

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

R.E. Essel¹

¹ University of Cape Coast

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

24th August 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

ATTN: Gabriele Marinello

Open Peer Review on Qeios

Kindly find below my queries in respect of Ming Guan's manuscript titled " Shopping bags: own or plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam"

Comments/Queries

1. **Title:** In my personal opinion, the manuscript's/article's title is not indicative of the fact that the study performed mediation analyses. The author can modify the title to capture the mediation analyses performed.
2. **Abstract:** The last but one sentence in the abstract is incomplete. The very sentence should read "controlling for socioeconomic factors, mediation analyses showed that personal norms (PN) mediated the relationship between Awareness of consequence (AC) and behaviour (BE) as well as ascription of responsibility (AR) and behaviour (BE). Also, intentions (IN) mediated the relationship between attitude (AT) and behaviour (BE) as well as mediated the relationship between perceived behaviour control (PBC) and behavior (BE).
3. **Theoretical Literature/Framework/Models:** The author assumed that the journal's readership are all familiar with the terminologies and concepts as well as the individual constitutes of the models and theories utilized in the study and as such did not provide any explanation to their respective meanings. For example what do the individual constituent found in the Norm Activation Model (NAM) of Awareness consequence (AC), Ascription of responsibility (AR), and personal norms mean/denotes?
4. **Methods – Data source:** In the fifth sentence, I do not agree with the author when he/she says "the valid questionnaire is characterized by all questions answered". This is because, depending on prior and preceding questions type and their given corresponding responses will indicate to the researcher if a particular question has been answered appropriately and as such constitute a valid questionnaire. The fact that a questionnaire obtains responses for all questions doesn't guarantee its validity. Survey questionnaire validity are measured as follows:

Convergent validity – High factor loadings; Discriminant validity – Average variance extracted; Reliability (Internal consistency) – High cronbach's alpha and high composite reliability (CR) values.

5. Research design: The author has used a cross-sectional research approach to address the research question. For the last two to three decades, behavioral studies have measured the behavioral outcomes with a longitudinal research approach, so the author need to justify the use of cross-sectional research design in this very present study.

I am not convinced that this approach would help the author more in measuring the consumer journey from intention to actual behavior.

6. Sampling technique: What sampling technique was espoused for the study, which produced the sample size of 536 made up of 211 (direct distribution via on the spot primary data collection) and 325 (online survey via Google form document)? [Probabilistic (simple random, systematic, stratified, multi-stage, cluster) vs. non-probabilistic (purposive, convenience/accidental/judgmental, snowballing, quota)]. What quantitative/statistical methodology (technique/procedure) was utilized to arrive at the sample size of the study? Some clarification on how the total figures of 211 and 325 responses that were recorded was obtained. How many questionnaires were dispatch to the study participants out of which the 211 arrived from direct on the spot data collection procedure and 325 via online survey responses were obtained?

7. Common Method Variance (CMV): The author should test for Common Method Variance (CMV) bias since all the primary data for this study were obtained using survey questionnaire via direct distribution and online survey. The researcher can perform Harman's (1967) one-factor test or single-factor score [in which, all items measuring latent variables/unobserved/hidden variables are loaded into one common factor. If the total variance for a single factor is less than 50%, it suggests that CMV does not affect your data, hence the results]. This can be based on the approach described by "Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003). "Common Method Variance in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879". The researcher can also use CFA common factor, which is a more advance, sophisticated and psychometrically convincing means/method. [see. (1). Essel, R.E. (2021b). "Assessing Materials Management Practices Effect on Firm Performance in Ghana Using Dominance Analysis: Evidence from A listed Company." *Journal of Operations and Strategic Planning*.4 (2) 174-201 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2516600X211043210>. Published on 10th October 2021 by *SAGE Publications, INDIA*. (2). Essel, R.E. (2022). Assessing the Moderating Role of Trialability and Perceived Risk in E-banking Adoption in Ghana. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/09722629221106260 published by *SAGE Publications, INDIA*].

8. Survey participants/respondent's heterogeneity: How was heterogeneity in the profile of the respondents addressed? Elaborate explanation is expected. The effect of socio-demographic information/data which was collected earlier on the respondents should be analyzed.

Many Thanks

Ronald Ebenezer Essel [External Reviewer]

Unit of Business Programmes, College of Distance Education (CoDE), University of Cape Coast (UCC), University Post Office Private Mail Bag (P.M.B), Cape Coast 03321, Ghana. E-mail: esselronald@yahoo.com.

Online Identities

1. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2735-1252>.
2. Web of Sciences ResearcherID: AFR-5263-2022 [www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/AFR-5263-2022]
3. Google Scholar Page: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=rcravMIAAAAJ&hl=en>
4. ResearchID: <https://researchid.co/rid14148>
5. LiveDNA: <https://livedna.org/233.36190>
6. Researchgate: <https://www.researchgate.net/scientific-contributions/Ronald-Ebenezer-Essel-2182693434>
7. LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/ronald-essel-8273771b>

Facebook: <https://web.facebook.com/ronald.essel.1>