) discusses the surge in political activities in both Europe and the U.S.A. aimed at packaging as a means of reducing the amount of household waste. His work criticises the packaging industry for its defensive response to its plummeting reputation due to packaging waste. The article finds a positive correlation between GDP per capita and household waste per capita. Excessive packaging and single use packaging is detailed as a major problem but again the impact and responsibility of brands for litter is not discussed.

Bone and Corey (2000) discuss the ethics of packaging with three interested stakeholder groups; packaging professionals, brand managers and ethically interested consumers. They outline the possibility that some managers may not recognise the societal impact of their decisions and that anecdotal evidence suggests "some packaging decisions are made without ethical sensitivity on the part of the practitioner" (p201). Bone and Corey

discuss the potential industry norms and perceived consequences regarding the ethics of packaging. Their paper finds that the business practitioners exhibit less ethical sensitivity than consumers and they are more likely to have a pragmatic value system. Litter again is not a factor that is dealt with in Bone and Corey's research. It may be that within the industry the perceived consequences of litter are low and that as far as brand managers are concerned, the industry norms possibly only relate to the promotional opportunities afforded by packaging rather than worrying about their packets post-consumption. Similarly, litter is mentioned by Prendergast and Pitt (1996) but again, only very briefly, the main thrust of their paper being the trade off between environmentally friendly packaging and the attractiveness of packaging to customers.

Gregory (1992) discusses similar environmental concerns and reports that over half of buyers in its survey considered the responsible disposal of waste an important buying criterion. However, marketing related criteria prove to be more important to the sample. Greater importance is being placed upon the quality of the packaging and recognition of the brand as well as environmental concerns. 63% of buyers consider the environmental aspects of a product when making a purchasing decision, 63% consider advertising to be very important to their decision, 75% packaging and 91% branding. Again, waste and refuse sites are mentioned but not litter nor the relationship of litter to branding and packaging.

Strong (1998) discusses the impact of environmental education on primary school children. Litter is mentioned and is categorised as a non-urgent, local concern. The children see it as good citizenship to influence the local environment by not dropping litter. Despite this, however, Strong's research amongst school children reports that 64% of respondents admit to dropping litter.

Polonsky, Carlson and Fry (2003) discuss a "harm chain," in order to allow public policy makers to consider potential negative outcomes from marketing activities. They discuss the failure of the marketing literature to consider how harm (externalities in the language of economics) has been generated and managed through the exchange network. Polonsky et al consider the entire chain that is pre-production, production, consumption and post-consumption. They comment that consumers may cause harm by the inappropriate use of products. This could mean a failure to properly dispose of brand packaging causing litter (post-consumption harm). Polonsky et al congratulate those firms that conduct social responsibility audits aiming to minimize negative effects but state that consumers are often not in a position to protect themselves. This would certainly be the case regarding litter in the natural environment and the difficulty is that the fragmented nature of the manner in which public policy is developed in

relation to marketing issues means that it is difficult to seek redress for issues such as litter.

Although litter is a huge problem for modern society, during this review of literature, only one article was found that linked litter with brands. Stack (1998) discussed how beverage companies spent billions of dollars annually on brand image but their success came back to haunt them when one of their containers appear as litter on the American landscape. He encourages all manufacturers to subscribe to the Keep America Beautiful anti-litter campaign. The lack of literature that associates the problems of literature with brand owners (or manufacturers) is surprising, given the recent interest in corporate social responsibility (CSR). It would appear that CSR tends towards the 'corporate' rather than the 'social'. For example, at the time of writing Tesco has announced that it will be using biodegradable materials in its plastic bags. A corporate decision intended to have a positive effect on the environment. Nevertheless, in a letter to a broad-sheet newspaper, an on-line shopper reported that in this same week, 32 items that had been delivered by Tesco's on-line shopping service, arrived contained in 18 plastic bags. If the shopper, does not 'take on' the social responsibility of disposing of the bags appropriately, then these bags could end up as litter on the street, damaging the local aesthetic environment, until they decompose (which can take between 60 and 540 days).

Methodology

The preceding literature review has discussed the importance of packaging and the positive impact it has on brands. However, many fmcg brands are generating potential negative brand communication post consumption, if they end up as litter. A pilot study was developed to assess the occurrence of branded litter in an urban environment. The purpose of the study was to identify the types of packaging that most frequently occurred as litter and the brands that appeared most often. The aim was to produce a snapshot of the occurrence of brand related litter.

The first stage of the research was designed to produce a suitable measurement instrument for use during the second stage of the study. Over the course of a one month period, the authors made a note of all packaging related litter encountered during two separate journeys per day made on foot. Following this a pamphlet was designed detailing the most popular categories of litter found. These were soft drinks, alcoholic drinks, snack products, tobacco, fast food and then a category for all others. The most frequently found brands were included in the pamphlet and there was ample room for respondents to fill in other brand names that they discovered. A cohort of 20 undergraduate students were recruited at a major city centre

business school and instructed to record items of litter that they came across by brand over a 2 week period, recording the details during separate journeys on foot over this time period. A 5-bar gate system was used to record instances of litter. A prize draw offering book tokens was used as an incentive to ensure participation in the exercise. De briefing of the students took place after the collection to ensure data collection had taken place in accordance with instructions.

During the 2 week data collection period in stage 2 a total of 352 journeys were recorded and reported upon.

Results

There were 5 major categories of branded litter – soft drinks, snack products, tobacco, alcohol and fast food. Table 1 shows the frequency of observed litter by brand.

Table 1. Top 10 Brands by Recorded Litter in 5 Categories

Soft Drinks		Snacks		Tobacco		Alcohol		Fast Food	
Coca Cola	288	Walkers Crisps	292	Marlboro Lite	163	Stella	163	McDonalds	141
Diet Coke	199	Cadburys	208	Richmond	141	Fosters	123	Greggs	116
Fanta	174	McCoys	69	Marlboro	137	White Lightening	97	KFC	55
Lucozade	122	Doritos	57	Benson & Hedges	120	Heineken	81	Subway	55
Pepsi	122	Milky Way	54	Lambert & Butler	113	Carling Lager	79	Burger King	46
Lucozade Sport	70	Kit Kat	47	Rizla	97	Smirnoff Ice	69	Dominos	11
Ribena	70	Mars	45	Embassy Regal	81	Strongbow	68	Starbucks	11
Highland Spring	66	Golden Wonder	39	Superkings	68	Carlsberg Export	67	Kansas	5
Dr Pepper	38	Seabrooks Crisps	35	Sovereign	44	Carlsberg Special Brew	53	Pizza Hut	4
Irn Bru	32	Snickers	29	Embassy No.1	43	Grolsch	53	Café Nero	3
Total	1181		875		1007		853		447

The top 10 brands in each of the five categories accounted for 4,363 recorded cases. Soft drinks is the largest category of litter by item, the top 10 offending brands accounting for 1,181 cases in a 2 week period. Tobacco

packaging (i.e. packets rather than cigarette ends) is the second highest category (1,007 cases) snack products and alcohol record similar numbers (875 and 853 cases) with fast food recording 447 cases amongst the top ten recorded incidents.

This pilot study demonstrates the prevalence of branded litter. The biggest offenders in each category reflected the status of particular brands. Coca-Cola was the worst culprit in the soft drink category reflecting its status as the number one brand in the world (Businessweek 2005). Walker's crisps headed the snack foods category and this again ties in with Walker's position as the number one grocery brand in the UK (AC Nielsen 2005). Marlboro cigarettes are the lead litter provider in the tobacco category. Marlboro is the world's 10th largest brand (Businessweek 2005). Stella Artois, the biggest take home beer in Britain and the 10th largest UK grocery brand is in first place in the alcohol category and the most successful fast food brand in the world, McDonald's is the leader in providing fast food litter, reinforcing its status as the 7th largest brand in the world according to Businessweek as well as the most well known fast food brand in the UK.

One could draw assumptions about the type of person dropping litter from the brands recorded in table 1. Younger people are the greatest consumers of snack, soft drink, tobacco and fast food products. The alcohol results are interesting; the proliferation of high strength products is again indicative of a younger user group and also what is known in the trade as the "park-bench sector". An indication of the sheer volume of fmcg's that are consumed on the move can be drawn from this data.

Discussion

The most 'popular' products in this survey are unsurprisingly fast moving consumer goods. Items are consumed and then disposed of, the difficulty being that they are not disposed of in a responsible manner. Research by the Scottish Executive (October 2005) reported a link between social deprivation and the occurrence of rubbish - with those living in urban deprived areas 7 per cent more likely to report litter and rubbish as a 'big problem'. As this study was undertaken in a city centre, then we may expect to see more litter - nevertheless, given the mixed socio-economic profile of those using the space (city centre residents, students, commuters etc.) it would appear that litter-dropping is not confined to the 'deprived'. In the UK, ENCAMS runs the 'Keep Britain Tidy' campaign, to change consumers' post-consumption behaviour, with regards to the disposal of packaging. In addition, The Offence of Leaving Litter (section 87 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990) says that if a person drops, throws, deposits or leaves anything so as to cause defacement in a public place, they could be committing a littering

offence. It is a crime to drop litter in a public place. A court has the power to fine someone up to £25,000 for dropping litter.

So far, however, very little blame seems to have attached itself to the manufacturers. This may be changing, however. At the time of writing, a group of 20 councils has joined a coalition of towns and cities nationwide that have paid for a full page advertisement in the national press calling for action against manufacturers of chewing gum. The group estimates it costs 3 pence to produce a stick of gum but up to 10 pence to clean it from the streets. As an example, Manchester City Council spends £200,000 per annum cleaning chewing gum from the city streets. The chewing gum industry, worth £300 million per annum is being lobbied to provide 1 penny per packet on the price of chewing gum to assist with the disposal of its product from the UK's streets (Gammell 2006). A report in the Manchester Evening News estimates that 300 tonnes of rubbish per day are discarded in Manchester city centre by shoppers and other users. Similar news stories indicate that this is an issue that is becoming more sensitive

Street control litter notices can be posted forcing individual businesses to tackle litter problems that can be traced back to, for example, a restaurant and action can be taken to ensure the individual business complies. Also, at the level of the individual, councils are now beginning to issue fixed penalty notices and to prosecute individuals who drop litter. Sponsored litter picks are another attempt by certain local authorities to tackle the problem. However, with the exception of chewing gum no blame seems to be attaching itself to the major fmCG brands as yet.

Packaging must "intrigue, inform, involve, entertain and persuade," (Pickton and Broderick 2001, p606). Does it continue to do this as litter or does it merely annoy? Is packaging continuing to act as a reinforcer of the brand message when it is lying in the street as litter or is this a negative influence on the consumer? The colours and font of Coca-Cola, for example are still recognisable when the can lies discarded in the gutter. Is it actually in the interests of the brand (from a commercial perspective) to have such brand messages communicated in what could be viewed as free advertising space?

Future Research

One way to engage manufacturers more actively (and willingly) into initiatives to reduce the amount of litter is to establish the consumers' true feelings toward 'branded litter'. The next stage of our research will be to ascertain firstly how well consumers recognise brands as litter and establish whether or not this has any affect upon their perception of these brands. As we have shown, the marketing communication and branding literature concentrates on the communication cycle between the brand and the

consumer when the messages are under the control of the brand owner or intermediary (during, for example, a television advert or through point of sale displays). We argue that brands are still able to communicate a message when they are litter on the street, but we are not sure what message this is. We plan to investigate the attitudes of consumers to branded litter. The positive, negative or indeed ambivalent attitude of consumers and the subsequent impact upon brands and their image needs further research. We would anticipate that there will be two audiences for these findings. Firstly, the brand owners but also those groups responsible for trying to reduce the amount of litter on the streets, such as ENCAMS.

It is important to investigate the opinions of the brand owners themselves on the litter created by their products. Commercial organisations are keen to emphasise their commitment to corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the early years of the 21st Century. The websites of the leading littering brands were accessed to consider their commitment to CSR. Coca-Cola claim to *"conduct our business in ways that protect and preserve the environment,"* and *"we strongly believe we have a responsibility to promote the environment."* They also talk of producing *"innovative and environmentally friendly packaging."*

Walker's crisps website states that they are *"passionate about making a positive difference to the world around us,"* and notably to *"minimise the impact of packaging."* Philip Morris, the manufacturer of Marlboro cigarettes state that they are not merely interested in financial performance but *"we also measure the expectations society has of us.."* McDonald's was the category leader in the fast food area and claim *"we have a long standing record of industry leadership in environmental conservation."* They also claim to be good citizens who *"...help keep the local environment clean and attractive."* Stella Artois was the leader in the alcohol sector but their website had no reference to CSR issues.

With these claims in mind it will be interesting to discuss with the major brands their attitude to the litter problem related to their own flagship products. Researching the opinions of brand managers on this issue is also a future stage of this research.

Conclusion

This pilot study is presented as a first stage of research in this area. Brands as litter is an underdeveloped area of research and the purpose of this paper has been to raise this as an area worthy of study and to lay the groundwork for future research. From a practitioner's perspective, there has already been considerable interest in the preliminary findings of this study. For example, the Association of Town Centre Management whose members, predominantly those involved in town centre management, can devote much of their time and resources to dealing with litter in their towns and city

centres. As more locations adopt Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) an additional levy paid by businesses to tackle local issues, such as litter and graffiti and fund local initiatives, such as marketing campaigns, the more business owners, especially those in the retail sector, may start to quantify the effect of packaging as litter upon their bottom lines. In other words, the bigger proportion of any BID levy that goes on keeping areas clean and tidy the less money there is available to invest in more strategic and long-term business improvement such as place branding campaigns.

At the moment, the responsibility for litter, is shouldered, collectively by voluntary organisations and local authorities and ultimately by the taxpayer. As two non-litter dropping tax-payers we are keen to pursue this research to ensure that the brand owners, who make many millions of pounds of profit between them, share the task and cost of cleaning up their 'silent salesmen' once they have been made redundant by the organisation and the consumer.

References

- Barnes, R. (2005), "Retailers Set to Trial Greener Packaging," *Marketing Magazine*, March 23, pp. 13.
- Belk, R.W., Dholakia, N. and Venkatesh, A., Eds, (1996), *Consumption and Marketing: Macro Dimensions*, Cincinnati: International Thomson Publishing.
- Blyth, J. (2001), *Essentials of Marketing 2nd Edition*, Harlow: FT-Prentice Hall
- Bone, P.F. and Corey, R.J. (2000), "Packaging ethics: Perceptual Differences Among Packaging Professionals, Brand Managers and Ethically-interested Consumers," *Journal of Business Ethics*, **24**, pp. 199-213.
- Buxton, (2004), *Marketing Magazine*, May 12, pp. 39-41.
- de Rouffignac, P. (1990), *How to Sell in Europe*, London: Pitman.
- Fill, C. (2002), *Marketing Communications: Contexts, Strategies and Applications*, 3rd Edition, Harlow: FT-Prentice Hall.
- Gammel, C. (2006), "Gum War Blasts Off," *Manchester Evening News*, January 16, 2006.
- Gregory, S. (1992), "Environment Moves Up Packaging Agenda," *Marketing Magazine*, August 20, pp. 18-20.
- Gregson, N. and Crewe, L. (2003), *Second-hand Cultures*, Oxford: Berg.
- Hall, J. (1991), "Packaged Good," *Campaign*, 18 October, pp. 21-23.
- Harrell, G.D. and McConacha, D.M. (1992), "Personal Factors Related to Consumer Product Disposal Tendencies," *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, **26**(2), pp. 397-417.
- Kassaye, W.W. (2001), "Green Dilemma," *Market Intelligence and Planning*, **19**(6), pp. 444-455.

- Kassaye, W.W. and Verma, D. (1992), "Balancing Traditional Packaging Functions with the New 'Green' Packaging Concerns," *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, Autumn, **57**(4), pp. 15-25.
- Keller, K.L. (1998), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Kornblau, C. (1961), "Packaging and Supermarkets: The Package in the Market Place," *Effective Marketing Coordination*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 296-306.
- Kotler, P. Armstrong, G., Saunders, J. and Wong, V. (1999), *Principles of Marketing, 2nd European Edition*, London: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Manchester Evening News. (2006), "Fined £75 for Dropping a Lolly Stick," *Manchester Evening News*, 9th May, 2006.
- McNeal, J.U. and Ji, M.F. (2003), "Children's Visual Memory of Packaging," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, **20**(5), pp. 400-427.
- McNeal, J.U. and Yeh, C.H. (1993), Stages of Consumer Socialization in Childhood," *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section*, Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association, pp. 856-60.
- Olney, T.J. and Byrce, W. (1991), "Consumer Responses to Environmentally Based Product Claims," *Advances in Consumer Research*, **18**, pp. 693-696.
- Pickton, D and Broderick, A., (2001), *Integrated Marketing Communications*, Harlow: FT-Prentice Hall.
- Polonsky, M.J., Carlson, L. and Fry, M. (2003), "The Harm Chain: A Public Policy development and Stakeholder Perspective," *Marketing Theory*, **3**(3), pp. 345-364.
- Prendergast, G. and Pitt, L. (1996), "Packaging, Marketing, Logistics and the Environment: Are there Trade-offs?" *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, **26**(6), pp. 60-72.
- Scottish Executive Environmental Group, Findings No.25/2005 Public Attitudes and Environmental Justice in Scotland, October 2005. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005>
- Sjolander, R. (1996), "Market Effects of an 'Environmental' Beverage Tax," *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **12**(3), pp. 333-345.
- Southgate, P. (1994), *Total Branding by Design*. London: Kogan Page.
- Stack, E.G. (1998), *Beverage World*, June 15, pp. 106.
- Strong, C. (1998), "The Impact of Environmental Education on Children's Knowledge and Awareness of Environmental Concerns," *Market Intelligence and Planning*, **16**(6), pp. 349-355.
- Thøgersen, J. (1996), "Wasteful Food Consumption: Trends in Food and Packaging Waste," *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **12**(3), pp. 291-304.
- Underwood, R.L. (1999), "Construction of Brand Identity Through Packaging: A Qualitative Enquiry," in Menon, A and Sharma, A (Eds), *Marketing Theory and Applications*, Chicago: American Marketing

Association, pp. 147-8.

Warlop, L., Ratneshwar, S. and Osselaer (2005), "Distinctive Brand Cues and Memory for Product Consumption Experiences," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, **22**, pp. 27-44.

www.acneilsen.co.uk "The Top 100 Grocery Brands in the UK."

www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4758419.stm "All Tesco Bags to be Degradeable"

www.businessweek.com "The Top 100 Brands."

www.coca-cola.com "Citizenship: Environmental Report"

www.defra.gov.uk "Local Environment Quality: Litter"

www.keepwalestidy.org "UK Filthy Facts"

www.mcdonalds.com "Environment"

www.pepsicowiderworld.co.uk "Sustaining the Environment"

About the Authors

Stuart Roper is Lecturer in Marketing at Manchester Business School, UK. His main teaching interests focus on branding, marketing strategy and services marketing. His PhD involved research into corporate branding and reputation in the business-to-business sector. He is a co-author of the book *Corporate Reputation and Competitiveness* and his main research area in branding. Prior to working in academia Stuart gained marketing management experience in business-to-business markets, notably in the telecommunications sector.

Cathy Parker is Principal Lecturer in Retailing at Manchester Metropolitan University Business School and Director of the Retail Enterprise Network. She has published in international journals such as the *International Journal of Service Industries Management*, *The European Journal of Marketing* and the *Journal of Marketing Management*. Her research interests include the independent retail sector and town and city centre management and marketing.