

Public Engagement on Aviation Taxes Final Report

Client: Sustainable Development Commission

31st May 2007

**Dr Tim Ryley, Dr Lisa Davison &
Professor Abigail Bristow**

**Transport Studies Group,
Loughborough University**



CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Background	3
3. A focus group approach	6
4. Composition of the focus groups	7
5. Focus group analysis	8
5.1 Environmental issues associated with aviation	9
5.2 Examine people's acceptability and attitudes towards existing aviation taxes	10
5.3 How people would like to see the money spent (additional revenue) that has been raised from aviation taxes	11
5.4 Exploring possible future aviation taxes and air travel choices	14
5.5 Segmentation of the focus groups	17
6. Conclusions	18
7. Recommendations for further research	18
Acknowledgements	19
References	19
Appendices	
1. Topics for discussion within the focus groups	
2. Focus group summary sheets	
3. Questionnaire given to respondents	
4. A Table to show the composition of participants within the focus groups	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall objective of the 'Public engagement on aviation taxes' study was to deepen understanding of the arguments around the acceptability of current and potential future aviation taxes. The project, based on four focus groups in Loughborough, was conducted during March 2007. During this time frame, the subject of aviation taxes was high on the transport policy agenda, with a lot of media coverage.

Focus groups are a qualitative method that provide a forum for participants to share their attitudes, feelings and beliefs and perhaps reach a consensus on a topic. The focus groups were semi-structured, following discussion themes that included environmental issues associated with aviation, acceptability and attitudes towards existing aviation taxes, measures on which to spend any additional revenue from aviation taxes, and possible future tax and charging systems for aviation. A short, standardised questionnaire survey was administered at the close of each focus group, to gain information on respondent attitudes to the environment, measures to reduce aviation emissions, and their likely behavioural response to price signals.

There was confusion amongst focus group participants on the current aviation tax system, Air Passenger Duty (APD). One suggestion to improve APD was to incorporate air freight companies. Other possible improvements to the tax system mentioned were to improve aircraft occupancy in order to reduce emission levels per passenger, and to create a higher band of aviation tax for passengers if there is a viable surface transport alternative. There was some support for proportional taxes such as fuel duty and VAT on flights; a frequent flyer tax received a more mixed response. Participants wanted to create an independently managed and accountable trust fund to use aviation tax for environmental improvements. In terms of where additional aviation tax revenues should be spent, there was greatest support for the long-term measures of improving UK surface transport and aircraft technology. Short-term 'green energy' measures were also popular amongst participants.

Participants were tentatively supportive of the European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) and felt that the UK should lead by example for climate change solutions such as the EU ETS. However, participants would like to see companies within the EU ETS striving for maximum carbon reductions. The focus groups felt there was a need to educate and inform the public about climate change and the environmental impacts of transport. A range of methods were put forward to inform passengers; an interesting idea was to develop a league table of airlines that would incorporate carbon emissions as well as flight costs for a particular journey.

1. INTRODUCTION

The overall objective of this 'Public engagement on aviation taxes' study is to deepen understanding of the arguments around the acceptability of current and potential future aviation taxes (while it can be argued that aviation using, current DEFRA values, covers its externalities this is not the case using the Stern Review values – Stern, 2006). A focus group methodology was utilised. The project timescale was extremely short, and this research has aimed to deliver as much insight into the issues as can be achieved within a four week time frame.

2. BACKGROUND

Individuals are flying more than ever before and over greater distances. Air travel has increased five-fold in the UK over the past 30 years, and demand is projected to be between two and three times current levels by 2030 (Department for Transport, 2003). Although this increasing demand has provided greater travel opportunities for individuals, there are environmental challenges to ensure that the development of aviation is more sustainable. The UK was set a legally binding target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012. The UK is set to meet the Kyoto targets, partly due to manufacturing decline and changes in the energy sector 'dash for gas', but increases in road transport and aircraft emissions are of concern¹. The aviation sector's contribution to climate change is expected to increase substantially over coming decades. "Green taxes" are one way of limiting demand (and emissions).

At present air travel is subject to Air Passenger Duty (APD), introduced in 1994 and payable per passenger per flight on departure from UK airports at standard amounts differentiated by distance and class (HM Customs & Excise, 2003). APD is currently, in the lowest class of travel, £10 for most European destinations and £40 for further a field; the levels were doubled from 1st February 2007, announced in the Pre-Budget Report (HM Customs & Excise, 2006). There are a number of other options which have been considered in this project:

- VAT on flight tickets
- Fuel duty payable on aviation fuel
- Inclusion of air travel in the European Union Emission Trading Scheme
- Individual carbon rationing
- Frequent flyer taxes

¹ Only domestic aviation emissions of CO₂ are accounted for in the Kyoto Protocol

The Stern Review (Stern, 2006) calls for the aviation industry and air passengers to cover the external costs of air travel in terms of the cost of climate change. The Stern Review identifies the growing contribution air travel is making to greenhouse gas emissions both in terms of carbon emissions and the effect of 'radiative forcing'. The report recognises that there is potential for efficiency gains for the aviation industry but at present there is no prospect of technology switching (although biofuels, and possibly some hydrogen or electric vehicles could have some impact for surface transport, technology breakthroughs are unlikely in the aviation sector). Cairns and Newson (2006) suggest that support for making air travel more expensive on environmental grounds has grown over time. Their suggestions for restraining air travel demand include an increase in APD levied by the UK Government on passenger trips from UK airports, and the addition of VAT to domestic air tickets (also suggested by the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee in August 2006). Other options might include fuel tax, and a more radical solution would be to develop personal carbon allowances. This project complements aviation work currently being undertaken by the Commission for Integrated Transport (although yet to be in the public domain).

This project explores current understanding (Air Passenger Duty) and possible future measures by which aviation could pay for externalities imposed, and the acceptability levels amongst the general public. For a 'green' tax to be acceptable, it helps if it is transparent to the general public and revenue neutral, with funds hypothecated towards a general good: an illustration of what may happen where this is not perceived to be the case is the unsuccessful development of the Edinburgh congestion charging scheme (see Ryley and Gjersoe, 2006).

During the time frame of the project, March 2007, the subject of aviation taxes was high on the policy agenda. This was partly due to the development of green policies by the two main political parties. In mid-March, the Conservative party produced a Consultation document on the use of environmental taxes to reduce carbon emissions from aviation (The Conservative Party, 2007); these proposals include fuel tax on domestic flights and a frequent flyer tax. The UK Government also put forward for consultation a draft Climate Change Bill (HM Government, 2007), which would make CO₂ targets binding.

Surveys on the acceptability of aviation taxes have also been reported in the UK media. For instance, a survey conducted by YouGov of nearly 1,900 people (Sunday Times, 2007) shows that 63% of Britons believe that politicians are using climate change as a ruse to raise taxes, and 60% do not think there should be environmental taxes on cheap flights. Negative public acceptability of aviation tax is also evident from a BPIX survey (1,907 people) in the Mail on Sunday (2007); only 14% of individuals agree that extra taxation is essential to curb the growth of air travel and cut the amount of greenhouse gases it produces. That said, there is 44% of general public support for a 'green' tax on air travel, and 29% have already reduced their air travel due to environmental concerns (although this is a smaller sample – a Continental / KNOT survey of 250 British travellers in Daily Telegraph, 2007). There is also pressure group representation within the UK media that argues for higher aviation taxes (e.g. Independent, 2007).

The Transport Studies Group at Loughborough University is undertaking a research project with strong links to the 'Public engagement on aviation taxes' study. The EPSRC funded 'Propensity to Fly' project (November 2006 to April 2009), examines individual responses to low cost air travel in the East Midlands; Dr Tim Ryley is the Principal Investigator. The project will deliver a stated choice modelling capability and a greater understanding of air travel market segments. Data for these modelling and segmentation tasks will largely come from a questionnaire survey of individual flying preferences, from over 1,000 residents of the East Midlands region. Such findings will be of benefit to aviation policy-makers, as they consider air travel demand forecasting and future airport capacity.

The first data collection within the Propensity to Fly research project involved three focus groups exploring some of the issues surrounding the propensity to fly, particularly for leisure trips with the low cost sector. The focus group discussion topics include some of relevance to the 'Public engagement on aviation tax' research: opinions on air travel and aviation; the decision-making process when choosing a flight; individual change in travel behaviour over time; and the effect of life-stage.

Three focus groups were undertaken, one in Loughborough and two in East Goscote (a large village in Charnwood) as follows:

1. Lunchtime, Monday 19th February 2007, East Goscote. Retired people.
2. Evening, Wednesday 28th February 2007, East Goscote. Those in employment.
3. Evening, Thursday 8th March 2007, Loughborough. Those in employment.

As added value to the 'Public engagement on aviation taxes' project, supplementary questions were added to the second and third focus groups to tie in with the research outlined in this report. These supplementary questions provided some insights into the public response towards aviation taxes, although issues surrounding aviation tax arose before any questions about taxation were asked. Participants reacted to aviation tax as they would to any form of taxation, that they are inclined to say 'no' towards it with an unwillingness to pay (focus group 2). Participants in both focus groups were frustrated and saw aviation tax as 'hidden' cost, added on after they had been attracted by low-cost flights advertised by airlines. There was a feeling of ignorance over aviation tax (focus group 2), and not knowing what the tax is for (focus group 3). Both focus groups would be more supportive of aviation tax if they know where it was going and recommended funding research to make the aviation industry more fuel efficient and investigating alternative fuel sources. A participant in focus group 2 mentioned planting trees to absorb carbon dioxide and there was support for improving public transport in focus group 3; this included improving public transport links to airport.

There are also some relevant findings from a air travel survey of 361 households in and around Loughborough (Charnwood Borough Council area), conducted in October 2006. Attitudes amongst the Charnwood air travel survey sample (reported in Ryley, 2007) indicate majority agreement with the economic benefits (air travel essential to the UK economy) and environmental disbenefits (air travel contributing to climate change) of air travel. However, those that agree with the environmental arguments are more likely to disagree with the economic arguments. Slightly more respondents are against, than in favour of, a solution that passengers should pay more to fly because of the negative environmental aspects of aviation; a question relating to the price levels at which individuals would fly less shows that it would take a £50 return air fare rise (covering all costs) for the majority of individuals to fly less often (Ryley, 2007).

3. A FOCUS GROUP APPROACH

Focus groups are a qualitative research method, defined as “a group of individuals selected and assembled by researchers to discuss and comment on, from personal experience, the topic that is the subject of the research” (Powell et al, 1996, p499). They provide a forum for participants to share their attitudes, feelings and beliefs and perhaps reach a consensus on a topic.

Knowledge of the focus group literature, together with experience of the research team, influenced the design of this research study. A preferable focus group size involves 6-8 participants plus the moderator(s), however Gibbs provide examples of successful focus groups which included between four and 15 people (Gibbs, 1997).

An independent sample of participants was recruited from people in central Loughborough. Recruitment was undertaken at various locations within Loughborough town centre on the afternoon of Friday 9th March and the morning of Saturday 10th March. With the intention of having between six and eight people at each of the four focus groups, 40 people were recruited in total across the four focus groups. A financial incentive of £20 was provided to each individual participating. Individuals passing recruiters were invited to participate in one of the following four pre-scheduled focus groups:

- Focus Group 1: Saturday 17th March 2007, 10am – 12pm
- Focus Group 2: Saturday 17th March 2007, 2pm – 4pm
- Focus Group 3: Monday 19th March 2007, 7pm – 9pm
- Focus Group 4: Tuesday 20th March 2007, 7pm – 9pm

To ensure a more representative sample, recruitment quotas were set of no more than three students invited to each focus group, and at least three of each gender.

Focus groups should be located as close to the focus group participants as possible to allow easy access; suitable accommodation should allow for taping of the focus group, and so should be quiet and free from interruption (Morgan, 1997; Krueger and Casey, 2000). To enable this, the focus groups were held at the Ramada hotel, close to the central Loughborough recruitment area.

The groups were moderated by Tim Ryley, with Lisa Davison as assistant moderator. The general responsibility of the moderator is to facilitate the group, make sure everyone is involved and introduce the topics of discussion. The moderator can decide to take a more or less directive role depending upon the objectives of the group; while the assistant is responsible for the recording equipment, making notes and general assistance. There are two Dictaphone recordings of each focus group. There was a short, standardised questionnaire survey within each focus group, to gain information on respondent attitudes to the environment, measures to reduce aviation emissions, and their likely behavioural response to price signals (a copy of the questionnaire is in the Appendix). The questionnaire data provides more quantitative information than the qualitative focus group data, and proved a useful validation tool.

The aim of the focus groups is to ascertain the acceptability of current and potential future aviation taxes. To enable this, the following topics of discussion headings were developed (a full version, including all of the questions, is in the Appendix):

1. Introduction – their air travel
2. Environmental issues associated with aviation
3. Examine people's acceptability and attitudes towards existing aviation taxes
4. How people would like to see the money spent (additional revenue) raised from aviation taxes
5. Exploring possible future aviation taxes and other measures

To assist with the focus group analysis, the questions were semi-structured according to themes. For concepts that may be difficult for individuals to grasp (e.g. EU Emissions Trading Scheme), time was provided to participants to explore these issues, before being provided with a sheet summarising the measure. The summary sheets used, for APD and the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, are in the Appendix.

4. COMPOSITION OF THE FOCUS GROUPS

There were 27 focus group participants; the numbers split according to each focus group, and by gender (total of 13 male, 14 female) are:

- Focus Group 1: 6 (2 male, 4 female)
- Focus Group 2: 8 (3 male, 5 female)
- Focus Group 3: 7 (5 male, 2 female)
- Focus Group 4: 6 (3 male, 3 female)

All groups, therefore, had the preferred size of between 6 and 8 participants. Table 1 shows the age and status of all focus group participants; a full list of each focus group participant by gender, age and status is in the Appendix. Although fairly representative of the population, the composition of the focus groups is younger than the population of Loughborough and the UK as a whole. Of the 27 participants, 23 live in the town of Loughborough, the remainder in the surrounding villages.

Table 1. The age and status of focus group respondents

AGE	
18-24	9
25-34	6
35-44	5
45-54	3
55-59	1
65-74	2
75 and over	1
TOTAL	27
STATUS	
Employed full time	8
Employed part time	4
Looking after home or family	2
Permanently retired from work	2
Unemployed and seeking work	1
In education	6
Unable to work: short-term illness or injury	4
TOTAL	27

All of the focus group participants had flown before (from the ice-breaker question). Most (20) had flown the previous year, as shown by the questionnaire; three of these could be considered frequent flyers (flown at least four times the previous year). Most flights undertaken by participants the previous year had been for leisure purposes; only three participants had flown for business purposes (two had made one business trip, and one at least five business trips).

5. FOCUS GROUP ANALYSIS

The analysis has been undertaken systematically according to the focus group themes; data has been used from the focus groups and the questionnaires. As argued by Bloor (2001), in academic social research a full transcript of each focus group is essential to avoid losing valuable detail, richness, and rigour in analysis. A word-for-word transcription was undertaken by an administrator with full experience of this task; direct focus group quotations have been incorporated into the analysis to illustrate the findings.

5.1 Environmental issues associated with aviation

From the initial focus group question, the benefits of aviation to participants were the convenience and speed of air travel and the opportunity for new travel destinations. Prior to discussing environmental issues, focus group participants were asked the main problems associated with aviation. The responses did not concern environmental issues, rather personal inconvenience at airports (especially security) and uncomfortable seating on aeroplanes.

Participants were asked about the fairness of the presentation of climate change within the media. The role of the media sensationalising climate change was mentioned in all focus groups, and there was a lack of trust in the media. In the second focus group there was a feeling that the media has become obsessive over climate change. However, there was a mixed response from the questionnaires on the climate change content, whether the 'UK media tends to over-state the effects of climate change': 10 agreed, 4 neither agreed or disagreed, and 13 disagreed.

A wide range of media representations on the environmental issues associated with aviation were mentioned by focus group participants. Those mentioned specifically by name included 'The Great Global Warming Swindle' (Channel 4, Thursday 8th March – focus group 1), Comic Relief (BBC, Friday 16th March - focus group 1), and a media report on Greenpeace offering free train tickets for those booked on a new British Airways flight from London to Cornwall (BBC, 2007; The Guardian, 2007 - focus groups 1 & 3). Several participants had recently been affected by climate change messages within specific programmes; one participant quoted the Al Gore film 'An Inconvenient Truth' (focus group 2), another a David Attenborough climate change programme (focus group 3).

"We have to trust in the media that they put the right things in our way and we have to know where the truth is." (Focus group 1, Participant 2)

"Two incidents that I've heard in the news in the last week: BA has flown a 737 from Cardiff to Heathrow; they're flying it six times a week with no passengers on board purely so that it can keep its landing slot at Heathrow. And there's another, there's a short haul, I can't remember who operates it, flying from Gatwick or one of the London airports to Cornwall and they're suggesting is it really necessary to have a flight from London to Cornwall, how long's the train take? Maybe less than five hours from Paddington to Penzance?" (Focus group 3, Participant 5)

In terms of sector contributions to the emissions of greenhouse gases, the second and third focus groups were in agreement about heavy industry making the largest contribution to climate change; the other two focus groups were less sure.

"I thought airline industry contributed the most, but maybe power stations." (Focus group 4, Participant 2)

5.2 Examine people's acceptability and attitudes towards existing aviation taxes

There was much confusion and a lack of understanding about the nature of the existing aviation tax system. Some of this confusion related to UK Government messages: they are encouraging more personal air travel and then trying to stop this flying (focus group 2). There was general frustration across focus groups that airlines attract you with a low price and only then adds tax to the cost; it is particularly difficult when having to pay for multiple flights (e.g. when travelling with children).

5.2.1 Participant responses to Air Passenger Duty (APD)

In response to the APD summary sheet, all of the focus groups wanted transparency in the tax system, value for money, and were critical of the UK Government. This was particularly the case for focus group 2. In terms of improvements, focus group 1 thought that air freight companies should pay for their emissions. Focus group 4 reckoned that more bands could be added to the current APD structure to incorporate distance.

"I think this [APD] is a sneaky way of getting more taxes in." (Focus group 2, Participant 6)

"Why not trial some new freight charges and check the air freight as they are carrying a heavy load and some take 30 to 40 tons out a night, no offence, but they should pay more as they do for fuel as they are in and out all night using the airport." (Focus group 1, Participant 4)

Amongst all focus groups was a desire for an open, accountable UK Government (quoted in focus group 1). Examples within the focus groups for UK Government misuse of taxation money included the Iraq War (focus groups 1 & 3), road tax (cannot see where the money is going - focus groups 1, 3 & 4) and the NHS (lot of money spent and cannot see improvements - focus group 2). One view within the second focus group was that the UK is already taxed on everything through VAT and the UK is the highest taxed country in Europe. This focus group was also cynical towards aviation tax, that it would undoubtedly increase further.

The idea of a Trust Fund was proposed within the second focus group. The general public could decide, say through an election, where the aviation tax goes to; the fund would have independent (i.e. not political) management. This concept was also considered in focus group 4, a fund marked for environmental improvement, but with increased accountability.

"I think the tax ought to go into a set fund with somebody being over it and no-one could draw it out unless for research, of fuels and cleaner air and the money comes out of this pot for it. Then I wouldn't mind paying it this tax so much then because I have got children and grandchildren to benefit from it. Personally, people themselves elect a board of people, not all the time, but not the Government. Somebody, the people in the company want a non political bias and the tax it is just for us." (Focus group 2, Participant 5)

“I do think it should be made fair for all whether poor or rich but preferably the money should go into an unbiased pot and only for greener aviation.” (Focus group 2, Questionnaire from Participant 8)

5.2.2 Taxation levels at which participants would fly less

Participants were asked the taxation levels at which they would fly less. Across focus group discussions, the amount varied by individual circumstances and length of journey. The only agreement over a particular figure was for focus group 4, with an agreed value of £50 that would discourage flying. From the questionnaire responses (rises by £10, £20, £50 and £100 were presented to respondents), a price rise of £50 for all short-haul return flights ensured that most participants would “probably fly less often” (total 19: 3 fly the same, 16 less often); the equivalent price rise for long-haul return flights is £100 (total 16: 3 fly the same, 13 less often – rises by £20, £40, £100 and £200 were presented to respondents). A price rise of £50 for all return flights is the price rise that ensures most respondents (65% of 282 survey respondents) would “probably fly less often” from the Charnwood air travel survey (Ryley, 2007). A similar level was reported in the BPIC survey of 1,907 people (Mail on Sunday, 2007) – it would take a £50 premium on the cost of air fares for a significant number of people to cut back on air travel (48%).

5.3 How people would like to see the money spent (additional revenue) raised from aviation taxes

From the questionnaire, the three most popular responses (in order) to Question 6 (of the nine listed), ‘Where should any additional money raised from increased aviation tax go?’ were: ‘Green’ energy (e.g. wind farms, solar panels, energy efficient light bulbs), improving aircraft and aviation technology, and investment in UK transport infrastructure. The most popular response to measures that should be developed to reduce carbon emissions from aircraft was to ‘improve aircraft efficiency’; all participants were supportive of this measure. A list of responses to the measures is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Questionnaire responses as to which measures should be developed to reduce carbon emissions from aircraft

	Yes	No	Don't know or unsure	TOTAL
Be part of the EU Emission Trading System	15	4	6	25
Improve aircraft efficiency	25	0	0	25
Link aviation tax to fuel price	12	7	7	25
Link aviation tax to the percentage price of the ticket (e.g. VAT)	13	9	3	25
Relate aviation tax to the frequency of flying	9	11	5	25
Relate aviation to lifestyle choices across sectors	7	11	7	25
Impose limits on the number of flights an individual can make	2	20	3	25

Note: 25 focus group participants filled in this part of the questionnaire, Question 7

5.3.1 Long-term carbon reduction measures

Long-term carbon reduction measures to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad, were discussed within the focus groups in advance of mention by the moderator. Such projects included improving aircraft and aviation technology, aviation research, and investment in UK transport infrastructure (must be UK based).

“I think I like the engineering aspects of the fuel development of other forms of energy like hydrogen. I know this isn’t going to be very helpful in the short term but in the long term if somebody can come up with a breakthrough that could potentially change a lot. Obviously that’s the long term because people are still sceptical if they can do it.” (Focus group 4, Participant 2)

Across all focus groups UK surface transport came up as an issue. The UK railway system was remarked as the “worst in Europe for being on time and cleanliness” (focus group 2). The first focus group put forward the US yellow school bus system and the Swedish train system as examples of good practice. Mainland Europe and Japan were presented as a good examples in focus groups 3 and 4. Improved rail pricing was stressed in focus group 3, to make rail travel more competitive than air travel; focus group 4 stated a preference for high speed rail.

The third focus group had an emphasis on the role of aviation research and improving aircraft technology. There was a feeling that “something should be done”, and that “if there is a solution for cars, there should be for planes”. As an associated measure, the first and third focus groups put forward improvements in aircraft capacity. They proposed that flights be combined to ensure fuller aeroplanes and less fuel waste; perhaps airlines should meet a percentage capacity before flying (although it was acknowledged that airlines need to keep to their designated routes).

“But I think running flights half empty, you’ve got to sort of question it really, is it really worth doing it and I think airlines like Ryanair and easyJet are good in the sense they get the load up on the aircraft and if they recognise that the routes not working then they take it away but they’re the ones that contribute to a massive growth in air travel cause we all want to get away for £5 return.” (Focus group 3, Participant 6)

5.3.2 Short-term carbon reduction measures

Money raised from aviation taxes could be spent on a variety of measures; a range were put forward by the moderator in the focus groups. A number of carbon reduction projects (short-term) to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad were presented to participants: planting trees, improving degraded areas, and ‘green’ energy (e.g. wind farms, solar panels, energy efficient light bulbs). There was general agreement in favour of these measures, particularly the ‘green’ energy measures (e.g. focus group 1). Often when ‘green’ energy is mentioned, participants would like more wind turbines, but recognise people tend to complain about them because of visual pollution (e.g. focus groups 3 & 4). Focus group 4 would like help for households to implement green energy (e.g. solar panels), both in terms of awareness and financial assistance.

“Planting trees to make things better is a good idea, I don’t think many people would have a problem with that. I am not sure whether wind power is researched well enough and could be researched better. Would the energy needs of transporting it to places for us be a consideration too? At the moment it is experimental research and investments that is needed for such things.” (Focus group 2, Participant 5)

“We’ve heard of research into those areas of energy and a lot of money is put into research to the sum of 30 million, but sometimes we never get to see the results of it. We may hear of 20 million going into research of energy this year, but people want to see evidence of it.” (Focus group 2, Participant 7)

5.3.3 Carbon adaptation measures

In response to carbon adaptation measures (sustainable tourism, promote drought resistant crops), focus groups 1 and 3 were hesitant, stating the issues associated with Genetically Modified food. Of the environmental measures, not necessarily carbon reducing, such as protecting nature and habitats, focus group 1 were particularly supportive.

5.3.4 Other measures

The first focus group had more of an emphasis on the moral implications of climate change, and the impact upon developing countries. This focus group also seemed to have the most ‘green’ participants. Mention was made in the first focus group of Comic Relief (on TV the previous night) and the human need associated with poverty and survival; money from aviation tax should be put towards poverty in developing countries as well as alleviating climate change impacts. It was acknowledged in focus group 1 that corruption is a problem in the developing world. Developing countries were also mentioned in passing during the second and third focus groups.

”I was thinking whilst seeing Comic Relief on the TV last night the poverty in Africa, that it is horrendous the poverty abroad, and thinking about this country as well things are bad in places like Glasgow. So if this money was spent on that and it goes on that, I think people would be more content to pay more.” (Focus group 1, Participant 2)

“If it helped people I wouldn’t mind paying more, but there are still companies like Ryanair trying to undercut other companies, what would happen to them?” (Focus group 2, Participant 3)

The role of video-conferencing, to reduce travel, was discussed in focus group 3. Although this saves money for businesses and reduces emission, they acknowledged that face-to-face contact is often necessary to develop business relationships.

Educating the general public about climate change was considered to be very important in focus group 1, and came back as a recurrent theme. It was also mentioned in passing during the second focus group. A particular stress was made of junior school education in focus group 1, but at other times the education and informing of all of the population about the climate change impacts was referred to, for the UK and to other (particularly developing) countries.

“Junior school education should be a part of this learning, it all starts then at an early stage and this should be part of education.” (Focus group 1, Participant 2)

5.4 Exploring possible future aviation taxes and other measures

5.4.1 European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS)

This analysis section explores possible future aviation taxes and other, associated measures, starting with the European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS). At least one individual within each focus group had heard of EU ETS, although the numbers were always in the minority, and there was little understanding of the concepts involved. In response to the EU ETS summary sheet, participants were tentatively supportive of the scheme. Focus group 1 agreed that it worked on the surface, although it would depend on the level set (and that the US is the worst polluter and not in the scheme). Within focus group 2, it was agreed that companies would not take the initial step to improve their emissions and so the only way would be to compel them through government intervention (e.g. via the EU ETS).

“Air travel is expanding, and so it would be difficult to stay under the emission cap. Technology can only go so far. As a result they would just break the level and undermine the system which defeats the object.” (Focus group 4, Participant 4)

Focus groups 3 and 4 felt that EU ETS should encourage companies further to aim as low as possible in their carbon emissions. Rather than setting a percentage cap, higher expectations should be encouraged with tax breaks to companies who exceed their targets by the most. In focus group 4 it was suggested that companies over the target should be penalised, but that those under the target should not be rewarded; also, if the cap is reduced larger companies will have more power to buy permits and so smaller companies might suffer.

“Anything that gets the emissions down sounds good to me but rather than settling a percentage figure that they have to achieve like 10%, which is very small, we should be striving for the absolute maximum that you can go for and the more percentage that a company can reduce the CO₂ the more tax breaks you’ll get. I suppose it seems silly to me to set like a percent reduction you can easily do that but there’s no incentive to push the boundary even further.” (Focus group 3, Participant 6)

Most focus groups reflected on the international aspects of aviation growth and improving co-operation between countries. Many of the countries with large emissions were mentioned (e.g. the US, China and India in focus group 3). Focus group 1 stated the difficulty to achieve a consensus between the UK and the US, and to monitor emissions. Focus groups 2 and 3 felt that the UK should lead by example and promote the EU ETS, without being discouraged that other countries are not promoting climate change policies.

5.4.2 Aviation tax developments

On the suggestion that aviation tax should be linked to fuel price (difficult with legally binding bilateral agreements but many are being renegotiated), focus group 1 thought it would make sense to link to fuel, ensuring tax would be proportional to flight price rather than as a flat rate. In a similar vein, focus group 4 considered that proportional fuel duty or VAT should be considered.

“Either a tax charged to the airline for passenger miles flown, or a percentage of the ticket cost with a minimum charge for low-cost airlines” (Focus group 4, Questionnaire from Participant 1)

A variety of opinions were provided on the proposal to relate aviation tax to the frequency of flying (e.g. the Conservative Party proposal that passengers pay more if fly more than once a year – see The Conservative Party, 2007). Focus group 1 was of the view that people who fly more often should be taxed more, with a differential to allow people to still go on holiday. Focus group 2 was against the frequent flyer proposal because you cannot tax people for being successful. The frequency of flying was also rejected as a proposal on grounds that people who fly more are taxed more anyway (focus groups 1 & 3). On the other hand, some in focus group 4 backed the frequent flyer proposal, but only for those who have holiday homes or “fly too frequently”.

The role of lifestyle choices across sectors (e.g. trade-off air travel against energy choices), and the associated concept of rationing, were proposed by the moderator during the focus groups. Focus group 1 stated that this is an EU ETS scheme at a lower, individual level. Focus groups 3 and 4 were cynical about the practicalities of this proposal, that there would be difficulty in administering and policing the system (“people would fiddle the system”). An individual within focus group 4 stated that rationing flights would be fine for most people but not for businesses.

“Perhaps we could think of people having a bank of carbon credits and spending them could affect our lifestyle and how people can fly. When they have used them up, perhaps they can buy them off someone else. Living on individual terms doesn’t always work, but at least the carbon emission output is more controlled.” (Focus group 1, Participant 1)

A suggestion from focus group 3 was to charge a higher aviation tax if there is a surface transport alternative; this would be the case for UK flights and also for certain mainland European destinations such as Paris and Brussels.

“Personally I think there should be a higher tax for flights where you could easily take a train, so if you had a higher rate of tax, let’s say if you were coming out of Heathrow for example, you’d have a high rate of tax on flights to Manchester Glasgow, Edinburgh, down the south coast, but even across to Paris and even across to Brussels because you could take the Eurostar and it’s far more kind” (Focus group 3, Participant 6)

5.4.3 The role of ‘greener’ airlines

During the consideration of the choice of a ‘greener’ airline, all focus groups at some point stressed a tendency to go for price when booking airline tickets. This would continue unless some airlines become particularly green (focus group 1); it was also felt that airlines should do more, not just passengers (focus group 1). Focus group 3 reckoned there would be no way to police this measure. The Virgin Atlantic trial measure of towing aircraft to the runway in order to save fuel was mentioned (focus groups 3 & 4); the prize on offer by Richard Branson (Chief Executive of Virgin Atlantic) for measures to alleviate climate change was mentioned in focus group 4.

5.4.4 Assisting participants in their air travel choices

A variety of measures to assist focus group participants in their air travel choices were discussed (e.g. better information on carbon emissions, labelling on tickets & emissions per passenger data). Such measures were linked to education by the first focus group. Focus group 3 thought that it depends how the measures were advertised – they would need to be in laymen’s terms not jargon. Focus group 4 had a desire to know the efficiency of a flight, not available at the moment.

“When I use the Council tip for rubbish, percentages are being quoted and you can see the effects. I think of recycling and this is well publicised.” (Focus group 1, Participant 2)

An interesting idea coming from Focus Group 4 was that of a league table of airlines incorporating carbon emissions, to enable choice by cost and environmental credentials. An energy efficiency rating could be applied as with certain electronic goods. Air companies would need to be encouraged to use the league tables for their advantage – to be seen to do the right thing.

“League tables, so you could choose by cost and my environmental credentials ... you know you should be going with the green one but you can see which one is the most expensive, which is the greener and perhaps a happy medium.” (Focus group 4, Participant 5)

5.5 Segmentation of the focus groups

It is of interest to explore the concept of different levels of 'greenness' amongst focus group participants. There was a spectrum of views across the focus groups. The first focus group had the most 'green' participants. One individual within this group supported carbon allowances and a limit to flying (people should purchase credits to allow for further flights):

"I feel that we as a community have become over developed in some ways and some options we have will have to be taken away from us and there will be alternatives. We did not have all this choice years ago. I think we have got to be prepared to have some choices taken away from us." (Focus group 1, Participant 1)

One distinct viewpoint amongst respondents is the 'no turning back' approach to climate change (Focus Groups 1 & 3) – the fact that it is inevitable and whatever measures are implement will not have an effect upon climate change. For example:

"It is a bit late now isn't it to get worried with global warming etc. which is already happening. This sort of thing is going to be inevitable and something should have been done earlier anyway." (Focus group 1, Participant 4)

These viewpoints can be linked to the 'levels of greenness' segments generated from recent attitudinal work. Although there were a few participants in the focus groups that could be classified as 'Greens', most would be 'Basic Contributors', in that they show environmental concerns but have barriers to green behaviour, such as expense or fitting in with lifestyle (using the classification in DEFRA, 2007). There are also, therefore, indications of focus group participants being in the two extreme segments of the MORI classification: 'the ultra Greens' and the 'Disengaged' (MORI, 2007).

It is difficult to determine segments from focus groups when participants make statements as a group rather than as individuals. The questionnaire responses provided a further insight into individual environmental attitudes. Almost all participants agreed that 'I think it's important that I do everything I can to limit my impact on the environment' (23 out of 27 participants). Around half (13 out of 27 participants) thought that 'passengers should pay more to fly because of the negative environmental aspects of aviation'. However, in terms of translating attitudes to air travel behaviour, only 5 out of 27 participants agreed that 'I am trying to fly less for environmental reasons'. It could be argued, therefore, that individuals are receptive of the idea of policies designed to reduce the environmental impact of flying, but are unwilling to restrict their air travel behaviour. Further information on intended behaviour change are available from questions in the Omnibus survey (DfT, 2007) – a fifth of adults who had flown said they were likely to reduce their flights due to concerns about climate change.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This Section is a summary of the key findings and conclusions from this focus group project. Participants have been influenced by the media, from a range of examples, and there is a mixed response as to whether the media overemphasised the impacts of climate change. Amongst participants there was much confusion and a lack of understanding about the nature of the existing aviation tax system. All of the focus groups wanted the aviation tax system to be transparent and independently managed (i.e. not political).

Focus group discussion included how participants would like to see the money spent that is raised from aviation taxes. There was greatest support for the long-term measures of improving UK surface transport and aircraft technology. Short-term 'green energy' measures were also popular amongst participants. In the exploration of future developments of the aviation tax system, participants were tentatively supportive of the European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) and felt that the UK should lead by example for climate change solutions such as the EU ETS (current Government policy is to include aviation in the EU ETS). However, participants would like to see companies within the EU ETS striving for the absolute maximum in carbon reductions. There was some support for proportional taxes such as fuel duty and VAT on flights; a frequent flyer tax received a more mixed response.

There were some interesting, unprompted proposals generated from the focus groups that could be developed further in the debate on improvements to the aviation tax system:

- Incorporate air freight companies into the current aviation tax system;
- Create an independently managed and accountable trust fund to use aviation tax for environmental improvements;
- Improve aircraft occupancy in order to reduce emission levels per passenger; one possibility would be to impose minimum capacity levels at which an aircraft should fly - although airlines would probably then offer low-fare tickets to fill their aircraft, thus stimulating demand;
- Educate and inform the public about climate change and the environmental impacts of transport;
- Create a higher band of aviation tax for passengers if there is a viable surface transport alternative (e.g. within the UK or some mainly Europe destinations); and
- Develop a league table of airlines that would incorporate carbon emissions as well as flight costs for a particular journey.

The next step would be to assess the feasibility of such proposals.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Focus groups have been an effective method to assist in the understanding of public engagement on aviation taxes, over a very short timescale. The focus group findings could be extended to further research by using targeted segments (rather than those across the population), such as those with strong green credentials (e.g. charged with educating the general public) and/or secondary school children (e.g. to show long-term acceptability of green taxes).

Focus groups are often used to complement other methods, and this project could form the first stage of more in-depth research into the attitudes towards, and acceptability of, aviation taxes. It would be of particular relevance to examine how these aspects affect air travel behaviour. There have been some recent research insights into 'green' segments, as well as some relevant findings from attitudinal surveys; further research should be conducted with a more in-depth data collection effort and using more rigorous statistical and theoretical approaches. Some of this will evolve from the CfIT work (e.g. MORI, 2007) and the Propensity to Fly project, but there is also a need for further research which has a focus on public attitudes, acceptability and travel behaviour relating to aviation taxes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following staff at Loughborough University for their assistance in the recruiting of focus group participants and/or the transcribing of the focus group data: George Raymond, Ann Cluskey, Joe Kendal and Stuart Meek.

REFERENCES

- BBC (2007). Greenpeace protest at BA flights. 17 March 2007. [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/6462139.stm> – accessed 27-3-07]
- Bloor, M (2001). Focus groups in social research. London: Sage.
- Cairns, S. and C. Newson (2006). Predict and decide. Aviation, climate change and UK policy. Environmental Change Institute, September 2006.
- The Conservative Party (2007). Greener skies: A consultation on the environmental taxation of aviation [<http://www.conservatives.com/pdf/greenskiesconsultation.pdf>, accessed 28-3-2007]
- The Daily Telegraph (2007). Half of Britons support 'green' air tax. 17 March, 2007.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs – DEFRA (2007). Segmentation and attitudes. *Annex A. Segment profiles provided by Alison Pridmore, Sustainable Development Commission, March 2007.*
- Department for Transport - DfT (2003). The Future of Air Transport. Air Transport White Paper. HMSO, London.
- Department for Transport (2007). Public attitudes to climate change and the impact of transport. Published on 22nd March by Transport Statistics. HMSO, London [<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/att/attitudestoclimatechange?version=1>, accessed 29-3-2007]
- Gibbs, A (1997). Social Research Update, 19: Focus Groups
- The Guardian (2007). BA passengers offered free train tickets. 20 March, 2007 [<http://environment.guardian.co.uk/travel/story/0,,2038611,00.html> – accessed 27-3-07]

HM Custom and Excise (2003). Notice 550 Air Passenger Duty, [http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageExcise_InfoGuides&propertyType=document&id=HMCE_CL_0005_05#downloadopt], accessed 28-3-2007]

HM Custom and Excise (2006). Pre-budget report notes [<http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/pbr2006/pbrn-all.pdf>, accessed 28-3-2007]

HM Government (2007). Draft Climate Change Bill. March 2007. [<http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm70/7040/7040.asp>, accessed 28-3-2007]

The Independent (2007). Pressure group urges higher air taxes to penalise 'rich' flyers. 19 March, 2007

Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A (2000). Focus groups : a practical guide for applied research. 3rd edition. Sage Publications, London.

Mail on Sunday (2007). Cameron's green tax on air travel a massive vote loser. 18 March, 2007.

Morgan, D.L (1997). Planning focus groups. London: Sage.

MORI (2007). Attitudes to aviation and climate change. Draft report by MORI for the Centre for Integrated Transport (CfIT), February 2007. *Permission granted from CfIT to quote from this report, March 2007.*

Powell R.A., Single H.M., and Lloyd K.R (1996). 'Focus groups in mental health research: enhancing the validity of user and provider questionnaires', International Journal of Social Psychology 42 (3): 193-206.

Riley, T (2007). An examination of air travel preferences in the East Midlands. Paper presented at Universities' Transport Studies Group 39th Annual Conference, Harrogate 3rd - 5th January 2007.

Riley, T. and Gjersoe, N (2006). 'Newspaper response to the Edinburgh congestion charging scheme proposals', Transport Policy, 13 (1), pp. 66-73.

Stern, N (2006). Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, HM Treasury, 30 October 2006 [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_review_economics_climate_change/sternreview_index.cfm – accessed 28-3-2007].

The Sunday Times (2007). 'Green' Cameron shades it over Brown. Voters prefer Tories on environment but fear tax-raising ruse. 18 March, 2007. [<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article1530994.ece> – accessed 27-3-2007]

APPENDICES

1. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION WITHIN THE FOCUS GROUPS

Pre-amble

Introduce ourselves, the purpose of the research (part of on-going air travel research), the nature of a focus group, our role in the focus group, importance that everyone participates. State confidentiality and recording. State that we are not political or have an agenda, it is an exercise to find out what people think. There are no right or wrong answers! Also state that it doesn't matter how much they have flown.

Outline practicalities: no longer than 1½ hours.

1. Introduction – their air travel

Go round the group with introductions, with an outline of their flying experiences – previous flights and typical destinations and types of trip – or if have never flown.

What are the main benefits of air travel, to you and to society as a whole?

2. Environmental issues associated with aviation

What are the main problems associated with aviation?

Probe the perceptions of the environmental impacts of aviation.

How serious do you consider the problem of climate change to be?

Do you think the presentation of climate change in the media is fair?

Which sectors contribute most to the emissions of greenhouse gases?

What do you think are the best ways of reducing carbon emissions from aviation?

3. Examine people's acceptability and attitudes towards existing aviation taxes

What do you think of the current system of taxing aviation?

Tease out what focus group participants know about aviation taxes.

What type of tax/charge do you think would be effective in reducing carbon emissions?

What do you think is the purpose of aviation taxes?

[Hand out sheet summary of APD – and ask them to look through it]

Do you find the existing system of aviation taxes, using APD, acceptable?

If not, which aspects of the current APD could be improved to make it more acceptable?

At what taxation levels are you likely to fly less? Split by long-haul and (e.g. more than 2 hours, outside Continental Europe) and short haul flights (e.g. less than 2 hours, within Continental Europe)?

Increase all by £10, £20, £50, £100

Once you have paid a tax, such as APD, would you feel you then have the right to fly? Is this any sense of 'guilt', and would this be alleviated?

(would respondents feel absolved and still fly as much as they do currently)

4. How people would like to see the money spent (additional revenue) raised from aviation taxes

How would you like to see the money raised from aviation taxes spent?

Money raised from aviation taxes could be spent on a range of measures. What are your thoughts on the following measures (if not mentioned in previous question)?

- Carbon reduction projects (short-term) to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad
 - Planting trees
 - Improving degraded areas
 - 'Green' energy (e.g. wind farms, solar panels, energy efficient light bulbs)
- Carbon adaptation measures
 - Sustainable tourism
 - Promote drought resistant crops
- Environmental measures, not necessarily carbon reducing
 - Protecting nature & habitats
- Carbon reduction projects (long-term) to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad
 - Improving aircraft and aviation technology
 - Aviation research
 - Investment in UK transport infrastructure (must be UK based).

How would you want assurances that this is where the money would go?

5. Exploring possible future aviation taxes and other measures

In what ways do you think aviation tax could be developed in the future?

Tease out what focus group participants know about EUETS.

[Hand out sheet summary of EUETS – and ask them to look through it]

Do you think that EUETS is an acceptable way of including aviation in efforts to reduce carbon emissions, and why?

Do you think aviation tax should:

- Be linked to fuel price? (difficult with legally binding bilateral agreements but many are being renegotiated)
- Be linked to the difference between long haul (e.g. more than 2 hours, outside Continental Europe) and short haul flights (e.g. less than 2 hours, within Continental Europe)?
- Incorporate both the outward & return segments of flights?
- Be a percentage of the ticket price? (e.g. VAT system)
- Be used to incentivise airlines to be greener? (navigation charges, airport charges)
- Relate to the frequency of flying? (e.g. Conservative proposal that pay more if fly more than once a year)
- Relate to lifestyle choices across sectors?
- Incorporate rationing?

Many within the scientific community consider the environmental impacts of aviation to be greater than just carbon (e.g. radiative forcing). Should individuals pay more for this impact?

Is which airline you use important to you?

What factors influence your choice? (e.g. price, frequency, timing, service quality)

If so, would you consider a 'greener' airline?

Would the following help in your air travel choices?

- Better information (e.g. marketing, internet) on carbon emissions etc.
- Labelling on tickets
- Emissions per passenger data (by aircraft or at the airport)

As aviation is an international issue, how would you like to see international co-operation being improved? Any other thoughts on the international aspects of aviation growth?

END OF FOCUS GROUP

Thank all respondents, and ask them to fill in the short questionnaire.

2. FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY SHEETS

Focus group summary sheet 1

Air Passenger Duty

Air Passenger Duty (APD) was introduced on 1st November 1994. Each time an individual purchases a ticket for a flight from a UK airport, Air Passenger Duty is added to the cost of their departure flight, to be received by the Treasury. The amount paid is a flat rate fee which varies depending upon the end destination of the chargeable passenger. There are limited exemptions from this tax, which include small aircraft, seating fewer than 20 people and aircraft carrying freight.

APD Rates from 1st February 2007	In the lowest class of travel	In other than the lowest class of travel
Passengers flying to destinations in the European Economic Area (EEA), the European Common Aviation Area, countries applying to join the European Union (EU), and Switzerland.*	£10	£20
Passengers flying to other destinations.	£40	£80

*EEA destinations comprise all EU member states, Norway and Iceland. Countries applying to join the EU are Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Turkey. The European Common Aviation Area, applies to Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo under the Interim Administration of the United Nations, Montenegro and Serbia.

Focus group summary sheet 2

European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS)

The European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) was introduced in January 2005 as a key mechanism to reduce green house gas emissions. Companies within the EU ETS may either reduce their emissions below the 'cap' set and sell permits, or emit above the cap and purchase additional permits. Companies will choose to whatever is cheapest and emissions are reduced, therefore, where it is easiest and cheapest to do so first.

Currently this includes emissions of CO₂ from electricity generation and the main energy intensive industries. Overall, these account for around 50% of UK CO₂ emissions. Phase II, beginning in 2008, may consider other greenhouse gases and be extended to other industries, such as aviation.

The European Commission has adopted a proposal for legislation to include aviation in EUETS, and this would occur in two phases. From the start of 2011, emissions from domestic and international flights between EU airports would be covered, and from the start of 2012 the scheme would cover emissions from all international flights, that arrive or depart from an EU airport.

3. QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO RESPONDENTS



FOCUS GROUP ON AVIATION TAXES
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE
MARCH 2007

NAME:

YOUR AIR TRAVEL

If you have never flown before, please go to Question 4

1. How many **return flights**, either domestic or international, have you taken over the last 12 months?
Please tick one box

0 1 2 3 4 5+

1a. Of these return flights, how many were for leisure trips, and how many were for business trips?
Please tick one box for each type of trip

Leisure trips	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5+ <input type="checkbox"/>
Business trips	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5+ <input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please provide the following information about **your most recent return flight**:

2a. UK departure airport _____

2b. The destination _____

2c. What was the reason for this trip? *Please tick one box*

Leisure trip: Visiting friends and relatives Business trip
Leisure trip: Holiday

Other (please state) _____

2d. Why did you choose this particular flight?

2e. If known, how much did you pay for this flight (total return air fare including all costs and taxes)?

£ _____ Don't know – **please go to Question 3**

2f. What is the maximum price that you would have been willing to pay for this flight?

£ _____

ACCEPTABILITY OF AVIATION TAXES

If you do not currently fly for short-haul trips (flights within Continental Europe), please go to Question 3b

3a. We are interested in how your air travel choices might change in the future in response to changes in the costs associated with air travel for **short-haul trips (flights within Continental Europe)**. Please state how **your air travel might change** in response to a change in all air fares (the return air fares quoted cover all costs).

Please tick one box for each fare

Total return air fare	I would probably fly more often my air travel	There would be no change in	I would probably fly less often
Decrease by £20 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decrease by £10 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £10 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £20 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £50 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £100 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you do not currently fly for long-haul trips (flights outside Continental Europe), please go to Question 4

3b. We are interested in how your air travel choices might change in the future in response to changes in the costs associated with air travel for **long-haul trips (flights outside Continental Europe)**. Please state how **your air travel might change** in response to a change in all air fares (the return air fares quoted cover all costs).

Please tick one box for each fare

Total return air fare	I would probably fly more often my air travel	There would be no change in	I would probably fly less often
Decrease by £40 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decrease by £20 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £20 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £40 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £100 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase by £200 for all return flights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Following on from the focus group, how do you think, if at all, aviation taxes should be developing in the future?

ATTITUDES TO AIR TRAVEL AND AVIATION TAXES

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your attitudes towards air travel?

Please tick one box for each statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Air travel is essential to the UK economy and to the country's continuing prosperity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air travel is a significant contributor to climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The UK media tends to over-state the effects of climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Passengers should pay more to fly because of the negative environmental aspects of aviation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am trying to fly less for environmental reasons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think it's important that I do everything I can to limit my impact on the environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Where should any additional money raised from increased aviation tax go?

Please do not select more than five in the 'Yes' category

	Yes	No	Don't know or unsure
Carbon reduction projects (short-term) to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad			
• Planting trees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Improving environmentally degraded areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• 'Green' energy (e.g. wind farms, solar panels, energy efficient light bulbs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carbon adaptation measures			
• Sustainable tourism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Promote drought resistant crops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental measures, not necessarily carbon reducing			
• Protecting nature and habitats	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carbon reduction projects (long-term) to reduce the environmental impacts of aircraft, either in the UK or abroad			
• Improving aircraft and aviation technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Aviation research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Investment in UK transport infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Do you think the following measures should be developed to reduce carbon emissions from aircraft?
- | | Yes | No | Don't know or unsure |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Be part of the EU Emission Trading System | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improve aircraft efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Link aviation tax to fuel price | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Link aviation tax to the percentage price of the ticket (e.g. VAT) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relate aviation tax to the frequency of flying | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relate aviation to lifestyle choices across sectors | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Impose limits on the number of flights an individual can make | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SECTION E. YOU AND YOUR HOUSEHOLD

8. Please state your age band. *Please tick one box*

18-24 35-44 55-59 65-74
 25-34 45-54 60-64 75 and over

9. How many adults are there in your household (18 or over)? _____

10. How many children are there in your household (under 18)? _____

11. Which of the following best describes your current situation? *Please tick one box*

Employed full time	<input type="checkbox"/>	In education	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employed part time	<input type="checkbox"/>	Government work or training scheme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Looking after home or family	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unable to work: short-term illness or injury	<input type="checkbox"/>
Permanently retired from work	<input type="checkbox"/>	Permanently sick or disabled	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unemployed and seeking work	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Other _____

12. We may set up further air travel focus groups. Would you be willing to take part in a focus group?
Please tick one box

Yes No

13. Please state any further comments you have on the questionnaire and the focus group.

THANK YOU FOR FILLING IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND TAKING PART IN THE FOCUS GROUP

4. A TABLE TO SHOW THE COMPOSITION OF PARTICIPANTS WITHIN THE FOCUS GROUPS

Number of the focus group	Number within focus group	Gender of respondent	q8 Age of interviewee	q11 Status of respondent
1	1	Male	18-24	Unable to work: short-term illness or injury
1	2	Female	45-54	Unable to work: short-term illness or injury
1	3	Female	35-44	Employed part time
1	4	Male	75 and over	Permanently retired from work
1	5	Female	35-44	Employed full time
1	6	Female	35-44	Employed part time
2	1	Male	25-34	Employed full time
2	2	Female	45-54	Unable to work: short-term illness or injury
2	3	Female	18-24	Unable to work: short-term illness or injury
2	4	Female	18-24	In education
2	5	Female	25-34	In education
2	6	Male	65-74	Permanently retired from work
2	7	Male	25-34	Employed full time
2	8	Female	45-54	In education
3	1	Male	25-34	Unemployed and seeking work
3	2	Female	18-24	Looking after home or family
3	3	Female	55-59	Employed part time
3	4	Male	18-24	In education
3	5	Male	25-34	Employed full time
3	6	Male	25-34	Employed full time
3	7	Male	18-24	Employed full time
4	1	Male	65-74	Employed part time
4	2	Male	18-24	In education
4	3	Female	18-24	Employed full time
4	4	Female	18-24	In education
4	5	Female	35-44	Looking after home or family
4	6	Male	35-44	Employed full time