Journal of Economics, Business, and Accountancy Ventura Vol. 26, No. 3, December – March 2024, pages 367– 385

Match or Mismatch of Expectation-Realization Behind the Motives in Supporting Social Entrepreneurship Programs

Prama Widayat[1,2], Afred Suci[1]*, Sri Maryanti[1,3], Lucky Lhaura Van FC[1,4], Abu Amar Fauzi[5,7], Satria Tri Nanda[6]

[1] *Universitas Lancang Kuning, Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia*
[2] *Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia*
[3] *Universitas Andalas, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia*
[4] *Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia*
[5] *Universitas Hayam Wuruk Perbanas, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia*
[6] *Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor, Malaysia*
[7] *National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Jakarta, Indonesia*

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:
Received: 30 August 2023
Revised: 03 February 2024,
03 March 2024
Accepted: 15 March 2024

JEL Classification:
D84, D91, L31

DOI:
10.14414/jebav.v26i3.4110

Keywords:
Sociopreneur, Social enterprise, Motivation, Expectation-realization gap, Waste bank

A B S T R A C T

Abundant studies regarding motives in social enterprise have been conducted but have barely explored the gaps between motivational expectations and realizations. Particularly in waste bank studies, such a study has yet to be scholarly discussed. Using expectancy theory and mismatch hypotheses, this study explored the motives in waste bank participation towards owners/managers and customers and measured the gaps between the motive expectations and realizations. Quantitative comparison tests were employed on 45 Indonesian waste bank owners/managers and 162 customers whose data were collected directly and through online surveys. The findings reveal that the most expected motive was the environmental, while the least was the economic; this went for both waste bank owners/managers and customers. The results also show that severe mismatches occurred between expectations and realizations, in which the most significant gap for waste bank owners/managers was educational, while the environmental motive was the biggest for customers. This study's findings enrich the social entrepreneurship literature by showing that the motives per se are insufficient to reveal individuals' actual situations in supporting the social programs, as disparities are very likely to occur between expectations and realities. The gap analysis in this study provides a different alternative to conducting studies related to the underlying motives for supporting social entrepreneurship programs.

A B S T R A K

Studi terkait motif dalam wirausaha sosial telah banyak dilakukan, namun masih sangat jarang mengeksplorasi kesenjangan antara ekspektasi dengan realisasinya. Bahkan dalam konteks kajian bank sampah, hal tersebut belum pernah didiskusikan secara ilmiah. Teori ekspektasi dan hipotesis ketidaksesuaian digunakan untuk mengetahui motif-motif pemilik/pengelola dan nasabah dalam berpartisipasi di program bank sampah serta mengukur kesenjangan yang terjadi antara ekspektasi motif dan realisasinya. Pengujian perbandingan kuantitatif dilakukan terhadap 45 orang pemilik/pengelola dan 162 nasabah bank sampah di Indonesia, dimana data-data dikumpulkan baik secara langsung mau pun melalui survei daring. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan motif yang paling tinggi adalah lingkungan, sedangkan pertimbangan ekonomi menjadi motif yang paling lemah, di mana hasil ini berlaku bagi pemilik/pengelola dan nasabah bank sampah. Hasil penelitian juga memperlihatkan adanya kesenjangan yang signifikan antara ekspektasi dengan realisasi, di mana kesenjangan yang paling besar bagi pemilik/pengelola adalah pada motif edukasi, sementara motif lingkungan menjadi kesenjangan yang terbesar bagi para nasabah bank sampah. Temuan penelitian ini memperkaya literatur kewirausahaan sosial dengan menunjukkan bahwa motif yang melatarbelakangi partisipasi belum mampu menggambarkan kondisi sesungguhnya karena disparitas antara ekspektasi dengan realita sangat mungkin terjadi. Analisa kesenjangan yang dilakukan di penelitian ini memberikan alternatif berbeda dalam melakukan kajian terkait motif dukungan pada program-program kewirausahaan sosial.

* *Corresponding author, email address: afredsuci@unilak.ac.id*

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing interest in social entrepreneurs' roles in fostering and advancing environmental sustainability (e.g., Parris & McInnis-Bowers, 2014; Veleva, 2021). At the same time, the world population growth results in a gigantic waste increase, which unfortunately cannot comply with the availability of landfills in many developing and underdeveloped countries. Therefore, a waste management system—a strategy used to manage waste generation, storage, collection, treatment, transportation, processing, recycling, and final disposal (Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015)—is crucial to prevent people from drowning in waste. Skyrocketing problems concerning solid waste disasters have called upon each community member to participate in waste management programs, one of which is the waste bank initiative (Aprilia, 2021). Rooted in Bantul, Indonesia, in 2008, the number of Indonesian waste banks exponentially raised over 27,000 units in 2023 (Simba, accessed on 8th August 2023), initiated mainly by the local social micro entrepreneurs with support of the surrounding community as the regular waste producers.

Such an innovative breakthrough of waste bank—the waste management facility using the reduce, reuse, and recycle principles, as well as means of education, behavior change in waste management, and the realization of a circular economy managed by the community, business entities, and local governments (Regulation of Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 14 Year 2021 regarding Waste Management in Waste Banks)—has altered the "polluters pay principle" which obligates waste producers to pay various waste mitigation and management costs (Milon, 2019) into "polluters get paid" by selling their wastes to waste banks. This model opens up micro and small socio-preneurship opportunities while providing additional income for the community from exchanging their household garbage for savings (e.g., Kubota et al., 2020; Soesanto et al., 2021).

However, participating in waste bank communities is more than just about economic motives. Today's business model should also include socio-environmental consciousness—individuals' cognitive awareness towards social and environmental issues (Tsai et al., 2014)—as the sustainability business strategy. As such, exploring more motives, such as social and environmental drivers (e.g., Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015; Gopal et al., 2018), in waste bank participation is essential. In a broader context of the waste management system, the processes should be economically affordable—or, in our case, profitable—socially accepted by the community, and environmentally effective (e.g., Worrell, 2014; Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015; Nguyen, 2022). In the narrower context of Indonesian waste banks, these three motives have been broadly discussed by previous researchers (e.g., Lubis, 2015; Muttaqien et al., 2019; Hapsari et al., 2020; Shahreza et al., 2020; Ivakdalam & Far, 2022; Erris et al., 2023), mainly emphasizing the importance of economic, social, and environmental motivation in waste bank participation.

Knowing the genuine and most important motive behind people's decision-making may help promote and develop business strategies (e.g., Todd-Maddox & Markman, 2010; Murnieks et al., 2019; Abbasi et al., 2021). Yet, individuals' motivations are not always satisfied; there are always gaps between expectations and perceptions or what people can obtain and accomplish (e.g., Das, 2014; Wong & Kuvaas, 2018) resulting from, for example, different individuals' characteristics, time allocation, efforts, capacity, and perceived incentives (Todd-Maddox & Markman, 2010; Maloshonok & Terentev, 2017; Burch, 2018). Having that said, measuring the gaps between motive expectations and realizations in a waste bank context has yet to be explored. Moreover, the gap between waste bank owners/managers and customers is worth investigating to understand the potential motive discrepancies and, ultimately, to align waste bank strategies with customers' motivation to strengthen their commitments and get more people to participate in the waste bank program. Answers to these questions remain unclear; thus, the current study employs the expectancy theory and mismatch hypothesis to address these gaps. Accordingly, the current study's aims are two-fold: first, to determine the motives rank of waste bank owners/managers and customers; second, to measure the motive expectations-realizations gaps. The findings are expected to offer novel contributions in expanding the literature of expectancy theory on socio-preneurial motivation and participation, particularly focusing on the waste bank context.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Motives Behind the Waste Bank Participation

Waste bank as a practical example of social enterprise—a hybrid business model falling between profit- and nonprofit-oriented organizations, which pursue monetary benefits while creating social values

(Chang & Chuang, 2021)—is initiated and established by and for the community (Dhokhikah et al., 2015). It becomes one manifestation of the circular economy, which basically reevaluates waste as a resource to create new products while reducing the usage of intermediate resources (i.e., energy, water) and environmental pollution, as well as compensating for material scarcity (Neofotistos et al., 2023). The challenges for waste banks as social enterprises, thus, are not merely to pursue profit maximization but also to consider other aspects, such as social and environmental benefits (Chang & Chuang, 2021).

Using one of the most cited motivation theories, Vroom's expectancy theory, the current study attempts to investigate the motives behind waste bank participation from both owners'/managers' and customers' perspectives. This theory was introduced by Victor Vroom (1964), suggesting that an individual's tendency to act depends on their expectations for the outcomes. The fundamental premise of this theory is that individuals' motivation depends on how much they want something and how likely they think they can get it (Griffin et al., 2020). In short, Vroom's expectancy theory emphasizes the importance of self-interest (motive) in individuals wanting to achieve or be rewarded and how they perceive the actual results/realizations. It can predict how individuals will act in certain ways based on expectations that such an act will result in expected outcomes (e.g., "I can earn extra income by participating in waste bank business, while helping the environment as well") (Renko et al., 2012). Numerous working and organizational behaviors have used expectancy theories but barely investigated in socio-entrepreneurship studies, although few evidences of this theory have observed the role of motivational expectancy in entrepreneurial motivation/intention and goal-setting (e.g., Krueger et al., 2000; Gatewood et al., 2002; Renko et al., 2012; Hsu et al., 2014; Barba-Sánchez & Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2017), including in social enterprises (e.g., Audenaert et al., 2020; Ghatak et al., 2023). Yet, expectancy theory has scarcely been discussed in waste bank studies.

Economic motive. Economic motives relate to potential monetary benefits or rewards one can gain by performing particular things through cost-benefit analysis (Bucher et al., 2016; To et al., 2020). It is highly correlated with classical economic theory arguing the concept of "*homo oeconomicus*" suggesting individuals' actions are purely motivated by rational monetary considerations (Planing, 2015). To participate in a particular social enterprise, people need to be monetarily rewarded (Neofotistos et al., 2023); this goes both ways to waste bank owners/managers and customers. The waste banks receive or buy various types of waste from the community or industry, compensating with money saved in a deposit book (Dhokhihah et al., 2015). These wastes are sorted; some are recycled, while the rest are sold to other parties or industries, leaving the residues to be transported to landfills or incinerated. Typically, waste banks gain 10% to 15% of the margin through these processes (Shahreza, 2021); it can be more if they can upcycle new products with higher economic values with smart solutions (Yadav et al., 2023).

Social motive. Waste management programs certainly need community participation, especially in developing countries, including a shared commitment to healthy, clean, and green neighborhoods (Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Lubis, 2015). This motive refers to perceived benefits from interacting with others through gaining others' recognition, getting close to others, and establishing friendships (Hapsari et al., 2020; Chang & Chuang, 2021), particularly in supporting waste management programs through waste banks in the neighborhood. A waste bank is a social engineering to persuade and engage citizens to manage their waste responsibly, including sorting, collecting, and selling or donating their household waste to the nearest waste banks (Ivakdalam & Far, 2022). The family members' and neighbors' social bonds and norms in managing their waste might determine the success of waste banks by participating in community-based waste management (e.g., Murad et al., 2007; Nguyen, 2022), making public participation one of the crucial drivers in waste management programs (Gopal et al., 2018).

Environmental motive. This motive refers to individuals' traits and beliefs about the importance of living in harmony with the environment (Chang & Chuang, 2021). For ecopreneurs, such as waste bank owners/managers, green value might be the strongest motivation when deciding to start businesses related to environmental preservation (Anisa & Fitria, 2020). Together with their customers, waste banks should initiate the awareness of waste reduction, reuse, and recycling (Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015), starting by sorting them at the source point since it will be more effective and efficient in reducing waste handling and costs (e.g., Yadav et al., 2023; Nguyen, 2022) while also minimizing potential hazardous contamination to the environment (Gopal et al., 2018).

Educational motive. Unlike the other motives mentioned above, which are widely known as triple drivers of ecopreneurial and sociopreneurial action (e.g., Lubis, 2015; Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015; Chang & Chuang, 2021), this might be the least discussed motive in existing waste management studies, particularly in the context of waste bank. Thus, it might be another literature gap this study aims to address. Education motive is about transforming people's paradigms and implanting knowledge in handling their waste (e.g., Gopal et al., 2018). The presence of waste banks in the neighborhood is expected to change people's ignorant mindset and behaviors to be knowledgeable and aware of managing waste in proper ways (e.g., Fikriyyah & Adiwibowo, 2018; Muttaqien et al., 2019; Hapsari et al., 2020). Educating and coaching about waste management might ensure people's participation in waste bank programs (Shahreza, 2021). Moreover, the official definition of waste bank per se implicitly mentions the environmental education goal (Regulation of Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 14 Year 2021 regarding Waste Management in Waste Banks); thus, this motive should be included as a critical driver in waste bank participation.

2.2. Motivational Expectation-Realization Gaps

Of course, not all motives can be realized perfectly. There are spaces where one or more elements of the motives are not fulfilled, leading to differences and mismatches between what is expected and perceived (Renko et al., 2012). It is relevant to Vroom's expectancy theory, suggesting that individuals are motivated to exert effort when they expect that such efforts will lead to a particular performance and that performance will generate desired outcomes. Moreover, the theory points out a crucial factor: a valence situation where individuals will evaluate the achievement of their expectations. The realization could be higher (positive valence), equal (neutral valence), or even lower (negative valence) than the expectations (Hsu et al., 2014). Such a concept has yet to be investigated in waste bank participation studies. However, from previous relevant studies discussing the barriers to achieving environmental, economic, social, and educational goals in waste management and social entrepreneurship, it can be predicted the possible gaps falling between expected motives and realizations.

For example, Gopal et al. (2018) noted that sustainable solid waste management is challenging because of poor environmental commitments and capacities in developing countries. Dhokhikah et al. (2015) found that Indonesian waste bank customers did not implement waste sorting and recycling because of their laziness and lack of knowledge. Gopal et al. (2018) also noted that a crucial barrier to waste management is the poor social value and lack of public participation. In the economic aspect, Fikriyyah & Adiwibowo (2018) and Dhokhikah et al. (2015) found no significant positive effect of participating in waste banks on household income. Lack of literacy and knowledge might also lead to a low commitment to supporting waste management and waste bank participation, figuring challenges in educational motives (e.g., Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Gopal et al., 2018; Neofotistos et al., 2023). Thus, this research hypothesizes:

H1 There are mismatches between motives in waste bank participation, such that the strongest motivation is the environmental motive (a), while the weakest is the economic motive (b).

What is more interesting is that Chang & Chuang (2021) found that the environmental motive went beyond social and economic (the lowest) motives in socio-ecopreneur motivation in Taiwan. It contradicts Lubis's study (2015) finding that economic motive was the most expected for waste bank customers while social motive became the strongest motive for waste bank owners/managers. However, since waste banks are essentially a community-based environmental movement, this current study stands for Chang & Chuang's (2021) finding. In addition, according to Shahreza (2021), Indonesian waste bank stakeholders tend to have different orientations; that is, the Environment Agency focuses on environmental aspects, while the social business side seeks economic and social benefits. Led by these findings, the hypothesis is:

H2 There are mismatches between motivational expectations and perceived realizations in waste bank owners/managers (a) and customers (b).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Data Collection and Sample

The data was collected in July 2023 using a combination of offline and online survey data collection

Table 1. Waste bank owners'/managers' profile (*N* = 45)

Profile	Aspects of information	*N* (%)
Gender	Male	20 (44.4%)
	Female	25 (55.6%)
Waste bank status	Principle	17 (37.8%)
	Unit	28 (62.2%)
Resources	Self-financed	21 (46.7%)
	Other parties aid	8 (17.8%)
	Mixed	16 (35.6%)
Bookkeeping model	Computerized/digitalized	8 (17.8%)
	Manually organized	32 (71.1%)
	Not yet neatly organized	5 (11.1%)
Property/location	Self-owned	17 (37.8%)
	Rent	4 (8.9%)
	Borrowed	7 (15.6%)
	Others	17 (37.8%)
Type of waste managed	Organic	6 (13.3%)
	Non organic	25 (55.6%)
	Mixed	14 (31.1%)

Table 2. Waste bank customers' profile (*N* = 162)

Profile	Aspects of information	Frequency (%)
Gender	Male	39 (24.1%)
	Female	123 (75.9%)
Age	Min.	15 years old
	Max.	67 years old
	Ave.	42.4 years old
Length of time being a waste bank customer	Min.	1 month
	Max.	60 months
	Ave.	8.3 months
Number of family members living in the same house	Min.	1 person
	Max.	7 persons
	Ave.	3.97 persons
Sorting organic and non-organic wastes at home	Yes	43 (26.5%)
	No	119 (73.5%)
Pay a monthly fee for home waste collection	Yes	67 (41.4%)
	No	95 (58.6%)
Distance from home to the nearest waste bank	Near	118 (72.8%)
	Quite far	23 (14.2%)
	Far	21 (13.0%)

towards two types of respondents: Indonesian waste bank owners/managers (*N* = 45) and customers (*N* = 162), as summarized in Table 1 and Table 2. The first step was contacting the waste bank associations to obtain contact information for waste banks. Further, by securing their approval, their registered customers were, asking for their approval to participate in this survey.

Most waste bank owners/managers were female (55.6%) but not too different from the males (44.4%), showing no gender gap in running such a social enterprise as a waste bank in Indonesia. Most surveyed waste banks were classified as units (62.2%) that were mostly self-financed (46.7%) and still manually organized (71.1%). Many waste banks' properties were self-owned (37.8%), while many others temporarily used the urban village or sub-district properties (37.8%). Moreover, most waste type managed was non-organic (55.6%).

Contrarily, most waste bank customers were dominated by females (75.9%) with an average age of 42.4 years old and living with 3.97 persons in the same house. On average, they have been 8.3 months as waste bank customers. With such a condition, most did not pay any monthly fee for waste collection (58.6%), which was probably caused by the fact that they lived near a waste bank (72.8%). Moreover, despite their status as waste bank customers, most of them did not separate the organic and non-organic garbage at home (73.5%).

3.2. Measurement

As summarized in Table 3, there were four variables to explain the motive for waste bank participation in this study. Four items taken from Lubis (2015) continuously measured the environmental motive. A five-item scale, each used for social and economic motives, was also modified from Lubis (2015). Taken from Shahreza (2021) and Neofotistos et al. (2023), the educational motive was measured by four items. All items were measured with a five Likert scale and differed into two groups: expectation ranging from 5 = "very important" to 1 = "very unimportant" and realization ranging from 5 = "very easy" to 1 = "very difficult". Using the 0.70 cut-offs (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016), all items were valid and reliable.

3.3. Analysis Method

A quantitative research design was used to test the hypotheses. Referring to Sekaran & Bougie (2016), the data underwent analysis using some features in SPSS 23, such as descriptive analysis, independent t-test, and paired-sample t-test. Using descriptive analysis, the first step was measuring the mean scores of each motive, both for waste bank owners/managers and customers, to test the H1a and H1b. In addition, to strengthen the analysis of H1a and H1b findings, an independent t-test was employed to check the motive differences between waste bank owners/managers and customers. Prior to these comparison tests, an assumption test with Levene's was conducted to check the equality of variances between groups (Cleophas & Zwinderman, 2016). The next step was comparing the mean scores of each motive with its realization to examine the H2a and H2b using a paired-sample test for waste bank owners/managers and customers.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Mismatch Between Waste Bank Owners'/Managers' and Customers' Motives

As shown in Table 4, the two highest expectations for waste bank owners/managers were environmental (M = 4.51; SD = .42) and social motives (M = 4.51; SD = .53) as compared to economic (M = 4.18; SD = .85) and educational ones (M = 4.47; SD = .59). The difference between environmental and social motive was insignificant (t = .00; $sig.$ = 1.00); yet, as the environment's standard deviation was smaller (SD = .42) than the social motive (SD = .53), it can be said that the first was expected more

Table 3. Validity check

Motives	*N*	*a*[1]
Environment (E | R)[2]	30	.87 | .95
1. Sorting waste before selling or donating it to a waste bank.		.81 | .93
2. Reducing harmful effects of waste on the environment.		.83 | .91
3. Participating in decreasing environmental pollution.		.86 | .92
4. Waste recycling.		.84 | .96
Social (E | R)[2]	30	.93 | .93
1. Informing waste bank benefits to others.		.91 | .92
2. Encouraging waste bank participation to others.		.90 | .93
3. Socializing waste bank awareness to others.		.89 | .90
4. Community togetherness to support waste bank programs.		.93 | .91
5. Mutual benefits between waste banks and society.		.92 | .92
Economic (E | R)[2]	30	.86 | .92
1. Financial incentives from waste bank participation.		.86 | .92
2. Economic prospects from waste bank participation.		.85 | .90
3. Paying parts of living costs from waste bank participation.		.78 | .88
4. Waste as additional income.		.80 | .90
5. Obtaining higher values from waste.		.84 | .90
Education (E | R)[2]	30	.90 | .91
1. To change the paradigm towards waste.		.85 | .86
2. To change waste treatment habituation.		.87 | .85
3. To grow awareness towards community-based waste handling.		.91 | .91
4. To grow participation in community-based waste handling.		.83 | .90

[1] *threshold a ≥ .70*

[2] *E = expectation R = realization*

than the latter despite insignificant. From this figure, the economic motive was the lowest expectation of waste bank owners/managers, showing a significant difference with the environmental (t = 2.96; *sig.* = .01***), social (t = 3.35; *sig.* = .00***), and educational motives (t = 1.93; *sig.* = .06*). From the waste bank customers' point of view, the highest expectation was the environmental expectation (M = 4.50; SD = .48), which was significantly different from social (M = 4.37; SD = .53; t = 4.65; *sig.* = .00***), economic (M = 4.14; SD = .66; t = 7.16; *sig.* = .00***), and educational motives (M = 4.32; SD = .53; t = 4.73; *sig.* = .00***). Furthermore, the economic motive was the lowest expectation of waste bank customers, showing a significant difference with the environmental (t = -7.16; *sig.* = .00***), social (t = -4.99; *sig.* = .00***), and educational motives (t = -3.73; *sig.* = .00***).

Led by the above findings, H1a was only fully supported for waste bank customers but partially for the owners/managers. Meanwhile, the H1b was accepted entirely for waste bank owners/managers and customers. In addition, Table 5 shows that there were insignificant differences

Table 4. Motive expectations and realizations comparison

	$M \mid SD$	$t \mid sig^1.$			
		1	2	3	4
Owners'/managers' motive expectations					
Environmental motive	4.51 | .42	-	.00 | 1.00	2.96 | .01***	.42 | .68
Social motive	4.51 | .53	.00 | 1.00	-	3.28 | .00***	.65 | .52
Economic motive	4.18 | .85	-2.96 | .01***	3.35 | .00***	-	1.93 | .06*
Educational motive	4.47 | .59	-.42 | .68	-.65 | .52	2.87 | .01***	-
Owners'/managers' motive realizations					
Environmental motive	3.14 | 1.21	-	-3.36 | .00***	.60 | .55	2.26 | .03**
Social motive	3.56 | 1.06	3.36 | .00***	-	3.35 | .00***	4.70 | .00***
Economic motive	3.03 | .99	-.60 | .55	-3.35 | .00***	-	1.93 | .06*
Educational motive	2.75 | 1.24	-2.26 | .03**	-4.70 | .00***	-1.93 | .06*	-
Customers' motive expectations					
Environmental motive	4.50 | .48	-	4.65 | .00***	7.16 | .00***	4.73 | .00***
Social motive	4.37 | .53	-4.65 | .00***	-	4.99 | .00***	1.21 | .23
Economic motive	4.14 | .66	-7.16 | .00***	-4.99 | .00***	-	- 3.73 | .00***
Educational motive	4.32 | .53	-4.73 | .00***	-1.21 | .23	3.73 | .00***	-
Customers' motive realizations					
Environmental motive	3.19 | 1.25	-	-3.76 | .00***	2.93 | .00***	.59 | .56
Social motive	3.42 | 1.03	3.76 | .00***	-	7.03 | .00***	4.10 | .00***
Economic motive	2.94 | 1.20	-2.93 | .00***	-7.04 | .00***	-	-2.82 | .01***
Educational motive	3.15 | 1.14	-.59 | .56	-4.10 | .00***	2.82 | .01***	-

[1] *$^{*}p < .10$; $^{**}p < .05$, $^{***}p < .01$*

Table 5. Mismatch motive analysis of bank waste owners/managers and customers

	[1]*Levene's*	*M*	*SD*	*MD*	*t*	[2]*sig.*
Expectations (owners/managers | customers)						
Environment motive	.99	4.51 | 4.50	.42 | .48	-.01	-.10	.92
Social motive	.93	4.51 | 4.37	.53 | .53	-.15	-1.64	.10*
Economic motive	.16	4.18 | 4.14	.85 | .66	-.04	-.35	.73
Educational motive	.35	4.47 | 4.32	.59 | .53	-.15	-.17	.10*
Realizations (owners/managers | customers)						
Environment motive	.61	3.14 | 3.19	1.21 | 1.25	.05	.26	.80
Social motive	.54	3.56 | 3.42	1.06 | 1.03	-.13	-.77	.44
Economic motive	.01	3.03 | 2.94	.99 | 1.20	-.09	-.51	.61
Educational motive	.64	2.75 | 3.15	1.24 | 1.14	.40	2.03	.04**

[1] *sig. Levene's < .05 means equal variances not assumed; if sig. Levene's > .05 means equal variance assumed*

[2] *$^{*}p < .10$; $^{**}p < .05$, $^{***}p < .01$*

between waste bank owners'/managers' and customers' environmental (t = -.10; *sig.* = .92) and economic (t = -.35; *sig.* = .73) motives, proving that these two motives similarly became the highest and lowest motivation for waste bank owners/managers and customers.

Although doing business is essentially driven by rational monetary considerations (Planing, 2015), socio-entrepreneurship demands more than just money (e.g., Tsai et al., 2014; Elsaid &Aghezzaf, 2015; Gopal et al., 2018). Waste banks mostly fall on micro and small businesses based on community engagement. As a result, the potential additional income offered by waste bank participation was still not too promising (e.g., Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Fikriyyah & Adiwibowo, 2018; Muttaqien et al., 2019). With that said, the business spirit is rooted in a shared consciousness to protect the earth from drowning in and being polluted by waste. It can be said that participating in waste bank programs is an alternative to living in harmony with the environment (Chang & Chuang, 2021). Such concepts, thus, should place environmental motive as the top driver in waste bank participation over other motives, especially the economic one. As such, although the current study's findings contradict Lubis (2015), who found the economic as the most crucial motive in waste bank participation, placing the environment as the most expected motive while the economic in the lowest can be rationally accepted (e.g., Anisa & Fitria, 2020; Chang & Chuang, 2021).

4.2. Mismatch Between Expectations and Realizations

Table 6 reveals that expectations were entirely higher than its realizations for waste bank owners/managers and customers, thus fully supporting H2a and H2b. From the perspective of owners/managers, the biggest gap between expectations and realizations occurred in educational motive (*MD* = 1.72; t = 8.95; *sig.* = .00***) while social motive was the smallest (*MD* = .96; t = 6.70; *sig.* = .00***). This finding relates to the primary function of waste bank, as officially defined in the Regulation of Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 14 Year 2021 regarding Waste Management in Waste Banks, emphasizing the educational role of waste banks to educate and change surrounding communities' paradigms and behavior of how to treat and manage waste (e.g., Gopal et al., 2018; Fikriyyah & Adiwibowo, 2018; Hapsari et al., 2020), starting from the first source point: home. However, in practice, this role is challenging to conduct. Lack of literacy, poor social values, laziness, and household limitation of home waste sorting media (e.g., Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Gopal et al., 2018; Shahreza, 2021; Widayat et al., 2023) might be the main obstacles in educating people to manage waste responsibly. Besides, relevant to Shahreza's finding (2021), most Indonesian waste banks still seek economic and social benefits rather than functioning their institutions as educators for surrounding communities.

On the contrary, the biggest gap between expectations and realizations from customers' point of view occurred in environmental motive (*MD* = 1.31; t = 13.37; *sig.* = .00***) while social motive, similar to the owners/managers, was the smallest (*MD* = .94; t = 11.46; *sig.* = .00***). Sorting and recycling waste to participate in reducing environmental pollution is obviously not easy. It is relevant to Dhokhikah et al.'s findings (2015), revealing that most Indonesian waste bank customers, in fact, did not implement waste sorting and recycling despite the strongest expectation in this aspect. It also supports Elsaid & Aghezzaf's findings (2015), stating that most urban household waste is not appropriately sorted.

Table 6. Mismatch analysis of expectations and realizations

	M	*SD*	*MD*	*T*	[1]*sig.*
Owners/managers (expectations|realizations)					
Environment motive	4.51|3.14	.42|1.21	1.37	7.24	.00***
Social motive	4.51|3.56	.53|1.06	.96	6.70	.00***
Economic motive	4.18|3.03	.85|.99	1.15	7.65	.00***
Educational motive	4.47|2.75	.59|1.24	1.72	8.95	.00***
Customers (expectations|realizations)					
Environment motive	4.50|3.19	.48|1.25	1.31	13.37	.00***
Social motive	4.37|3.42	.53|1.03	.94	11.46	.00***
Economic motive	4.14|2.94	.65|1.20	1.20	11.91	.00***
Educational motive	4.32|3.15	.53|1.14	1.17	12.85	.00***

[1] $^{*}p < .10$; $^{**}p < .05$, $^{***}p < .01$

Moreover, although recycling might help manage waste more easily (Nguyen, 2022; Yadav et al., 2023), most people do not practice it automatically at home (Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Widayat et al., 2023). These become the rationale of the biggest gap between what is expected and realized towards waste bank customers' environmental motive.

5. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, SUGGESTION, AND LIMITATIONS

In the green economy era, micro and small businesses should pay great attention to the rapid business dynamic, especially regarding environmental issues (Rofiaty et al., 2022). In this vein, they must recognize the motives behind people's willingness to participate, especially in community-based micro and small businesses, such as waste banks. Therefore, studying the multi-motives of waste bank participation is necessary (Lubis, 2015; Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015). This study sought motives and determined which ones are more and less important. The answers might help stakeholders recognize the reasons behind people's decision-making in community-based waste management, particularly in waste banks. It will help design program campaigns to increase the number of public participations, given that most Indonesian households still prefer to hand over their daily garbage to monthly-paid waste collectors, which only ends up in landfills (Widayat et al., 2023).

In general, the hypothesis testing reveals that waste bank owners/managers or customers mostly prioritized the environmental consideration of the four motives. In contrast, the economic motive became the least expected when participating in waste bank programs. Furthermore, the perceived realizations were significantly lower than expected in all cases, showing severe mismatches for waste bank owners/managers and customers to satisfy their motives. With these results, the current study's implications might at least offer three contributions to related literature. First, the findings expand the scope of expectancy theory used in socio-eco-preneurship studies by showing and explaining multi-motives in waste bank participation literature. It is also worth noting that such motives could vary among individuals. Like Chang and Chuang (2021), this study put the domination of environmental motive, which contradicts Lubis's finding (2015), emphasizing economic rationale's superiority. It leads to the importance of further studies to understand the logic behind such motive prioritization. Second, unlike past studies focusing on the motives/drivers (e.g., Lubis, 2015; Elsaid & Aghezzaf, 2015; Dhokhikah et al., 2015; Gopal et al., 2018; Shahreza, 2021), the current study reveals that there are mismatches between expectations and realizations. The results suggest that motives often cannot be satisfied when participating in community-based waste management programs such as the waste bank. Third, this study also shows that the well-known "triple drivers," i.e., social, economic, and environmental, should be added with educational motives to explain the drivers of socio-eco-entrepreneurship more comprehensively.

Identifying critical motives and understanding the barriers will help decision-makers prepare better strategies to amplify the community-based program and increase the number of participants (Gopal et al., 2018). Thus, incorporating educational motives into a community-based program is crucial to encourage public participation (e.g., Gopal et al., 2018; Shahreza, 2021). The way is by disseminating knowledge and skill development, particularly in treating and managing community waste more responsibly, while also getting opportunities to gain additional monetary benefits. Since this study reveals the superiority of environmental motives, such educational programs should emphasize the community's understanding of the types of waste, the hazards of each type and how to deal with them, the derivative benefits of garbage, and how to exploit these benefits into economic benefits, thus, involving academicians and educators might significantly enhance the quality of knowledge dissemination and skill building in the community because of their ability to customize curriculum development and pedagogical excellence. Last but not least, most of the observed waste banks in this study were self-financed and manually organized, which has typically become the profile of Indonesian micro and small businesses with poor finance and supporting technology (e.g., Widodo & Mahi, 2022; Nareswari et al., 2023). Considering the noble goals of a waste bank program, more interventions from government and private sectors are needed. A waste bank is only a tiny part of the waste management ecosystem. However, if the number can be continuously multiplied and integrated into the waste management chain, the volume of waste rushing to landfills can be significantly reduced.

Despite some contributions offered by this study, a few limitations should be considered by further research. First, the social motive realizations in this study are the highest among other motives;

thus, the expectation gap becomes the lowest for waste bank owners/managers and customers. However, they are already actively involved in the waste bank program, whereas the willingness to participate might differ if the respondents are still outside the system. Therefore, conducting a follow-up study on the community who have yet to become customers or owners/managers is recommended. In addition, the waste bank model that was initially rooted in Indonesia has the potential to be a globally recognized and impactful method for waste management systems worldwide, particularly in developing and underdeveloped countries. Moreover, unlike the enormous numbers of Indonesian researchers, international researchers have scantly studied and published the waste banks topic. Therefore, further studies should expand the geographical and demographical aspects to get more worldwide insights about the willingness to implement the waste bank model and explore more participation motives among global communities.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, H. A., Johl, S. K., Shaari, Z. B. H., Moughal, W., Mazhar, M., Musarat, M. A., ... & Borovkov, A. (2021). Consumer motivation by using unified theory of acceptance and use of technology towards electric vehicles. *Sustainability*, *13*(21), 12177.

Anisa, A., & Fitria, S. E. (2020). Analisis motivasi ecopreneur dalam mewujudkan mrogram kangpisman (Studi pada penggagas bank sampah unit binaan Bank Sampah Resik Pd Kebersihan Kota Bandung). *eProceedings of Management*, *7*(1), 62-69.

Aprilia, A. (2021). Waste Management in Indonesia and Jakarta: Challenges and Way Forward. *Proceedings of the 23rd ASEF Summer University, Virtual*, 1-18.

Audenaert, M., Van der Heijden, B., Conway, N., Crucke, S., & Decramer, A. (2020). Vulnerable workers' employability competences: the role of establishing clear expectations, developmental inducements, and social organizational goals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *166*, 627-641.

Barba-Sánchez, V., & Atienza-Sahuquillo, C. (2017). Entrepreneurial motivation and self-employment: evidence from expectancy theory. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *13*, 1097-1115.

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., & Lutz, C. (2016). What's mine is yours (for a nominal fee)–Exploring the spectrum of utilitarian to altruistic motives for Internet-mediated sharing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *62*, 316-326.

Burch, S. (2018). Small businesses and sustainability innovation: Confronting the gap between motivation and capacity. *Policy Brief*, 127 – April 2018. Center for International Governance Innovation.

Chang, H. H., & Chuang, W. J. (2021). Encourage stakeholder engagement in sustainable development: Drivers of consumers themselves benefits and society welfares. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *28*(2), 748-762.

Cleophas, J. T., & Zwinderman, A.H. (2016). *SPSS for Starters and 2nd Levelers, 2nd ed*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Das, P. (2014). Women's participation in community-level water governance in urban India: The gap between motivation and ability. *World Development*, *64*, 206-218.

Dhokhikah, Y., Trihadiningrum, Y., & Sunaryo, S. (2015). Community participation in household solid waste reduction in Surabaya, Indonesia. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *102*, 153-162.

Elsaid, S., & Aghezzaf, E. H. (2015). A framework for sustainable waste management: challenges and opportunities. *Management Research Review*, *38*(10), 1086-1097.

Erris, Ariyadi, B., & Harahap, V. A. I. (2023). The effect of community concern on interest in saving at the Jaya Abadi Waste Bank, Jambi City. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Digital*, *2*(2), 547-556.

Fikriyyah, D. F., & Adiwibowo, S. (2018). Pengaruh bank sampah terhadap perilaku pengelolaan sampah rumah tangga dan pendapatan nasabah. *Jurnal Sains Komunikasi dan Pengembangan Masyarakat [JSKPM]*, *2*(6), 703-716.

Gatewood, E. J., Shaver, K. G., Powers, J. B., & Gartner, W. B. (2002). Entrepreneurial expectancy, task effort, and performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *27*(2), 187-206.

Ghatak, A., Chatterjee, S., & Bhowmick, B. (2023). Intention towards digital social entrepreneurship: An integrated model. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *14*(2), 131-151.

Gopal, G. C., Patil, Y. B., Shibin, K. T., & Prakash, A. (2018). Conceptual frameworks for the drivers and barriers of integrated sustainable solid waste management: A TISM approach. *Management of Environmental Quality*, *29*(3), 516-546.

Griffin, R.W., Phillips, J.M., & Gully, S.M. (2020). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*, *13th ed*. Boston: Cengage.

Hapsari, R. S., Suwasono, E., & Daroini, A. (2020). Bank sampah sebagai upaya pemberdayaan masyarakat. *REVITALISASI: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, *8*(2), 226-231.

Hsu, D. K., Shinnar, R. S., & Powell, B. C. (2014). Expectancy theory and entrepreneurial motivation: A longitudinal examination of the role of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, *26*(1), 121-140.

Ivakdalam, L. M., & Far, R. A. F. (2022). Peningkatan partisipasi masyarakat dalam keberlanjutan pengelolaan sampah melalui bank sampah. *Jurnal Ilmiah Agribisnis dan Perikanan (Agrikan UMMU-Ternate)*, *15*(1), 161-181.

Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *15*(5-6), 411-432.

Kubota, R., Horita, M., & Tasaki, T. (2020). Integration of community-based waste bank programs with the municipal solid-waste-management policy in Makassar, Indonesia. *Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management*, *22*, 928-937.

Lubis, R. L. (2015). The triple drivers of ecopreneurial action for taking the recycling habits to the next level: a case of Bandung city, Indonesia. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought*, *5*(02), 17-48.

Maloshonok, N., & Terentev, E. (2017). The mismatch between student educational expectations and realities: Prevalence, causes, and consequences. *European Journal of Higher Education*, *7*(4), 356-372.

Milon, J. W. (2019). The polluter pays principle and Everglades restoration. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, *9*, 67-81.

Murad, W., & Siwar, C. (2007). Waste management and recycling practices of the urban poor: a case study in Kuala Lumpur city, Malaysia. *Waste Management & Research*, *25*(1), 3-13.

Murnieks, C. Y., Klotz, A. C., & Shepherd, D. A. (2020). Entrepreneurial motivation: A review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *41*(2), 115-143.

Muttaqien, K., Sugiarto, S., & Sarifudin, S. (2019). Upaya meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat terhadap kesehatan lingkungan melalui program Bank Sampah. *Indonesian Journal of Adult and Community Education*, *1*(1), 6-10.

Nareswari, N., Nurmasari, N. D., & Putranti, L. (2023). Financial constraints of micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in the Indonesia creative industries. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura*, *25*(3), 312-321.

Neofotistos, M., Hanioti, N., Kefalonitou, E., Perouli, A. Z., & Vorgias, K. E. (2023). A real-world scenario of citizens' motivation and engagement in urban waste management through a mobile application and smart city technology. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*, *3*(1), 221-239.

Nguyen, T. K. N. (2022). Individuals' waste separation practice in a relationship with social bonds: a case study of Hanoi, Vietnam. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *42*(9/10), 816-830.

Parris, D. L., & McInnis-Bowers, C. V. (2014). Social entrepreneurship questioning the status quo: Waste as a resource. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *48*(2), 359-366.

Planing, P. (2015). Business model innovation in circular economy reasons for non-acceptance of circular business models. *Open Journal of Business Model Innovation*, *1*(11), 1-11.

Regulation of Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 14 Year 2021 regarding Waste Management in Waste Banks.

Renko, M., Kroeck, K. G., & Bullough, A. (2012). Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, *39*, 667-684.

Rofiaty, R., Chong, D., Nusron, A., Yulianti, N. A., & Sunaryo, S. (2022). Entrepreneurship orientation and performance of green economy SMEs during COVID-19 pandemic: The mediating of strategic agility. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura*, *25*(1), 48-60.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Shahreza, M. (2021). Symbolic convergence of the waste bank community in South. *Communication Research*, *20*(22015), 199-218.

Shahreza, M., Sarwoprasodjo, S., Arifin, H. S., & Hapsari, D. R. (2020). Environmental communication in the circular economic activity of waste bank communities in South Tangerang City, Indonesia. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, *19*(1), 142-152.

Sistem Informasi Manajemen Bank Sampah (Simba). *Statistik jumlah bank sampah,* retrieved on August, 8th, 2023. https://simba.menlhk.go.id/portal/

Soesanto, Q. M. B., Utomo, L. R., Rachman, I., & Matsumoto, T. (2021). Life cycle assessment and cost benefit analysis of municipal waste management strategies. *Journal of Environmental Science and Sustainable Development*, *4*(1), 69-96.

To, C. K., Martinez, J. M. G., Orero-Blat, M., & Chau, K. P. (2020). Predicting motivational outcomes in social entrepreneurship: Roles of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and situational fit. *Journal of Business Research*, *121*, 209-222.

Todd-Maddox, W., & Markman, A. B. (2010). The motivation–cognition interface in learning and decision making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*(2), 106-110.

Tsai, Y. H., Joe, S. W., Lin, C. P., & Wang, R. T. (2014). Modeling job pursuit intention: Moderating mechanisms of socio-environmental consciousness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *125*, 287-298.

Veleva, V. (2021). The role of entrepreneurs in advancing sustainable lifestyles: Challenges, impacts, and future opportunities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *283*, 124658.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation.* New York: Wiley.

Widayat, P., Pahlawan, R., & Rajab, S. (2023). Community commitment in supporting the waste from home movement (Case study of Umban Sari Kelurahan). *Asia Pacific Journal of Business Economics and Technology*, *3*(01), 54-63.

Widodo, C. A., & Mahi, B. R. (2022). The effect of financial and non-financial supports on the productivity of MSEs in Indonesia. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura*, *25*(2), 229-243.

Wong, S. I., & Kuvaas, B. (2018). The empowerment expectation–perception gap: An examination of three alternative models. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *28*(2), 272-287.

Worrell, E. (2014). Recycling in waste management policy. In *Handbook of Recycling* (pp. 497-501). Elsevier.

Yadav, H., Soni, U., & Kumar, G. (2023). Analysing challenges to smart waste management for a sustainable circular economy in developing countries: a fuzzy DEMATEL study. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, *12*(2), 361-384.

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE
WASTE BANK OWNERS'/MANAGERS' MOTIVES

Dear waste bank owners/managers,

We are inviting you to participate in this study by completing the following survey. The purpose of this study is to investigate your underlying motives in supporting waste bank programs. This survey will require 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

Thank you for taking your time and effort to complete this survey. Please be assured that the data collected will remain confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

Sincerely yours,

Authors.

A. Approval

Do you agree to participate in this survey, either delivered to you directly or through Google Forms? You have the right to refuse or to withdraw from this survey without any obligation to explain the reasons.

◯ Yes, I agree ◯ No, I disagree

B. Respondent's information

1. Gender	◯ Male ◯ Female
2. Waste bank status	◯ Principle ◯ Unit
3. Resources	◯ Self-financed ◯ Other parties' aids ◯ Mixed
4. Bookkeeping model	◯ Computerized/digitalized ◯ Manually organized ◯ Not yet neatly organized
5. Property/location	◯ Self-owned ◯ Rent ◯ Borrowed ◯ Others: _____ (please write down)
6. Type of waste managed	◯ Organic

◯ Non organic

◯ Mixed

C. Motives

Please give your opinion on the following statements. ***Expectation*** describes your high and low expectations of the statement's meaning, while ***realization*** describes the feelings and experiences you know or experience from the statement. Please mark "X" or"√"in the box that best represents your answer.

Motive	Expectation	Realization
Environmental		
1. Sorting waste before selling or donating it to a waste bank	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
2. Reducing harmful effects of waste on the environment	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
3. Participating in decreasing environmental pollution	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
4. Waste recycling	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
Social		
5. Informing waste bank benefits to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
6. Encouraging waste bank participation to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
7. Socializing waste bank awareness to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
8. Community togetherness to support waste bank programs	□ Very important □ Important	□ Very easy □ Easy

Motive	Expectation	Realization
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
9. Mutual benefits between waste banks and society	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
Economic		
10. Financial incentives from waste bank participation	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
11. Economic prospects from waste bank participation	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
12. Paying parts of living costs from waste bank participation	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
13. Waste as additional income	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
14. Obtaining higher values from waste	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
Educational		
15. To change the paradigm towards waste	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
16. To change waste treatment habituation	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult
17. To grow awareness towards community-based waste handling	□ Very important	□ Very easy
	□ Important	□ Easy
	□ Quite important	□ Quite easy
	□ Unimportant	□ Difficult
	□ Very unimportant	□ Very difficult

	Motive	Expectation	Realization
18.	To grow participation in community-based waste handling	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE
WASTE BANK CUSTOMERS' MOTIVES

Dear waste bank customers,

We are inviting you to participate in this study by completing the following survey. The purpose of this study is to investigate your underlying motives in supporting waste bank programs. This survey will require 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

Thank you for taking your time and effort to complete this survey. Please be assured that the data collected will remain confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

Sincerely yours,

Authors.

A. Approval

Do you agree to participate in this survey, either delivered to you directly or through Google Forms? You have the right to refuse or to withdraw from this survey without any obligation to explain the reasons.

◯ Yes, I agree ◯ No, I disagree

B. Respondent's information

1. Gender	◯ Male ◯ Female
2. Age	_____ years old
3. Length of time being a waste bank customer	_____months/years
4. Number of family members living in the same house	_____person(s)
5. Sorting organic and non-organic wastes at home	◯ Yes ◯ No
6. Pay a monthly fee for home waste collection	◯ Yes ◯ No
7. Distance from home to the nearest waste bank	◯ Near ◯ Quite far ◯ Far

C. Motives

Please give your opinion on the following statements. ***Expectation*** describes your high and low expectations of the statement's meaning, while ***realization*** describes the feelings and experiences you

know or experience from the statement. Please mark "X" or"√"in the box that best represents your answer.

Motive	Expectation	Realization
Environmental		
1. Sorting waste before selling or donating it to a waste bank	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
2. Reducing harmful effects of waste on the environment	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
3. Participating in decreasing environmental pollution	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
4. Waste recycling	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
Social		
5. Informing waste bank benefits to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
6. Encouraging waste bank participation to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
7. Socializing waste bank awareness to others	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
8. Community togetherness to support waste bank programs	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
9. Mutual benefits between waste banks and society	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult

	Motive	Expectation	Realization
Economic			
10.	Financial incentives from waste bank participation	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
11.	Economic prospects from waste bank participation	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
12.	Paying parts of living costs from waste bank participation	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
13.	Waste as additional income	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
14.	Obtaining higher values from waste	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
Educational			
15.	To change the paradigm towards waste	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
16.	To change waste treatment habituation	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
17.	To grow awareness towards community-based waste handling	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult
18.	To grow participation in community-based waste handling	□ Very important □ Important □ Quite important □ Unimportant □ Very unimportant	□ Very easy □ Easy □ Quite easy □ Difficult □ Very difficult