PORI

HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
香 港 民 意 研 究 所

Hong Kong Public Opinion Program
of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute

Survey on Municipal Solid Waste Charging Bill

Research Report

Compiled by
CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert, PANG Ka-Lai Karie
and CHAN Wai-Man Joyce

11 March 2021

Table of Content

1.   Background

1.1   The Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute Limited (HKPORI) was registered in Hong Kong as a limited company on 19 February 2019 and started to operate on 4 May 2019. Since our establishment, first under HKUPOP in June 1991 and now under HKPORI, we have been providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations. We are dedicated to collect and study public opinion on virtually all topics, which are of interest and value to academics, journalists, policy-makers and the general public. POP" in this publication may refer to HKPOP or HKUPOP as the case may be.

1.2   In December 2020, ADM Capital Foundation commissioned the Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) of the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI) to conduct the "Survey on Municipal Solid Waste Charging Bill" targeting Cantonese-speaking residents in Hong Kong of age 18 or above. The objectives of the survey were to gauge Hong Kong citizens' practices of waste management, their views on waste management and on the key elements of the proposed municipal solid waste charging bill.

1.3   The research design and instrument used in this study were designed by the HKPOP Team after consulting ADM Capital Foundation while fieldwork operations, data collection and data analysis were conducted independently by the HKPOP Team without interference from any outside party. In other words, HKPOP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the research and would therefore take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

2.   **Research Design**

2.1   This was a random telephone survey conducted by telephone interviewers under close supervision. The data was collected by our interviewers using a Web-based Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (Web-CATI) system which allowed real-time data capture and consolidation. To ensure data quality, on top of on-site supervision and random checking, voice recording, screen capturing and camera surveillance were used to monitor the interviewers' performance.

2.2   To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication service providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers were then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final sample. Both landline and mobile numbers were included in the sampling frame with a target ratio of 1:1. Please see Appendix 1 for more detailed description of the sampling procedures.

2.3   The target population of this survey was Cantonese-speaking residents in Hong Kong of age 18 or above. If more than one subject had been available in the landline sample, selection was made using the "next birthday rule" which selected the person who had his/her birthday next within the same household. Telephone interviews were conducted during the period of **14 to 25 January 2021**. A total of **1,012** qualified respondents were successfully interviewed, including 505 landline and 507 mobile numbers. As shown in the calculation in Appendix 2, the effective response rate of this survey was **74.4%** (Table 2), and the standard error for percentages based on the full sample was less than 1.6%. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages using the full sample was less than +/-3.1% at 95% confidence level. Please see Appendix 2 for more detailed explanation of response rate calculations.

2.4   To ensure representativeness of the findings, the raw data collected have been rim-weighted according to figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department. The gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population came from their "Mid-year Population [Figures] for 2019", while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from their "Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2019 Edition)". All figures in this report are based on the weighted sample. Please see Appendix 3 for more detailed description of the weighting procedures.

3.   Survey Findings

The questionnaire of this survey comprises 15 questions which cover the respondents' attitudes towards waste management and municipal solid waste charging bill. The key findings are summarized in this section while all frequency tables referred to this section can be found in Appendix 4. It should be noted that the figures in the main text of this report have been rounded up to the nearest integers after considering the second decimal place, and because of the rounding procedure, the total of some figures may not add up to 100%, which are not mistakes.

I.   <u>Practices of waste management</u>

3.1.   The first part of the survey aimed at gauging the respondents' current practices of waste management in general. Results showed that when asked if they had bought less polluting products, such as products with excessive packaging, products with high carbon footprint, in the past year for the purpose of waste reduction, around one quarter said "very often" (24%), another one-third did it "sometimes" (33%) whilst more than 20% said "seldom" (23%) and 15% did not do it at all (Table 3).

3.2.   Regarding reusable products such as bottles and lunchbox, nearly half of the respondents claimed they used these products "very often" (47%) in the year past for the purpose of waste reduction while around 30% said "sometimes" (30%). Besides, around one-eighth opted for "seldom" (13%) and less than one-tenth "not at all" (9%; Table 4).

3.3.   As for recycling papers, cans, metals and plastic bottles, etc. for the purpose for waste reduction, nearly half of the respondents reported that they did it "very often" in the past year (46%) while nearly one quarter said "sometimes" (24%). At the same time, one-seventh each chose "seldom" and "not at all" (15%; Table 5).

3.4.   The respondents were then asked to name the major difficulties or hindrances in implementing waste reduction practices in their daily life. Results revealed that "too inconvenient" topped the list with nearly half of the respondents mentioning it (47%). Followed at a distance, "better alternatives were not available or trusted (e.g. recyclables still ended up at the landfill, less packaged product option was not available in the market)" was mentioned by nearly 40% of the respondents (37%). Reasons like "no policy required him / her to do", "always forgot", and "not enough knowledge" form the next tier as mentioned by 27%, 24% and 22% of the sample respectively. Other relatively less frequently cited difficulties or hindrances included "no one around him / her was doing this" (13%) and "no

incentive" (9%). Meanwhile, 4% said there was "no difficulties or hindrances at all", 1% said "no reasons" while 7% could not give a definite answer (Table 6).

II.   **<u>Views on waste management and municipal solid waste charging bill</u>**

3.5.   The next section of this survey aimed to gauge respondents' views on waste management and municipal solid waste charging bill. The respondents were first asked if they were aware of various government initiatives on waste management. Findings showed that over 90% were aware of the "Three Color Bins (since 2005, i.e. Source Separation of Domestic Waste)" (95%) and "Bring-your-own-bag scheme (since 2009)" (93%). Besides, more than 70% had heard of "Producer responsibility schemes (e.g. Plastic Shopping Bag Charging Scheme, Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment)" (71%). As for "Green Community (since 2011, i.e. Community Recycling Network), the awareness level was much lower, at 37% only (Table 7).

3.6.   When asked to assess the impact of the overall waste problem in 3 to 5 years, more than two-fifths thought the impact of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong would be big to their own quality of life (42%), including 18% who answered "very big" and 23% "somewhat big". More than a quarter opted for the middle ground "half-half" (26%). On the other hand, more than a quarter believed the impact was small (27%), with 9% choosing "somewhat small" and 18% opting for "very small / no impact at all". The remaining 5% answered "don't know / hard to say" (Table 8).

3.7.   Next, respondents' views on the municipal solid waste charging bill were gauged. Some basic information and two principles of the bill were read out, in random order, and the respondents were asked to give their level of agreement to each of them. Firstly, regarding the "'polluter pays' principle", instead of covering the waste management budget from general tax, which is the case now, two-thirds of the sample agreed to this principle (66%), with half "very much agreed" (34%) and the other half "somewhat agreed" (32%). On the contrary, just one-sixth disagreed to this (16%), with 8% "somewhat disagreed" and 7% "very much disagreed". Meanwhile, one-seventh chose "half-half" (15%). The remaining 4% did not give a definite answer (Table 9).

3.8.   With regard to the principle of "encouraging the public to 'reduce waste at source' and 'practice clean recycling' in their daily life", a landslide majority of nearly 90% of the respondents agreed to it (88%), in which 55% chose "very much agreed" and 34% "somewhat agreed". One the other hand, only 3% showed disagreement, with 2% each choosing "somewhat disagreed" and "very much disagreed". Besides, 6% thought it "half-half" and only 2% had no clue on it (Table 10).

3.9.   The survey went on to ask all respondents their acceptance level of the proposed charge rate of the bill. Under the bill, pre-paid designated garbage bags had to be used and the proposed charge was $0.11 per liter. This means an average household with 3 members would have to pay $1-2 per day. For comparison, today just operating the waste facilities costed the tax payer around $2.5 dollar per household per day. Results showed that two-thirds thought this charge rate was acceptable (65%), in which 30% found it "very acceptable" and 36% found it "somewhat acceptable". On the other hand, more than 20% gave a negative response (22%), with 9% saying "somewhat unacceptable" and 13% saying "very unacceptable / not acceptable at all". More than one-tenth chose "half-half" (11%) while 2% could not give a definite answer to this question (Table 11).

3.10.   Once the municipal solid waste charging was implemented, the government would provide a subsidy of $10 per person per month for all recipients of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme and Higher Old Age Living Allowance. The number of respondents who thought it was not enough has out-numbered those who thought it was by 7 percentage points. Specifically, 38% thought the subsidy was enough whereas a total of 44% thought it was not sufficient, among them, 29% had counter suggested a subsidy amount ranging from $15 up to $1,000 per person per month, giving an overall average of $51 among these respondents; 12% could not think of any counter proposals; 2% believed these recipients should be fully subsidized while 1% thought other citizens needed subsidy as well. Meanwhile, 3% believed providing a subsidy of $10 per person per month was too much while 15% had no view (Table 12).

3.11.   When it came to the proposed transitional period of 12-18 months between passing and actual implementation of the charge, nearly 80% of respondents believed this period was long enough (79%) for the citizens to get to know and become accustomed to this new waste management style. On the other hand, close to 15% thought the opposite (14%), in which 11% had counter suggested a different time frame ranging from 20 to 120 months, giving rise to an overall average of 31.5 months among these respondents, and 3% did not have any counter proposal, just thinking the transitional period should be longer. Besides, 7% had no clue on this question (Table 13).

3.12.   To tackle the current problem of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong, three measures were mentioned and all respondents were asked to rank them according to their preference, which included "new incinerators", "new landfills" and "municipal solid waste charging". Results revealed that among those 901 respondents (90%) who showed their preference, 46% picked "municipal solid waste charging" as their first choice, followed by 42% who preferred "new incinerators" most while only 12% picked "new landfills" as their most preferred measure.

Taking all ranking scores into consideration, "municipal solid waste charging" topped the list and attained an overall rank of 1.77 (from 1 to 3), followed closely by "new incinerators" at 1.82. "New landfills" apparently lagged behind and was least preferred by the respondents, with an average rank of 2.41. Another 4% said they had no preference while 6% could not make a choice among these measures (Tables 14 and 15).

3.13.   With regard to the helpfulness of the municipal solid waste charging bill in reducing the overall waste disposal to landfill in Hong Kong, half of the respondents gave a positive answer (50%), in which 17% and 34% found it "very helpful" and "somewhat helpful" respectively. Meanwhile, around one quarter chose "half-half" (24%) and one-fifth found it unhelpful (21%), with 11% opting for "somewhat unhelpful" and 9% "very unhelpful / not helpful at all". The remaining 5% could not give a definite answer to this question (Table 16).

3.14.   The last part of the survey was set out to investigate citizens' overall acceptance level of the municipal solid waste charging bill. Results reviewed that over two-thirds of the overall sample agreed to implementing this policy in Hong Kong (68%), with 30% "very much agree" and 38% "somewhat agree". One-eighth opted for "half-half" (13%). On the other hand, 15% showed disagreement, with 7% "somewhat disagreed" and 8% "very much disagreed". Meanwhile, 3% had no view (Table 17).

3.15.   Among those 156 respondents who disagreed to implementing the policy, one-third thought it would "increase financial burden to citizens" (34%), which was the main hindrance identified. Followed at a considerable distance, around one-seventh each believed it "should not be paid by citizens" (15%) and found it "not very effective" (13%). One-tenth each went to the reasons "increase in illegal deposition" (10%), "manufacturers / retailers should bear the responsibility (e.g. over-packaging by supermarkets)" (10%), "difficult to change ones' lifestyle" (10%), "difficult to implement / regulate" (9%), and also "the government should bear the responsibility" (9%). Other less frequently mentioned answers are listed in Table 18 of Appendix 4. Meanwhile, 5% could not provide any reason for their disagreement (Table 18).

4.   Conclusion

4.1.   Overall speaking, most Hong Kong people have practiced waste reduction in one way or another like buying less polluting products, consuming reusable products and recycling in the past year. Nearly half of the respondents reported that the major difficulty which hindered them from practicing waste reduction was "too inconvenient".

4.2.   The awareness of government initiatives on waste management was on the high side in general. Nearly all respondents have heard of "Three Color Bins" and "Bring-your-own-bag scheme" prior to the interview whereas more than 70% have heard of the "Producer responsibility schemes". However, there seems ample room to further promote "Green Community" as only less than 40% were aware of this scheme.

4.3.   When asked to assess the impact of overall waste problem in Hong Kong, more than 40% of respondents thought the impact would be big to their own quality of life in 3 to 5 years. On the other hand, more than a quarter believed the impact would be small.

4.4.   Findings also reveal that majority of respondents showed agreement to the general principles of municipal solid waste charging bill, with two-thirds consented to "polluter pays" principle and nearly 90% agreed to encouraging the public to "reduce waste at source" and "practice clean recycling" in their daily life. Meanwhile, two-thirds thought the proposal charge rate of the bill (i.e. 0.11 per liter) was acceptable, and around two-fifths believed the subsidy of $10 per person per month to the needy people was enough. Moreover, as high as 80% thought the transitional period of 12-18 months was long enough for the local citizens to get to know and become accustomed to this new waste management style.

4.5.   As regards their preference over measures for tackling the municipal solid waste problem in Hong Kong, municipal solid waste charging topped the list, followed closely by new incinerators while new landfills were least preferred among these three measures. Besides, half of the respondents believed that municipal solid waste charging bill, when implemented, would help reduce the overall waste disposal to landfill in Hong Kong.

4.6.   Lastly, more than two-thirds of the respondents agreed to implementing municipal solid waste charging bill in Hong Kong as contrast to one-seventh who had reservation to this policy. Among those who disagreed to its implementation, the main reason was they believed this would add further financial burden to the citizens.

Appendix 1: Sampling Procedures

HKPOP adopts the following procedures in generating telephone numbers for surveys:

Step 1

Telephone numbers were randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA).

Step 2

Since mid-January 2014, a softphone screening program has been used to ring up the numbers generated to obtain the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) responses. For landline samples, invalid numbers were eliminated from the sampling frame based on the SIP responses and the manually dialed record samples (of HKPOP dating back to 2011) to produce the "SIP distilled sample". For mobile sampling introduced in July 2017, results from a softphone screening program was used and no further elimination was done.

Step 3

All telephone numbers that have been called once or more in the past 90 calendar days were eliminated from the sampling frame.

Step 4

Starting from July 2017, other than using landline samples, POP introduced mobile numbers in all its regular surveys to become mixed mode samples. The ratio of mobile versus landline was initially set at 1:4, then increased to 1:2 on July 2018, and was further increased to 1:1 starting from July 2019.

Step 5

For landline samples, if more than one eligible respondents were available in the sampled household during the call, selection would be made using the "next birthday rule", whereby the person who had his/her birthday the soonest among eligible respondents available at that call time was selected for interview. For the mobile samples, respondents were asked whether they were of age 18 or above. Both procedures screened for Cantonese speakers only unless a project has other specifications.

Appendix 2: Contact Information and Response Rates

Table 1   Overall contact information

	Frequency	**Percentage**
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	**2,895**	**9.9%**
Fax / data line	568	1.9%
Invalid number	942	3.2%
Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number	228	0.8%
Non-residential number / not personal mobile	702	2.4%
Language problem	417	1.4%
No eligible respondents	23	<0.1%
Miscellaneous	15	<0.1%
Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed	**25,185**	**86.2%**
Line busy	2,732	9.3%
No answer	7,285	24.9%
Answering device	5,193	17.8%
Call-blocking	29	0.1%
Interview terminated before the screening question	73	0.2%
Appointment date beyond the survey period - eligibility not confirmed	9,830	33.6%
Miscellaneous	43	0.1%
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	**134**	**0.5%**
Household-level refusal	--	--
Known respondent refusal	--	--
Appointment date beyond the survey period - eligibility confirmed	64	0.2%
Partial interview	39	0.1%
Miscellaneous	31	0.1%
Successful cases	**1,012**	**3.5%**
Total	**29,226**	**100.0%**

Table 2   Calculation of effective response rate (by HKPOP definition)

$$= \frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\substack{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases*} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^\wedge \\ + \text{Refusal cases by prorated-eligible respondents}^\#}} \times 100.0\%$$

Effective response rate

$$= \frac{1,012}{1,012 + (39 + 73) + (0 + 0) + 236} \times 100.0\%$$

$$= \ 74.4\%$$

* Including "Partial interview" and "Interview terminated before the screening question"
^ Including "household-level refusal" and "known respondent refusal"
 # Figure obtained pro rata

Appendix 3: Weighting Procedures

HKPOP adopts a weighting method developed over decades. At this stage of development, HKPOP adopts a "14 by 3 by 4" weighting procedures involving three variables, namely, a compound variable "gender-age" with 14 cells, two one-way variables of "education attainment" and "economic activity status" with 3 and 4 cells respectively. For practically all random telephone surveys conducted by HKPOP, the raw data is rim-weighted by the 168 cell-values obtained from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department so that the marginal distribution of the sample in terms of age, gender, education and economic activity status would match that of the general population. This rim-weighting method (sometimes called raking) is found to be the most practicable cum useful method in processing HKPOP's telephone survey data.

To be precise, the gender-age groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- Male; 18-29
- Male; 30-39
- Male; 40-49
- Male; 50-59
- Male;60-69
- Male; 70+
- Female; 18-29
- Female; 30-39
- Female; 40-49
- Female; 50-59
- Female; 60-69
- Female; 70+
- Male; Refuse to disclose age
- Female; Refuse to disclose age

The highest education level attainment groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- Primary or below
- Secondary
- Tertiary or above

The economic activity status groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- Working populations and others
- Homemaker
- Students
- Retired

Appendix 4: Frequency tables

Table 3   [Q1] In the past year, how often did you take the following actions for the purpose of waste reduction? **[Buy less polluting products (e.g. products with excessive packaging, products with high carbon footprint, disposable products)]**

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Very often	246	24.3%
Sometimes	337	**33.3%**
Seldom	231	22.8%
Not at all	157	15.5%
Not applicable	16	1.6%
Don't know / hard to say / forgotten	25	2.4%
Total	1,012	100.0%

Table 4   [Q2] In the past year, how often did you take the following actions for the purpose of waste reduction? **[Use reusable products (e.g. bottle, lunchbox)]**

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Very often	477	**47.1%**
Sometimes	307	30.4%
Seldom	129	12.8%
Not at all	93	9.2%
Not applicable	5	0.5%
Don't know / hard to say / forgotten	1	<0.1%
Total	1,012	100.0%

Table 5   [Q3] In the past year, how often did you take the following actions for the purpose of waste reduction? **[Recycle (e.g. papers, cans, metals, plastic bottles)]**

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Very often	470	**46.4%**
Sometimes	240	23.7%
Seldom	149	14.7%
Not at all	149	14.8%
Not applicable	3	0.3%
Don't know / hard to say / forgotten	1	0.1%
Total	1,012	100.0%

Table 6   [Q4] What do you think are the major difficulties / hindrances in implementing waste reduction practices in your daily life? (Read out the 7 items below, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

	Frequency	Percentage of responses (Base=1,968)	Percentage of sample (Base=1,009)
Too inconvenient	469	23.8%	**46.5%**
Better alternatives are not available or trusted (e.g. recyclables still end up at the landfill, less packaged product option is not available in the market)	372	18.9%	36.9%
No policy requires me to do	276	14.0%	27.4%
Always forget	239	12.1%	23.7%
Not enough knowledge	224	11.4%	22.2%
No one around me is doing this	134	6.8%	13.2%
No incentive	93	4.7%	9.2%
Others (See below)	47	2.4%	4.7%
No difficulties / hindrances at all	40	2.0%	3.9%
No reasons	8	0.4%	0.8%
Don't know / hard to say	66	3.4%	6.5%
Total	1,968	100.0%	
Missing	*3*		
Other responses that cannot be grouped			
No enough available facilities	31	1.6%	3.0%
Lazy	5	0.3%	0.5%
Useless to do	4	0.2%	0.4%
Not enough education	3	0.2%	0.3%
No time to do	2	0.1%	0.2%
COVID-19	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Not planning to have the next generation	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	47	2.4%	4.7%

Table 7   [Q5] Are you aware of the following government initiatives on waste management? (Read out the 4 items below, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

	Frequency	Percentage of responses (Base=3,005)	Percentage of sample (Base=1,012)
Three Color Bins (since 2005, i.e. Source Separation of Domestic Waste)	961	32.0%	**95.0%**
Bring-your-own-bag scheme (since 2009)	941	31.3%	93.0%
Producer responsibility schemes (e.g. Plastic Shopping Bag Charging Scheme, Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment)	715	23.8%	70.7%
Green Community (since 2011, i.e. Community Recycling Network)	375	12.5%	37.0%
None of the above	9	0.3%	0.9%
Don't know / hard to say	3	0.1%	0.3%
Total	3,005	100.0%	

Table 8   [Q6] How much do you think the overall waste problem in Hong Kong, i.e. municipal solid waste, might impact your own quality of life in 3 to 5 years? (Interviewer to probe the intensity)

		Frequency		Percentage (Base=1,010)	
Very big	**}Big**	186	}421	18.4%	**}41.7%**
Somewhat big		235		23.3%	
Half-half			267		26.5%
Somewhat small		93		9.2%	
Very small / no impact at all	}Small	177	}270	17.5%	}26.8%
Don't know / hard to say			51		5.1%
Total		1,010		100.0%	
Missing		2			
Mean score#		**3.2**			
Median		3.0			
Standard error		+/-0.1			
Base		958			

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1= Very small / no impact at all, 5= Very big, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 9   [Q7] In municipal solid waste charging bill, it is proposed that all waste producers from residential, commercial and industrial sectors will pay based on the quantity of waste. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following two principles of the bill? (Read out the 2 items below, order to be randomized by computer; interviewer to probe intensity) **["Polluter pays" principle, instead of covering the waste management budget from general tax, as is the case today]**

		Frequency		Percentage (Base=1,011)	
Very much agree	**}Agree**	341	}663	33.8%	**}65.6%**
Somewhat agree		322		31.8%	
Half-half			148		14.6%
Somewhat disagree	}Disagree	86	}157	8.5%	}15.6%
Very much disagree		72		7.1%	
Don't know / hard to say			42		4.2%
Total		1,011		100.0%	
Missing		*1*			
Mean score#		**3.8**			
Median		4.0			
Standard error		+/-0.1			
Base		968			

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1=very much disagree, 5=very much agree, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 10   [Q8] In municipal solid waste charging bill, it is proposed that all waste producers from residential, commercial and industrial sectors will pay based on the quantity of waste. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following two principles of the bill? (Read out the 2 items below, order to be randomized by computer; interviewer to probe intensity) **[Encourage the public to "reduce waste at source" and "practice clean recycling" in their daily life]**

		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Very much agree	**}Agree**	555 }895	54.9% **}88.4%**
Somewhat agree		340	33.6%
Half-half		58	5.7%
Somewhat disagree	}Disagree	16 }35	1.6% }3.5%
Very much disagree		18	1.8%
Don't know / hard to say		24	2.4%
Total		1,012	100.0%
Mean score#		**4.4**	
Median		5.0	
Standard error		+/-0.1	
Base		988	

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1=very much disagree, 5=very much agree, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 11   [Q9] Under the bill, pre-paid designated garbage bags have to be used and the proposed charge is $0.11 per liter. This means an average household with 3 members will have to pay $1-2 per day. For comparison, today just operating the waste facilities costs the tax payer around $2.5 dollar per household per day. Do you think this charge rate is acceptable?

	Frequency		Percentage (Base=1,011)	
Very acceptable	300		29.6%	
Somewhat acceptable **}Acceptable**	361	}660	35.7%	**}65.3%**
Half-half		110		10.9%
Somewhat unacceptable	92		9.1%	
Very unacceptable / }Unacceptable not acceptable at all	127	}219	12.6%	}21.6%
Don't know / hard to say		22		2.2%
Total	1,011		100.0%	
Missing	*1*			
Mean score#	**3.6**			
Median	4.0			
Standard error	+/-0.1			
Base	989			

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1=very unacceptable / not acceptable at all, 5=very acceptable, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 12   [Q10] Once the municipal solid waste charging is implemented, the government will provide a subsidy of $10 per person per month for all recipients of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme and Higher Old Age Living Allowance. Do you think the subsidy is enough? If no, how much would you propose?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,004)
Yes	382	**38.1%**
No, it should be a subsidy of $_____ per person per month for the above recipients	294	29.3%
15	*26*	*2.6%*
20	*52*	*5.2%*
25	*3*	*0.3%*
30	*94*	*9.4%*
33	*1*	*0.1%*
40	*10*	*1.0%*
45	*4*	*0.3%*
48	*1*	*0.1%*
50	*50*	*4.9%*
60	*26*	*2.6%*
70	*1*	*0.1%*
100	*15*	*1.5%*
200	*4*	*0.4%*
300	*3*	*0.3%*
500	*2*	*0.2%*
1000	*1*	*0.1%*
No, the above recipients should be fully subsidized	17	1.7%
No, but no counter proposal	118	11.7%
No, other citizens need subsidy as well	8	0.8%
Providing a subsidy of $10 per month is too much	30	3.0%
Don't know / hard to say	154	15.4%
Total	1,004	100.0%
Missing	*8*	
Mean	**$51.0**	
Median	$30.0	
Standard error	+/-9.9	
Base	294	

Table 13   [Q11] Between passing and actual implementation of the charge, there will be a transitional period of 12-18 months for the citizens to get to know and become accustomed to this new waste management style. Do you think this period is long enough? If no, how long would you propose?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Yes	789	**78.8%**
No, the transitional period should be_____ months	114	11.3%
20	*3*	*0.3%*
23	*1*	*0.1%*
24	*68*	*6.8%*
30	*2*	*0.2%*
36	*30*	*3.0%*
48	*2*	*0.2%*
60	*3*	*0.3%*
75	*1*	*0.1%*
120	*3*	*0.3%*
No, but no counter proposal	29	2.9%
Don't know / hard to say	70	7.0%
Total	1002	100.0%
Missing	*10*	
Mean	**31.5 months**	
Median	24.0 months	
Sampling error	+/-3.1	
Base	114	

Table 14   [Q12] To tackle the current problem of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong, which of the following measures do you prefer? Please rank from 1 to 3, 1 meaning the best, and 3 meaning the worst.

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,004)
Have preference	901	89.7%
No preference	42	4.2%
Don't know / hard to say	61	6.1%
Total	1,004	100.0%
Missing	*8*	

Table 15   [Q12_others] To tackle the current problem of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong, which of the following measures do you prefer? Please rank from 1 to 3, 1 meaning the best, and 3 meaning the worst.

	New incinerators		New landfills		Municipal solid waste charging	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=901)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=901)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=901)
1	382	**42.4%**	107	11.9%	412	**45.7%**
2	300	33.3%	314	34.8%	287	31.8%
3	219	24.3%	480	**53.2%**	203	22.5%
Total	901	100.0%	901	100.0%	901	100.0%
Mean	**1.82**		**2.41**		**1.77**	
Median	2.00		3.00		2.00	
Sampling error	+/-0.05		+/-0.05		+/-0.05	
Base	901		901		901	

Table 16   [Q13] If implemented, how helpful do you think the municipal solid waste charging bill in reducing the overall waste disposal to landfill in Hong Kong? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

		Frequency		Percentage (Base=1,011)	
Very helpful	**}Helpful**	169	}509	16.7%	}**50.4%**
Somewhat helpful		340		33.7%	
Half-half		238		23.5%	
Somewhat unhelpful	}Unhelpful	114	}210	11.3%	}20.8%
Very unhelpful / not helpful at all		96		9.5%	
Don't know / hard to say		54		5.3%	
Total		1,011		100.0%	
Missing		*1*			
Mean score#		**3.4**			
Median		4.0			
Sampling error		+/-0.1			
Base		957			

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1=very unhelpful / not helpful at all, 5=very helpful, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 17   [Q14] Now that you know more details about municipal solid waste charging, to
           what extent do you agree or disagree to implementing this policy in Hong Kong?
           (Interviewer to probe intensity)

		Frequency		Percentage (Base=1,012)	
Very much agree	**}Agree**	301	}690	29.8%	**}68.2%**
Somewhat agree		389		38.4%	
Half-half		132		13.1%	
Somewhat disagree	}Disagree	71	}156	7.0%	}15.4%
Very much disagree		85		8.4%	
Don't know / hard to say		34		3.3%	
Total		1,012		100.0%	
Mean score#		**3.8**			
Median		4.0			
Sampling error		+/-0.1			
Base		978			

#Mean score is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, that is 1=very much disagree, 5=very much agree, and then calculate the sample mean.

Table 18   [Q15] [Only asked those answered "somewhat disagree" or "very much disagree" in Q14, base=156] Why not? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)

	Frequency	Percentage of responses (Base=207)	Percentage of sample (Base=149)
Increase financial burden to citizens	50	24.2%	**33.6%**
Should not be paid by citizens	22	10.7%	14.9%
Not very effective	19	9.4%	13.1%
Increase in illegal deposition	15	7.4%	10.3%
Manufacturers / retailers should bear the responsibility (e.g. over-packaging by supermarkets)	15	7.2%	10.0%
Difficult to change ones' lifestyle	15	7.0%	9.8%
Difficult to implement / regulate	13	6.3%	8.7%
The government should bear the responsibility	13	6.1%	8.5%
Should educate the citizens first	12	6.0%	8.3%
Too inconvenient to carry out	6	3.0%	4.1%
Not enough available facilities	5	2.5%	3.5%
Increase the workload of cleaners	5	2.4%	3.4%
The bill is not clear enough	2	1.1%	1.5%
Should have better alternatives	2	0.8%	1.1%
Others (See below)	5	2.3%	3.2%
Don't know / hard to say	7	3.6%	5.0%
Total	207	100.0%	
Missing	7		
Other responses that cannot be grouped			
Disagree to use designated garbage bags	1	0.6%	0.8%
Cannot force citizens to adopt a waste less living style	1	0.5%	0.7%
Not planning to have the next generation	1	0.5%	0.6%
Should use general tax to pay the cost	1	0.4%	0.6%
Do not trust the government	1	0.4%	0.5%
Sub-total	5	2.3%	3.2%

Appendix 5: Demographic Profile of Respondents

The raw data collected was rim-weighted according to figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department. The gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population came from "Mid-year Population [Figures] for 2019", while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from "Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2019 Edition)".

Table 19   [DM1] Gender

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Male	421	41.6%	476	47.0%
Female	591	58.4%	536	53.0%
Total	1,012	100.0%	1,012	100.0%

Table 20   [DM2a] How old are you now?

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)
18 – 19	20	2.0%	20	2.0%
20 – 29	130	13.1%	139	14.0%
30 – 39	148	14.9%	163	16.5%
40 – 49	145	14.6%	171	17.2%
50 – 59	170	17.1%	194	19.6%
60 – 69	183	18.4%	164	16.5%
70 or above	196	19.8%	142	14.3%
Total	992	100.0%	992	100.0%
Missing	*20*		*20*	

Table 21   [DM3] What is your educational attainment? (Highest level attended, i.e. regardless of whether the course had been completed, including the course in progress)

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)
Primary or below	178	17.8%	189	18.9%
Secondary	436	43.6%	466	46.6%
Lower Secondary (F.1-F.3)	*138*	*13.8%*	*133*	*13.3%*
Upper Secondary (F.4-F.7 / DSE / YiJin)	*298*	*29.8%*	*333*	*33.3%*
Post-secondary	386	38.6%	345	34.5%
Post-secondary: non-degree course (including diploma / certificate / sub-degree course)	*73*	*7.3%*	*61*	*6.1%*
Post-secondary: degree course (including bachelor degree / postgraduate)	*313*	*31.3%*	*284*	*28.4%*
Total	1,000	100.0%	1,000	100.0%
Missing	*12*		*12*	

Table 22   [DM4] What is your occupation?

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)
Executive and professional	165	16.6%	184	18.4%
Clerical and service worker	200	20.1%	268	26.9%
Production worker	85	8.5%	125	12.5%
Student	51	5.1%	45	4.5%
Homemaker / housewife	170	17.1%	106	10.7%
Retired person	281	28.2%	208	20.9%
Unemployed or not working for other reason	44	4.4%	60	6.0%
Total	996	100.0%	996	100.0%
Missing	*16*		*16*	

Table 23   [DM5] Which district do you live in?

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)
Hong Kong Island	136	13.7%	124	12.5%
Kowloon East	175	17.6%	181	18.2%
Kowloon West	162	16.3%	162	16.2%
New Territories East	248	24.9%	247	24.8%
New Territories West	275	27.6%	282	28.3%
Total	996	100.0%	997	100.0%
Missing	*16*		*15*	

Table 24   [DM6] Political inclination

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=893)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=895)
Inclined toward the pro-democracy camp	199	22.3%	202	22.5%
Inclined toward the pro-establishment camp	93	10.4%	95	10.6%
Inclined toward the centrist	218	24.4%	232	25.9%
No political inclination / politically neutral / don't belong to any camp	306	34.3%	295	32.9%
Others / don't know / hard to say	77	8.6%	73	8.1%
Total	893	100.0%	895	100.0%
Missing	*119*		*117*	

Appendix 6: Full Questionnaire

Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute
香港民意研究所
Hong Kong Public Opinion Program
香港民意研究計劃

ADM Capital Foundation

Jointly conduct
合作進行

Survey on Municipal Solid Waste Charging Bill
公眾對都市固體廢物收費意見調查

Questionnaire
調查問卷

January 11, 2021
2021 年 1 月 11 日

Part I Introduction
第一部分自我介紹

Good afternoon/evening! My name is X. I'm an interviewer from the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute. We are conducting an opinion survey on waste reduction. This will only take you around 10 minutes. Can we start now? (Interviewer to explain when needed: Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute is formerly known as the Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong.)

喂,先生／小姐／太太你好,我姓X,係香港民意研究所嘅訪問員黎嘅,我哋而家做緊一個關於減少廢物嘅意見調查,只會阻你十分鐘時間左右,請問可唔可以開始呢?(如果被訪者有疑問, 可以解釋: 香港民意研究計劃前身為香港大學民意研究計劃)

Yes 可以
No 唔可以　=> Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye 訪問告終,多謝合作,拜拜

Your phone number is randomly selected by computer and your information provided 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. For quality control purpose, our conversation will be recorded for internal reference. All data containing personal identifiers and the recording will be destroyed within six months upon project completion.

你呢個電話號碼係經電腦隨機抽樣抽中嘅,而你提供嘅資料係會絕對保密,並只會用作綜合分析。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問,你可以打xxxx-xxxx同我哋嘅督導員聯絡。為咗保障數據嘅真確性,我哋嘅訪問會被錄音,但只會用作內部參考。所有含個人識別資料嘅數據同埋錄音,會喺調查完成後六個月內銷毀。

[S1] The telephone number I dialed just now was xxxx-xxxx. Please tell me if it was incorrect.
我頭先打嘅電話號碼係xxxx-xxxx,如果我打錯咗請你話俾我知。

Correct, continue 冇打錯,繼續 => Landline家居電話版本[S2a] / Mobile手提電話版本[S2b]
Incorrect 打錯 => Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye 訪問告終,多謝合作,拜拜

Part II Selection of Respondents
第二部分選出被訪者

Landline version 家居電話版本

[S2a] The target population of this survey is Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents of age 18 or above. May I know how many members in your household belong to this group?
呢份問卷既訪問對象係18歲或以上操粵語嘅香港居民，請問你屋企有幾多位屬於呢個組別既呢?

One only   => Q1 (If the qualified family member is not the one who answered the phone, invite him/her to the phone and repeat the introduction)
More than one, ____ (exact number) => S3
No   => Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye.
Refuse to answer => Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye.

有一位   =>   Q1
                  (如合資格家庭成員不是接聽電話者，請邀請合資格家庭成員聽電話並重覆自我介紹)
有多過一位，____位 (入實數) => S3
冇   =>訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜
拒答   =>訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

[S3] Since there is more than one, we hope that all qualified family members have equal chance to be interviewed. I would like to speak to the one who will have his/her birthday next. Is it okay? (Interviewer can ask: "is there anyone whose birthday is in January or the coming three months?")
因為多過一位，我哋希望所有家庭成員都有同等機會接受訪問，所以想請最快生日嗰位嚟聽電話。請問可唔可以呢？(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇1月或未來三個月內生日嘅人喺度？』)

Yes – The one answered the phone is the respondent   => Q1
Yes – Another family member is the respondent   => Q1 (interviewer to repeat the introduction)
No – Family member refuses to answer   => Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye.
No – Target respondent refuses to answer   => Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye.

可以 – 接聽電話的人士是被訪者   => Q1
可以 – 其他家人是被訪者   => Q1 (訪問員請重覆自我介紹)
唔可以 – 接聽電話人士拒絕合作   =>訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜
唔可以 – 被抽中被訪者拒絕受訪   =>訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

Mobile version手提電話版本
[S2b] Are you a Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong resident of age 18 or above?
請問你係唔係18歲或以上操粵語嘅香港居民？

Yes 係
No 唔係=>Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

Part III Opinion Questions
第三部分問卷主體部分

I.   **Practices of waste management廢物管理習慣**

[Q1-Q3] In the past year, how often did you take the following actions for the purpose of waste reduction? (Read out 3 items below, order to be randomized by computer; interviewer to probe intensity)

過去一年，你有幾經常做以下嘅嘢去減少產生廢物？(讀出以下3項，次序由電腦隨機排列，追問程度)

		Very often經常	Sometimes 有時	Seldom 好少	Not at all 完全冇	Not applicable不適用	Don't know / hard to say/ forgotten 唔知／難講／唔記得	Refuse to answer拒答
Q1	Buy less polluting products (e.g. products with excessive packaging, products with high carbon footprint, disposable products) 避免購買唔環保嘅產品 (例如過度包裝嘅產品、碳足跡高、即棄產品)							
Q2	Use reusable products (e.g. bottle, lunchbox) 用可重複使用嘅產品 (例如樽、飯盒)							
Q3	Recycle(e.g. papers, cans, metals, plastic bottles) 回收 (例如紙張、罐頭、金屬、膠樽)							

Q4 What do you think are the major difficulties/hindrances in implementing waste reduction practices in your daily life? (Read out the 7 items below, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

你認為喺日常生活中實行減少廢物嘅主要困難／障礙係乜嘢？(讀出以下7項，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項)

No incentive	做咗都冇著數
No one around me is doing this	身邊冇人咁做
Too inconvenient	太唔方便
Always forget	成日忘記去做
Not enough knowledge	對減廢知識不足

Better alternatives are not available or trusted (e.g. recyclables still end up at the landfill, less packaged product option is not available in the market)	冇更好嘅替代品／呢啲替代品唔可信 (例如：循環再用最終都會被送到堆填區、市場上冇包裝較少嘅產品可供選擇)
No policy requires me to do	無政策要求我去做
Others, please specify: _____	其他，請註明：_____
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

II. Views on waste management and municipal solid waste charging bill對廢物管理及都市固體廢物收費的意見

Q5 Are you aware of the following government initiatives on waste management? (Read out the 4 items below, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)
你知唔知道以下由政府推行嘅廢物管理措施？(讀出以下4項，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項)

Bring-your-own-bag scheme (since 2009)	自備購物袋計劃(自2009年推行)
Three color Bins (since 2005,i.e. Source Separation of Domestic Waste)	三色回收箱(自2005年推行；即家居廢物源頭分類計劃)
Green Community (since 2011,i.e. Community Recycling Network)	綠在區區(自2011年推行；即社區回收網絡)
Producer responsibility schemes (e.g. Plastic Shopping Bag Charging Scheme, Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment)	生產者責任計劃(例如：塑膠購物袋收費、「四電一腦」)
None of the above	以上皆否
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q6 How much do you think the overall waste problem in Hong Kong, i.e. municipal solid waste, might impact your own quality of life in 3 to 5 years? (Interviewer to probe the intensity)
你認為嚟緊3至5年，香港整體嘅垃圾問題，亦即係都市固體廢物，會對你嘅生活質素有幾大影響？(追問程度)

Very big	好大
Somewhat big	幾大
Half-half	一半半
Somewhat small	幾細
Very small / no impact at all	好細／完全冇影響
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q7-Q8] In municipal solid waste charging bill, it is proposed that all waste producers from residential, commercial and industrial sectors will pay based on the quantity of waste. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following two principles of the bill? (Read out the 2 items below, order to be randomized by computer; interviewer to probe intensity)

都市固體廢物收費條例草案建議所有住宅、商業同工業廢物產生者要按照廢物量付費。你有幾同意或者唔同意以下呢兩個有關條例草案嘅原則？(讀出以下2項，次序由電腦隨機排列，追問程度)

		Very much agree好同意	Somewhat agree幾同意	Half-half一半半	Somewhat disagree幾唔同意	Very much disagree好唔同意	Do not know / hard to say唔知／難講	Refuse to answer拒答
Q7	"Polluter pays" principle, instead of covering the waste management budget from general tax, as is the case today 「污染者自付」原則，代替而家用一般稅收嚟處理垃圾嘅開支							
Q8	Encourage the public to "reduce waste at source" and "practice clean recycling" in their daily life 鼓勵大眾喺日常生活中「源頭減廢」同「實行乾淨回收」							

Q9 Under the bill, pre-paid designated garbage bags have to be used and the proposed charge is $0.11 per liter.This means an average household with 3 members will have to pay $1-2 per day. For comparison, today just operating the waste facilities costs the tax payer around $2.5 dollar/ per household per day. Do you think this charge rate is acceptable? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

根據條例草案，市民需要使用指定垃圾袋，而建議收費為每公升$0.11

(一毫一／毫一紙)。即係一個3人家庭平均每日需要支付$1-2

(一至兩蚊)。相比之下，現時每戶每日需要納稅人支付大約$2.5

(兩個半)以應付廢物設施營運費用。請問你認為每日一至兩蚊呢個廢物收費標準可唔可以接受？(追問程度)

Very acceptable	好接受
Somewhat acceptable	幾接受
Half-half	一半半
Somewhat unacceptable	幾唔接受
Very unacceptable / not acceptable at all	好唔接受／完全唔接受
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q10 Once the municipal solid waste charging is implemented, the government will provide a subsidy of $10 per person per month for all recipients of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme and Higher Old Age Living Allowance. Do you think the subsidy is enough? If no, how much would you propose?
當都市固體廢物收費實施後，政府會向所有綜援同高額長者生活津貼嘅受助人每月提供$10
(十蚊)嘅津貼。你認為呢個津貼足唔足夠？如果唔足夠，你會建議幾多？

Yes	足夠
No, it should be a subsidy of $_____ per person per month for the above recipients	唔足夠，應該向以上受助人每月提供$_____嘅津貼
No, but no counter proposal	唔足夠，但冇建議
No, other citizens need subsidy as well	唔足夠，其他市民都需要津貼
Providing a subsidy of $10 per month is too much	每月提供$10津貼已經太多
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q11 Between passing and actual implementation of the charge, there will be a transitional period of 12-18 months for the citizens to get to know and become accustomed to this new waste management style. Do you think this period is long enough? If no, how long would you propose?
由通過條例草案到實際執行，將會有12至18個月嘅「過渡期」，令市民了解同習慣呢個新廢物管理模式。你認為呢個「過渡期」足唔足夠？如果唔足夠，你會建議幾耐？

Yes	足夠
No, the transitional period should be_____ months	唔足夠，「過渡期」應該要_____月
No, but no counter proposal	唔足夠，但冇建議
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q12 To tackle the current problem of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong, which of the following measures do you prefer? Please rank from 1 to 3, 1 meaning the best, and 3 meaning the wosrt. (Read out the 3 items below, order to be randomized by computer)
要解決香港嘅都市固體廢物問題，你傾向選擇以下邊一項措施？請以1至3排序，當中1代表最好，3代表最差。(讀出以下3項，次序由電腦隨機排列)

New incinerators	建新嘅焚化爐
New landfills	建新嘅堆填區
Municipal solid waste charging	都市固體廢物收費
No preference	冇偏好
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q13 If implemented, how helpful do you think the municipal solid waste charging bill in reducing the overall waste disposal to landfill in Hong Kong? (Interviewer to probe intensity)
如果實施都市固體廢物收費，你認為對減少香港堆填區嘅整體廢物棄置量有幾大幫助？(追問程度)

Very helpful	好有幫助
Somewhat helpful	幾有幫助
Half-half	一半半
Somewhat unhelpful	幾冇幫助
Very unhelpful / not helpful at all	好冇幫助／完全冇幫助
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Q14 Now that you know more details about municipal solid waste charging, to what extent do you agree or disagree to implementing this policy in Hong Kong? (Interviewer to probe intensity)
而家你知道多咗有關都市固體廢物收費嘅內容，你有幾同意或者唔同意香港實施呢個政策呢？(追問程度)

Very much agree (Skip to DM1)	好同意 (跳至DM1)
Somewhat agree (Skip to DM1)	幾同意 (跳至DM1)
Half-half (Skip to DM1)	一半半 (跳至DM1)
Somewhat disagree	幾唔同意
Very much disagree	好唔同意
Don't know / hard to say (Skip to DM1)	唔知／難講 (跳至DM1)
Refuse to answer (Skip to DM1)	拒答(跳至DM1)

Q15 Why not? (Do not read out the options, multiple answers allowed)
點解唔同意？(不讀答案，可選多項)

Manufacturers / retailers should bear the responsibility (e.g. over-packaging by supermarkets)	製造商／零售商應該承擔責任(例如超級市場過度包裝產品)
Increase financial burden to citizens	增加市民嘅經濟負擔
Increase in illegal deposition	增加非法棄置廢物
Increase the workload of cleaners	增加清潔工人嘅工作量
Too inconvenient to carry out	太唔方便
Difficult to change ones' lifestyle	好難去改變現時嘅生活方式
Difficult to implement / regulate	好難去執行／監管
Others, please specify: _____	其他，請註明：_____
Don't know / hard to say	唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

Part IV Demographics
第四部分個人資料

We would like to ask you some personal information for aggregate analyses. Your information provided will be kept strictly confidential. You may also refuse to answer any question.
我哋想請問您一啲簡單嘅個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供嘅資料係會絕對保密，你亦有權拒絕回答任何問題。

[DM1] Gender
    性別

Male   男
Female   女

[DM2a] How old are you now?
    你今年幾多歲？

____ (Exact age)   ____ (準確數字)
Do not want to tell   唔肯講

[DM2b] (For those unwilling to give exact age) Then how old are you now approximately? (Read out options)
    (只問不肯透露準確年齡的被訪者) 咁你今年大約幾多歲？(讀出範圍)

18 – 19   18 – 19歲
20 – 24   20 – 24歲
25 – 29   25 – 29歲
30 – 34   30 – 34歲
35 – 39   35 – 39歲
40 – 44   40 – 44歲
45 – 49   45 – 49歲
50 – 54   50 – 54歲
55 – 59   55 – 59歲
60 – 64   60 – 64歲
65 – 69   65 – 69歲
70 or above   70歲或以上
Refuse to answer   拒答

[DM3] What is your educational attainment? (Highest level attended, i.e. regardless of whether the course had been completed, including the course in progress)
    你讀書讀到乜嘢程度？(最高就讀程度，即不論有否完成該課程，包括現正就讀)

Primary or below   小學或以下
Lower secondary (F.1-F.3)   初中 (中一至中三)
Upper secondary (F.4-F.7 / DSE / YiJin)   高中 (中四至中七／DSE／毅進)
Post-secondary: non-degree course (including   專上教育：非學位課程
  diploma / certificate / sub-degree course)   (包括文憑／證書／副學位課程)

Post-secondary: degree course (including bachelor degree / postgraduate)	專上教育：學位課程 (包括學士學位／研究院)
Refuse to answer	拒答

[DM4] What is your occupation?
你嘅職業係？

Executive and professional	行政及專業人員
Clerical and service worker	文職及服務人員
Production worker	勞動工人
Student	學生
Homemaker / housewife	料理家務者／家庭主婦
Retired person	退休人士
Unemployed or not working for other reason	失業／待業／其他非在職
Others (Please specify: _____)	其他 (請註明：_____)
Refuse to answer	拒答

[DM5] Which district do you live in?
你嘅居住地區係？

Hong Kong Island	香港島
Kowloon East	九龍東
Kowloon West	九龍西
New Territories East	新界東
New Territories West	新界西
Refuse to answer	拒答

[DM6] Political inclination (Read out the 3 items below, order to be randomized by computer)
政治取向(讀出以下3項，次序由電腦隨機排列)

Inclined toward the pro-democracy camp	傾向民主派
Inclined toward the pro-establishment camp	傾向建制派
Inclined toward the centrist	傾向中間派
No political inclination / politically neutral / don't belong to any camp	冇政治傾向/政治中立/唔屬於任何派別
Others /don't know / hard to say	其他／唔知／難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

This is the end of the interview. Thank you for your time.
問卷已經完成，多謝你接受訪問。