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Abstract
Many urban areas in Mysore are heavily polluted with plastic waste. Households as a subset of the public consume more plastic products and subsequently generates enormous amount of waste. In addition, their waste management practices affect the environment. In view of this, the study was carried out to ascertain the plastic waste situation, identify household plastic waste management practices and challenges, and to find out from the household’s perspective the way forward to reducing plastic wastes. This questionnaire-based study was carried out in ten (10) randomly selected electoral areas, and the analysis of the results showed that about 65.13% of households believed that the plastic waste situation was bad. Household waste management practices identified included temporal storage of waste in dustbins, boxes, buckets and large polythene bags. At the household level, plastic waste was generally collected together with other household waste and temporarily stored in waste storage bins. In terms of final disposal from the household, about 58.12% of households disposed their waste at approved dumping sites while 28.45% burned their waste, 9.97% disposed their waste at any available open space whilst 3.46% buried their waste. Challenges of household waste management identified were distance to dumpsites, lack of sufficient dumpsite and dustbins as well as irregular collection of waste by waste management firms. Households however believed that dealing with the problem required a change of attitude towards waste disposal, discontinuation of plastic use, recycling, and all stakeholder participation in waste management. Recommendations made included the establishment of a recycling plant, creation of awareness and carrying out educational campaigns, the use of environment R’s (Reduce, Reuse and Recycle) and support for the City Corporation Assembly in its waste management efforts.

Keywords: “waste, plastics, household, management, Mysore, Karnataka
1. Introduction

Plastics are man-made organic materials that are produced from oil and natural gas as raw materials. They are relatively cheap, durable and versatile material. Products made from plastics have brought benefits to society in terms of economic activity, jobs and quality of life. Plastics can even help reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions in many circumstances, even in some packaging applications when compared to the alternatives (European commission DG ENV, 2011). The benefits driven from plastics compel manufacturers to increase production. According to Spokas (2007) and Geographical (2005) around 500 billion of plastics bags are used worldwide. A United Kingdom group Wasteonline also puts annual global production of plastic around 100 million tonnes per year. In a study conducted in Switzerland in 2010, approximately 1000,000 tonnes or 125 kg of plastic material was used or consumed per head. According to the same report, the world produces 20 times more plastic today than 50 years ago(FOEN 2003).

As plastic consumption is increasing, more and more plastic waste is being generated (World Bank, 1996; Yankson, 1998). FOEN (2003) indicates that, plastics form around 15% of household refuse and according to a report published in December 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) determined that, the United States alone generated 30 million tonnes of plastic waste in 2009. It is believed after their entry into the environment, plastics can persist up to 100 years without being decomposed by sunlight and/or microorganisms (Stevens, 2001 and UNEP, 2005a).

The issue of plastic waste management is therefore a major global phenomenon that has crept up over the decades, and really requires a global and comprehensive solution that includes systemic rethinks about usage and production (Wassener, 2011). It is a crucial problem not only for developing countries but for the developed countries as well.

As enormous amount of plastic waste is generated throughout the world, the most crucially posed question is how to manage it effectively and efficiently to save the environment and the continuous existence of mankind (Wienaah, 2007). Many municipalities, cities and towns the world over continue to grapple with the problem because it imposes negative environmental externalities. It is usually non-biodegradable and therefore can remain as waste in the environment for a very long time (EC, DG ENV, 2011), it may pose risks to human health as well as the environment; and it can be difficult to reuse and/or recycle in practice. An issue of particular concern is that, giant masses of plastic waste have been discovered in the North Atlantic and Pacific Ocean; the full environmental impacts of which are not yet fully understood but which cause severe damage to seabirds, marine mammals and fish (EC DG ENV, 2011). In Ghana, most of the concern for plastic waste management is with the urban areas than the rural areas. Urban areas in Ghana produce a variety of these plastic wastes because of the adoption of a more hygienic mode of packaging food, beverages, “iced water” and other products. This has brought plastic packaging to replace the existing cultural packaging methods (leaf wrappers, brown paper and metal cup uses) in cities and towns (Adarkwa and Edmundsen, 1993; KMA, 1995; World Bank, 1995; Schweizer and Annoh, 1996). This widespread replacement of the modes of packaging with plastics is an indication of the uniqueness of plastic properties such as
versatility, inertness and flexibility, especially in the application areas of packaging. As a result of their unique properties, plastics have become the most favoured packaging materials in commerce with firms making windfall profits and transferring the environmental cost associated with cleaning plastic waste on the general public.

The shift to this new form of plastic packaging in Ghana has equally created or generated huge quantities of waste and created pressing sanitation problem as many towns and cities are overwhelmed with management of wastes. According to a study conducted in Accra, Ghana by GOPA Consultants in 1983, Plastic Waste accounted for 1-5% (of net weight) of the total amount of waste generated (Lardinois and Van de Klundert, 1995). The majority of these wastes are sachet water bags. This is so because, the public have developed a strong taste for such sachet water since it is portable and can easily be carried from one place to another. There is also a perception that such sachet water is cleaner and more mineralized than tap water. After gulping down the liquid content, these bags are discarded indiscriminately thereby littering the whole environment. These bags now constitute a major proportion of the plastic waste generated throughout the urban areas in Ghana (Wienaah, 2007). Statistics released by the Accra Metropolitan Assembly (AMA) Waste Management Department and other waste management bodies indicated that about 9000 tonnes of waste is generated daily, out of which 315 tonnes are plastic related (Amankwah, 2005). In addition to the plastic sachet that poses problems, other forms of plastics include plastic bottles, polythene bags and wrappers. It is estimated that, there are over 40 plastic producing industries in the country producing over 30,000 metric tons per annum of assorted plastic products. In addition, about 12,000 metric tons of finished plastic products are imported annually into the country. These add to compound the plastic waste problem in the country. At least about 20-30% of these end up as waste in the streets. With very few recycling facilities in the country, the issue of post-consumer plastic waste has become a major issue of concern. However, there have been serious attempts to address the problem. Plastic wastes are sent to dumpsites, but majority end up in drains, streams and open places. Some plastic wastes are disposed of by open dumping, open burning, controlled burning and tipping at dumpsites. These methods employed in the management of plastics over the years have only proved unsuccessful.

The current state of plastic waste management leaves much to be desired. Less than 40% of urban residents are served with waste collection services. The traditionally applied methods of dealing with wastes including burning, burying and open space dumping have been unsuccessful, and the resulting contamination of water and land has led to growing concern over the absence of an integrated approach to waste management in the country. This therefore implies that, there is no single solution to the challenge of plastic waste management. Generally, waste management process is usually framed in terms of generation, storage, treatment and disposal, with transportation inserted between stages required. Hence, George, (2008) indicated that a combination of source reduction, recycling, incineration and burying in landfills and conversion is currently the optimal way to manage domestic waste which includes plastic waste. However in order to achieve this optimal way of managing waste in general, participation by all stakeholders including households is key.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study site

Mysore is the third-largest city in the state of Karnataka, India. Located at the base of the Chamundi Hills about 146 km south west of the state capital Bangalore, it is spread across an area of 128.42 km². According to the provisional results of the 2011 national census of India, the population of Mysore is 887,446. The total population of Urban Agglomeration (U/A) is 9, 83,893. It is the Second biggest U/A in terms of Population. Mysore City Corporation (MCC) is responsible for the civic administration of the city, which is also the headquarters of the Mysore district and the Mysore division. Tourism is the major industry in Mysore. The city attracted about 3.15 million tourists in 2010. Mysore has traditionally been home to industries such as weaving, sandalwood carving, bronze work and the production of lime and salt.

2.2 Description of the Study Area

Waste Collection Scheme in the City

The municipal solid waste collection in the city includes door to door collection, street sweeping activity and secondary collection and transportation.

2.2.1 Primary Collection (Door to Door Collection of Solid Waste) This scheme is implemented in all 65 wards of the city. Out of all the 65 wards, 62 wards are handled by contract labourers, while the other 3 wards are handled by federation of Mysore City Wards Parliament. There are 240 auto tippers and 396 pushcarts deployed for the collection of waste. Chicken and mutton market waste are being collected separately by 5 auto tippers and 1 canter.

2.2.2 Street Sweeping Activity In Mysore city, 17 wards are handled by MCC permanent Pourakarmikas, 1 ward by federation of Mysore City Wards Parliament (W-28), and 47 wards are handled by contract labourers. The cleaning of streets and drains takes place during day time while the truck mounted street sweeping machine is used for night sweeping of main roads.

2.2.3 Secondary Collection and Transportation For the collection of waste from 65 municipal corporation wards, 255 numbers of single compartment containers and 130 numbers of 4 compartments 4.5 cum containers are placed in all the wards. For the collection of bulk waste from markets/choultry/hotels etc., 66 numbers of 4.5 cum Skip Containers are placed in all 65 wards. secondary collected wastes, 20 numbers of Dumper Placers and 2 numbers of Compactors are used. For the transportation of street sweeping waste and silt, 55 numbers of Tipper Lorries are used by MCC. All SWM vehicles in MCC are monitored through GPS system.
Figure 1: Map of Mysore City Corporation

4. Research Design and Methodology

Descriptive survey design (Knupfer and McLellan, 2001) was adopted in this study applying both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. The study used structured close-ended questionnaires as the main instrument to collect data alongside with focused group discussions, key informant interviews and observation. These methods sought to provide an opportunity to have an in-depth knowledge of the research which up till now was not clear. Empirical verification was done via observation on attitudes and behaviors of respondents (Anderson, 1971) to test the truth or otherwise of empirical statements. In all, three (3) focus group discussions were held with the various groups. It involved opinion leaders within schools, households, students from the study areas etc. This method sought to help these groups to freely express themselves concerning the subject. The researcher conducted a series of in-depth interviews with members of each of household during data collection. The interview with the
participants focused on ten structured questions designed by the researcher. This was to ascertain and verify the other sources already employed to collect the information. Interpretation of the questionnaires to those who could not understand was done by the researcher and the appropriate responses ticked. A total of one thousand and twenty five (1,025) male and female households’ heads and other stakeholders aged 18 and above was obtained as the sample frame of the assessment survey. The sample size for the study was three hundred and sixty (460). To find out the haulage of waste to the dumpsite, the time of loading the waste and the time of discharge at the dumping site was determined. The kilometric reading was taken from the waste vehicles to determine the distance of each Electoral area (EA) to the dumping site.

4.1 Data Analysis
Data obtained was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Scientist (SPSS) 16.0 and Microsoft Excel.

4.2 Results and Discussion

Table 1: Relationship between educational status and reason for choosing to use plastic products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cheap (1.40)</th>
<th>Common (18.62)</th>
<th>Light in weight (6.95)</th>
<th>Lack alternatives (4.75)</th>
<th>Total (18.62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26 (7.26) 44</td>
<td>27 (12.29) 76</td>
<td>69 (19.27) 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>215 (60.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 (2.23) 38</td>
<td>49 (13.69) 48</td>
<td>143 (39.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td>143 (39.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (9.50) 82</td>
<td>125 (34.92) 117</td>
<td>358 (100.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>358 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number in each cell of the table represents the count or frequency, whilst the number in parenthesis indicates the cell percentage. For instance, out of the 215 female respondents, 26 of them indicated that they preferred plastic products because they are cheap. This constituted 7.26% of the total respondents. The chi square test performs a hypothesis test to determine whether or not to reject the idea that the row and column classifications are independent. Since the p-value 0.135 is greater than 5% level of significance, there is a failure to reject the null hypothesis of independence of gender and reason for choosing to use plastic products. However, the observed value for gender for a particular case may bear no relation to its corresponding value of reason for chosen to use plastic products.

Table 2: Relationship between educational status and reason for choosing to use plastic products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Cheap (1.40)</th>
<th>Common (18.62)</th>
<th>Light in weight (6.95)</th>
<th>Lack alternatives (4.75)</th>
<th>Total (18.62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>5 (1.40) 10</td>
<td>9 (2.51) 3</td>
<td>27 (7.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4 (1.12) 5</td>
<td>2 (0.56) 6</td>
<td>17 (4.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11 (3.07) 38</td>
<td>47 (13.13) 37</td>
<td>133 (37.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>11 (3.07) 23</td>
<td>65 (18.16) 69</td>
<td>168 (46.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>3 (0.84) 6</td>
<td>2 (0.56) 2</td>
<td>13 (3.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (1.68) 9</td>
<td>9 (2.51) 8</td>
<td>32 (8.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The likelihood ratio test on the relationship between level of education of the respondent and the reason why they chose to use plastic products indicated at the 5% level of significance that the
reason for the choice of plastic products was largely dependent on the educational status of the respondent with a p-value of 0.000.

4.3 Persons responsible for management of household waste

Figure 1 below shows that within households in the Mysore City Corporation, 44.35% of mothers; 45.14% of children and 10.51% of fathers are responsible for managing waste. It can then be concluded that waste management at the household level is virtually the work of mothers and children. In majority of the households, the mothers clean the homes and collect the rubbish and the children carry out the final disposal from the homes. Some households had children completely in charge of cleaning, collecting and disposing of waste from the home. In most home, fathers did not play any role in waste management. In household that males managed waste, they were either single or married with their partners elsewhere. Generally fathers were not very much involved in household waste management.

![Responsibility for waste management at House Hold](image)

Figure 2: Responsibility for waste management at House Hold

4.4 Responsibility for waste management at House Hold

However they indicated that, in the institution of marriage, it is the duty of the woman to cook, fetch water and clean, dispose of waste and keep the house in order. In addition, since it is the woman who produces waste as a result of her domestic activities, it beholds on her to find the means to dispose her waste. They argued that since men are normally out of the house most of the time and as such produces less refuse as compared to the other members of the household they are not bothered and should not be bothered. This is possibly the reason why they were few men involved in plastic waste management at the household level in the Mysore Municipality.

4.5 Temporal Storage of household waste

The manner in which households store temporally store waste at the household level can positively or negatively affect the environment especially the household immediate environment.
When households have good temporal storage systems, the environment is enhanced and vice versa. Figure 3 below indicates that, 37.45% of households handled waste in trash bins with lid; 43.25% in buckets, 15.58% in trash bins without lid, 2.64% in large polythene bags whilst 1.08% handled their waste in other objects.
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Figure 3: Handling waste at household level

The use of wide variety of containment systems like dustbins, baskets, boxes, cement bags, concrete vats, metal bins, buckets, sacks and polythene bags was observed. Similar observations were made by Puopiel (2010) and George (2008) in Ghana; Banjo et al., (2009) in Nigeria and Dobbs, (1991) in Kolkata, India.

### 4.6 Methods of Disposal of Household Waste and Time spent

According to Puopiel (2010), the method of disposal of household solid waste which generally includes plastic waste is one of the functional elements in the management of waste. From figure 4 below, the commonest place of plastic waste disposal is the dumpsite with 58.12% of respondents disposing their waste there. Most respondents within these EAs; Atulbabisi, Soe, Bukere and Dapoore-Tindongo virtually depended on dumpsites some of which were self-designated. Out of 210 respondents the following percentages 75.18%; 15.78%; 6.23% and 2.81% are between 5-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 and 26-30 minutes walking distance from the household. This is depicted on Table 3 below. Some respondents however were not comfortable spending more time to disposing their waste and indicated that they often resorted to disposing it at any bushy or undeveloped space around the household environment.
This observation is consistent with Puopiel’s (2010) findings in Tamale. He observed that respondents at different location of his study area spent different minutes in disposing of their waste. 79.2% spent above 10 minutes in disposing their waste and out of the 79.2%, 63.3% of the respondents said it inconvenienced them to spend such time to dispose their waste in the nearest skip. This presupposes that household’s waste disposal practices can improved if dump sites are located somehow closed them.

With regards to how households finally disposed their waste, a wide diversity of methods were identified. From figure 3, 28.45% of household disposed their plastic waste by burning. Households within EAs like Kumbosgo, Yarigabisi and Yekene disposed plastics by burning in the open place. Some, households within these same EA’s who did not have approved dumping sites or skips disposed their waste on any available open space. They accounted for the 9.97%. A small percentage of households disposed their plastic waste by burying representing 3.46% as shown on Figure 3 below. Generally, almost all respondents admitted having to burn plastic waste some time.
Observed ways through which households final disposed of their plastic waste. These methods of doing away with household waste have been reported by a number of researchers. Among some of the methods of household final disposal of waste observed are; dumping in open space, gutters, undeveloped lands, roadsides, skip and approved dumpsite for collection by waste management firms (Anomanyo, 2004; Banjo et al., 2009; Puopiel, 2010; Adane and Muleta, 2012). Banjo et al. (2009) observed in Ije Ode, that inhabitants waste management practices as burning (65, 21.7%), burying (22, 7.3%), depositing into gutter (45, 15%), putting on road side for waste managers (150, 50%) and dumping on undeveloped land (18, 6%). Adane and Muleta, (2011) on the other hand observed that 137 (59.56%), 94 (40.86%) and 43 (18.69) disposed their waste through open dumping, burning and burying respectively.

**4.7 Mode of disposing plastic waste**

Knowledge of how household dispose plastic waste is an important function in the effective management of plastic waste. Table 4 below indicates that, out of the 180 households examined, 60 (20.56%) separated plastics from household waste before final disposal whilst a total of 120 (78.33%) disposed their household waste together with other household waste. This is to say that household waste is thrown together with its plastic components without the necessity to sort. One reason giving for not sorting was the fact that they were not going to be paid for that. Another had to do with the absence of a recycling firm in the Municipality. Those few respondents (74, 20.56) who did some form of separation or sorting did that so that they could burn the plastics components of the waste and in some cases to sell some component such as plastic bottles and broken plastic buckets and chairs.
Table 4: Mode of disposing plastic waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Plastic waste Disposal</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separated from household waste</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrown together with household waste</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>74.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar observation was made in Ije Ode in Nigeria but in this case there was no sorting of waste at all. Banjo et al., (2009) observed that all the 300 respondents of Ije Ode state did not undertake any form of sorting of waste before disposal. In a study on sustainable plastics waste management in Accra, Wiennah (2007) observation revealed the importance of plastic waste separation if recycling efforts were to be effective.

4.8 Challenges of household waste disposal

Households within the Municipality faced numerous challenges in disposing of their waste. The most common challenge was the problem of irregular collection of waste as depicted on figure 4 below. This problem was common to those households dumping waste at approved dumpsite with waste containers and a section of those who received door to door services. According to the Municipal Assembly’s boss, their waste collection vehicle had been down for almost three (3) years and for that matter they had to rely on Zoomlion Ghana Limited to do the collection of waste for them. Considering the fact that, the private waste management has its own client it would have to deal with first before attending to the areas covered by the Municipal Assembly, the issue of irregular collection often arises and for that matter is the most common problem encountered by households.

Similar observations were made by observations were made by Puopiel, (2010) where inhabitants identified some of the above problems as major challenges militating against the effective disposal of waste in the Tamale Metropolitan Area. Other challenges confronting household waste disposal included, lack of dustbins and the long distance of dumping sites (Tsiboe and Marbell, 2004) and higher charges from waste management firms providing door to door services (Edmunson,1991; Adelaide, 1995). Such challenges when continuously are not address leads to the use of in appropriate dumping strategies by households such as dumping in gutters, roadsides, behind houses, in water bodies and any available open spaces. This could possibly be the reason why the Mysore City Corporation has an increased plastic waste (polyethen bags and pure water sachets) in its environment and for that matter a total of 180 respondents. felt that, the environment situation was bad. While 60, (33.33%) said the situation was fair, that is not too good and not too bad, 4 (1.11%) said the environmental situation was good. 5 (1.39%) of respondents were not sure about the environmental situation.

5. Conclusion

Plastic waste was generally thrown together with other waste out of the household. 54.77% of households finally disposed their waste at approved dumping site while 34.77% burned their
waste. A percentage of 8.92% disposed their waste at any available open space whilst 1.54% buried their waste. Household waste management challenges identified were distance of dumpsites, lack of dumpsite and dustbins as well as irregular collection of waste by waste management firms. From the household perspective, the solutions to the problems of the plastic menace included change of attitude towards waste disposal, discontinuation of plastic use with the introduction of alternatives, recycling, and all stakeholder participation in waste management. The study did reveal that at the household level waste was basically managed by mothers and children while most fathers or grown up men did not play any active role in waste management. With regards to temporal storage of waste at the household, plastic waste was generally stored with other waste in dustbins with and without lids, buckets, paper boxes and large polythene bags. Some households did not have any medium for temporal storage of waste and therefore disposed waste immediately after generation in any available open space around the home. Final disposal of waste from households was at approved dumping sites, any available space, burying and burning.

6. Recommendations

The researcher sees it necessary for authorities to take action now to address the problem. The following recommendations are therefore made.

1. Public awareness and education campaigns

The creation of awareness among households and all in society regarding indiscriminate use and disposal of plastic bags will be a good option to overcome the problem in future. Even though household are already aware of the impacts of plastics such awareness and educational campaigns must still be carried to remind people continuously. This could be done through anti-littering campaigns and promotions where residents are educated on the dangers posed by plastic bags. Awareness campaigns should be used to encourage behavioural change on plastic bag use. It is important to educate the public on the ills of plastic bags and ensure that information on the possible safe alternatives is available. There already are numerous alternatives to plastic shopping bags which include paper bags, green bags and degradable bags. Such education campaigns should encourage men to be much involved in household waste management since they have a greater common and influence at that level.

2. Use of environmental R’s

Even though the government of Ghana is taking measures to regulate the use of plastic bags, this seems not to achieve the intended objectives. Instead, the application of the environmental R’s could curtail the use of plastic bags. The government, environmental Non-Governmental Organizations and concerned stakeholders should utilize the three environmental R’s (reduce, recycle and reuse) to mitigate the use of plastics. Producers and users should be encouraged to reduce the use of plastics. A reduction in the use of plastics means that alternatives such as paper and other biodegradable bags should replace the plastic ones; and new strategies of packaging should be practiced. Customers should have a mind-set that accepting plastic bags at the point of sale such as supermarket is unfashionable. In addition, households should be encouraged to (re)use plastic bags and bottles as many times as possible thus curtailing their production. With
sound campaigns people should be educated to carry old plastic bags when going for shopping. They could be reused to carry books by school going pupils. They could also be utilised as carrier bags in various sectors. Plastic bottles could be used as water bottles and milk containers. In some communities they are reused as paraffin containers. This will prevent unnecessary discarding of these bottles.
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