

STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION IN HOUSEHOLD ORGANIC WASTE MANAGEMENT IN SEMARANG CITY.

Abstract:

Household organic waste presents a specific challenge for Semarang City, as its waste volume represents the highest proportion in Central Java Province. The rising accumulation of household organic waste has led to a continuous increase in the volume of waste disposed of at Final Processing Sites (TPA). Without active stakeholder support, achieving sustainability and a positive environmental impact in household organic waste management remains difficult. Although stakeholder involvement in waste management and the implementation of Supply Chain Management (SCM) are often discussed separately, there is still a lack of conceptual models that integrate these two perspectives within the context of household organic waste in Semarang. This study aims to examine stakeholder collaboration in the implementation of the supply chain for household organic waste management. The research utilizes a quantitative method approach. Primary data from 177 respondents—representing every sub-district (*kelurahan*) across the 16 districts of Semarang—were collected via questionnaires. Respondents were selected using the stratified random sampling method. Data analysis was conducted using the Partial Least Square (PLS) method through SmartPLS 4.0 software. The data for analysis consisted of scores from scale-based responses. The findings indicate that active stakeholder involvement is a key factor in improving system or organizational performance. In the context of the organic waste supply chain, SCM relies not only on technical and operational aspects but also on social support and collaboration between actors.

Key words:-

Stakeholder, Supply Chain Management, Household organic waste.

Introduction:-

Waste represents a specific challenge for the city of Semarang, as its waste volume accounts for the largest share in Central Java Province. Data from the National Waste Management Information System (SIPSN) in 2024 shows that Semarang generates 434,243.97 tons of waste annually, out of a total of 5,922,936.85 tons in Central Java Province (1), as illustrated in Figure 1. Of this waste, only 27.17% is managed, while the remaining 72.83% is discharged into the environment. A point of particular concern is the composition of waste in Semarang, which primarily consists of food waste (60.8%). The primary source of this food waste (72%) is household waste (1);(2);(3).




Figure 1. Waste Generation in Central Java in 2024

38 Source: (1)

39 Inadequate waste management leads to an increase in waste accumulation and negatively impacts ecosystems. A
40 further consequence is the rising volume of household organic waste, which also results in increased waste volumes
41 at management facilities. Ministry of Environment and Forestry Regulation (Permen LHK) No. 14 of 2021 considers
42 that waste management needs to be carried out comprehensively and in an integrated manner from upstream to
43 downstream (supply chain management) using a circular economy approach by the central government, local
44 governments, and the community, thereby providing economic benefits while being healthy for the public and safe
45 for the environment.

46 The successful implementation of a circular economy is supported by proper supply chain management (4);(5);(6).
47 Implementation requires the cooperation and participation of relevant stakeholders (government, community, private
48 sector) to ensure an integrated and holistic waste management system that prioritizes circular economy principles to
49 enhance the economic benefits of waste. Without active stakeholder support, it will be difficult to make organic
50 waste management sustainable and achieve a positive environmental impact. As emphasized by Muhammad et al.,
51 the roles of stakeholders—such as government policies, private sector involvement, and public awareness
52 campaigns—are vital for a successful transition toward sustainable management (7).

53 One of the primary issues in organic waste supply chain management is the lack of synchronization among
54 stakeholders, particularly between the government, the private sector, communities, and the general public (8).
55 Normatively, local governments have encouraged waste segregation policies at the source as part of national waste
56 reduction targets coordinated by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. However, in practice, these policies are
57 often not followed by the readiness of separate transportation systems or adequate processing infrastructure.
58 Consequently, waste that has been sorted by the community becomes mixed again during the collection stage,
59 thereby reducing the quality of raw materials for the composting process. On the other hand, the private sector
60 investing in organic waste processing facilities experiences uncertainty regarding the supply of raw materials
61 because there is no clear partnership scheme with either households or local governments. Based on these gaps, it is
62 necessary to analyze how stakeholder collaboration influences the implementation of the supply chain in household
63 organic waste management in Semarang City.

64 **Literature Review**

65 **The Concept of Household Organic Waste**

66 Kadir et al. state that organic waste is biodegradable waste. This waste is generated from various sources, such as
67 agricultural waste, market waste, kitchen waste, municipal solid food waste, and municipal solid waste (9).
68 According to Law Number 18 of 2008, household waste is defined as waste originating from daily household
69 activities, excluding feces and specific waste. Karatas notes that organic waste is a significant factor in
70 environmental pollution (10). Without proper waste management, it can lead to several environmental issues (9).
71 Furthermore, Kalonde et al. argue that improper waste management—specifically open dumping in the
72 environment—creates unpleasant odors and contaminates water resources (11). This view is supported by Ferdinan
73 (12), who states that poorly managed household waste has the potential to pollute the environment and interfere with
74 public health. Proper household waste management is an effort to preserve the environment and increase
75 independent household waste control (12).

76 Waste management is defined as various approaches and procedures designed and implemented to identify, control,
77 and handle different types of waste from production to disposal (13). According to (14), household waste
78 management includes the collection, transportation, and processing of waste. Under Law No. 18 of 2008, waste
79 management consists of household waste reduction activities (VI Article 20), which include limiting waste
80 generation, recycling, and reuse; and household waste handling (Chapter VI, Article 22), which includes sorting,
81 collection, transportation, and final processing. The concept of organic waste management in Indonesia underwent a
82 paradigm shift (fundamental transformation) in 2025. The focus is now on the mandatory segregation of waste at the
83 source, the economic cycle, and the prohibition of organic waste disposal in Final Processing Sites (TPA). In

84 accordance with the Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No. 2569 of 2025, food scraps and leaf
85 waste must be processed into fertilizer, energy, or animal feed.

86 **Supply Chain Management (SCM) in Waste Management**

87 Mukhamedjanova states that Supply Chain Management (SCM) is the integration of key business processes for end-
88 users through tangible suppliers that provide value-added products, services, and information that complement each
89 other for customers and other stakeholders (15). According to Prasetyo et al., SCM is the process of linking core
90 business functions across a network consisting of suppliers, manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and customers
91 with the goal of improving the sustainable flow of information, products, and services from the supplier to the end-
92 user (16).

93 Waste SCM, which still focuses primarily on collection, transportation, and disposal with minimal efforts toward
94 waste prevention, results in high waste volumes ending up in Final Processing Sites (TPA). This hinders the
95 achievement of the "No TPA" and "Zero Waste" targets by 2045. Therefore, integrated waste management reform
96 from upstream to downstream (Waste SCM) is identified as one of the most important transformative steps for
97 Indonesia, as stated in the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN) 2025-2045 (17). Household waste SCM
98 in Indonesia is further regulated in Government Regulation (PP) No. 81 of 2012, which specifically encourages the
99 supply chain, including the role of waste banks, recycling, and waste reuse by producers.

100 Gupte & Saptarshi argue that there are three main elements of integrated supply chain management: information
101 systems (information management) and financial flows; inventory management (product and material flow
102 management); and supply chain relationships (stakeholder relationship management) (18). While SCM generally
103 regulates the flow of food production and distribution from households that eventually results in waste, there is a
104 need for reverse logistics that regulates the collection and processing of organic waste into useful products to ensure
105 sustainability, where nothing is discarded as waste.

106 Reverse logistics in household organic waste is a system for collecting and re-processing organic waste from homes
107 so it gains utility value and does not end up as trash. The goal of reverse logistics, besides reducing waste to the
108 TPA and reducing methane emissions, is to generate new economic value and support the **circular economy**. Elma
109 Sibonghanoy Groenewald also states that the implementation of a circular economy emerges as a viable solution to
110 address the environmental and economic challenges posed by traditional linear production and consumption models.
111 Integrating circular economy principles into supply chain management has gained attention as a way to achieve zero
112 waste and enhance sustainability (19). Thus, SCM in household organic waste management regulates the flow from
113 the source (households producing organic waste such as food scraps, rotten fruits/vegetables, and kitchen leaf
114 waste), followed by reverse logistics (collection, material flow moving from the consumer back to the production or
115 utilization system, e.g., households storing organic waste separately). Transportation (organic waste is transported
116 from households to temporary disposal sites (TPS) or processing facilities by sanitation departments, community
117 waste managers, or composting units. Processing (organic waste is processed into valuable products through methods
118 such as composting, biogas, animal feed, or liquid organic fertilizer. Re-utilization (the processed results are
119 reintroduced into the economic system e.g., compost for agriculture, biogas for household energy, or liquid fertilizer
120 for farming) (20).

121

122 **Stakeholder Participation in the Organic Waste Supply Chain**

123 Aschemann-Witzel et al. and Franchina et al. state that collaboration between stakeholders is a key success factor in
124 the implementation of supply chain management. Similarly, in household organic waste management, stakeholder
125 collaboration is highly essential (4);(21). Michael Ayorinde Dada also asserts that stakeholder collaboration is a
126 critical success factor in the implementation of supply chain management (22). Agustang et al., in their findings,
127 state that stakeholders play a significant role in community empowerment related to sustainable environmental
128 sanitation management, particularly urban waste (23). Muhammad et al. also emphasize that stakeholder roles—

129 such as government policies, private sector involvement, and public awareness—are vital for driving a successful
130 transition toward sustainable waste management (24).

131 The views of Agustang et al. and Muhammad et al. are further supported by Siems et al., who state that stakeholder
132 participation is the role of an organization in managing and interacting with individuals or groups (stakeholders)
133 who influence or are affected by their business operations. Regarding waste management practices, stakeholders can
134 be categorized into two parts: institutional (external) and communal/societal (internal) (25). External stakeholders
135 consist of the government (central, provincial, and city/regency levels) and private parties (NGOs, academics,
136 corporations, etc.), while internal stakeholders comprise the household community acting as the suppliers of organic
137 waste. The roles of each stakeholder are as follows: Government (primarily responsible for formulating policies,
138 regulations, and waste management programs, as well as providing infrastructure such as integrated waste
139 processing sites (TPST), composting facilities, and waste collection and processing systems; Private Sector (acts as a
140 partner in organic waste management operations; NGOs (LSM) (play a role in community assistance, increasing
141 environmental awareness, encouraging public participation in waste management, and acting as a liaison between
142 stakeholders); Academics (responsible for conducting research, developing organic waste processing technology,
143 and providing scientific recommendations for effective and sustainable waste management systems; whereas,
144 Internal Stakeholders is the community acting as the primary source and supplier of household organic waste.

145 Empirically, based on the researcher's findings during a pre-survey at the TPS 3R in Semarang City, stakeholders
146 have not yet demonstrated comprehensive participation. The community, government, and private sector have not
147 yet participated in a collective, synchronized manner.

148 **Methods**

149
150 Research regarding stakeholder participation in household organic waste management is a quantitative study
151 utilizing questionnaires for data collection. The study was conducted across 16 districts in Semarang City. Data were
152 collected through surveys distributed to 177 households, serving as the sample, by responding to specific inquiries.
153 Households were selected as the target group because they represent the largest portion of waste production in
154 Semarang, a finding supported by Becerra et al. and Ayu Safitri Dika (26);(3).

155 A stratified random sampling method was employed for this study. According to Firmansyah & Dede; Iliyasu
156 & Etikan, this method involves selecting several groups of elements from a population using classification and
157 random selection (27). The population was divided into strata for each sub-district (*kelurahan*), with one respondent
158 randomly selected from each. The selected respondents were either heads of households or household members
159 actively involved in managing domestic waste. Written questionnaires were distributed to respondents via Google
160 Forms.

161 The primary data collection instrument, in the form of a questionnaire, was developed based on several previous
162 studies, such as those that define stakeholders as individuals or groups who can influence or be influenced by the
163 achievement of an organization's objectives (28). Stakeholders consist of both external and internal actors. Numerous
164 external and internal supply chain stakeholders encourage, facilitate, or monitor the implementation of sustainable
165 supply chain management practices. While governmental and non-governmental organizations are primary drivers
166 for implementing these practices, they also support their execution. Furthermore, proactive engagement with
167 external supply chain stakeholders facilitates organizational learning through capability development, increased
168 sustainability awareness, and knowledge creation (25).

169 Regarding the household organic waste supply chain management variable, the theory states that Supply Chain
170 Management (SCM) describes the coordination of all supply chain activities, starting from suppliers,
171 manufacturers/service providers, to distributors, wholesalers, and retailers delivering products/services to the end
172 consumer (29). SCM involves supplier selection, logistics planning, and supply distribution. It encompasses the
173 management of activities aimed at transforming raw materials into work-in-progress or finished goods and
174 subsequently delivering those products to consumers through a distribution system (16).

175 These theories were selected to support the research, specifically as a reference for developing the research
 176 instrument. Based on this literature, the research measurement tools can be summarized as follows:

177 **Table 1. Indicators of Stakeholder Participation and SCM Implementation**

Stakeholder Participation		
No	Indicator	Number of Question Items
A	Participation of household organic waste suppliers (The Community)	7
B	Participation of household waste managers	6
C	Participation of organic waste product users	8
D	Participation of other parties in the business sector	5
E	Participation of other parties in the non-business sector	8
Supply Chain Management (SCM) Implementation		
Household Organic Waste		
No	Indicator	Number of Question Items
A	Product development	9
B	Procurement	5
C	Planning and control	6
D	Operation/Production	13
E	Delivery/Distribution	6

178 Source: Primary Data, 2025

179
 180 Data processing results using structured reports were prepared at all stages of this study. Based on the variables
 181 definitions "stakeholder participation" and "household organic waste supply chain management (SCM)," a
 182 questionnaire was used as the data collection instrument. Respondents were asked to rate various indicators using a
 183 5-point Likert scale to indicate the level of agreement or disagreement, where 1 for "Strongly Disagree" (STS), 2 for
 184 "Disagree" (TS), 3 for "Neutral" (N), 4 for "Agree" (S), and 5 for "Strongly Agree" (SS). The collected data were
 185 processed using the Partial Least Square (PLS) method via SmartPLS 4.0 software and subsequently analyzed
 186 descriptively.

187
 188 Based on the SmartPLS test results, the R-Square value for the SCM variable was 0.284. This indicates that the
 189 independent variable in this study is able to explain 28.4% of the variation in SCM, while the remaining 71.6% is
 190 driven by other factors outside the research model. The Adjusted R-square value of 0.270 suggests that the model
 191 has an adequate level of explanation and does not exhibit significant overfitting.

192
 193 Discriminant validity testing was conducted using the Fornell-Larcker criterion. This criterion requires the square
 194 root of the Average Variance Extracted(\sqrt{AVE})for each construct to be greater than its correlation with any other
 195 construct. The results show a value of 0.835 for Stakeholders and 0.813 for SCM, while the correlation between
 196 Stakeholders and SCM is 0.524. The result showed that \sqrt{AVE} values in each construct exceed the inter-construct
 197 correlation; which can be concluded that all variables in this study has met the criteria for discriminant validity
 198 based on Fornell-Larcker method.

199
 200 Discriminant validity testing using the cross-loadings method aims to ensure that each indicator has its highest
 201 loading on the construct it is intended to measure compared to other constructs. Findings obtained from the
 202 stakeholder construct analysis show that the loading values for each indicator on the stakeholder construct range
 203 from 0.771 to 0.896. These values are higher than the cross-loadings between stakeholders and SCM, which range
 204 from 0.253 to 0.568. Meanwhile, the SCM construct analysis shows loading values between 0.715 and 0.881,
 205 compared to cross-loadings between stakeholders and SCM ranging from 0.253 to 0.568. It can be concluded from
 206 the cross-loadings analysis that all indicators for both the stakeholder and SCM constructs have the highest loadings
 207 on their respective measured constructs. Therefore, it can be stated that there are no discriminant validity issues
 208 between constructs; each indicator can distinguish its construct effectively, and the measurement model meets the
 criteria for discriminant validity.

209 To evaluate discriminant validity, the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) values were compared against
 210 commonly used thresholds of 0.85 (conservative criterion) or 0.90 (more liberal criterion). Good discriminant
 211 validity indicates that a construct is uniquely distinct from other constructs and does not correlate excessively. The
 212 HTMT analysis results yielded a value of 0.522 between Stakeholder and SCM, which is below the maximum
 213 threshold of 0.85. Thus, both tested constructs—Stakeholder and SCM—demonstrate good discriminant validity.

214 Based on the construct reliability and validity analysis, the quality of the research instrument can be evaluated using
 215 PLS-SEM. The recommended threshold for reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha, rho a, rho c) is 0.70, while for convergent
 216 validity (AVE), it is > 0.50. The results for the Stakeholder construct show that the Cronbach’s Alpha, rho a, and rho
 217 c values are 0.938, 0.943, and 0.949, respectively. These values are above 0.70, indicating excellent reliability.
 218 Furthermore, rho a and rho c values approaching 1 indicate a very high and satisfactory level of internal consistency.
 219 The AVE test result for this study is 0.698, meaning that 69.8% of the stakeholder indicator variance can be
 220 explained by the stakeholder construct; this is a very good result as it exceeds 0.50.

221 For the SCM construct, the analysis shows that the Cronbach’s Alpha, rho a, and rho c values are 0.980, 0.983, and
 222 0.981, respectively. These are all above 0.70, indicating that the construct possesses excellent reliability. Similarly,
 223 rho a and rho c values near 1 indicate a very high and satisfactory level of internal consistency for the indicators
 224 used. The AVE validity result in the study is 0.662, implying that 66.2% of the variance in SCM indicators can be
 225 explained by the SCM construct. This value is considered very good (> 0.50), confirming that convergent validity
 226 has been met.

227 **Results and Discussion for the Stakeholder Construct**

228
 229 This study involved 177 heads of households or household members who are actively engaged in household waste
 230 management. The participants represent 16 districts within Semarang City with characteristic profile as follows:
 231
 232

Table 2. Respondent’s Characteristic Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	90	51
	Male	87	49
Age Group	20-30 years old	29	16
	31-40 years old	49	28
	41-50 years old	55	31
	51-60 years old	35	20
	61-70 years old	9	5
Education	High School	25	15
	Diploma	55	31
	Bachelor	54	30
	Master	43	24

233 Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

234
 235 Based on Table 2, the respondent profile describes the distribution is relatively balanced between female (51%) and
 236 male (49%), indicating inclusive gender representation in research participation. The majority of respondents fall
 237 within productive and mature age ranges, specifically 41–50 years (31%) and 31–40 years (28%). This suggests that
 238 respondents possess sufficient life experience and perspective to respond effectively to the research instruments. The
 239 profile is dominated by Diploma graduates (31%) and Bachelor's degree holders (30%). This high level of education
 240 supports the validity of the data, as respondents are deemed to have the intellectual capacity to comprehend and
 241 accurately answer the survey items.
 242

243 The descriptive analysis of this study includes the description of the Supply Chain Management variable and the
244 Stakeholder Participation variable. The details of the descriptive analysis are as follows:

245

246 Supply Chain Management Variable Description

247

248

Table 3. Supply Chain Management Description

No.	Variable Indicator	Average Response
1.	Product Development	4,449
2.	Procurement	4,383
3.	Planning and control	4,351
4.	Operation or Production	4,585
5.	Delivery or Distribution	4,717
Average		4,497

249 Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

250

251 Based on the descriptive analysis results presented in Table 3, the Supply Chain Management variable has an overall
252 mean score of 4.497. This value indicates that, in general, respondents provided ratings within the "Very High"
253 category. This suggests that SCM practices in household organic waste management are performing well according
254 to the respondents' perceptions. In detail, the indicator with the highest mean score is Delivery or Distribution at
255 4.717.

256

257 This finding shows that the distribution aspect of processed waste (such as compost or other derivative products) is
258 considered the most effective compared to other indicators. This may indicate a relatively smooth and well-
259 coordinated product distribution system within the supply chain. The second highest indicator is Operations or
260 Production, with a mean score of 4.585, showing that the organic waste processing has been implemented optimally.

261

262 A robust production process plays a vital role in maintaining the quality and continuity of the processed output.
263 Meanwhile, the Product Development indicator obtained an average of 4.449, followed by Procurement at 4.383,
264 and Planning & Control at 4.351. Although all indicators fall within the "Very High" category, the lowest score is
265 found in the Planning & Control aspect.

266

267 This indicates that there is still room for improvement in terms of coordination, monitoring, and controlling the
268 supply chain flow to ensure it is systematic and integrated. Overall, these results show that the operational and
269 distribution components of the supply chain are functioning excellently; however, strengthening strategic planning
270 and control aspects could further enhance the overall effectiveness of the system.

271

272 Stakeholder Participation Variable Description

273

274

Table 4. Stakeholder Participation Variable Description

No.	Variable Indicator	Average Response
1	Household-scale organic waste suppliers	4,053
2	TPS 3R waste management operators	4,079
3	Users of processed organic waste product	4,106
4	Other parties in the business sector	4,166
5	Other parties in the non-business sector	4,025
Average		4,085

275 Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

276

277 Based on the descriptive analysis, the Stakeholder Participation variable has an overall mean score of 4.085. This
278 indicates that the level of stakeholder participation in the Supply Chain Management (SCM) of household organic
279 waste is in the "High" category (assuming a Likert scale of 1–5). This suggests that stakeholders play an active role
280 in supporting the sustainability of the organic waste supply chain.

281

282 Specifically, the indicator with the highest mean score is Other parties in the business sector (4.166). This shows that
283 business actors, such as processing enterprises or distribution partners, have the strongest level of involvement in the

284 supply chain system. The engagement of the business sector is crucial for maintaining operational sustainability and
285 the economic aspects of organic waste management. The next highest indicator is Users of processed organic waste
286 products (4.106), indicating market acceptance and support for products like compost or organic fertilizer.
287 The high participation of end-users reflects a demand that supports system continuity. Furthermore, Waste
288 management operators obtained a mean of 4.079, showing that operational processing units contribute significantly
289 to the supply chain. Meanwhile, Household-scale organic waste suppliers had a mean of 4.053, indicating that the
290 community is sufficiently active in supplying or sorting organic waste as the primary raw material. The lowest mean
291 score was for Other parties in the non-business sector (4.025), though it remains within the "High" category.
292

293 The SmartPLS analysis reveals an R-Square value of 0.284 for the SCM variable. This indicates that the
294 independent variables in this study explain 28.4% of the variation in SCM, while the remaining 71.6% is influenced
295 by other factors outside this research model. In the context of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling
296 (PLS-SEM), an R-Square of 0.284 is categorized as moderate to low. The Adjusted R-Square of 0.270 suggests that
297 after adjusting for the number of independent variables, the model's explanatory power remains relatively stable.
298

299 The Fornell-Larcker criterion results show that each construct in the model has a strong ability to distinguish itself
300 from other constructs. With discriminant validity satisfied, the measurement model is considered robust and fit for
301 structural model testing. Conceptually, this reinforces that each variable has a clear theoretical definition without
302 overlap.

303 Furthermore, Cross-Loading results demonstrate that each indicator empirically represents its assigned construct
304 more strongly than other constructs. Most loading values are above 0.70, indicating that the indicators contribute
305 significantly to forming the constructs without measurement overlap.
306

307 To ensure even stricter differentiation, the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) was applied with a threshold of
308 0.85. The relationship between Stakeholders and SCM showed an HTMT value of 0.522 (well below the 0.85 limit).
309 This confirms that the Stakeholder and SCM constructs meet discriminant validity criteria, proving that performance
310 measurement is conceptually and empirically distinct from SCM measurement.
311

312 Reliability testing yielded Cronbach's Alpha values above the 0.70 minimum threshold. Similarly, convergent
313 validity tests (ρ_{aa} and ρ_{cc}) for all constructs were above 0.92, confirming that both Stakeholder and SCM
314 constructs are highly reliable. This indicates that the research instrument can consistently measure the variables.
315 Additionally, all constructs (Stakeholder, SCM) achieved an Average Variance Extracted (AVE) > 0.50, satisfying
316 the requirements for strong convergent validity.
317

318 **Conclusion:**

319
320 Based on the data analysis conducted using SmartPLS 4.0, the following conclusions can be drawn:
321

322 The research model demonstrates a sufficient level of explanatory power. However, there remains an opportunity to
323 enhance the model's predictive capability by incorporating other variables theoretically relevant to SCM practices
324 such as information technology factors, supply chain integration, collaboration between business partners, and
325 management support, aligning with the perspectives of Gupte & Saptarshi (18).
326

327 Based on the Fornell-Larcker discriminant validity test using SmartPLS, all constructs in the research model
328 successfully met the discriminant validity requirements. Furthermore, the cross-loading discriminant validity
329 analysis result indicates no issues regarding discrimination between constructs; every indicator effectively
330 distinguishes its respective construct, measurement model met discriminant validity criteria. Discriminant validity
331 according to the MHTT can be concluded that there are no multicollinearity or overlapping between constructs that
332 differentiate one another.
333

334 Construct Reliability and Validity analysis concludes that all instruments used in this study demonstrate very high
335 reliability and consistency in measuring their respective variables. Regarding convergent validity, each construct is
336 capable of explaining a major portion of its indicators' variance, ensuring that convergent validity is well-satisfied.
337

338 These findings reinforce the perspective of Stakeholder Theory, which posits that active stakeholder engagement is a
339 key factor in improving system or organizational performance. In the context of the organic waste supply chain,
340 SCM depends not only on technical and operational aspects but also on social support and collaboration between
341 actors. Thus, improving the quality of stakeholder participation serves as a primary strategy for strengthening
342 sustainable SCM integration and performance.

344 **Recommendations**

346 Future researchers are suggested to expand the research model by adding variables theoretically relevant to SCM
347 practices, such as the utilization of information technology, supply chain integration, business partner collaboration,
348 and management support, to provide a more comprehensive explanation of SCM variations.

350 For Academics, the measurement model in this study can serve as a reliable reference, as it has met all validity and
351 reliability criteria. This indicates that the research instruments are robust and suitable for reuse in similar research
352 contexts.

354 For Waste Management Operators, the results highlight the importance of active stakeholder involvement in
355 improving organic waste SCM performance. In line with stakeholder theory, collaboration between the government,
356 the community, business actors, and other related parties is essential to create a more effective and sustainable
357 management system.

359 For Policy Makers, there is a need for policies that encourage increased stakeholder participation and strengthen the
360 links between all parties involved in the organic waste supply chain. Policy support is expected to enhance system
361 integration and improve SCM performance sustainably.

363 **Acknowledgment**

365 The authors would like to express their gratitude to the lecturers and research assistants who provided valuable
366 suggestions and guidance during the development of this study.

368 **References**

- 370 1. SISPN. Statistik Pengelolaan Sampah [Internet]. Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup / Badan Pengendalian
371 Lingkungan Hidup Deputi Bidang Pengelolaan Sampah, Limbah dan B3 Direktorat Penanganan Sampah.
372 2025. Available from: <https://portal-sipsn.kemenvh.go.id/>
- 373 2. Becerra V, Stirrat BA, Green G. CLEAN CITIES, BLUE OCEAN Initial Solid Waste Management
374 Assessment (ISWMA) | Indonesia. 2021;
- 375 3. Ayu, Safitri Dika H. Peran Serta Ibu Rumah Tangga dalam Pengelolaan Sampah di Lingkungan RW 2
376 Kelurahan Tambakharjo Kota Semarang. 2023;11(2):10–21.
- 377 4. Aschemann-Witzel J, de Hooge IE, Rohm H, Normann A, Bossle MB, Grønhøj A, et al. Key characteristics
378 and success factors of supply chain initiatives tackling consumer-related food waste – A multiple case study.
379 J Clean Prod. 2017;155:33–45.
- 380 5. Chintapalli P, Vakharia AJ. The waste management supply chain: A decision framework. Decis Sci.
381 2023;1–31.
- 382 6. Hazen BT, Russo I, Confente I, Pellathy D. Supply chain management for circular economy: conceptual
383 framework and research agenda. Int J Logist Manag. 2020;32(2):510–37.
- 384 7. Ojo AO, Fauzi MA. Environmental awareness and leadership commitment as determinants of IT
385 professionals engagement in Green IT practices for environmental performance. Sustain Prod Consum.

386 2020;24:298–307.

387 8. Mukhlis I, Fauzan S, Rahmawati F, de Silva S, Melati IS. Stakeholder dynamics and sustainable waste
388 management in peri-urban settings: a case study of actor interactions in Indonesia. *Front Sustain Cities.*
389 2025;7(March).

390 9. Kadir AA, Azhari NW, Jamaludin SN. An Overview of Organic Waste in Composting. *MATEC Web Conf.*
391 2016;25:0–5.

392 10. Karataş M, Aydoğmuş E. Physical and Chemical Properties of Organic Waste Reinforced Polyester
393 Composites. *Int J Adv Nat Sci Eng Res.* 2023;16–9.

394 11. Kalonde PK, Austin AC, Mandevu T, Banda PJ, Banda A, Stanton MC, et al. Determinants of Household
395 Waste Disposal Practices and Implications for Practical Community Interventions: Lessons from Lilongwe.
396 *SSRN Electron J.* 2022;

397 12. Ferdinan. Optimizing household organic waste management in support of sustainable household waste
398 management in Bekasi City, Indonesia. *Waste, Soc Sustain.* 2024;1(1):41–54.

399 13. Vallero DA, Shulman V. Introduction to Waste Management. *Waste: A Handbook for Management.* 2019.
400 3–14 p.

401 14. Cheng KM, Tan JY, Wong SY, Koo AC, Sharji EA. A Review of Future Household Waste Management for
402 Sustainable Environment in Malaysian Cities. *Sustain.* 2022;14(11).

403 15. Mukhamedjanova KA. Concept of supply chain management. *J Crit Rev.* 2020;7(2):759–66.

404 16. Prasetyo DS, Emaputra A, Parwati CI. Pengukuran Kinerja Supply Chain Management Menggunakan
405 Pendekatan Model Supply Chain Operations Reference (Scor) Pada Ikm Kerupuk Subur. *J PASTI.*
406 2021;15(1):80.

407 17. Gubernur Jawa Tengah. Keputusan Gubernur No. 100.3.3.1/220 Tahun 2025 Tentang Roadmap tentang
408 Rencana Aksi Akselerasi Penuntasan Pengelolaan Sampah Jawa Tengah TAHUN 2025 – 2029 [Internet].
409 JDIH Provinsi Jawa Tengah; 2025. 55 p. Available from: <https://jdih.jatengprov.go.id/>

410 18. Gupte DD, Saptarshi PG. Supply Chain Management as a Tool for Collection and Disposal of Organic
411 Waste in Pune. *Univers J Environ Res Technol.* 2012;4(2):261–8.

412 19. Elma Sibonghanoy Groenewald. Circular Economy Strategies in Supply Chain Management: Towards Zero
413 Waste. *Power Syst Technol.* 2024;48(1):464–80.

414 20. Muhammad A, Muhammad Hussein MZS, Zulfakar MH, Sundram VPK. Reverse logistics activities for
415 household e-waste management: A review. *Int J Supply Chain Manag.* 2020;9(1):312–8.

416 21. Franchina L, Calabrese A, Inzerilli G, Scatto E, Brutti G, de los Ángeles Bonanni MV. Thinking green: The
417 role of smart technologies in transforming cities' waste and supply Chain's flow. *Clean Eng Technol.*
418 2021;2(November 2020).

419 22. Michael Ayorinde Dada, Michael Tega Majemite, Alexander Obaigbena, Johnson Sunday Oliha, Preye
420 Winston Biu. Zero-waste initiatives and circular economy in the U.S.: A review: Exploring strategies,
421 outcomes, and challenges in moving towards a more sustainable consumption model. *Int J Sci Res Arch.*
422 2024;11(1):204–21.

423 23. Agustang A, Hairuddin K, Agustang AD, Yulis D. The role of stakeholders in the management of
424 sustainable environmental cleanliness in Makassar City. *JED (Jurnal Etika Demokrasi) [Internet].*
425 2023;8(2):191–205. Available from:
426 <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/jed/article/view/10551%0Ahttps://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/jed/article/download/10551/5908>
427

428 24. Muhammad A, M. Naidu B, Sundram VPK, Muhammad Hussain MZS, Chew LL, Amirrudin FA.
429 Sustainable Waste Management in Malaysia: Leveraging Supply Chain Solutions for a Greener Future. *Inf*
430 *Manag Bus Rev.* 2023;15(3(SI)):147–54.

431 25. Siems E, Seuring S, Schilling L. Stakeholder roles in sustainable supply chain management: a literature
432 review. *J Bus Econ.* 2023;93(4):747–75.

433 26. Becerra P, Mula J, Sanchis R. Green supply chain quantitative models for sustainable inventory
434 management: A review. *J Clean Prod.* 2021;328.

435 27. Firmansyah D, Dede. Teknik Pengambilan Sampel Umum dalam Metodologi Penelitian: Literature Review.
436 *J Ilm Pendidik Holistik.* 2022;1(2):85–114.

437 28. Benn S, Abratt R, O’Leary B. Defining and identifying stakeholders: Views from management and
438 stakeholders. *South African J Bus Manag.* 2016;47(2):1–11.

439 29. Heizer J, Render B, Munson C. *Operation Management. Sustainability and Supply Chain Management.* 14th
440 ed. PEARSON; 2024. 913 p.

441

442

443

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR