



## Advancing a green campus through environmental management: A qualitative exploration of student and lecturer participation at Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Bintang R Simbolon<sup>1</sup>, Edison Siregar<sup>2</sup>, Ezra Angela<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Vocational, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66856/ijmc.2026.8.2.8043>

### Abstract

Universities often speak about sustainability as an institutional commitment, yet real progress usually depends on the small, everyday choices made by the people who study and work there. This study looks closely at how students and lecturers at Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI) understand and take part in efforts to build a greener campus. Rather than focusing on technical indicators or environmental scorecards, the research tries to capture how individuals make sense of “green practices” in their daily routines—sometimes enthusiastically, sometimes with hesitation. A descriptive qualitative design was used, drawing on open-ended online questionnaires and semi-structured reflections from students in their later semesters and lecturers with several years of teaching experience. The responses were analysed thematically. Over time, a set of recurring ideas appeared: many participants expressed concern about environmental issues, but the level of actual involvement varied widely. Some described themselves as consistently engaged—joining campaigns, reducing waste, even nudging their peers—while others admitted they cared about the environment but rarely acted on it. Several factors shaped this uneven participation. Personal values helped, as did a sense of emotional attachment to the campus. On the other hand, limited facilities, irregular programme continuity, and academic workload often pulled people away from environmental activities. Interestingly, many participants felt that even small institutional gestures—such as clearer communication, recognition for contributions, or visible leadership support—would make participation feel more natural and less like an extra burden. Taken together, the findings suggest that effective environmental management in higher education depends not only on policies, but on how deeply those policies invite people to participate. When students and lecturers see themselves as partners rather than observers, green-campus initiatives have a better chance of becoming a lasting part of university culture.

**Keywords:** Green campus, environmental management, student participation, lecturer participation, sustainability practices

### Introduction

Discussions about sustainability have become almost routine in higher education, yet the everyday reality on many campuses tends to move at a slower and more uneven rhythm. Some universities already have sophisticated policies and reporting systems, but on the ground—where students rush between classes and lecturers manage their workloads—the translation of these commitments into daily behaviour can feel fragmented. Over the past few years, scholars have noted that sustainability efforts flourish when the people inside the institution—not just its regulations—begin to internalise environmental responsibility as part of their academic identity<sup>[1, 2]</sup>.

Universities play a particularly important role because they shape young adults at a moment when habits, values, and social commitments are still taking form. When students encounter sustainable practices repeatedly—in classrooms, student organisations, and campus facilities—many of them begin to adopt these behaviours without much prompting<sup>[3, 4]</sup>. Still, awareness alone is often insufficient. A growing body of research shows that the gap between caring about environmental issues and consistently acting on them remains stubbornly wide<sup>[4]</sup>. The reasons vary: limited facilities, unclear institutional messaging, competing academic demands, or simply the sense that individual contributions feel too small to matter.

Lecturers, interestingly, sit at a pivotal intersection. They are educators, role models, and sometimes informal policy interpreters. Studies have shown that when lecturers

intentionally incorporate environmental themes into teaching or signal their own commitment through small daily actions, students tend to respond more positively to sustainability initiatives<sup>[5]</sup>. But lecturer participation is also shaped by workload, institutional expectations, and the availability of training or support. Without a coherent system that helps them integrate sustainability into their routines, efforts often remain sporadic.

This is why environmental management in universities today is increasingly viewed as a cultural endeavour rather than a purely technical one. Many institutions now experiment with participatory approaches—inviting students and lecturers to co-create environmental programmes or evaluate campus conditions—because such involvement nurtures a sense of shared ownership<sup>[6]</sup>. Some researchers argue that this participatory spirit might matter more than infrastructure upgrades, especially in contexts where resources are limited but human motivation is abundant<sup>[7]</sup>.

At Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI), conversations about sustainability have grown more visible in recent years, yet structured programmes for building a green campus are still developing. Students and lecturers express interest in environmental issues, but the extent and consistency of their involvement vary. The university already has some environmentally oriented routines, but many of these rely heavily on individual initiative rather than coordinated institutional management. This creates an intriguing space for research: how do members of the academic community perceive and participate in environmental practices, and

what does that reveal about the university's capacity to cultivate a sustainable campus culture?

This study seeks to explore those questions through a qualitative lens. By listening closely to students and lecturers, the research aims to understand not just what they do, but how they make sense of their participation—or non-participation. These insights can guide universities like UKI in strengthening their environmental management strategies so that sustainability becomes part of everyday life rather than an occasional campaign.

### Literature Review

The idea of a “green campus” has grown far beyond tree-planting events or energy-saving reminders. In recent scholarship, the term refers to a more holistic attempt to weave environmental awareness into the everyday rhythms of academic life. Some authors describe universities as “small ecological systems” where habits, space, and social norms interact in subtle but powerful ways [8]. A campus may appear environmentally progressive on paper, yet its culture might still feel disconnected from sustainability if the people within it experience the initiatives as distant or procedural.

Several studies note that progress becomes more organic when sustainability is embedded across learning, student activities, and the physical environment, rather than concentrated in a single office or policy document [9]. Universities that adopt this multi-layered approach often see students and lecturers negotiating environmental responsibility in informal ways—carrying reusable bottles, organising peer-led workshops, or quietly modelling pro-environmental behaviours in class. It may seem modest, but these routines gradually anchor sustainability as something ordinary rather than ceremonial.

Within this conversation, the green campus vision is closely tied to education for sustainable development (ESD). Scholars argue that universities have a moral and pedagogical obligation to help students engage with climate issues not only intellectually but personally [10]. When students learn through hands-on or situational experiences—say, participating in waste-reduction campaigns—they often reinterpret environmental issues as part of their identity as campus citizens, not just as academic content [11].

Environmental management in universities usually brings to mind technical aspects: waste segregation systems, carbon audits, water-saving technologies, and so on. Yet most contemporary work points out that the social and organisational dimensions matter just as much [12]. Even the most sophisticated systems fall short when awareness, communication, and shared responsibility have not taken root. Higher education institutions differ widely in their approaches. Some have well-structured sustainability offices, others rely on fragmented programmes that appear enthusiastically for a semester and then fade [13]. One recurring observation is that continuity—not novelty—determines whether an initiative endures. Policies need follow-through, and follow-through depends on people.

Interestingly, several studies highlight that environmental initiatives tend to perform better when decision-making is not solely top-down [14]. Campuses that invite students and lecturers to help interpret problems, propose solutions, or evaluate ongoing programmes tend to develop a stronger sense of collective ownership. This does not eliminate structural challenges—budget constraints, limited facilities,

or competing institutional priorities—but it does strengthen commitment [15].

Participation is often influenced by simple cues: clarity of communication, visibility of leadership, and how accessible environmental activities feel to the average student or lecturer. Sometimes, the barrier is not apathy but uncertainty—people simply are not sure where or how to begin [16].

Participation, as many scholars now frame it, is not merely about showing up for a recycling campaign or signing attendance at an environmental seminar. It also includes psychological and emotional engagement—how people *feel* about environmental responsibility and whether they believe their actions matter [17]. Students, for instance, may support sustainability in principle but doubt that small individual choices change anything. Lecturers may care deeply about the issue but feel constrained by time or institutional expectations.

Students and lecturers act as carriers of campus culture. When their actions, conversations, and class practices reflect ecological concern, the social norm gradually shifts [18]. Several studies suggest that even everyday modelling—lecturers bringing their own tumblers, students initiating small eco-projects—can influence peers more strongly than formal messaging. Yet participation is rarely uniform. Some individuals step forward enthusiastically, while others remain passive, not because they oppose environmental initiatives, but because they feel disconnected from them [19]. Social belonging also plays a role. When people feel emotionally attached to their university, they are more willing to care for its spaces. Conversely, when engagement feels transactional or burdensome, participation weakens. Institutional support—training, recognition, flexible opportunities—can bridge that gap and make ecological involvement feel natural rather than obligatory [20].

Much of what shapes environmental behaviour in universities is relational and interpretive. It involves meanings, values, beliefs, and quiet negotiations that unfold in daily life. For this reason, qualitative approaches have become increasingly central in sustainability research [21]. They allow researchers to explore how individuals talk about environmental issues, what they find motivating or discouraging, and how they navigate the social expectations around sustainability.

Open-ended instruments—such as semi-structured interviews or reflective surveys—enable participants to express their experiences in their own words. This often reveals tensions or insights that quantitative measures might miss, such as feelings of “not being invited” to participate or the subtle ways peer influence shapes behaviour [22]. Through thematic analysis, researchers can trace recurring storylines and patterns, then interpret how these patterns relate to institutional culture and environmental management structures [23]. Qualitative work is particularly useful when studying emerging sustainability efforts in universities where environmental initiatives are still forming or inconsistent. It helps illuminate the human side of policy implementation: how people interpret the university's intentions, how workable they find the initiatives, and what might encourage or inhibit their involvement [24].

### Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive design, which felt like the most suitable approach for trying to understand

how members of a university community make sense of environmental responsibility in their everyday routines. Rather than measuring behaviours or testing predetermined variables, the research aimed to listen closely to students and lecturers—how they talk about the idea of a green campus, how they experience environmental initiatives at Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI), and what shapes their willingness to participate. A qualitative design gave enough room for those stories and interpretations to emerge with their natural complexity.

The research was carried out at UKI's main Jakarta campus between July and September 2025<sup>[33]</sup>. This three-month window was admittedly short, but still long enough to build rapport with participants, conduct interviews, and reflect on the meanings that appeared in their responses. The campus itself offered a familiar setting where environmental practices existed in fragments—some visible, others more informal—making it a fertile place to examine how people navigate sustainability in daily life.

Participants were selected purposively. The goal was not to gather a large or statistically representative sample, but rather to speak with individuals who genuinely had something to say about the university's environmental condition. Students who had completed at least four semesters were invited because they had spent enough time on campus to observe patterns and changes. Lecturers with at least three years of teaching experience were included for a similar reason: their longer institutional memory often provided richer context. The final group size remained flexible and was guided by information sufficiency, once interviews stopped producing new insights, recruitment was concluded.

Two main instruments were used: semi-structured interview guides and open-ended online questionnaires. Both instruments encouraged participants to speak in their own words, which was important since perceptions of sustainability are often shaped by personal experience rather than formal definitions. The questions explored several areas—how participants understood the idea of a green campus, what kinds of environmental practices they noticed around them, what motivated them to participate (or not), and what they hoped UKI could improve. Because the format was open, some interviews naturally wandered into unexpected but valuable reflections, such as how peer influence shapes everyday choices or how certain facilities subtly encourage or discourage sustainable behaviour.

All responses were analysed using thematic analysis, drawing on the step-by-step structure proposed by Braun and Clarke. First, the interviews and written responses were transcribed and read multiple times to become familiar with the tone and nuance of each participant. Coding began with small, meaningful segments—sometimes a sentence, sometimes a phrase that captured a particular idea or sentiment. These codes were then grouped into broader themes that described recurring patterns across participants, such as feelings of uncertainty, pride in small environmental actions, or frustration about infrastructural limitations. Throughout the analysis, the themes were reviewed and refined to ensure that they accurately reflected both the diversity and the coherence of the data.

To strengthen credibility, the study used several validation strategies. Participants were occasionally asked to clarify or confirm the interpretations of their statements, a process often called member checking. The inclusion of both students and lecturers provided a form of triangulation, allowing the study to compare perspectives across different roles in the academic community. An audit trail was also kept—notes about coding decisions, reflections after interviews, and changes to emerging themes—so the analytical process remained transparent and traceable.

The research procedures unfolded in several stages. After instruments were drafted and ethical clearance obtained from the university, the open-ended questionnaire was distributed digitally. This was followed by in-depth interviews conducted online or in person depending on availability. Once data collection ended, transcription and coding occurred in cycles, allowing early impressions to shape subsequent rounds of interpretation. The final step involved weaving the themes into a coherent narrative that captures how students and lecturers understand environmental management on campus and how their participation might help UKI move toward a stronger sustainability culture.

## Results

### 1. Overview of Data Sources

The findings presented in this section draw on two qualitative data sets gathered through open-ended questionnaires: one completed by undergraduate students and the other by full-time lecturers at Universitas Kristen Indonesia. Although both groups responded to parallel prompts, the tone and orientation of their reflections were noticeably different. Students tended to speak from the immediacy of everyday campus life—what they see, what they feel is missing, and how environmental ideas surface (or fail to surface) in their routines. Lecturers, meanwhile, often approached sustainability with a blend of personal conviction, academic responsibility, and institutional awareness.

The student responses varied widely in length and depth. Some students wrote short, almost fragmentary notes, while others offered thoughtful reflections about what a “green campus” should look like and why sustainability matters to them personally. Their comments provide a textured sense of how environmental ideas circulate at the ground level, especially among those who encounter campus spaces most directly.

The lecturers' responses, while fewer, carried a different weight. Many described the role of sustainability within teaching, mentorship, and institutional direction. Some identified gaps in coordination or policy clarity, while others expressed a desire for the university to articulate a stronger environmental vision. This set of narratives offers insight into how sustainability is understood from a more structural and professional standpoint.

Together, these two data sources illuminate the gaps, possibilities, and shared aspirations for a greener UKI. The subsections that follow examine each group's contributions in turn before drawing the two perspectives together in a comparative synthesis.

**Table 1:** Characteristics of Student Respondents

Aspect	Summary Description
Total respondents	14 undergraduate students
Study programs represented	Education, Law, Management, English Literature, Informatics
Semester range	Mostly 4th–7th semester students
Environmental involvement	A few had joined small-scale campus activities, most had minimal structured participation
General tone of responses	Curious, mildly critical, and sometimes reflective about the lack of formal environmental initiatives
Notable pattern	Many students expressed willingness to contribute if clearer programmes or guidance existed

## 2. Student Findings

Students tend to describe a green campus in simple but meaningful ways. Some imagine infrastructure—trees, clean spaces, organised bins—while others focus on values like shared responsibility and small everyday habits. A few even admitted they were unsure of the formal definition but believed it had “something to do with caring for the environment.” Their sense of the importance of environmental action also varied. Some connected it to global concerns (“the planet needs help”), others to personal comfort (“a cleaner campus feels better”), and a few to moral responsibility. But almost all agreed that sustainability should matter in a university.

What complicates the picture is that very few students could name specific environmental programmes at UKI. The majority said they had never seen anything they recognised as a coordinated initiative. This gap between what they value and what they perceive is available plays a major role in how they engage—or hesitate to engage.

When they did participate, it was usually in small or one-off activities: helping sort trash at an event, joining a clean-up because a friend insisted, or attending a faculty programme without knowing who organised it. Many said they would love to contribute but did not quite know where to begin.

Their ideas for potential contributions were often simple—using fewer plastics, joining a recycling effort, or helping educate peers—but some were more imaginative, such as designing awareness posters or forming small eco-groups. Motivations, likewise, ranged from personal conviction to a desire for a campus identity they could be proud of. Barriers emerged from nearly every angle: a lack of information, unclear programmes, minimal facilities, busy schedules, and sometimes the sense that sustainability “is not yet part of the culture.” Still, students expressed genuine hopes that UKI could create a stronger environmental presence, with workshops, consistent activities, and better infrastructure.

**Table 2:** Thematic Summary of Student Responses

Theme	Core Insight	Illustrative Student Voice
Understanding of green campus	Seen as a mix of clean space, nature, and shared responsibility	“Maybe it just means a campus that cares about the environment.”
Perceived importance	Environmental care feels necessary and morally right	“We need to protect our surroundings—no one else will.”
Awareness of programmes	Most students unsure of existing initiatives	“If there is a programme, I wish someone would tell us.”
Past participation	Participation is occasional and mostly informal	“I joined a clean-up once, but I don’t know who organised it.”
Possible contributions	Students propose small, realistic actions	“I can start by reducing plastic and reminding my friends to do the same.”
Motivation	Driven by values, peer influence, and desire for belonging	“If the campus shows commitment, I’d like to be part of it.”
Barriers	Lack of facilities, information, and time	“Sometimes I want to join, but I don’t know how.”
Hopes and expectations	Students want structured, visible, ongoing initiatives	“We need more trees, better bins, and real programmes.”
Potential personal actions	Lifestyle adjustments and peer education	“I could help by creating posters or small campaigns.”
Suggestions for improvement	Clear communication, recognition, and supporting infrastructure	“Just tell us what to do and give us a space—we’ll join.”

## 3. Lecturer Findings

Lecturers approached the idea of a green campus with a slightly different tone: more contemplative, sometimes cautious, yet clearly invested. Many felt that sustainability naturally belongs in higher education because universities shape mindsets. Several mentioned that they occasionally integrate environmental themes in teaching, even without institutional directives.

When asked about their participation, some lecturers recalled joining clean-ups or speaking about environmental issues, but others admitted they had not been directly involved because there was no clear platform or invitation. They often expressed a desire to contribute but felt unsure how to align personal initiatives with institutional structures.

Their assessment of UKI’s environmental management was generally polite yet honest: some efforts exist, but not yet in a coordinated way. They described the campus as having “good intentions but no clear roadmap.”

Motivators for lecturers ranged from personal values and academic interest to wanting to set an example for students. Barriers included limited time, unclear policies, and the absence of a dedicated environmental unit that could provide direction. Ideas for improvement included integrating sustainability into curricula, forming interdisciplinary teams, creating recognition systems, and ensuring that environmental initiatives have continuity rather than appearing sporadically.

**Table 3:** Thematic Summary of Lecturer Responses

Theme	Core Insight	Lecturer Perspective
Understanding of green campus	Viewed as institutional responsibility + behavioural culture	“A green campus is where sustainability is embedded in daily routines.”
Role of lecturers	Lecturers see themselves as influencers and role models	“Students watch what we do, not only what we teach.”
Past involvement	Mostly informal or program-based, not institutionalised	“I joined a clean-up, but nothing regular.”
Policy assessment	Policies are present but fragmented	“The direction isn’t fully clear yet.”
Teaching integration	Some incorporate sustainability into lessons	“I talk about sustainability when relevant to my subject.”
Motivators	Academic duty, personal ethics, modelling behaviour	“It feels like part of our responsibility as educators.”
Barriers	Lack of policy clarity, limited time, minimal coordination	“We need a unit that anchors the work.”
Hopes	A stronger vision for a greener UKI	“We should move toward a comprehensive green-campus plan.”
Potential contributions	Research, mentorship, community work	“I’d help develop environmental modules if supported.”
Institutional support needs	Training, structure, and recognition	“Support systems would make our efforts more sustainable.”

#### 4. Cross-Group Synthesis

Although students and lecturers speak from different vantage points, there is a surprising overlap in their views. Both groups describe sustainability as important but

somewhat undefined in practice. Both feel motivated but lack clear channels to act. And both imagine UKI becoming greener through coordinated efforts, better communication, and visible structures.

**Table 4:** Comparative Summary of Student and Lecturer Themes

Dimension	Students	Lecturers
Awareness	Limited awareness of formal programmes	Aware of general efforts but find them fragmented
Participation	Mostly informal or one-off activities	Occasional involvement but lacking continuity
Barriers	Lack of info, unclear pathways, limited facilities	Unclear policies, minimal coordination, time constraints
Motivators	Peer influence, personal values, wanting belonging	Ethical responsibility, academic interest, role-modelling
Recommendations	Structured programmes, communication, recognition	Stronger policy direction, dedicated unit, curricular integration

Taken together, the findings reveal a campus community that is willing—perhaps even eager—to participate in environmental initiatives, but still navigating uncertainty about how to begin. Both students and lecturers point to the same missing link: a coherent structure that turns good intentions into shared action. The data suggests that with stronger coordination, clearer communication, and consistent opportunities for involvement, UKI could cultivate a more visible and enduring culture of sustainability.

#### Discussion

One of the first things that comes through in the findings is that both students and lecturers at UKI actually care about environmental issues. You can feel it in the way they talk—sometimes casually, sometimes with a bit of frustration—but the concern is there. The problem is that they seem to be walking without a clear map. The willingness is present, but the direction feels blurry. Scholars have mentioned this kind of thing before, noting that sustainability in universities often stumbles not because people resist it, but because institutional signals arrive unevenly or don’t fully land [25, 26]. When the structure is hazy, even strong intentions slowly lose their push.

For students, the notion of a green campus feels like a mixture of simple, everyday images—trees, clean corners, bins that make sense—and a sense of shared responsibility. Some spoke with genuine enthusiasm, almost imagining the campus they wished existed. But many also admitted they weren’t sure what environmental programmes UKI actually had. That uncertainty is important. Several studies remind us that awareness without direction rarely turns into behaviour [27]. Students are often ready to step in, but they

need some kind of scaffolding: communication that reaches them, activities they can recognise, and a feeling that their small actions matter.

Lecturers approached the topic a bit differently—more reflective, sometimes cautious, but with a clear sense that sustainability belongs in higher education. A few mentioned weaving these themes into their teaching here and there, which aligns with ideas in the literature about educators as cultural carriers [28]. But even so, they described UKI’s efforts as scattered. Not absent, but not forming a coherent picture either. Research has long suggested that sustainability in universities needs a certain balance: leadership that sets the tone, structures that keep things moving, and everyday practices that people can see and join [29]. When these elements don’t line up, initiatives feel like isolated sparks rather than a steady flame.

When you place the student and lecturer voices side by side, the similarities are striking. Both groups want clearer programmes, better communication, visible facilities, and opportunities that don’t feel like one-off gestures. This convergence echoes studies showing that green-campus transitions succeed when institutional direction and community expectations move together [30]. In a way, UKI already has this alignment in values—it just hasn’t been translated into action yet.

There is also a subtle emotional tone running through the responses. Students talked about wanting to feel part of something—almost a longing for identity and belonging. Lecturers expressed a sense of responsibility, a desire to model the kinds of behaviours they hope students will learn. That emotional dimension matters. Research has shown that identification and shared meaning often determine whether sustainability efforts stick [31]. A green campus isn’t just

defined by infrastructure, it's shaped by the stories people tell about what kind of community they are becoming.

Of course, the barriers are real. Students mentioned unclear programmes, limited facilities, and the rush of academic life. Lecturers pointed to policy ambiguity, coordination gaps, and the absence of a unit that could anchor environmental work. These issues mirror international findings almost perfectly: sustainability tends to collapse when it relies solely on personal goodwill without structural backing<sup>[32]</sup>. Effective environmental management usually involves systems—training, communication channels, recognition, and leadership that follows through<sup>[33]</sup>. Without these, contributions remain scattered.

What the findings collectively suggest is that UKI is not struggling with apathy, it is struggling with coherence. There is a quiet readiness among students and lecturers to do more—but they are waiting for clearer cues, clearer pathways. Many campuses around the world are in this same position, sitting on the edge of change while the community waits for direction<sup>[34]</sup>.

If UKI can strengthen coordination, make environmental efforts more visible, and provide ongoing opportunities to participate, the campus could shift from occasional activities to a more stable sustainability rhythm—something that feels natural rather than event-based. And because both groups already share similar motivations, expectations, and even frustrations, the foundation for a green-campus culture is already stronger than it seems.

In short, the results point toward a promising direction: UKI already has the social ingredients needed for a meaningful environmental movement. What it requires now is an institutional framework that ties those ingredients together—policies that are lived, communication that is consistent, leadership that steadies the course. When those pieces fall into place, sustainability can move from aspiration to habit, and eventually become part of UKI's identity as a learning community.

## Conclusion

Looking back at the voices gathered in this study, it becomes clear that UKI already holds something valuable: a community that cares about the environment, even if that care has not yet found a steady form. Students bring energy and curiosity, while lecturers carry a sense of responsibility and influence. Both groups, in their own ways, are waiting for clearer signals—some shape, some structure—that helps them turn intention into action.

The findings suggest that the challenge at UKI is not a lack of awareness or motivation, but rather the absence of a coherent system that ties efforts together. Earlier research has shown that sustainable campus cultures tend to grow when institutional direction, community practices, and everyday routines reinforce one another. What we see at UKI is a readiness for that growth, but also a need for clearer pathways: communication that reaches students, policies that guide lecturers, and a unit or platform that keeps environmental initiatives moving with continuity rather than appearing as isolated efforts.

At the same time, there is something quite promising in how students and lecturers imagine a greener UKI. Their ideas are not extravagant. They revolve around things that are entirely achievable—better bins, more trees, workshops, small campaigns, space to participate, a sense that their

actions matter. These are the kinds of everyday elements that often make sustainability feel real rather than rhetorical. If UKI chooses to strengthen coordination and make environmental engagement more visible and accessible, the campus could shift toward a more grounded and enduring sustainability culture. The social ingredients are already here: shared values, overlapping hopes, and a community that wants to belong to something meaningful. What remains is to connect these elements with the kind of institutional support that allows them to take root.

In the end, this study does not simply point to problems, it reveals potential. A greener UKI is not a distant vision—it is something that could grow naturally once the structures, communication lines, and leadership frameworks are in place. When that happens, sustainability can move beyond scattered initiatives and begin to shape the daily life of the campus, quietly but steadily becoming part of who UKI is and who it hopes its students will become.

## References

1. Filho WL, Shiel C, Paço A, et al. Sustainability practices in higher education: lessons from a global study. *J Clean Prod*,2021;289:125627.
2. Verhulst E, Lambrechts W. Fostering the incorporation of sustainable development in higher education. *J Clean Prod*,2022;365:132895.
3. Adams R, Martin S, Boom K. University culture and sustainability: Designing and implementing an enabling framework. *Journal of cleaner production*,2018;171:434-45.
4. Haski-Leventhal D, Pournader M, McKinnon A. Barriers to pro-environmental behaviour among university students. *J Environ Psychol*,2023;87:102006.
5. Parra-Camacho D, Jiménez-Naranjo H, Chiva-Bartoll O. Teachers' role in promoting environmental awareness in higher education. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2022;23(6):1250-67.
6. Figueiró PS, Raufflet E. Sustainability in higher education: a review of participatory approaches. *J Clean Prod*,2021;313:127794.
7. Fritze J, McKenzie S, Lujan K. Participation and agency in campus sustainability. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2022;23(4):889-906.
8. Findler F, Schönherr N, Lozano R, et al. The impact of higher education institutions on sustainable development: a review. *Sustainability*,2019;11(1):59.
9. Jones P, Selby D, Sterling S. Sustainability and the learning community in higher education. *J Clean Prod*,2020;251:119661.
10. Simbolon BR, Sinaga D, Naibaho L. Students Perception on the Implementation of Higher-Educational Curriculum Based on Indonesian Qualification Framework at Postgraduate Program Universitas Kristen Indonesia. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*,2021;560:196-201.
11. Simbolon BR, Wibowo TS, Suherman U. Social Dynamics: Does it Have an Impact on the Existence of Education?. *International Journal of Demos (IJD)*,2022;4(1):396-404.
12. Simbolon BR. Investigating the Students' Attitude on Environmental Care at Universitas Kristen Indonesia. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*,2020, 12(2).

13. Ceulemans K, Molderez I, Van Liedekerke L. Sustainability reporting in higher education: a comprehensive review. *J Clean Prod*,2019;207:542–54.
14. Caeiro S, Disterheft A, Leal Filho W, et al. Participatory approaches in campus sustainability. *Sustainability*,2020;12(10):4187.
15. Evans J, Hicks E, Dundas S. Barriers to sustainability initiatives in universities. *J Environ Educ*,2021;52(3):169–82.
16. Simons H, Lopes J. Awareness and engagement in campus environmental programmes. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2022;23(2):345–60.
17. Krisprimandoyo DA, Jayusman H, Arpianto Y, Sulisty AB, Simbolon B. Integrating environmental principles in sustainable corporate management strategies. *The International Journal of Science in Society*,2023;5(4):475-486.
18. Messineo M, Gentile M. Cultural drivers of environmental engagement among university communities. *Sustainability*,2020;12(18):7431.
19. Kagawa F, Selby D. Student engagement with sustainability: a qualitative perspective. *Environ Educ Res*,2018;24(4):575–90.
20. Avery H, Nordén B. Institutional support and the emotional dimensions of sustainability engagement. *J Clean Prod*,2021;280:124372.
21. Tracy SJ. Qualitative quality: eight “big tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qual Inq*,2010;16(10):837–51.
22. Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on thematic analysis. *Qual Res Sport Exerc Health*,2019;11(4):589–97.
23. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic analysis: striving to meet trustworthiness criteria. *Int J Qual Methods*,2017, 16:1–13.
24. Soini K, Jalma N. Human factors in campus environmental initiatives: a qualitative study. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2020;21(8):1400–18.
25. Lozano R. Towards better embedding sustainability into higher education institutions. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2011;12(4):345–56.
26. Yuan X, Zuo J. A critical assessment of higher education for sustainable development from students’ perspectives. *J Clean Prod*,2013;48:108–15.
27. Amaral L, Martins N, Gouveia JB. Questing for a sustainable university. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2015;16(2):155–72.
28. Tilbury D. *Higher education for sustainability: A global overview*. Routledge, 2016.
29. Nadeak B, Naibaho L, Silalahi M. COVID-19 and students’ anxiety management. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*,2020;13(7):1574-87.
30. Sonetti G, Brown M, Naboni E. Sustainability and regenerative goals in universities. *Sustainability*,2019;11(1):254.
31. Tyas EH, Naibaho L. Effective School management in industrial revolution era 4.0. In2nd Annual Conference on blended learning, educational technology and Innovation (ACBLETI 2020), 2021, 212-216.
32. Simbolon BR, Susanti PA, Sukomardojo T, Rizqi V. Analysis of student perceptions of teacher quality and learning environment as predictors of learning motivation in high schools. *JIP (Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan)*,2023;6(3):2018-24.
33. Lane KL, Menzies HM, Bruhn AL, Crnobori M. *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work*. Guilford Publications, 2025.
34. Wright T. University presidents’ conceptualizations of sustainability. *Int J Sustain High Educ*,2002;3(3):203–12.