International Journal of Management and Economics
www.managementjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-7079
Received: 07-12-2025, Accepted: 06-01-2026, Published: 21-01-2026
Volume 8, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 11-17

Green human resource management and the making of a sustainable campus culture at Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Edison Siregar[1], Bintang R Simbolon[2], Agustinus Fernando[1]
[1] Faculty of Vocational, Financial Analysis Study Program, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] Magister of Education Administration, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract
Universities often say they care about sustainability, yet the everyday reality on campus does not always match that ambition. This study looks at how Green Human Resource Management (Green HRM) can play a quiet but decisive role in shaping a more sustainable campus culture at Universitas Kristen Indonesia. The idea is simple: when people—lecturers, staff, students—begin to see sustainability as part of their work and identity, cultural change slowly gains momentum. But getting there is rarely straightforward. Using a qualitative exploratory approach, the study draws on open–ended questionnaires, observations of daily campus routines, and a review of institutional documents. The goal was to understand how people at UKI think about environmental issues, how they actually behave, and how HR-related practices—recruitment, training, performance expectations, small incentives—might either support or weaken sustainable habits. Several themes emerged. Awareness of environmental problems is generally high, but behaviour does not always follow, especially when facilities are limited or when sustainability is seen as "additional work." At the same time, subtle shifts are visible: students experimenting with waste sorting, lecturers weaving sustainability into class discussions, and staff showing interest in training that feels practical rather than symbolic. What stands out from the findings is that Green HRM works best when it feels embedded in the everyday life of the university, not imposed from above. Small, consistent HR actions—clear messages during recruitment, meaningful training, recognition for green initiatives—help create that sense of shared purpose. The study argues that universities like UKI can develop a stronger sustainability culture not by launching one grand programme, but by aligning HRM practices with the values they hope to cultivate.

Keywords: Green human resource management, sustainable campus culture, higher education, environmental behaviour

Introduction

Sustainability has become one of those ideas that universities like to highlight—sometimes in glossy brochures, sometimes in strategic plans that look very convincing on paper. Yet, the everyday reality on many campuses still feels a bit uneven. Over the past few years, several studies have shown that universities are indeed moving toward greener policies, but the cultural shift inside the institution often takes longer than the policy documents suggest [1, 2, 3]. Students may talk about climate anxiety, staff may agree that environmental issues matter, but daily habits—waste sorting, energy use, even the way people think about campus spaces—do not always follow with the same intensity.

Interestingly, research in higher education has found a fairly consistent pattern: awareness tends to be high, but behaviour lags behind [4, 5, 6]. This gap appears in many countries, including Indonesia. Students might fully understand why reducing plastic matters, yet still choose bottled drinks because reusable options are inconvenient or simply less visible. Lecturers may support sustainability as an educational value, yet feel they lack guidance or resources to incorporate it into their routines. It creates a quiet tension between intention and action, something many universities are still learning to navigate.

This is where Human Resource Management (HRM) comes in, even though it is not always the first place people look when discussing sustainability. A growing body of literature on Green Human Resource Management (Green HRM) suggests that HR practices—recruitment, training, performance evaluation, even subtle cues about what the institution values—can meaningfully shape pro-environmental behaviour [7, 8, 9, 10]. Organisations that embed sustainability into their HR processes tend to show stronger environmental engagement among employees, sometimes in ways that build momentum over time. Higher education is slowly picking up this idea, and a few recent studies point to the potential of Green HRM as a cultural lever in universities [11, 12, 13].

Leadership also plays a role. When senior leaders signal that sustainability is not just an add-on but an institutional priority, staff often develop a stronger sense of responsibility around environmental issues. Combined with HR policies that reinforce these expectations, a kind of cultural coherence begins to form [14, 15]. Some universities have experimented with sustainability-oriented training, green performance indicators, or recognition systems for environmental initiatives—often with encouraging early results.

But there is still a significant gap in the literature, especially in contexts like Indonesia where higher education institutions vary widely in resources, governance styles, and organisational cultures. Research on sustainable campuses in Indonesia has expanded in the last few years, but the HRM dimension remains underexplored [16, 17]. Many universities in the country have launched "green campus" initiatives, yet HR practices—arguably the backbone of cultural change—are not always part of the conversation.

Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI) represents an interesting case in this regard. Located in East Jakarta,

surrounded by urban density and the environmental pressures that come with it, UKI has both a challenge and an opportunity. On one hand, environmental issues are highly visible in everyday life; on the other, the university has a long-standing identity rooted in values and community engagement. This combination creates a unique setting to explore how people inside the institution think about sustainability and how HR-related actions—some formal, some informal—shape the rhythm of campus life.

This study follows a simple but important assumption: a sustainable campus culture does not emerge from a single large programme. It grows from a series of small decisions, supported by people who feel that sustainability is part of their shared identity. Using a qualitative exploratory approach, the research aims to uncover how lecturers and students at UKI make sense of environmental issues, how they participate (or hesitate to participate) in sustainability initiatives, and how HRM practices influence these everyday choices. Ultimately, the study hopes to offer pathways for Green HRM strategies that fit the realities of Indonesian universities—strategies that move sustainability from aspiration to lived experience.

Literature Review

Many universities today speak enthusiastically about sustainability, yet daily behaviours on campus often move at a slower pace. Several recent studies show that students generally understand environmental issues, but translating that awareness into consistent action remains tricky. It's not that they are indifferent—sometimes they simply face small frictions that shape behaviour more than good intentions. A few scholars even describe campus sustainability as something that "lives or dies in the mundane," meaning tiny everyday choices matter more than grand institutional statements [18, 19].

One recurring theme in the literature is that students tend to act more sustainably when the campus environment makes it feel natural. When waste bins are clearly labelled, when refill stations are visible, when peers seem to care—sustainable behaviour starts to spread almost effortlessly [20]. But when facilities are limited or inconvenient, intentions collapse rather quickly. Other studies point out that students often respond strongly to social cues: when sustainability feels like a shared norm rather than a niche concern, participation increases [21]. Interestingly, universities that weave sustainability into multiple touchpoints—classroom discussions, student organisations, campus design—tend to see better behavioural consistency [22, 23]. It's not a single intervention that changes behaviour, but a gradual layering of meaning and habit.

Green Human Resource Management (Green HRM) has gained impressive momentum in the past five years, largely because organisations are beginning to realise that environmental performance is tied not only to technology or infrastructure but to people—their skills, habits, and values [24, 25]. In its simplest form, Green HRM refers to HR practices that encourage employees to act in environmentally responsible ways. But the field has expanded: researchers now see it as a cultural and psychological process, not just an administrative one.

Recent studies highlight several mechanisms. Green recruitment, for instance, signals to new staff that sustainability matters from day one; some universities now actively prefer candidates with experience in sustainability-related teaching or community projects [26]. Training also plays an important role. Hands-on workshops tend to have stronger effects than theoretical training because they make sustainability feel real and doable [27].

Performance evaluation and recognition systems are another interesting dimension. When employees feel that their environmental contributions—big or small—are acknowledged, they become more invested [28]. In fact, some researchers argue that recognition may be more effective than financial incentives in academic settings, where intrinsic motivation is often strong [29]. While Green HRM research is flourishing in the private sector, studies in higher education are still emerging. A few universities in Asia and Europe have begun experimenting with sustainability-oriented HR systems, and early findings are encouraging: staff engagement increases, and sustainability initiatives become more consistent [30, 31].

If sustainability is to become a real cultural force inside a university, it needs to move beyond policies into shared norms, habits, and ways of thinking. Recent work suggests that sustainable campus culture evolves when HRM, leadership, and academic practices reinforce one another rather than operate in isolation [32]. Campus culture is shaped by constant small interactions—how new lecturers are socialised into institutional values, how students observe staff behaving, how sustainability appears in conversations and routines [33]. When HRM embeds sustainability into recruitment, training, and development, it helps set a tone that gradually becomes part of the institutional identity.

Some studies emphasise leadership as the spark. Leaders who articulate sustainability clearly—and act on it—tend to inspire broader participation [34]. Yet leadership alone isn't enough unless HR systems back it up with structures that make sustainable behaviour easier. Universities with stronger sustainability cultures usually combine visible commitments (green buildings, energy projects) with less visible HR mechanisms (competency development, recognition structures) [35]. Recent research in Southeast Asia also suggests that culturally grounded approaches tend to work better than imported models [36]. For instance, universities that frame sustainability as part of communal responsibility, rather than purely environmental compliance, often see stronger engagement from staff and students. Taken together, the literature implies that HRM can become a hinge point in sustainability work. It is not flashy, but it is persistent—and cultural change relies on persistence.

Methodology

This study used a qualitative exploratory approach, mainly because sustainability on a university campus is something that is experienced rather than easily measured. The goal was not to test a rigid hypothesis but to understand how people inside Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI) think about environmental issues and how they see the institution—especially its HR-related practices—either supporting or limiting the development of a sustainable campus culture. A flexible qualitative design made it possible to follow the nuances of these lived experiences instead of forcing them into predefined categories.

Participants were selected purposively. The study invited lecturers who were involved in curriculum work or had taken part in environmental activities, as well as students who had some degree of engagement with sustainability programs or student communities. The idea was not to

represent everyone statistically, but to gather voices that could speak meaningfully from different positions within the institution. Data collection continued until the material felt sufficiently full and no new insights were emerging, a point where the narratives started echoing one another in ways that signaled thematic saturation.

Data were collected through open-ended questionnaires. Although simple in form, these instruments allowed participants to write in a reflective way—some answers were brief, while others unfolded like small stories about daily campus life, frustrations, hopes, or quiet observations about what sustainability looked like at UKI. The questionnaire prompts encouraged them to discuss their understanding of sustainability, the behaviours they noticed around them, and their perceptions of how the university (and its HR structures) supported or failed to support environmental initiatives. To enrich these personal accounts, several institutional documents—policy statements, program descriptions, internal guidelines—were examined, along with informal observations around campus. These included noting the presence of recycling facilities, environmental signage, green spaces, or any physical cues that might influence behaviour.

The analysis followed a thematic process. Everything started with reading and rereading the material—not rushing, but letting patterns slowly appear. Coding came next: labeling segments of text that seemed important, sometimes descriptive, sometimes interpretive. These codes then gravitated toward one another, forming clusters that hinted at broader themes. Some themes captured the tension between awareness and behaviour; others reflected the perceived gaps in institutional support or the ways HR practices shaped expectations. Themes were refined several times to ensure that they were internally coherent and distinct from one another. The final step was to craft a narrative that stayed close to the participants' voices while also linking the findings to the relevant literature.

To maintain research quality, several steps were taken. Insights from the questionnaires were compared with the document review and observational notes to check whether they reinforced or challenged each other. Discussions with academic colleagues served as a way to test emerging interpretations, making sure that the analysis did not lean too heavily on personal assumptions. Throughout the study, an audit trail was kept to record how decisions were made at each stage—from assembling the questionnaire to defining the final themes. And rather than using member checking, which is less suitable for written open-ended responses, the study relied on cross-group consistency: when both lecturers and students independently raised similar issues, this strengthened confidence in the credibility of the findings.

Results

This section presents the findings generated from all data sources collected in the study. Although the research relied on a qualitative exploratory approach, the patterns that emerged were surprisingly consistent across students, lecturers, campus observations, and institutional documents. Rather than describing each instrument in isolation, the findings are displayed through a series of structured tables that capture the depth and texture of the data while keeping the reporting as transparent as possible.

To help the reader understand how the insights took shape, the results open with a mapping of all instruments and the type of information each contributed. This overview also reflects the logic of the analysis: themes emerged not from a single source but from the overlap between what people said, what was observed, and what the institution formally documented. Only after laying out this landscape do we move into thematic displays, comparative tables, and excerpts from participants' written responses.

1. Overview of Data Sources

Before moving into thematic findings, it is important to understand how each instrument contributed to the broader analysis. Students tended to speak from their daily routines: what they see, what they can or cannot do easily, and how their peers behave. Their responses were often rooted in practical considerations—what facilities exist, what cues are missing, and how sustainability "feels" in everyday campus spaces.

Lecturers approached sustainability with a wider institutional lens. They reflected on curriculum opportunities, HRM structures, and long-term aspirations for the university. Their narratives frequently pointed to areas where the institution had strong intentions but lacked operational clarity or follow-through. Campus observations added a grounding element. They showed where sustainability signals were strong or weak, which facilities were consistently used, and which were largely symbolic. In several cases, the observations confirmed the concerns expressed in questionnaires; in others, they revealed mismatches between formal structures and lived behaviour.

Document analysis offered insight into formal institutional commitments. Policies and plans spoke about sustainability in broad terms, but the absence of HRM-linked indicators was notable—especially when compared to the expectations voiced by lecturers and students. The interplay of these sources allowed the study to trace sustainability at UKI not just as a policy idea, but as something lived, noticed, negotiated, and sometimes improvised.

Table 1: Mapping of Instruments to Focal Areas and Data Contribution

Instrument	Focal Area	Example Data Contribution
Student questionnaire	Sustainability awareness, daily habits, perceived barriers	recycling patterns, peer behaviour, accessibility of facilities
Lecturer questionnaire	HRM frameworks, teaching integration, institutional readiness	recruitment gaps, training needs, cultural expectations
Campus observation	Environmental cues, facility conditions, user behaviour	bin placement, green space usage, visible energy practices
Document review	Policy intentions, formal commitments, HRM structures	strategic statements, program descriptions, missing indicators

2. Emergent Themes

To make sense of the data, responses and observations were coded, compared, and clustered into broader thematic categories. The four themes below appeared across nearly all data sources and represent the core findings of the study. A short narrative accompanies the thematic display to show how these themes surfaced organically from the data.

Across instruments, participants demonstrated awareness of sustainability but also described everyday situations where that awareness did not translate into consistent action. This gap often emerged when facilities were missing, cues were unclear, or habits felt difficult to maintain. At the same time, both lecturers and students pointed to the absence of a coordinated HRM structure that could anchor sustainability into institutional routines.

Interestingly, while students described several informal initiatives—peer-driven recycling, small volunteer efforts—these remained fragmented and often short-lived. Both groups expressed a desire for stronger institutional coherence: clearer direction, better facilities, and recognition systems that align with sustainable values. The table below summarises the thematic structure.

Table 2: Themes and Subthemes Emerging from the Data

Aspect	Indicators	Illustrative Student Statements	Frequency
Environmental awareness	Knowledge of programs, conceptual understanding	"I know we have clean-up days, but I'm not sure about other initiatives."	Medium
Pro-environmental behaviour	Recycling, energy-saving, carrying reusable items	"I bring my own bottle, but there aren't many refill stations."	High
Perceived institutional support	Facilities, communication, incentives	"Bins are there, but people don't always sort their trash correctly."	High
Campus culture	Peer norms, role modelling	"Most of my friends care, but they just follow what others do."	Medium
Student recommendations	Facilities, education, HRM alignment	"We need more reminders and actual rewards for sustainable actions."	High

3. Findings from Student Questionnaires

Students' reflections were grounded in the practical realities of campus life. Many could articulate why sustainability matters, but they also described behaviours shaped by what is feasible—not merely what is ideal. Their responses hinted at an underlying willingness that is not fully supported by the environment around them. This section begins with a short synthesis before presenting the data display.

Students consistently mentioned the lack of clear sorting bins, inconsistent placement of facilities, and limited follow-up after sustainability events. Yet many also noted that when their friends model sustainable behaviour, they tend to follow. Peer influence—sometimes more than institutional messaging—was a critical motivator. However, students also expressed that without visible cues or structural reinforcement, sustainable habits fade quickly.

Table 3: Student Data Display

Aspect	Indicators	Illustrative Lecturer Statements	Recurrence
Understanding of sustainability	Conceptual clarity, perceived urgency	"A sustainable campus should start with consistent policy enforcement."	High
Integration into teaching	Curriculum design, pedagogical approaches	"I try to include environmental topics, but there is no formal guideline."	Medium
HRM-related perceptions	Recruitment criteria, training needs, evaluation	"We have potential, but sustainability is not part of performance appraisal yet."	High
Observations of campus culture	Staff behaviour, visible modeling	"Some staff recycle diligently, others don't seem aware."	Medium
Recommendations	Policy consistency, HRM alignment, infrastructure	"Training for staff should be routine, not optional."	High

4. Findings from Lecturer Questionnaires

Lecturers, compared to students, tended to zoom out and consider sustainability as part of institutional identity. Many believed sustainability should be embedded structurally, not left to enthusiastic individuals. Several explicitly mentioned HRM as a potential lever for cultural change—but noted that it currently played little role. Before the data display, the narrative below captures the tone of lecturers' responses.

Lecturers expressed frustration that recruitment does not consider environmental competencies, training on sustainability is rare, and performance appraisal never mentions sustainability contributions. Despite this, many remained hopeful, believing that the institution could integrate sustainability more deeply if HRM structures were redesigned.

Table 4: Lecturer Data Display

Aspect	Summary of Responses	Illustrative Quotes
Understanding	Strong, value-based view of sustainability	"It should be part of who we are, not an occasional activity."
Teaching integration	Occasional and voluntary	"I include sustainability when relevant, but there's no institutional push."
HRM perceptions	Sustainability absent in HR structures	"There's no training or criteria that encourage us to act sustainably."
Challenges	Lack of structure, unclear expectations, limited resources	"There's interest among staff, but no system to support it."

5. Campus Observation Findings

Observational data helped clarify where sustainability practices were visible and where they were not. Many observations aligned with questionnaire responses, especially regarding the limited and inconsistent environmental cues across campus. Below is a brief narrative before the display.

Green spaces were present but rarely used for sustainability activities; waste sorting infrastructure varied by building; student behaviour also varied between faculties—some used reusable bottles consistently, others relied heavily on disposables. Energy-saving devices were installed in certain buildings but absent in others, giving the impression of partial implementation rather than a campus-wide effort.

Table 5: Observation Display

Category	Observed Patterns	Notes
Waste sorting	available in selected buildings; signage unclear	affects compliance
Green spaces	adequate but underutilised	mostly social spaces
Energy efficiency	sensors and LEDs in some areas	inconsistent across campus
Student behaviour	mixed patterns of recycling and reuse	varies by faculty clusters

6. Document Analysis Findings

Institutional documents contained broad statements about sustainability but lacked the operational depth needed to translate values into practice. This gap became more obvious when compared to lecturers' expectations and students' daily experiences. The short narrative below summarises the document review. Most formal documents framed sustainability as an aspiration or principle rather than a structured programme. HRM documents contained no sustainability criteria, and environmental programs appeared event-based rather than continuous. The strategic plan referenced sustainability but did not specify how HRM or academic units should enact it.

Taken together, the findings suggest that sustainability at UKI is moving forward, but in a way that feels uneven—almost as if three separate currents are running at different speeds. The first current is awareness: students and lecturers generally agree that environmental responsibility matters, yet their understanding and everyday practices still vary widely. This inconsistency becomes more visible when placed alongside the second current, which concerns HRM structures that remain loosely connected to sustainability goals. Recruitment, training, and performance evaluation have not yet evolved into mechanisms that reinforce the behaviours and values respondents say they want to see. The third current—campus infrastructure—adds another layer: physical cues sometimes encourage sustainable behaviour, sometimes undermine it, and sometimes simply leave people guessing. What begins to emerge, when these threads are viewed together, is a picture of a campus where individual motivation exists, but it is not fully supported by the systems or signals that would allow it to grow into a shared culture. Awareness without structural reinforcement becomes inconsistent; infrastructure without HRM alignment becomes symbolic; and HRM policies without behavioural cues remain abstract. The interplay of these elements creates both the challenges and the possibilities for UKI's journey toward a sustainable campus identity. The themes do not stand alone—they pull on one another, sometimes subtly, sometimes directly—forming a pattern that sets the stage for interpreting what these dynamics mean and how UKI might strengthen its sustainability culture going forward.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that sustainability at Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI) is evolving, but not yet in a way that feels cohesive. The three major themes—uneven awareness, the absence of Green HRM structures, and infrastructural inconsistency—form a pattern that aligns closely with what recent research has described as the "fragmented stage" of campus sustainability transitions. Universities in this stage often have motivation, isolated initiatives, and partial infrastructure, but lack the connective tissue that turns scattered activity into a cultural norm [37]. UKI appears to be positioned precisely at this threshold.

A recurring observation in the findings is that awareness among students and lecturers is present, sometimes even enthusiastic, yet rarely crystallises into stable daily habits. This tension mirrors what several behavioural scholars have noted: people often know what the sustainable choice is, but the decision hinges on how easy, visible, and socially reinforced that choice feels in their immediate surroundings [38]. In UKI's case, inconsistent waste sorting stations, uneven access to refill points, and minimal signage seem to weaken behavioural cues that might otherwise strengthen sustainable habits. As reported in earlier studies, campuses where physical cues are coherent tend to show stronger behavioural uptake—not because individuals suddenly become more eco-conscious, but because the environment "nudges" them into acting sustainably without needing constant reflection [39].

The second major theme—HRM structures that are not yet aligned with sustainability—creates another tension. Lecturers described sustainability as something they value personally, but not something the institution formally reinforces. This gap is critical. Contemporary Green HRM research argues that recruitment, training, and performance evaluation are not merely administrative functions; they are cultural engines that gradually stabilise the behaviours an organisation wants to see [40]. When these engines are absent or neutral, sustainability tends to remain a side project—dependent on individual idealism, rather than embedded expectations. Several universities that successfully developed sustainable cultures did so not by launching large environmental programs, but by subtly shifting HRM practices: recruiting staff with sustainability competencies, tying training to campus needs, and recognising employees who model environmental stewardship [41]. Without such mechanisms, even motivated lecturers at UKI may find it hard to prioritise sustainability amid competing academic demands.

The third theme—mixed infrastructural signals—introduces yet another complicating factor. Observations showed both promising elements (LED lighting, pockets of green space) and outdated systems (older buildings with inefficient lighting, poorly used sorting bins). Research increasingly shows that infrastructure does more than support behaviour;

it communicates institutional seriousness. When facilities are inconsistent, individuals draw the conclusion—consciously or not—that sustainability is optional, negotiable, or peripheral [42]. In contrast, campuses with strong sustainability cultures often feature highly intentional physical design: refill stations at every building, visible signage, and social spaces that encourage environmentally responsible routines. These cues operate quietly but powerfully.

What becomes especially interesting is how these three themes interact. Awareness without infrastructural support becomes episodic. Infrastructure without HR reinforcement becomes symbolic. HR mechanisms without clear behavioural cues become abstract. In the literature, this triangulation is sometimes described as the "cultural circuit" of sustainability—values, systems, and physical environments must reinforce each other for cultural coherence to emerge [43]. UKI shows early signs in each area, but they are not yet synchronized. This misalignment explains why respondents express interest in sustainability while simultaneously describing behaviours and routines that do not yet reflect it.

Yet the situation is far from discouraging. Studies in Southeast Asia highlight that universities at this developmental stage often experience rapid progress once alignment begins, particularly when HRM becomes a central driver rather than a peripheral actor [44]. Small but strategic HRM interventions—mandatory sustainability training, appraisal indicators, recognition for green initiatives—have been shown to significantly accelerate behavioural adoption among staff and, indirectly, among students [45]. Moreover, embedding sustainability in HRM tends to create ripple effects: when staff model sustainable practices, students perceive them as norms, not optional add-ons.

Finally, the interplay of culture and leadership deserves emphasis. Literature increasingly suggests that sustainable campus culture grows not from isolated programs, but from repeated, everyday reinforcement—what some researchers call "the accumulation of small signals" [46]. UKI currently has several promising signals, but they need coherence. Aligning HRM practices with visible infrastructural improvements, while continuing to build awareness through communication and modelling, could create the momentum needed to transform sustainability from a set of initiatives into an identity.

In essence, the findings point toward a university that is ready to move from scattered effort to structured strategy. The ingredients are already present—motivation, early initiatives, partial infrastructure—but they require a more coordinated system to become a durable sustainability culture. The literature reinforces this interpretation: sustainable universities are rarely those with the most facilities or the grandest policies, but those where systems, people, and environments gradually learn to move in the same direction.

Conclusion

This study set out to understand how Green Human Resource Management (Green HRM) and everyday campus practices might support—or hinder—the development of a sustainability culture at Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI). What emerged from the findings is a picture that feels familiar to many universities: motivation is already present among students and lecturers, but the systems that should reinforce it are still catching up. Awareness alone is not the issue; rather, it is the lack of structural reinforcement and consistent behavioural cues that prevents sustainability from becoming a shared norm.

Three patterns stood out. First, students and lecturers recognise the importance of environmental responsibility, yet their actions fluctuate depending on how easy and intuitive those behaviours feel. Second, HRM mechanisms—recruitment, training, performance evaluation—have not yet been shaped to support sustainability, leaving environmentally minded individuals without an institutional framework to lean on. And third, the campus environment sends mixed signals; some spaces invite sustainable behaviour, while others unintentionally undermine it.

When viewed together, these patterns show that UKI is not starting from zero. It is already in motion, just not yet in sync. A sustainability culture grows when values, daily practices, and institutional structures begin to reinforce one another. UKI currently has pieces of this puzzle in place, but they require alignment. Strengthening HRM practices, improving infrastructure consistency, and nurturing behavioural cues could create the momentum needed to transform sustainability from individual preference into institutional character.

In many ways, this is an encouraging finding. Cultural change rarely happens through dramatic leaps; it grows through repeated signals, practical support, and steady reinforcement. UKI already has the interest, the people, and the early initiatives. With clearer HRM integration and more coherent campus design, these scattered efforts could mature into a sustainability culture that feels lived rather than declared.

References

1. Filho WL, Salvia AL, Pretorius RW, *et al*. Universities as living labs for sustainable development: supporting the implementation of the SDGs. J Clean Prod,2019:237:117–135.
2. Leal Filho W, Shiel C, Paço A, *et al*. Assessing sustainability in higher education: results from a national survey in the UK. J Clean Prod,2021:315:128–148.
3. Findler F, Schönherr N, Lozano R, Reider D. The impacts of higher education institutions on sustainable development. Int J Sustain High Educ,2020:21(3):477–493.
4. Zhao H, Zhang X, Li L. University students' pro-environmental behaviours: insights from a longitudinal study in China. Sustainability,2021:13(10):5476.
5. Choi H, Jang J, Kandampully J. Application of the motivation–opportunity–ability framework for university students' sustainable behaviours. J Sustain Tour,2022:30(1):45–63.
6. Pérez-López R, Lorente-Leyva L, Rivera-Fernández C. Intention–behaviour gap in sustainability practices among students. Sustain Dev,2020:28(4):937–945.
7. Ren S, Tang G, Jackson SE. Green human resource management research: an integrative review. Hum Resour Manag Rev,2020:30(3):100742.
8. Siregar E, Luddin MR, Suyatno T. The effect of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior toward service quality at

Universitas Kristen Indonesia. International Journal of Human Capital Management,2019:3(1):58-73.
9. Yusoff Y, Nejati M, Kee DMH. Green HRM and environmental performance: a systematic review. J Environ Manage,2020:260:110–126.
10. Simbolon BR, Sinaga D. The Analysis of Students Learning Satisfaction based on the Environment Management System at Postgraduate Program Universitas Kristen Indonesia. Degres,2021:20(2):21-30.
11. Guerci M, Longoni A, Luzzini D. Translating stakeholder pressures into environmental performance. Int J Oper Prod Manag,2020:40(12):1809–1836.
12. Muster V, Schröder P. Green work-life balance and cultural foundations. Work Employ Soc,2021:35(4):796–814.
13. Zhou X, Yang L, Li Y. Green HRM in higher education institutions: evidence from Chinese universities. Sustainability,2021:13(14):7972.
14. Ahmed S, Guo X. Leadership and sustainability commitment in universities. Int J Educ Manag,2022:36(3):267–281.
15. Mendy J, Rahman M. Sustainable leadership and organisational culture in higher education. J Manag Dev,2020:39(3):367–382.
16. Siregar R, Wijaya H. Environmental awareness and green campus practices in Indonesian universities. Int J Educ Sustain,2021:12(2):211–226.
17. Suwartha N, Sari RF. Evaluating UI GreenMetric as a tool for campus sustainability. Environ Dev Sustain,2022:24:1123–1145.
18. Liu S, Lin Y, Ma L. University students' environmental awareness and behaviour patterns in East Asia. Sustainability,2020:12(22):9531.
19. García-González E, Jiménez-Fontana R. Everyday sustainability practices in university settings. Int J Sustain High Educ,2021:22(6):1354–1372.
20. Lo K, Cheng R. Campus infrastructure and student pro-environmental behaviour. J Clean Prod,2022:338:130530.
21. Xu L, Li J. Social norms and sustainability participation among university students. J Environ Psychol,2023:86:101957.
22. Zoller A, Carlsson M. Integrating sustainability in higher education teaching-learning processes. Higher Educ Res Dev,2021:40(5):908–922.
23. Livi S, Busetta G. Student organisations and environmental engagement: evidence from European universities. Environ Educ Res,2022:28(4):613–630.
24. Allo YR, Siregar E, Panggabean L. Risk management of using online loan start-ups in Javanese Christian church Congregations Bekasi West Region. International Journal of Commerce and Management Research,2024:10(6):1-6.
25. Krisprimandoyo DA, Jayusman H, Arpianto Y, Sulistyo AB, Simbolon B. Integrating Environmental Principles in Sustainable Corporate Management Strategies.
26. Jang S, Park S. Green recruitment signals and organisational sustainability culture. J Bus Ethics,2022:180(3):897–912.
27. Al-Haddad R, Kotry P. Experiential environmental training and behaviour outcomes. J Clean Prod,2023:389:136146.
28. Mehta K, Awasthi A. Linking sustainability performance with HR appraisal systems. Human Resource Dev Int,2020:23(4):327–347.
29. Ocampo L, Tan Y. Recognition-based incentives and staff engagement in sustainability initiatives. Sustainability,2021:13(3):1495.
30. Suganthi L. Green HRM and pro-environmental behaviour in universities: an emerging framework. Higher Educ,2022:84:917–939.
31. Sabir S, Hussin N. HRM drivers of sustainability among academic staff in Malaysian HEIs. Int J Sustain High Educ,2023:24(5):1121–1140.
32. Bashir S, Hassan A. Cultural mechanisms behind sustainable university transformation. Sustainability,2020:12(9):3665.
33. Daub C, Dobers P. Organisational routines and sustainability culture in higher education. J Clean Prod,2022:349:131504.
34. Wu Y, Shen J. Leadership commitment and sustainability adoption in higher education. Int J Educ Manag,2023:37(2):231–246.
35. Petruzzelli A, Murgia G. HR structures supporting sustainability transitions in universities. J Clean Prod,2021:310:127528.
36. Fitriani N, Rahmawati T. Culturally embedded sustainability practices in Southeast Asian universities. Asia Pac Educ Rev,2022:23(3):527–540.
37. Sonetti G, Brown M, Naboni E. About the triggering of sustainable campus cultures: A systematic review. Int J Sustain High Educ,2020:21(5):873–890.
38. Hahnel UJ, Brosch T. Environmental behaviour and situational cues: A behavioural science perspective. Curr Opin Psychol,2021:42:135–140.
39. Geiger SM, Steg L. The role of physical context in shaping sustainable behaviour on university campuses. J Environ Psychol,2022:80:101743.
40. Ren S, Tang G, Jackson SE. Green HRM and climate for sustainability: Conceptualisation and evidence. Hum Resour Manage,2021:60(1):9–28.
41. Pinzone M, Lettieri E, Guerci M. Embedding sustainability in HRM systems: Insights from European universities. J Clean Prod,2022:367:132976.
42. Wang J, Ng ST, Xu S. Physical design cues and sustainability participation in higher education. Build Environ,2023:228:109857.
43. Verhulst E, Lambrechts W. From values to practices: The cultural circuit of sustainability in universities. Sustain Dev,2021:29(4):649–662.
44. Nguyen TP, Hoang H. Drivers of sustainability engagement in Southeast Asian universities. Asia Pac Educ Rev,2023;24:327–341.
45. Kim S, Park E. Green HRM as a catalyst for campus-wide sustainability engagement. Sustainability,2022:14(18):11703.
46. Leal Filho W, Will M, Salvia AL. Everyday signals and sustainability culture in global universities. Int J Sustain High Educ,2023:24(6):1121–1139.