INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CHEMISTRY AND CHEMICAL ENGINEERING (ISSN: 2693-356X)
VOL.06 ISSUE01 (2026)

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER

Research Article

Integrated Policy, Behavioral, and Institutional Determinants of Separate Collection and Recycling Performance in European Municipal Solid Waste Systems

Dr. Lukas Meyer [1]

[1]Department of Environmental Economics and Public Policy, University of Freiburg, Germany

Abstract

Municipal solid waste management in Europe has undergone a profound transformation over the past three decades, driven by regulatory harmonization at the European Union level, technological advances in waste treatment, and evolving societal expectations regarding sustainability and climate responsibility. Central to this transformation is the separate collection of waste fractions, particularly bio-waste and dry recyclables, which is widely regarded as a prerequisite for high-quality recycling and material recovery. This article develops a comprehensive and integrative analysis of the determinants, impacts, and policy implications of separate collection systems in European municipalities, with a particular emphasis on behavioral responses, institutional arrangements, and governance models. Drawing strictly on the provided body of literature, the study synthesizes insights from environmental economics, public administration, and waste management engineering to explore how collection design, pricing instruments, privatization, inter-municipal cooperation, and regulatory frameworks interact to shape recycling outcomes. The article further examines how door-to-door bio-waste collection can generate positive spillovers for the collection of dry recyclables, how unit-based pricing affects household behavior, and how heterogeneous treatment effects challenge conventional evaluation methods in policy analysis. Rather than offering a narrow empirical assessment, the paper adopts a theoretically rich and descriptive approach, unpacking causal mechanisms, contextual contingencies, and long-term system dynamics. The findings highlight that separate collection performance cannot be understood in isolation but emerges from a complex interplay of behavioral incentives, institutional capacity, market structures, and legal constraints. The discussion critically assesses limitations in current approaches and identifies future research directions, particularly regarding equity, administrative feasibility, and the alignment of climate and resource efficiency objectives. The article concludes that achieving high recycling rates in Europe requires not only technical optimization but also coherent policy mixes and adaptive governance frameworks capable of accommodating local diversity while meeting overarching European targets.

Keywords: Municipal solid waste, separate collection, recycling policy, behavioral incentives, European Union, public service governance

Received: 12 November 2025
Revised: 2 December 2025
Accepted: 20 December 2025
Published: 01 January 2025

INTRODUCTION

Municipal solid waste management occupies a unique position at the intersection of environmental protection, public service provision, and everyday household behavior. Unlike many environmental policy domains that operate at abstract or industrial levels, waste management directly involves citizens in routine practices such as sorting, storing, and presenting waste for collection. In the European context, this everyday interaction has been progressively shaped by an evolving regulatory framework that emphasizes

waste prevention, reuse, recycling, and recovery over disposal, particularly landfilling. The Waste Framework Directive established a hierarchical approach that places recycling above energy recovery and disposal, while the Landfill Directive imposed stringent constraints on the landfilling of biodegradable waste, thereby accelerating the adoption of alternative treatment and collection systems (European Union, 2008; European Union, 1999).

Despite these overarching directives, the actual organization and performance of municipal waste systems vary substantially across countries, regions, and even municipalities. This heterogeneity reflects differences in institutional arrangements, market structures, socio-cultural norms, and historical trajectories of infrastructure development. At the core of these differences lies the question of how waste is collected, especially the extent to which households are required and enabled to separate waste into distinct fractions such as bio-waste, paper, glass, light packaging, and residual waste. Separate collection is widely considered essential for achieving high-quality recycling, as commingled waste streams tend to suffer from contamination and reduced material value (Jansen et al., 2013; Cecon et al., 2023).

However, the expansion of separate collection systems raises complex questions. From an economic perspective, separate collection entails higher collection costs, additional infrastructure, and increased administrative complexity. From a behavioral perspective, it demands sustained effort and compliance from households, which may vary according to incentives, convenience, and social norms. From an institutional perspective, it interacts with governance choices such as privatization, inter-municipal cooperation, and pricing schemes. The literature reflects this complexity, offering insights into specific mechanisms but often lacking an integrated perspective that connects behavioral, institutional, and policy dimensions.

Recent studies have begun to address some of these gaps. Research on door-to-door bio-waste collection suggests that introducing a dedicated organic fraction can have spillover effects that improve the separate collection of dry recyclables, challenging the assumption that households face fixed limits to sorting effort (Abeshev and Koppenborg, 2023). Behavioral economics studies demonstrate that targeted interventions can generate pro-environmental spillovers beyond the immediate behavior being incentivized (Alacevich et al., 2021). At the same time, economic analyses of unit-based pricing show consistent reductions in residual waste generation, though with varying impacts on recycling rates (Bel and Gradus, 2016). Parallel to these developments, the public administration literature has revisited long-standing debates about privatization and cooperation, emphasizing that governance choices can have nuanced and context-dependent effects on service delivery outcomes (Bel and Elston, 2024).

This article seeks to contribute to the literature by offering a comprehensive, theoretically grounded, and integrative analysis of separate collection and recycling performance in European municipal solid waste systems. Rather than focusing on a single country or empirical dataset, the paper synthesizes evidence from a wide range of studies, technical reports, and regulatory documents to develop a holistic understanding of how separate collection systems function and evolve. By doing so, it addresses a key gap in the literature: the lack of an overarching framework that connects micro-level behavioral responses, meso-level institutional arrangements, and macro-level policy objectives.

The central research problem guiding this article can be articulated as follows: how do policy instruments, behavioral mechanisms, and institutional configurations jointly determine the effectiveness and sustainability of separate collection systems in European municipalities? Addressing this problem requires moving beyond narrow efficiency metrics and considering broader questions of legitimacy, adaptability, and long-term resilience. The article therefore adopts a descriptive and interpretive approach, emphasizing theoretical elaboration and critical discussion rather than formal modeling or quantitative estimation.

The remainder of the article unfolds in a structured yet continuous manner. After outlining the methodological approach, the paper presents a detailed descriptive analysis

of key findings from the literature, followed by an in-depth discussion of their implications, limitations, and future research directions. The conclusion synthesizes the main insights and reflects on their relevance for policy design and implementation in the evolving European waste management landscape.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach adopted in this article is qualitative, integrative, and theory-driven. Given the strict constraint of relying exclusively on the provided references, the study does not introduce new empirical data or conduct original econometric analyses. Instead, it systematically synthesizes existing research, policy documents, and technical reports to construct a coherent analytical narrative. This approach is particularly suitable for addressing complex policy domains such as municipal waste management, where outcomes emerge from the interaction of multiple factors that cannot be easily isolated or quantified within a single empirical framework.

The first step in the methodological process involved a comprehensive review of the provided references, which span several disciplinary perspectives, including environmental economics, waste management engineering, public administration, and applied econometrics. Rather than treating these sources as isolated contributions, the analysis identifies thematic clusters that reflect recurring concerns and debates in the literature. These clusters include, among others, the design and impacts of separate collection systems, behavioral responses to waste policies, governance and market structures in waste service provision, and methodological challenges in policy evaluation.

Within each thematic cluster, the article engages in close reading and interpretive analysis, paying particular attention to theoretical assumptions, causal mechanisms, and contextual factors. For example, studies on unit-based pricing are not only examined for their reported effects on waste quantities but also for their underlying behavioral models and implicit assumptions about household decision-making (Bel and Gradus, 2016). Similarly, technical assessments of material recovery facilities are interpreted in light of broader policy debates about collection quality and system design (Jansen et al., 2013; Cecon et al., 2023).

A key methodological principle guiding the analysis is triangulation across sources. Where possible, insights from one strand of the literature are cross-referenced with findings from other strands to assess consistency, complementarity, or tension. For instance, behavioral spillover effects identified in experimental or quasi-experimental studies are discussed alongside administrative data and policy evaluations to explore their practical relevance and scalability (Alacevich et al., 2021; Abeshev and Koppenborg, 2023). This triangulation enhances the robustness of the conclusions and helps avoid overgeneralization from single-case studies.

Another important methodological consideration concerns the treatment of causality and heterogeneity. Several references highlight the limitations of traditional evaluation methods, particularly two-way fixed effects models, in the presence of heterogeneous treatment effects and staggered policy adoption (De Chaisemartin and D'Haultfœuille, 2020; Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021). While the present article does not conduct empirical estimation, it incorporates these methodological insights into the interpretation of existing findings. This means acknowledging that reported average effects may mask substantial variation across municipalities, time periods, and population groups.

Finally, the methodology emphasizes reflexivity and critical assessment. Rather than presenting the literature as a unified body of evidence pointing in a single direction, the article explicitly discusses disagreements, uncertainties, and unresolved questions. This reflexive stance is essential for advancing understanding in a field characterized by rapid policy change and diverse institutional contexts. By foregrounding complexity rather than simplifying it away, the methodological approach aligns with the article's overarching goal of providing a nuanced and comprehensive analysis.

RESULTS

The synthesis of the literature yields several interrelated findings that illuminate how separate collection systems function and why their performance varies across European municipalities. These findings are presented here in a descriptive and thematic manner, reflecting the integrative nature of the analysis.

One of the most prominent results concerns the role of bio-waste collection as a catalyst for broader improvements in recycling performance. Evidence from European capitals indicates that the introduction or expansion of door-to-door bio-waste collection is associated not only with higher capture rates of organic material but also with increased quantities of separately collected dry recyclables (Abeshev and Koppenborg, 2023). This finding challenges the conventional view that households face a fixed "sorting capacity" and that adding new fractions necessarily leads to confusion or reduced compliance. Instead, the results suggest that bio-waste collection can normalize sorting behavior, reinforce environmental norms, and reduce contamination in residual waste streams, thereby indirectly supporting the recovery of other materials.

Closely related to this is the finding that behavioral spillovers play a significant role in shaping waste sorting outcomes. Experimental and quasi-experimental evidence from Sweden shows that targeted interventions aimed at improving organic waste sorting can generate positive spillovers to other pro-environmental behaviors, including recycling and waste reduction (Alacevich et al., 2021). These spillovers appear to operate through mechanisms such as increased environmental awareness, strengthened self-identity as a "responsible recycler," and social signaling. Importantly, the magnitude and persistence of these effects depend on contextual factors, including the visibility of the behavior and the degree of community engagement.

Another key result pertains to the impact of economic incentives, particularly unit-based pricing schemes. Meta-regression analysis indicates that pricing waste by volume, weight, or frequency consistently reduces residual waste generation, confirming the basic economic prediction that households respond to price signals (Bel and Gradus, 2016). However, the effects on recycling are more nuanced. In some contexts, unit-based pricing leads to increased separation and recycling, while in others it may result in unintended consequences such as waste avoidance behaviors or increased use of communal bins. These mixed outcomes underscore the importance of complementary measures, such as convenient collection infrastructure and clear communication.

From an institutional perspective, the literature highlights that governance choices significantly influence waste management performance, but not in a uniform or deterministic manner. Studies examining privatization and inter-municipal cooperation find that these arrangements can yield efficiency gains under certain conditions but may also introduce coordination challenges or accountability issues (Bel and Elston, 2024; Callan and Thomas, 2001). Economies of scale and scope are present in waste collection, but their realization depends on factors such as population density, service standardization, and contractual design. As a result, no single governance model emerges as universally superior.

Technical assessments of material recovery facilities and collection systems provide further insights into the importance of upstream sorting quality. Research on plastics recovery demonstrates that mixed or poorly sorted waste streams significantly reduce the efficiency and output quality of recovery facilities (Jansen et al., 2013; Cecon et al., 2023). These findings reinforce the argument that investments in collection and behavioral change are not merely complementary to downstream technologies but foundational to their success. Similarly, analyses of dry recyclables collection in the European Union emphasize that collection impacts must be evaluated across the entire lifecycle, including transport, sorting, and treatment (Albizzati et al., 2024).

Finally, the results reveal substantial heterogeneity across regions and over time. Administrative data from Catalonia and other regions show wide variation in collection rates by fraction, reflecting differences in policy adoption, urban form, and socio-economic characteristics (ARC, 2022; ARC, 2023; ARC, 2024a). This heterogeneity complicates cross-sectional comparisons and underscores the need for context-sensitive

analysis. Methodological contributions in the econometrics literature further caution against simplistic interpretations of average treatment effects, highlighting the potential for bias in commonly used estimation techniques when policies are adopted at different times and affect units differently (De Chaisemartin and D'Haultfœuille, 2020; Borusyak et al., 2024).

DISCUSSION

The findings synthesized above have far-reaching implications for both theory and practice in municipal solid waste management. At a theoretical level, they challenge reductionist models that treat waste sorting as a purely individual cost-benefit decision or waste services as a homogeneous public good. Instead, the evidence points to a more complex system in which behaviors, institutions, and technologies co-evolve over time.

One important implication concerns the role of norms and learning in shaping household behavior. The positive spillovers associated with bio-waste collection and targeted interventions suggest that waste sorting can become habitual and self-reinforcing, particularly when supported by visible infrastructure and consistent messaging. This perspective aligns with broader theories of social practice, which emphasize that behaviors are embedded in routines, material arrangements, and shared meanings rather than being isolated choices. From this viewpoint, policies that focus narrowly on incentives without addressing convenience, identity, and social context may fall short of their potential.

At the same time, the discussion must acknowledge the limits of behavioral approaches. Not all households respond equally to interventions, and there is a risk that policies relying heavily on voluntary compliance may exacerbate inequalities. For example, unit-based pricing schemes can impose disproportionate burdens on low-income households if not carefully designed, while door-to-door collection may be more feasible in urban than in rural settings. These equity considerations are often underrepresented in the technical and economic literature but are crucial for the long-term legitimacy of waste policies.

Institutional arrangements add another layer of complexity. The mixed evidence on privatization and cooperation suggests that governance reforms should be evaluated in relation to specific objectives, such as cost control, service quality, or innovation capacity. Privatization may enhance efficiency through competition, but it may also weaken incentives for long-term investment in waste prevention or recycling if contracts are poorly aligned. Similarly, inter-municipal cooperation can help realize economies of scale but may dilute local accountability. These trade-offs highlight the importance of adaptive governance structures that can be adjusted as conditions change.

The discussion also underscores methodological challenges in evaluating waste policies. The recognition that treatment effects are heterogeneous and dynamic calls for more sophisticated analytical approaches and cautious interpretation of results. While recent advances in difference-in-differences methods offer promising tools, their effective application requires high-quality data and careful attention to institutional details (Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021; De Chaisemartin and D'Haultfœuille, 2023). For policymakers, this implies that evidence-based decision-making must be iterative and open to revision rather than relying on one-off evaluations.

Looking ahead, several avenues for future research emerge from this discussion. First, there is a need for more integrated studies that link household behavior with system-level outcomes, including environmental impacts and climate benefits. While the connection between waste management and climate change has long been recognized, it remains underexplored in empirical terms (Ackerman, 2000). Second, comparative research across regions and governance models could shed light on how institutional diversity influences policy effectiveness. Third, greater attention should be paid to distributional effects and social acceptance, particularly in the context of increasingly ambitious recycling targets.

CONCLUSION

This article has provided a comprehensive and theoretically rich analysis of separate collection and recycling performance in European municipal solid waste systems, drawing exclusively on the provided literature. By integrating insights from behavioral economics, public administration, waste management engineering, and policy analysis, the study has shown that effective recycling systems are not the product of isolated interventions but of complex and context-dependent interactions.

The central conclusion is that separate collection, particularly of bio-waste, plays a pivotal role not only in material recovery but also in shaping household behavior and reinforcing environmental norms. Economic incentives such as unit-based pricing can support these outcomes, but only when embedded in supportive institutional and infrastructural contexts. Governance choices, including privatization and cooperation, matter, but their effects depend on design and implementation rather than ideology.

Ultimately, advancing recycling performance in Europe requires a holistic approach that recognizes the interdependence of policy instruments, behavioral mechanisms, and institutional arrangements. Such an approach must be adaptive, equitable, and informed by continuous learning. As European waste policy continues to evolve in response to environmental and climate challenges, the insights synthesized in this article can help guide more effective and resilient strategies for the future.

REFERENCES

1. Abeshev K, Koppenborg F (2023) More than just organics: Boosting separate collection of dry recyclables with door-to-door bio-waste collection in EU capitals. Waste Management 161:156–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2023.02.026
2. Ackerman F (2000) Waste management and climate change. Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability 5(2):223–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830050009373
3. Alacevich C, Bonev B, Söderberg M (2021) Pro-environmental interventions and behavioral spillovers: Evidence from organic waste sorting in Sweden. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 108:102470
4. Albizzati P, Tonini D, Gaudillat P (2024) Impacts of the collection and treatment of dry recyclables. Publications Office of the European Union
5. ARC (2022) Metodologia d'obtenció de les dades estadístiques de residus municipals a Catalunya. Agència de Residus de Catalunya
6. ARC (2023) Estadístiques de residus municipals. Agència de Residus de Catalunya
7. ARC (2024a) Segons fraccions. Agència de Residus de Catalunya
8. ARC (2024b) Characteristics of selective collection of light packaging. Agència de Residus de Catalunya
9. Bel G, Elston T (2024) Disentangling the separate and combined effects of privatization and cooperation on local government service delivery. Public Administration 102(4):1624–1646. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12992
10. Bel G, Gradus R (2016) Effects of unit-based pricing on household waste collection demand: A meta-regression analysis. Resource and Energy Economics 44:169–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2016.03.003
11. Borusyak K, Jaravel X, Spiess J (2024) Revisiting event-study designs: Robust and efficient estimation. Review of Economic Studies 91(6):3253–3285. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdae007
12. Butts K, Gardner J (2022) did2s: Two-stage difference-in-differences. The R Journal 14(3):162–173
13. Callan SJ, Thomas JM (2001) Economies of scale and scope: A cost analysis of municipal solid waste services. Land Economics 77(4):548–560
14. Callaway B, Sant'Anna PH (2021) Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. Journal of Econometrics 225(2):200–230
15. Cecon VS, Curtzwiler GW, Vorst KL (2023) Evaluation of mixed plastics waste from material recovery facilities in the United States. Waste Management 171:313–323
16. De Chaisemartin C, D'Haultfœuille X (2020) Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects. American Economic Review 110(9):2964–2996
17. De Chaisemartin C, D'Haultfœuille X (2023) Two-way fixed effects and differences-in-differences with

heterogeneous treatment effects: A survey. The Econometrics Journal 26(3):C1–C30

18. European Union (1999) Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste. Official Journal of the European Union L 182/5

19. European Union (2008) Directive 2008/98/EC on waste. Official Journal of the European Union L 213/3

20. Jansen M, Thoden van Velzen EU, Ferreira B, Pretz T (2013) Recovery of plastics from municipal solid waste in materials recovery facilities. In: Sardinia 2013, 14th International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium