

# Review of: "Shopping bags: own or plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam"

Taher Ben Yahya<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject of this study is interesting; yet from an academic point of view, the study has a lot of room for improvement. Below my feedback on the first four sections. I didn't go over the remaining sections because I do not believe it is appropriate to generate analysis and results before correcting the LR, justify the framework proposed and provide a clear problem statement.

## Abstract

The Abstract is incomplete, as evidenced by the statement, "personal norms mediated the relationship between.???" then there is no further statement.

You must include the methodology and more details about the study results.

## Introduction

1. The author stated that "theory of planned behavior (TPB) has been extensively used to analyze purchase behaviors" If this is the case, why are you employing this theory in your research? Why the author integrating TPB and TAM what is the gap that leads to integrate those two theories.
2. The author stated, "There are no published studies regarding the selection of shopping bags." I believe the author should revise this statement, as numerous studies have already been conducted, discussed, and enriched this topic.

Some Example of studies discussed the same concept:

1. Lekavičius, V., Bobinaitė, V., Balsiūnaitė, R., Kliaugaitė, D., Rimkūnaitė, K., & Vasauskaitė, J. (2023). Socioeconomic impacts of sustainability practices in the production and use of carrier bags. *Sustainability*, 15(15), 12060.
2. Mugobo, V. V., & Ntuli, H. (2022). Consumer Preference for Attributes of Single-Use and Multi-Use Plastic Shopping Bags in Cape Town: A Choice Experiment Approach. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 10887.
3. Dikgang, J., Leiman, A., & Visser, M. (2012). Analysis of the plastic-bag levy in South Africa. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 66, 59-65.
4. Arifani, V. M., & Haryanto, H. (2018, November). Purchase intention: implementation theory of planned behavior (Study on reusable shopping bags in Solo City, Indonesia). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental*

Science (Vol. 200, p. 012019). IOP Publishing.

5. Aithal, P. S. (2022). An Analysis of the Implementation of Eco-Friendly Shopping Bags in the Retail Sector.
  6. Prendergast, G., Wai Ng, S., & Lee Leung, L. (2001). Consumer perceptions of shopping bags. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 19(7), 475-482.
  7. Muthu, S. S., Li, Y., Hu, J. Y., Mok, P. Y., & Ding, X. (2012). Eco-impact of plastic and paper shopping bags. *Journal of Engineered Fibers and Fabrics*, 7(1), 155892501200700103.
  8. Muposhi, A., Mpinganjira, M., & Wait, M. (2021). Factors influencing the use of non-plastic reusable shopping bags: A cognitive-normative-habitual approach. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 37(3), 306-325.
  9. Smith, M., Cho, E., & Smith, K. R. (2016). The effects of young consumers' perceptions of environment-friendly shopping bags and environmental consciousness on attitudes and purchase intentions. , 24(5), 687-696.
  10. Ashwini, V., & Aithal, P. S. (2023). A Systematic Review of Consumer Perception: Factors Affecting Green Shopping Bags. *International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters (IJAEML)*, 7(2), 68-90.
3. I cannot find a clearer problem statement or objective for this study.

### Theoretical model and hypotheses

4. There is very inadequate discussion and literature review of the theoretical part, and the author fails to identify the literature gap.
5. What are the motivations for generating hypotheses?
6. The author's discussion of NAM theory followed by a statement that he will integrate TPB with TAM theory without mentioning TAM (Technology Acceptance Model) theory? this is confusing.
7. What gaps in the literature lead the author to develop this conceptual framework? The study fails to identify the gap and the grounds for proposing this model.

### Methods

8. The author did not specify the data collection method and the instrument used for the data analysis in the methodology section.
9. The author did not explain the variable measurement or the sampling technique.
10. The author did not do or clarify any data screening before doing the analysis.
11. The author did not clarify if the questions were adopted or adapted from previous studies.