



**Friends of the Earth (HK)**

***Opinion Survey on Levy Scheme on Plastic Shopping Bags –  
A Report***

**June 2010**

**Performed by HKU POP ;**

**Sponsored by Environment and Conservation Fund**





## Table of Contents:

Preface by Friends of the Earth (HK)	3-5
HKU POP's Report on the Opinion Survey	
1. Research background	7
2. Research design	7
3. Research findings	8-10
4. Concluding remarks	10-11
Appendix 1 – Contact information	12-16
Appendix 2 – Frequency tables	17-28
Appendix 3 – Demographics of respondents	29-31
Appendix 4 – Questionnaire	32-40

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Contact: [foehk@foe.org.hk](mailto:foehk@foe.org.hk)

Web-site: [www.foe.org.hk](http://www.foe.org.hk)



## **Preface by Friends of the Earth (HK)**

1. The Product Eco-responsibility (Plastic Shopping Bags) Regulation was executed in 7 July 2009 after 4 years' deliberation. The first stage of the scheme covers specific retail businesses such as large supermarket chains and convenience stores.
2. The Environmental Levy Scheme on Plastic Shopping Bags is the first legislative move induced from producer's responsibility scheme. The design of the levy scheme is based on two principles: 1. To avoid waste generation by providing economic incentive; 2. to transform human behaviour and attitude. What concerns us, apart from the amount of waste reduced under the scheme, is that how the new policy has transformed public attitude towards environmental protection, especially people's motivation to use fewer plastic bags. We hope to evaluate the effectiveness of the scheme based on the two mentioned principles.
3. Consequently, we applied funding from the Environment and Conservation Fund in order to commission HKU POP to carry out a three-stage opinion survey in one year period. The study aims at understanding people's habit of using plastic shopping bags, reusable shopping bags, rubbish bags as well as their knowledge of the levy scheme before, one month and six months after the launch of the scheme respectively. We will further compare and analyze data collected from the three different stages in order to assess people's behavioural and attitudinal change.
4. The three-stage survey was carried out before the launch of the scheme (mid-April 2009), one month (August 2009) and six months after the launch (January 2010) respectively. It has successfully interviewed 3,022 Hong Kong citizens of age above 15, Cantonese speaking and have shopped in



supermarkets in the last month.

5. Our study has found that though the 50 cents levy cannot fully reflect the environmental cost of plastic bags, it can help reduce consumption of plastic bags by providing economic incentive. For instance, 78% of the interviewees would ask for plastic bags from supermarkets before the scheme has been put into practice, compared with one month after (54%). The percentage has further dropped to 15% six months after. Furthermore, the survey also shows that the percentage of those who “always” bring their own shopping bags has risen from 53% before the launch (April 2009) to 77% six months after the launch (January 2010). This indicates that citizens have undergone an obvious positive change in their living habits of using plastic bags.
  
6. The commence of the scheme has received many criticisms claiming that it will result in a sharp increase in rubbish bag consumption, which in turn will amplify the total consumption of plastic bags. Our survey has confirmed that 2% more interviewees now have to buy rubbish bags. Despite this, the average number of monthly plastic bag consumption has reduced from 29.4 (before) to 27.6 (one month after) to 26.3 (6 months after), which marks a 10.5% decrease in total usage. This demonstrates that people have actually reduced wasting plastic bags under the user-pay system. Friends of the Earth (HK) suggested that whilst educating people to reduce the use of plastic bags, the public should also be encouraged to separate waste for recycling. And then, property management offices could consider distributing fewer or smaller rubbish bags to their residents.
  
7. The survey also reveals that although people use more reusable shopping bags now, they have piled up more reusable shopping bags at the same time, from 8.9 on average before the launch to 9.5 one



month after and even 10.3 six months after. In view of this, we are worried that the abuse of reusable shopping bags will become more serious. Therefore, we urge the public not to abuse reusable shopping bags either.

8. In the last stage of the survey, **two third of the interviewees agree that the levy scheme should be enlarged to cover most of the retail businesses.** Concerning about the implementation timetable, 66% of them think that it should be carried out immediately or within 2010.
  
9. Friends of the Earth (HK) reckons that the levy scheme has proven a remarkable success in the reduction of plastic bag use and transformation of people's Bring Your Own Bag (BYOB) shopping behaviour. Consequently, the government should grasp the chance to fulfill her promise to extend the levy scheme to all dried product retailers. This move can not only help further reduce plastic bag use, but is also fairer to all sectors of the retail industry.



**THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG  
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME (POP)**

---

***Opinion Survey on Plastic Bag Levy***

**COMMISSIONED BY**

**FRIENDS OF THE EARTH (HK)**



**SURVEY REPORT**

Compiled by

Chung Ting-yiu Robert, Pang Ka-lai Karie,  
Lee Wai-kin Frank and Ng Tsz-ying Clarence

14 June 2010

*Copyright of this report is held jointly by Friends of the Earth (HK) and Public Opinion Programme, the University of Hong Kong. Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of the University of Hong Kong. Dr Robert Chung is fully responsible for the work of the POP.*



## Research Background

1. The Public Opinion Programme (POP) at the University of Hong Kong was commissioned by Friends of the Earth (HK) in February 2009 to conduct this “*Opinion Survey on Plastic Bag Levy*”, in order to gauge people’s opinion towards using plastic bags and the implementation of plastic bag levy in three stages, namely April 2009, August 2009 and January 2010.
2. The research instrument used in this study was designed by POP after consulting Friends of the Earth (HK), whilst fieldwork operations and data analysis were conducted independently by POP without interference from Friends of the Earth (HK) or any other party. In other words, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, so it would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

## Research Design

3. This was a random telephone survey conducted by interviewers under close supervision using the Web-based Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (Web-CATI) system, which allowed real-time data capture and consolidation. To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were first drawn randomly from the residential telephone directories as "seed numbers", from which another set of numbers was generated using the "plus/minus one/two" method, in order to capture the unlisted numbers. Duplicated numbers were then filtered, and the remaining numbers were mixed in random order to produce the final telephone sample. The target population of this survey was the **Cantonese-speaking local population aged 15 or above and have shopped in supermarkets in the past month**. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one target respondent was selected. If more than one subject had been available, selection was made using the "next birthday rule" which selected the person who had his/her birthday next from all those present.
4. This survey was conducted during the period of April 2009 to January 2010 in three stages. Sample size of each stage was **1,000 or more** successful interviews with Hong Kong residents. Please refer to the table below.

Survey period	Successful cases	Effective response rate	Standard error	Sampling error
1. 6-15/4/2009	1,000	71.3%	1.6%	+/-3.2%
2. 11-18/8/2009	1,003	73.0%	1.6%	+/-3.2%
3. 18-25/1/2010	1,019	67.7%	1.6%	+/-3.1%



5. Statistical tests of “difference-of-proportions” and “difference-of-means” have been employed whenever applicable, in order to check for significant changes. Figures marked with single asterisk (\*) denoted statistical significance at  $p=0.05$  level whereas those with double asterisks (\*\*) indicated that the variation has been tested to be statistically significant at  $p=0.01$  level. Please refer to each table in Appendix 2. However, it is noteworthy that whether numerical changes are statistically valid does not equal to the actual usage and meaning of such changes.

## Research Findings

6. The questionnaire comprised 13 opinion questions, in which 10 were tracking questions, i.e. asked in all three surveys, while another two questions (Q11 and Q12) only in the first two stages, and Q13 in Stage 3 only. Demographics of the respondents were located at the final part of the questionnaire. Key findings are summarized below with cross reference to the frequency tables in Appendix 2.

### (I) Habit of using shopping bags

7. The survey started with enquiring respondents, during the last month, the average number of plastic bags being taken every time they had shopped at supermarket. Results of Stages 1 and 2 showed that majority of respondents had the habit of taking plastic bags, with the proportions of 78% and 54% respectively. When it comes to Stage 3, or six months after implementation of plastic bag levy, the proportion of respondents taking plastic bags has plummeted to 15% only. Overall speaking (if to count “0” for those respondents who did not take plastic bags), respondents took 1.5 plastic bags on average in Stage 1, 1.0 plastic bag in Stage 2, and dropped much to 0.3 in Stage 3 (Tables 7 and 8).
8. How would respondents treat the plastic bags after shopping? Results of three stages showed that most respondents would “store them, use as garbage bags”, with respective percentages of 74%, 74% and 67% claiming so in the three surveys. It was followed by “storing and reusing them later on, like use as shopping bags”, with the proportions of 55%, 53% and 48% correspondingly. Besides, 7%, 7% and 9% of respondents would “dispose of” the plastic bags after shopping in the three stages correspondingly, while the proportions of respondents claiming he or she “seldom uses plastic bag” were 1%, 4% and 5%, showing an increase after the implementation of plastic bag levy (Table 9).
9. The survey continued by asking if the respondents bring with them an environmental shopping bag when going shopping. In Stage 1, 18% of respondents “never” did so, while the proportions of those saying “rarely”, “sometimes”, and “always” were 7%, 22% and 53% respectively. Results in Stage 2 have significant changes, for the proportions of “never”, “rarely”, “sometimes”, and “always” were 11%, 4%, 12% and 74% respectively. Results in Stage 3 were similar to those of Stage 2, implying an increased awareness of people bringing environmental shopping bags when shopping after the implementation of plastic bag levy. Moreover, in Stage 1, respondents on average had 9 environmental shopping bags at home, and 10 in Stages 2 and 3, which showed a slight increase (Tables 10 and 11).



10. The survey showed that majority of respondents said that “management office provides plastic bags”. 59%, 62% and 62% admitted so in the three stages respectively, while a respective of 26%, 20% and 21% would “use plastic bags of supermarkets/shops”. Proportions of respondents affirmed that their household expense on buying garbage bags were 14%, 16% and 14% in the three stages. Within these respondents, the average number of plastic bags used per month was 26 to 29 (Tables 12 to 13).
11. In Stage 3, the survey followed by gauging respondents the number of garbage bags provided by their management office in each month. Results showed the average was 30 plastic bags (according to 485 respondents who gave an affirmative answer). Within those 629 whose “management office had provided plastic bags”, 79% thought the number of garbage bags provided was “suitable”, while 15% thought they were “too many”, and 35 said “too few” (Tables 14 and 15).

## **(II) Attitude towards plastic bag levy**

12. Second part of the survey gauges mainly respondents’ opinions towards plastic bag levy in different stages. Before implementation, 86% admitted they would “bring their own bag”, 10% would not. For the reasons of not bringing their own bag to shopping, the most popular answer was because they “didn’t want to bother / inconvenient” (62%), followed by “easy to forget” (18%) and “not having a shopping habit, no need” (13%) etc. Besides, even if the stores respondents often visit charged for each plastic bag, 81% said that it would “not affect” their desire to shop at these stores. On the contrary, 17% said they “would shop less” (Tables 16 to 18).
13. In Stage 2 and Stage 3, that is one month or six months after implementation of plastic bag levy, 90% of respondents in both surveys reported that they had already developed the habit of bringing their own shopping bags, and 10% did not. Among those who gave a negative response, “not having a shopping habit, no need” was the most popular option, with 46% and 51% in the two surveys respectively. Meanwhile, if the stores respondents often visit charged for each plastic bag, more than 80% of them thought there would be “no impacts” on their desire to shop at these stores (85% and 86%, Tables 19 to 21).
14. The survey went on asking all respondents if the levy of 50 cents per plastic bag could reduce people from abusing plastic bags effectively. Results in all three stages showed that most respondents said “Yes”, with a respective of 79%, 72% and 81% thinking so (Table 22).
15. On the other hand, in Stage 1 survey, 16% of respondents expected the plastic bag levy would add on to their financial burden, while 84% thought the opposite. After levying, 94% in both Stage 2 and Stage 3 reported that the plastic bag levy had not added on to their financial burden, only a very small proportion thought so (Tables 23 and 24).
16. Stage 1 and Stage 2 surveys tried to gauge if the respondents had known which stores had been



implementing or were to implement plastic bag levy. "PARKnSHOP" was mostly mentioned, with 69% and 91% in Stage 1 and Stage 2 correspondingly. "Wellcome" came second, with 67% and 89% recognition rates respectively. Other popular answers included "Mannings" (Stage 1: 19%, Stage 2: 26%), "7-11 Convenience Store" (Stage 1: 10%, Stage 2: 21%), "CRC Shop" (18%, 16%), "Watsons" (10%, 14%), "Circle K Convenience Store" (3%, 7%), "JUSCO" (2%, 5%), etc. 26% of respondents in Stage 1 could not name any, and only 2% was the same in Stage 2 (Table 25).

17. The last question of the first two surveys asked all respondents, apart from supermarkets and large-scale chained stores, which type of stores they think should implement charging for plastic bags as soon as possible. Results revealed that most respondents answered "newspaper stand" (Stage 1: 59%, Stage 2: 57%) and "stationary" (Stage 1: 47%, Stage 2: 52%). Other popular answers included "pharmacy" (52%, 49%), "domestic products" (48%, 43%), "boutique" (46%, 43%), "watch and jewelry" (40%, 35%), "grocery" (40%, 35%), "electric appliances" (37%, 32%), "restaurants" (31%, 21%), etc. Moreover, 11% and 6% considered "all shops" should implement plastic bag levy as soon as possible in Stages 1 and 2 correspondingly, while a respective of 7% and 8% replied "none" (Table 26).
18. To gauge people's responses to the further implementation of plastic bag levy to most retail shops, three new questions were added in the last survey. Results showed that 67% "agreed" to this suggestion, while 21% "disagreed", and 8% said "half-half". 681 respondents who "agreed" were further asked for the appropriate time for implementation, 67% of them considered "year 2010 / immediate", 14% opt "year 2011", 5% said "year 2012 or after", 2% expressed "no need to hurry", and 12% had no clue. Among those 216 respondents who "disagreed", 24% admitted they "did not support the plastic bag levy at all", 23% thought it was "inconvenient to people", 21% thought "shops would refuse to follow / it was difficult in implementation", 19% thought "there were still many problems to be solved", and 12% "only supported implementing in some shops" (Tables 27 to 29).

## Conclusion

19. This 9-month opinion survey interviewed more than 3,000 people, asking for their opinions on plastic bag levy and corresponding behavioral changes in different stages, and thus the results are of high reference value.
20. Survey results clearly indicate that, before implementation of plastic bag levy and shortly after levying, many respondents would use plastic bags provided by supermarkets (78% and 54%). Nevertheless, six months after implementation, the proportion plummeted to 15% only, which reflects the high effectiveness of the levy. As for the habit of bringing their own bags to shopping, the proportion of doing so increased largely from 53% to 73% in the initial period after implementation, and to 77%



later on, implying that the policy has successfully raised people's awareness of conserving the environment, at least in the sense of using plastic bags.

21. In addition, people have very positive appraisal towards plastic bag levy. About 80% in all stages consider the levy could reduce people from abusing plastic bags, and majority of respondents reported that the charge did not add on to their financial burden.
  
22. In the last survey, two-third of respondents agreed the further implementation of plastic bag levy to most retail shops. As for the time of implementation, majority opted for "year 2010 / immediate". On the contrary, only 20% respondents showed opposition to the suggestion.



# **Appendix 1**

## **Contact information**



Table 1 Calculation of effective response rate (Stage 1)

Effective response rate
= $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Partial interview} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by prorated-eligible respondents}^*}$
= $\frac{1,000}{1,000 + 41 + 12 + 459 [(1,000 + 41 + 12) / (1,000 + 41 + 12 + 328)]}$
= 71.3%

<sup>^</sup> Includes “known respondent refusal” and “household-level refusal”

\* Figure obtained by prorata

Table 2 Breakdown of contact information of the survey (Stage 1)

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<b>Respondents’ ineligibility confirmed</b>	<b>3,934</b>	<b>40.1</b>
<i>Fax/ data line</i>	326	3.3
<i>Invalid number</i>	2,815	28.7
<i>Call-forwarding/ mobile/ pager number</i>	46	0.5
<i>Non-residential number</i>	376	3.8
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	43	0.4
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	328	3.3
<b>Respondents’ eligibility not confirmed</b>	<b>2,177</b>	<b>22.2</b>
<i>Line busy</i>	96	1.0
<i>No answer</i>	1,408	14.3
<i>Answering device</i>	34	0.3
<i>Call-blocking</i>	27	0.3
<i>Language problem</i>	141	1.4
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	459	4.7
<i>Others</i>	12	0.1
<b>Respondents’ eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>27.5</b>

<i>Household-level refusal</i>	5	0.1
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	7	0.1
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	2,592	26.4
<i>Partial interview</i>	41	0.4
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	59	0.6
<b>Successful cases</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>10.2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,815</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3 Calculation of effective response rate (Stage 2)

Effective response rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Partial interview} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by prorated-eligible respondents}^*}$
=	$\frac{1,003}{1,003 + 55 + 21 + 360} [(1,003 + 55 + 21) / (1,003 + 55 + 21 + 234)]$
=	73.0%

<sup>^</sup> Includes "known respondent refusal" and "household-level refusal"

\* Figure obtained by prorata

Table 4 Breakdown of contact information of the survey (Stage 2)

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Respondents' ineligibility confirmed</b>	<b>7,034</b>	<b>40.6</b>
<i>Fax/ data line</i>	746	4.3
<i>Invalid number</i>	5,319	30.7
<i>Call-forwarding/ mobile/ pager number</i>	64	0.4
<i>Non-residential number</i>	640	3.7
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	31	0.2
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	234	1.4
<b>Respondents' eligibility not confirmed</b>	<b>4,379</b>	<b>25.3</b>



<i>Line busy</i>	393	2.3	
<i>No answer</i>	3,199	18.5	
<i>Answering device</i>	92	0.5	
<i>Call-blocking</i>	128	0.7	
<i>Language problem</i>	180	1.0	
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	360	2.1	
<i>Others</i>	14	0.1	
<b>Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview</b>		<b>4,916</b>	<b>28.4</b>
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	7	0.0	
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	14	0.1	
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	4,824	27.8	
<i>Partial interview</i>	55	0.3	
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	16	0.1	
<b>Successful cases</b>		<b>1,003</b>	<b>5.8</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>17,332</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 5 Calculation of effective response rate (Stage 3)

Effective response rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Partial interview} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by prorated-eligible respondents}^*}$
=	$\frac{1,019}{1,019 + 87 + 18 + 502 [(1,019 + 87 + 18) / (1,019 + 87 + 18 + 353)]}$
=	67.7%

<sup>^</sup> Includes "known respondent refusal" and "household-level refusal"

\* Figure obtained by prorate

Table 6 Breakdown of contact information of the survey (Stage 3)

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<b>Respondents' ineligibility confirmed</b>	<b>2,359</b>	<b>36.5</b>
<i>Fax/ data line</i>	216	3.3
<i>Invalid number</i>	1,554	24.0
<i>Call-forwarding/ mobile/ pager number</i>	24	0.4
<i>Non-residential number</i>	207	3.2
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	5	0.1
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	333	5.5
<b>Respondents' eligibility not confirmed</b>	<b>1,854</b>	<b>28.7</b>
<i>Line busy</i>	128	2.0
<i>No answer</i>	1,096	17.0
<i>Answering device</i>	51	0.8
<i>Call-blocking</i>	24	0.4
<i>Language problem</i>	51	0.8
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	502	7.8
<i>Others</i>	2	0.0
<b>Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview</b>	<b>1,231</b>	<b>19.0</b>
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	7	0.1
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	11	0.2
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	1,114	17.2
<i>Partial interview</i>	87	1.3
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	12	0.2
<b>Successful cases</b>	<b>1,019</b>	<b>15.8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,463</b>	<b>100.0</b>



# **Appendix 2**

## **Frequency tables**



**(I) Habit of using shopping bags**

Table 7 [Q1a] During the last month, how many **shopping bags** did you take every time you shop at supermarket?

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=996)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Yes	780	<b>78.3%</b>	545	<b>54.3%**</b>	148	14.5%**
Never	213	21.4%	454	45.3%**	871	<b>85.5%**</b>
Don't know/hard to say	3	0.3%	4	0.4%	0	0.0%
Total	996	100.0%	1,003	100.0%	1,019	100.0%
Missing	4		0		0	

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 8 [Q1b] (Only ask respondents who have taken shopping bags in Q1a) Number of shopping bags taken

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=780)	Freq	Percentage (Base=545)	Freq	Percentage (Base=148)
Take less than 1 bag on average	26	3.3%	25	4.6%	0	0,0%
1-2 bag(s)	654	<b>83.8%</b>	480	<b>88.1%*</b>	124	<b>83.8%</b>
3-4 bags	51	6.5%	25	4.6%	15	10.1%*
5-6 bags	17	2.2%	10	1.8%	2	1.4%
7-8 bags	7	0.9%	1	0.2%	1	0.7%
9-10 bags	19	2.4%	2	0.4%**	4	2.7%**
11 bags or more	6	0.8%	2	0.4%	2	1.4%
Total	780	100.0%	545	100.0%	148	100.0%
Mean^	<b>1.5 bags</b>		<b>1.0 bag**</b>		<b>0.3 bag**</b>	
Standard error	0.1 bag		0.1 bag		0.1 bag	
Base	996		999		1,019	

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

^ Those who never take shopping bags are counted as "0" while those who take less than 1 bag on average are counted as "0.5". For other answers, the mid-points are used to calculate.



Table 9 [Q2] How would you treat the plastic bags usually after shopping? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	% of sample (Base=1,000)	Freq	% of sample (Base=1,002)	Freq	% of sample (Base=1,017)
Store them, use as garbage bags	741	<b>74.1%</b>	737	<b>73.6%</b>	684	<b>67.3%**</b>
Store and reuse them later on, like use as shopping bags	553	55.3%	526	52.5%	488	48.0%*
Dispose of	68	6.8%	67	6.7%	86	8.5%
I seldom use plastic bags	10	1.0%	35	3.5%**	47	4.6%
Put inside recycle bins	27	2.7%	21	2.1%	35	3.4%
Store them, and then give to other	15	1.5%	15	1.5%	18	1.8%
Sell them	4	0.4%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%
Don't know/ don't remember	2	0.2%	6	0.6%	3	0.3%
Total	1,420		1,409		1,362	
Missing	0		1		2	

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 10 [Q3] Do you often bring you an environmental shopping bag when you go shopping?

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,000)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Never	183	18.3%	107	10.7%**	89	8.7%
Yes, rarely	69	6.9%	37	3.7%**	23	2.3%
Yes, sometimes	217	21.7%	115	11.5%**	122	12.0%
Yes, always	531	<b>53.1%</b>	742	<b>74.0%**</b>	782	<b>76.7%</b>
Don't know	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	3	0.3%
Total	1,000	100.0%	1,003	100.0%	1,019	100.0%

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 11 [Q4] How many environmental shopping bags do you have at home?

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,000)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,019)
None at all	13	1.3%	13	1.3%	13	1.3%
1-5 bags	380	<b>38.0%</b>	281	28.0%**	265	26.0%
6-10 bags	303	30.3%	348	<b>34.7%*</b>	347	<b>34.1%</b>
11-15 bags	145	14.5%	159	15.9%	149	14.6%
16-20 bags	67	6.7%	93	9.3%*	101	9.9%

21 bags or more	86	8.6%	101	10.1%	132	13.0%*
Don't know	6	0.6%	8	0.8%	12	1.2%
Total	1,000	100.0%	1,003	100.0%	1,019	100.0%
Mean	<b>8.9 bags</b>		<b>9.5 bags*</b>		<b>10.3 bags**</b>	
Standard error	0.2 bag		0.2 bag		0.2 bag	
Base	994		995		1,007	

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 12 [Q5] Does your household need to spend on buying garbage bags?

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=999)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,002)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Yes	144	14.4%	160	16.0%	146	14.3%
No, provided by management office	588	<b>58.8%</b>	620	<b>61.9%</b>	630	<b>61.8%</b>
No, use plastic bags of supermarkets/shops	257	25.7%	198	19.8%**	216	21.2%
Don't know/hard to say	10	1.0%	24	2.4%*	27	2.6%
Total	999	100.0%	1,002	100.0%	1,019	100.0%
Missing	1		1		0	

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 13 [Q5a] (Only ask respondents who answered "Yes" in Q5) So how many garbage bags does your household use in one month on average?

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=144)	Freq	Percentage (Base=160)	Freq	Percentage (Base=146)
<10	6	4.2%	13	8.1%	12	8.2%
10 - 19	21	14.6%	28	17.5%	24	16.4%
20 - 29	15	10.4%	24	15.0%	19	13.0%
30 - 39	85	<b>59.0%</b>	77	<b>48.1%</b>	77	<b>52.7%</b>
40+	17	11.8%	18	11.3%	14	9.6%
Total	144	100.0%	160	100.0%	146	100.0%
Mean	<b>29.4 bags</b>		<b>27.6 bags</b>		<b>26.3 bags</b>	
Standard error	1.3 bag		1.4 bag		1.2 bag	
Base	144		160		146	



Table 14 [Q5b] (Stage 3) (Only ask respondents who answered “provided by management office” in Q5)  
So how many garbage bags would the management office provide each month?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=485)
Less than 10 bags	7	1.4%
10 – 19 bags	17	3.5%
20 – 29 bags	40	8.2%
30 – 39 bags	387	<b>79.8%</b>
40 bags or above	34	7.0%
Total	485	100.0%
<i>Don't know/hard to say/forgotten</i>	144	
Mean	<b>30.2 bags</b>	
Standard error	0.5 bag	
Base	485	

Table 15 [Q5c] (Stage 3) (Only ask respondents who answered “provided by management office” in Q5)  
Do you think the number of garbage bags provided by the management office is too many, too few, or suitable?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=629)
Too many	94	14.9%
Too few	19	3.0%
Suitable	494	<b>78.5%</b>
Don't know/hard to say	22	3.5%
Total	629	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	1	

## **(II) Attitude towards plastic bag levy**

**Tables 16 to 19 show questions in Stage 1**

Table 16 [Q6] If the plastic bag will be charged **in the future**, will you always bring your own bags then?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)
Yes	863	<b>86.3%</b>
No	100	10.0%
Don't know/hard to say	37	3.7%
Total	1,000	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	1	



Table 17 [Q7] (Only ask respondents said “no” in Q6) Why **not**? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)

	Frequency	% of responses (Base=117)	% of sub-sample (Base=112)
Don't want to bother / inconvenient	61	52.1%	<b>62.2%</b>
Easy to forget	18	15.4%	18.4%
Don't have shopping habit, no need	13	11.1%	13.3%
There are bags given by shops	7	6.0%	7.1%
Store them, and then give to other	6	5.1%	6.1%
Don't want to be ugly / not good-looking	5	4.3%	5.1%
I don't have shopping bags	4	3.4%	4.1%
Others (see below)	3	2.6%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
Other responses			
People shall use less plastic bags on voluntary basis	2	1.7%	1.8%
Depends on different occasions	1	0.9%	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>

Table 18 [Q8] If the stores you often visit charge for each plastic bag, **how would it** affect your desire to shop at these stores?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)
Would shop more	2	0.2%
Would shop less	172	17.2%
No impacts	810	<b>81.0%</b>
Don't know/hard to say/no comments	16	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Tables 19 to 21 show questions in Stages 2 and 3**

Table 19 [Q6] (Stages 2 and 3) Plastic bag levy has been implemented for 1 month / half a year, do you bring your own shopping bags usually?

	Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Yes	900	<b>89.7%</b>	919	<b>90.2%</b>
No	98	9.8%	97	9.5%
Don't know/hard to say	5	0.5%	3	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,003</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,019</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Table 20 [Q7] (Stages 2 and 3) (Only ask respondents who said “no” in Q6) Why **not**? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)

	Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	% of sub-sample (Base=98)	Frequency	% of sub-sample (Base=97)
Don't have shopping habit, no need	45	<b>45.9%</b>	49	<b>51.0%</b>
Don't want to bother / inconvenient	37	37.8%	32	33.3%
Easy to forget	10	10.2%	14	14.6%
There are bags given by shops	8	8.2%	7	7.3%
I don't have shopping bags	6	6.1%	7	7.3%
Don't want to be ugly / not good-looking	4	4.1%	5	5.2%
Store them, and then give to other	0	0.0%	3	3.1%
Environmental shopping bags are not that environmental	1	1.0%	2	2.1%
Don't know/hard to say	1	1.0%	1	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 21 [Q8] (Stages 2 and 3) If the stores you often visit charge for each plastic bag, **has** your desire to shop at these stores increased, decreased, or remained unchanged?

	Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Increased	4	0.4%	6	0.6%
Decreased	144	14.4%	119	11.7%
Unchanged	848	<b>84.5%</b>	879	<b>86.3%</b>
Don't know/hard to say/no comments	7	0.7%	15	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,003</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,019</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Table 22 [Q9] If the government decides to levy at 50 cents for each plastic bag, do you consider it could reduce people from abusing plastic bags effectively? (Stage 1) / The government currently levies at 50 cents for each plastic bag, do you consider it could reduce people from abusing plastic bags effectively? (Stages 2 and 3)

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,000)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Freq	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Yes	789	<b>78.9%</b>	722	<b>72.0%**</b>	823	<b>80.8%**</b>
No	184	18.4%	247	24.6%**	150	14.7%**
Don't know/hard to say/no comments	27	2.7%	34	3.4%	46	4.5%
Total	1,000	100.0%	1,003	100.0%	1,019	100.0%

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

Table 23 [Q10] (Stage 1) Would this plastic bag levy add on to your financial burden?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=999)
Yes	159	15.9%
No (including those who don't use plastic bags)	836	<b>83.7%</b>
Don't know/hard to say/no comments	4	0.4%
Total	999	100.0%
Missing	1	

Table 24 [Q10] (Stages 2 and 3) Has this plastic bag levy added on to your financial burden?

	Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,003)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Yes	58	5.8%	54	5.3%
No (including those who don't use plastic bags.)	943	<b>94.0%</b>	959	<b>94.1%</b>
Don't know/hard to say	2	0.2%	6	0.6%
Total	1,003	100.0%	1,019	100.0%



Table 25 [Q11] (Stages 1 and 2) Do you know which stores are charging or about to charge their customers for shopping bags already? Please name up to three stores. (Do not read out the options, allow maximum 3 answers)

	Apr 2009			Aug 2009		
	Freq	% of responses (Base=2,273)	% of sub-sample (Base=997)	Freq	% of responses (Base=2,833)	% of sub-sample (Base=1,002)
PARKnSHOP	689	30.3%	<b>69.1%</b>	912	32.2%	<b>91.0%**</b>
Wellcome	672	29.6%	<b>67.4%</b>	890	31.4%	<b>88.8%**</b>
Mannings	184	8.1%	18.5%	264	9.3%	26.3%**
7-11	103	4.5%	10.3%	207	7.3%	20.7%**
CRC Shop	176	7.7%	17.7%	164	5.8%	16.4%
Watsons	97	4.3%	9.7%	144	5.1%	14.4%**
Circle K	31	1.4%	3.1%	74	2.6%	7.4%**
JUSCO	17	0.7%	1.7%	49	1.7%	4.9%**
CitySuper	17	0.7%	1.7%	18	0.6%	1.8%
DCH Food Mart	5	0.2%	0.5%	14	0.5%	1.4%*
Taste	2	0.1%	0.2%	10	0.4%	1.0%*
CRC Depart't Store	2	0.1%	0.2%	9	0.3%	0.9%*
Yu Kee	1	0.1%	0.1%	9	0.3%	0.9%*
YATA	--	--	--	7	0.2%	0.7%
SOGO	--	--	--	6	0.2%	0.6%
Japan Home Centre	1	0.1%	0.1%	6	0.2%	0.6%*
Wing On Depart't Store	1	0.1%	0.1%	4	0.1%	0.4%
Yue Hwa	--	--	--	3	0.1%	0.3%
Kai Po Food Supermarket	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Great Pharmacy	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Others	12	0.5%	1.2%	1	0.1%	0.1%
Don't know/ forgotten	9	0.4%	0.9%	15	0.5%	1.5%
Don't know/ forgotten	254	11.2%	25.5%	23	0.8%	2.3%**
Total	2,273	100.0%		2,833	100.0%	
Missing	3			1		

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.



Table 26 [Q12] (Stages 1 and 2) Apart from supermarkets and large-scale chained stores, which of the following type of stores do you think should implement charging for plastic bags as soon as possible? (Read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	Apr 2009			Aug 2009		
	Freq	% of responses (Base=4,631)	% of sub-sample (Base=993)	Freq	% of responses (Base=4,174)	% of sub-sample (Base=1,001)
Newspaper stand	584	12.6%	<b>58.8%</b>	571	13.7%	<b>57.0%</b>
Stationary	468	10.1%	47.1%	517	12.4%	51.6%*
Pharmacy	514	11.1%	51.8%	486	11.6%	48.6%
Domestic products	474	10.2%	47.7%	429	10.3%	42.9%*
Boutique	453	9.8%	45.6%	425	10.2%	42.5%
Watch and jewelry	393	8.5%	39.6%	349	8.4%	34.9%*
Grocery	398	8.6%	40.1%	347	8.3%	34.7%*
Electric appliances	370	8.0%	37.3%	317	7.6%	31.7%**
Restaurants	304	6.6%	30.6%	210	5.0%	21.0%**
Bakery	261	5.6%	26.3%	202	4.8%	20.2%**
Fresh food	194	4.2%	19.5%	141	3.4%	14.1%**
All of the above	109	2.4%	11.0%	60	1.4%	6.0%**
None of the above	70	1.5%	7.0%	82	2.0%	8.2%
Others	18	0.4%	1.8%	7	0.2%	0.7%*
Don't know/ don't remember	21	0.5%	2.1%	31	0.7%	3.1%
Total	4,631	100.0%		4,174	100.0%	
Missing	7			2		

\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level as compared with previous survey.

\*\* figure tested to be statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level as compared with previous survey.

**Tables 27 to 29 show new questions in Stage 3**

Table 27 [Q13a] There is a view that the plastic bag levy should be further implemented, that means most retail shops have to charge for each plastic bag. Do you tend to agree or disagree this view?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,019)
Agree	681	<b>66.8%</b>
Half-half	78	7.7%
Disagree	216	21.2%
Don't know/ hard to say	44	4.3%
Total	1,019	100.0%
Missing	1	

Table 28 [Q13b] (Only ask respondents said “agree” in Q13a, base=681) When do you think it should be implemented the soonest?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=681)
Year 2010 / immediate	454	<b>66.7%</b>
Year 2011	94	13.8%
Year 2012	19	2.8%
Year 2013	9	1.3%
Year 2014 or after	5	0.7%
No need to hurry	16	2.3%
Don't know/ hard to say	84	12.3%
Total	681	100.0%

Table 29 [Q13c] (Only ask respondents said “disagree” in Q13a, base=216) Why do you disagree? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	Frequency	% of responses (Base=233)	% of sub-sample (Base=213)
Disagree plastic bag levy at all	50	21.5%	<b>23.5%</b>
Inconvenient to people	49	21.0%	<b>23.0%</b>
Shops will refuse to follow/ difficult in implementation	44	18.9%	<b>20.7%</b>
There are still many problems to be solved	41	17.6%	<b>19.2%</b>
Only support implementing in some shops	26	11.2%	12.2%
Not much difference	4	1.7%	1.9%
The charge is too high	4	1.7%	1.9%
Others (see below)	8	3.4%	3.8%
Don't know/hard to say	7	3.0%	3.3%



	Total	216	100.0%	
	<i>Missing</i>	3		
Other responses				
Acceptable to take a plastic bag if buy many things once a time		2	0.9%	0.9%
Affect the industry of plastic bag		2	0.9%	0.9%
Poor economy, should not extend plastic bag levy		1	0.4%	0.5%
Unfair to the lower class		1	0.4%	0.5%
Affect promotion		1	0.4%	0.5%
The levy should be paid by the government		1	0.4%	0.5%
	Total	8	3.4%	3.8%



# **Appendix 3**

## **Demographics of respondents**

## Demographics of the respondents

Table 30 Gender

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	415	41.5	392	39.1	426	41.8
Female	585	58.5	611	60.9	593	58.2
Total	1,000	100.0	1,003	100.0	1,019	100.0

Table 31 Age group

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
15 - 17	36	3.6	30	3.1	20	2.0
18 - 20	59	6.0	80	8.2	67	6.6
21 - 39	116	11.7	117	11.9	115	11.3
30 - 39	124	12.5	133	13.6	128	12.6
40 - 49	220	22.2	202	20.6	206	20.2
50 - 59	229	23.1	230	23.4	232	22.8
60 or above	207	20.9	189	19.3	251	24.6
Total	991	100.0	981	100.0	1,019	100.0
Missing	9		22		0	

Table 32 Education attainment

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Primary school or below	182	18.4	190	19.0	172	16.9
Secondary school	528	53.3	542	54.3	531	52.1
Tertiary education or above	280	28.3	266	26.7	316	31.0
Total	990	100.0	998	100.0	1,019	100.0
Missing	10		5		0	



Table 33 Occupation

	Apr 2009		Aug 2009		Jan 2010	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Administrators and professionals	193	19.7	170	17.3	219	21.5
Clerks and service workers and shop sales workers	193	19.7	193	19.6	176	17.3
Blue collar workers	88	9.0	83	8.4	74	7.3
Students	119	12.1	132	13.4	104	10.2
Full-time housewives	183	18.7	187	19.0	200	19.6
Others	204	20.8	219	22.3	246	24.1
Total	980	100.0	984	100.0	1,019	100.0
<i>Missing</i>	<i>20</i>		<i>19</i>		<i>0</i>	



# Appendix 4 Questionnaire



# *Opinion Survey on Plastic Bag Levy (Stages 1 to 3)*

---

Survey Questionnaire

April 2009 to January 2010



## Part I Self-introduction

Good evening, sir/madam, my name is X, an interviewer from the Public Opinion Programme (POP) of the University of Hong Kong. We are conducting a survey on people's opinions on the use of plastic bags as well as plastic bag levy. I would like to invite you to participate in an interview which will take only a few minutes. I would like to stress that your telephone number was randomly selected by our computer and all information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. If you have any questions about the research, you can call xxxx xxxx to talk to our supervisor XXX. If you want to know more about the rights as a participant, please contact the Human Research Ethics Committee for Non-Clinical Faculties of the University of Hong Kong at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded but will be destroyed shortly after our quality control process is complete.

[S1] Is it okay for us to start this survey?

Yes  
No (skip to end)

[S2] Is your telephone number xxxx xxxx?

Yes  
No (skip to end)

## Part II Selection of Respondent

[S3] Is there any household member aged 15 or above? Since we need to conduct random sampling, if there is more than one available, I would like to speak to the one who will have his / her birthday next. (If no one aged 15 or above, interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye)

Yes  
No → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye. (skip to end)  
Refuse to answer → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye. (skip to end)

[S4] Have you shopped at supermarket at least once in the **past month**?



Yes

No → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye. (skip to end)

Refuse to answer → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye. (skip to end)

## Part III Survey Questions

### (I) Habit of using shopping bags

[Q1a] During the last month, how many shopping bags did you take every time you shop at supermarket?

Never

Don't know/hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q1b] (Only ask respondents cannot provide exact figures in Q1a) Number of plastic bags (range)  
(Interviewers can read out the ranges)

Take less than 1 bag on average

1-2 bag(s)

3-4 bags

5-6 bags

7-8 bags

9-10 bags

11 bags or more

Refuse to answer

[Q2] How would you treat the plastic bags usually after shopping?

Don't know/hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q3] Do you often bring your an environmental shopping bag when you go shopping?

Never

Yes, rarely

Yes, sometimes



Yes, always  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q4] How many environmental shopping bags do you have at home?

---

Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q5a] Does your household need to spend on buying garbage bags? (If respondents answer "yes", interviewers then ask "so how many garbage bags would your household use per month on average?"; if respondents answer "no", interviewers then ask "so are they provided by management office or supermarkets/shops?")

Yes, \_\_\_\_\_ per month  
No, provided by management office  
No, use plastic bags of supermarkets/ shops  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q5b] (Stage 3) (Only ask respondents who answered "provided by management office") So how many garbage bags would the management office provide each month?

---

Don't know/hard to say/don't remember  
Refuse to answer

[Q5c] (Stage 3) (Only ask respondents who answered "provided by management office") Do you think the number of garbage bags provided by the management office is too many, too few, or suitable?

Too many  
Too few  
Suitable  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

## **(II) Attitude towards plastic bag levy**

**[interviewer read out: Now we would ask you a few questions on plastic bag levy.]**

[Q6] (Stage 1) If the plastic bag will be charged **in the future**, will you always bring your own bags then?



Yes  
No  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q6] (Stages 2 and 3) Plastic bag levy has been implemented for 1 month / half a year, do you bring your own shopping bags usually?

Yes  
No  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q7] (Only ask respondents who said "no" in Q6) Why **not**? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)

---

Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q8] (Stage 1) If the stores you often visit charge for each plastic bag, **how would it** affect your desire to shop at these stores?

Would shop more  
Would shop less  
No impacts  
Don't know/hard to say/no comments  
Refuse to answer

[Q8] (Stages 2 and 3) If the stores you often visit charge for each plastic bag, **has** your desire to shop at these stores increased, decreased, or remained unchanged?

Increased  
Decreased  
Remained unchanged  
Don't know/hard to say/no comments  
Refuse to answer

[Q9] If the government decides to levy at 50 cents for each plastic bag, do you consider it could reduce people from abusing plastic bags effectively? (Stage 1) / The government currently levies at 50 cents for each plastic bag, do you consider it could reduce people from abusing plastic bags effectively? (Stages 2 and 3)



Yes  
No  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q10] (Stage 1) Would this plastic bag levy add on to your financial burden?

Yes  
No (including those who don't use plastic bags.)  
I don't use shopping bags  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q10] (Stages 2 and 3) Has this plastic bag levy added on to your financial burden?

Yes  
No (including those who don't use plastic bags.)  
I don't use shopping bags  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q11] (Stages 1 and 2) Do you know which stores are charging or about to charge their customers for shopping bags already? Please name up to three stores. (Do not read out the options, allow maximum 3 answers)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don't know/forgotten  
Refuse to answer

[Q12] (Stages 1 and 2) Apart from supermarkets and large-scale chained stores, which types of stores do you think should implement charging for plastic bags as soon as possible? (multiple answers allowed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don't know/hard to say/no comments  
Refuse to answer

**[Q13 in Stage 3 only]**

[Q13a] There is a view that the plastic bag levy should be further implemented, that means most retail shops have to charge for each plastic bag. Do you tend to agree or disagree this view?

Agree (ask Q13b)



Half-half (skip to DM1)  
Disagree (ask Q13c)  
Don't know/hard to say (skip to DM1)  
Refuse to answer (skip to DM1)

[Q13b] (Only ask respondents said "agree" in Q13a) When do you think it should be implemented the soonest?

Year 2010 / immediate  
Year 2011  
Year 2012  
Year 2013  
Year 2014 or after  
No need to hurry  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

[Q13c] (Only ask respondents said "disagree" in Q13a) Why do you disagree? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don't know/hard to say  
Refuse to answer

## **Part IV Personal information**

I'd like to know some of your personal particulars in order to facilitate our analysis. If you do not want to disclose your info, you could refuse to answer.

[DM1] Gender

Male  
Female

[DM2] Age

\_\_\_\_\_ (Exact figure)  
Refuse to answer



[DM3] Education attainment

- Primary or below
- Secondary
- Matriculated
- Tertiary, non-degree holder
- Tertiary, degree holder
- Postgraduate or above
- Refuse to answer

[DM4] Occupation

---

Refuse to answer

*Thank you for your time. If you have any questions regarding this interview, you can call xxxx-xxxx to verify this interview's authenticity and confirm my identity, or call the Human Research Ethics Committee for Non-Clinical Faculties of the University of Hong Kong at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. Good-bye!*