

To: "M. Mujiya Ulkhaq" ulkhaq@live.undip.ac.id
From: "Environment, Development and Sustainability (ENVI)" aishwarya.ramasamy@springer.com
Subject: Major Revisions requested ENVI-D-21-03162

Dear Mr. Ulkhaq,

We have received the reports from our advisors on your manuscript, "Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability: A Comparison among three Universities in Sweden", which you submitted to Environment, Development and Sustainability.

Based on the advice received, I feel that your manuscript could be reconsidered for publication should you be prepared to incorporate major revisions.

When preparing your revised manuscript, you are asked to carefully consider the reviewer comments which are attached, and submit a list of responses to the comments. You are also requested to highlight the changes made on the revised manuscript.

YOU ARE KINDLY REQUESTED TO ALSO CHECK THE WEBSITE FOR POSSIBLE REVIEWER ATTACHMENTS.

Please note: When uploading your revised files, please make sure only to submit your editable source files (i. E. Word, tex).

In order to submit your revised manuscript, please access the Editorial Manager Website.

Your username is: *****

If you forgot your password, you can click the 'Send Login Details' link on the EM Login page at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/envi/>

With kind regards,
Luc Hens
Editor in Chief
Environment, Development and Sustainability

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer #1: This manuscript has concluded that there is a significant difference in student's attitude at those three universities in general; however, the authors have not provided any suggestions on improving Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability at each university, namely CU, JU, and GU.

Based on the results of the questionnaire and discussion in this manuscript, please add suggestions in conclusion for each university (CU, JU, and GU) on improving Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability.

Reviewer #2:

This research aimed to compare and analyze students' attitudes towards campus sustainability in connection with the impact of the university, but there is no scientific content to add to the readers of this journal.

This study is only a report.

Reviewer #3: Thank you for this opportunity to read and review this interesting and timely manuscript, " Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability: A Comparison among three Universities in Sweden".

Abstract:

An abstract should include the following sections: background/motivation, aim, methodology, principal findings and conclusion/significance.

You did not provide the study's methodology.

Introduction & Theoretical Framework

Both the introduction and literature review are full of other researchers' work. I suggest authors modify the introduction and literature review by adding the current situation of Campus Sustainability, Hypothesis and research questions will help readers to follow more and give more interest in reading the manuscripts,

Instruments and Measurements

This paragraph it doesn't look suitable for the this section, "The objective of this research is to compare and analyse the attitude of student towards campus sustainability in relation to the influence of the university. A case study was conducted to assess and compare three universities in Sweden, namely, CU, JU, and GU. The rationale behind choosing these three universities is due to the EMS certification status. The certification requires systematically improvement and organization of activities related to sustainability. It tends that certified universities are constantly improving their operations with a view to reduce any negative environmental impact and support the positive effects for SD through research, education, and cooperation with the surrounding society. Two well-known international EMS certifications are ISO 14001 and eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS)".

This section "Instruments and Measurements" needs extensive revision for meaningful understanding, please add information in a sequence, making it easier for the reader to understand.

I would suggest re-writing this part with different sub-headings and making reader orientation easier, such:

3-1 Procedure, How did you collect the data...

3-2 Participants

3-3 Measurement tools

3-4 Statistical analysis strategy is missing; how will you analyze the results? Tell your readers in detail and add a few examples of your process (coding).

You can also add how this data was collected, and when this data was collected, how much time take to complete the questionnaire.

Does informed consent was taking?

The Ethics Committee of the local university approved the study?

Details of the questionnaire can be attached in the appendix.

Results

What was your research design? How did you recruit the samples? Which sampling did you use and why? Add more details (The methodology part is missing).

Discussion and Conclusion

I would suggest adding the originality, limitation and contribution of this manuscript. It may interest readers to know more about the theoretical and practical implications and why this paper should be published and read by researchers.

good luck.

—

Please note that this journal is a Transformative Journal (TJ). Authors may publish their research with us through the traditional subscription access route or make their paper immediately open access through payment of an article-processing charge (APC). Authors will not be required to make a final decision about access to their article until it has been accepted.

Authors may need to take specific actions to achieve compliance with funder and institutional open access mandates. If your research is supported by a funder that requires immediate open access (e.g. according to Plan S principles) then you should select the gold OA route, and we will direct you to the compliant route where possible. For authors selecting the subscription publication route our standard licensing terms will need to be accepted, including our self-archiving policies. Those standard licensing terms will supersede any other terms that the author or any third party may assert apply to any version of the manuscript.

[Find out more about compliance](#)

This letter contains confidential information, is for your own use, and should not be forwarded to third parties.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at <https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy>. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/envi/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Author's Response To Reviewer Comments

Close

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for dedicating their time to read and comment on our manuscript. Three anonymous reviewers gave us comments and observations which we believe these have substantially helped to improve the paper. In this revised version of the manuscript, we hope to fully address the comments.

#Reviewer 1

This manuscript has concluded that there is a significant difference in student's attitude at those three universities in general; however, the authors have not provided any suggestions on improving Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability at each university, namely CU, JU, and GU.

Based on the results of the questionnaire and discussion in this manuscript, please add suggestions in conclusion for each university (CU, JU, and GU) on improving Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability.

=====

Thank you for this comment. We incorporate the suggestions in Section 5. Discussion, when talking about the results and findings of this study. We differentiate for each dimension of campus sustainability to give a clear and more specific discussion. Moreover, we only stress in which the students (in these three universities) have different attitudes. In addition, in the last subsection of Section 5, we provide a general overview.

=====

5. Discussion

...

5.1.2. Environmental management system indicators in which students have different attitudes

There are five indicators in the environmental management system dimension in which students in these three universities have different attitudes. The first indicator to be discussed is Q1.i (to leave the computer on standby mode when it is no longer used). As energy costs increase and adverse effects of energy production become more apparent, improving power management on computers, has estimated savings of over a billion dollars per year (Korn et al, 2004). Using system standby mode is considered as the most effective power saving features, where the system is saved to main memory and memory is kept in a low power mode while the system is asleep (Talebi and Way, 2009). It is then recommended to inform the students to leave the computer on standby mode; or to set the computer so that when users leave it inactively for more than let say 10 minutes, the computer will be logged off automatically.

The second indicator is Q1.vi (to avoid printing when it is not necessary). Printing has several environmental impacts, such as the use of non-renewable resources, use of toxic or harmful substances, and producing toxic waste (Viluksela, 2008). Due to these harms, it is suggested to these three universities for having explicit information to influence their students to avoid printing when it is not necessary. The universities could, perhaps, provide digital materials as learning materials, or set a more expensive cost of printing a paper inside the university.

The third and fourth indicators are Q1.v (to dispose waste in trash bin) and Q2.i (providing separate trash bins to sort the waste). In these three universities, efforts have been done regarding these initiatives, such as asking the students to dispose of the waste via printed notification posted in several visible spots and providing separate trash bins to sort waste. If one only looks at those two initiatives solely, s/he might think that the attitudes of students are similar since the universities have similar efforts. However, the result shows that the attitudes differ; JU are the lowest while GU are the highest. The reason might come from how to handle the waste. CU and GU are certified under ISO 14001 (JU is not); this standard demand the universities to have a good waste management plan. Therefore, it is recommended—especially for JU—to improve the waste management plan and to do more endeavor in engaging the students to actively participate in these initiatives.

The fifth indicator is Q2.vi (providing free or accessible public transportation). Green transportation can be promoted by providing free or access to public transportation and discouraging vehicles commuting to the university so that it can reduce emission and congestion. Evidently, all universities do not provide free transportation but accessible public transportation, meaning that students can reach the universities by bus, tram, or ferry. Public transportation in the city which lies CU and GU is apparently much better than in city of JU, ranging from the availability of transportation's alternatives, frequency of the transportation's modes, to the spots' accessibilities. In addition, finding car parking for students at JU is much easier than at CU and GU. Those might be the reason why the attitudes of students at JU are not as high as the attitudes of students at CU and GU. It confirms the study by Emanuel and Adams (2011) that the community or surrounding condition affects the perceptions of students towards sustainability. Therefore, it is recommended for JU to cooperate with city municipality to provide not only students, but also the residents more accessible and convenient public transportation.

...

5.2.2. Public participation and social responsibility indicators in which students have different attitudes

There are only two indicators in the public participation and social responsibility dimension in which students in these three universities have different attitudes. The first indicator is Q3.i (the university showed any involvement/partnership/cooperation with government agencies, private sectors, and/or NGOs in supporting sustainability). Regarding this indicator, CU and GU have been joining together for more than two decades to form a centre for SD and environmental research. They also collaborated with some NGOs that work towards SD. JU also has a partnership with NGOs and city municipality towards sustainability issues. However, students at three universities

differ in their attitudes irrespective to the universities' involvement with third parties to promote sustainability. The attitudes of students at CU and GU as well as their awareness are high compared to JU. This means that JU has to work harder to increase the awareness of the students so that they can be well informed about these initiatives. The second indicator is Q3.v (the university showed any involvement/partnership/ cooperation with student's association or community to promote sustainability). Students' association is involved to improve universities' sustainability efforts by being part of campus development and working for integrating sustainability into all education programs. Apparently, there are students' associations at these three universities working to promote sustainability. However, irrespective to these efforts, result shows that the attitudes differ. Students at GU have high attitudes, whereas students at JU and CU have moderate to high attitudes. According to Table 2, more than 90% of students at GU are aware of this initiative; while 87.3% of CU's students and only 57.8% JU's, answered that they know about this initiative. The high awareness and the highly engaged students' associations with GU's students could be the reason why students at GU have high attitudes. On the other hand, since the majority of JU's students are not aware about this initiative; thus, JU should take necessary steps that would inform their students about this and even encourage them to be actively involved in. Such an anomaly happened in CU: the awareness is high, but the attitude is moderate. Obviously, most students at CU know about students' association, but they do not really have any interest in joining the event since the participation rate was very poor. This condition is similar to the study of Abubakar et al. (2016) who reported that students at University of Dammam have high awareness and concern about campus sustainability, but they were reluctant to take part and participate in some initiatives to support sustainability.

...

5.3.2. Sustainability teaching and research indicators in which students have different attitudes

There are three indicators in the sustainability teaching and research dimension in which students in these three universities have different attitudes. The first and second indicators having different attitude are Q4.i (the university has workshops, seminars, meetings, and/or conferences on sustainability) and Q4.v (the university has events promoting sustainability). It is no question that all universities have such events, proving that they are supporting sustainability. However, the result shows that student's attitude differs. Looking at the awareness, it seems that students at GU are very aware of this initiative, making the students have the highest attitudes. For Q4.i initiative, about 24.5% of students at JU answered they have not heard that their university has this initiative. For Q4.v initiative, only 62.75% of students at JU are aware of this, making them score the lowest among all. Therefore, we come to an understanding that this difference is not because the universities have nothing to do regarding this initiative; instead, it is due to students' lack of awareness towards the initiative. Therefore, JU is recommended to do more endeavor in engaging the students (e.g., by better promotion, socialization, and campaign) to actively participate in this initiative.

The third indicator is Q4.iii (the university has courses or classes related to sustainability). It is expected that giving such course would produce graduates with the knowledge and commitment required to drive sustainability issues (Zeegers and Clark, 2014). Three universities do have classes related to sustainability. However, the result shows that the attitudes differ. At CU, the students have to take at least one course about SD to ensure that they have sufficient knowledge about sustainability. Moreover, it is expected that in the future all courses must be related to sustainability. GU, even though does not have similar policy, they have labelled the courses related to sustainability with "sustainability focused" to make students who have concerns about sustainability easier to pick courses. Contrarily, JU seems not to force the students to take any course related to sustainability, and in fact, it does not explicitly state that the particular course supports sustainability issues. It could be the reason why students at CU have the highest attitudes while students at JU have the lowest one.

5.4. Student's attitude in general

Analysis and discussion have been provided to find the reasons why the attitudes might be similar or different for each indicator of campus sustainability. Initiatives Q2.ii, Q2.iii, Q2.iv, Q4.ii, and Q4.iv are provided well by the universities since the students have high awareness. On the other hand, although the universities have initiatives Q3.iii and Q3.iv, the awareness of the students are low; therefore, it is recommended that the universities making the students well-informed towards those initiatives. Three indicators (Q1.ii, Q1.iii, and Q1.iv) result in similar attitudes even though the universities do not provide any information regarding those. Technological advancement and cultural situation make indicators Q1.ii and Q1.iii are no longer relevant to be applied. However, it is still recommended to have indicator Q1.iv due to its importance to preserve the environment. Lastly, since two indicators (Q.v and Q3.ii) become the national issues, they will obviously influence not only the attitudes of students at those three universities but also students in Sweden widely.

On the other hand, there are ten indicators resulting in different attitudes. Some indicators are different not because the universities do not have the initiatives, yet due to the difference in student's awareness. Three universities have different efforts regarding to indicators Q3.i, Q3.v, and Q4.iii. CU and GU have been joining together to form the centre for SD and environmental research. The existence of this centre could increase the attitudes of students there. In regard to indicator Q3.v, students at CU have the lowest attitudes among all. CU could adopt the policy from GU or JU to increase the attitudes of the students. Contrarily, students at CU are considered as having the best policy in initiative Q4.iii, resulting in the highest attitudes among all; whereas JU has the weakest policy that results in the lowest attitudes. The community or surrounding condition could somehow affect the attitudes of the students as has been shown in indicator Q2.vi.

Overall, the result shows that there is a difference in student's attitude at those three universities, whereas GU ranks the first position due to having the highest attitude and JU ranks the bottom. By looking at the position only, one might mislead to jump to a conclusion that the difference is due to the EMS certification status since it is coincidence with the fact that GU has two certifications, CU has one, while JU has none. However, it is too early to say so since it has been clearly discussed that there are various factors affecting the difference.

=====

#Reviewer 2

This research aimed to compare and analyze students' attitudes towards campus sustainability in connection with the

impact of the university, but there is no scientific content to add to the readers of this journal.

This study is only a report.

=====

Thank you for this comment. Actually, there are several studies which investigated student's attitude towards campus sustainability. We provide a brief literature review in Section 2.3.

To make it clear, we add the contributions of this study in the introduction section.

=====

1. Introduction

...

This study contributes to the literature as follows:

There are several studies investigating student's attitude towards campus sustainability, see Subsection 2.3 for a brief literature review. However, studies on the influence of university to students' attitudes are still in the initial phase—moreover, they produced inconsistent results. The study from Dagiliūtė et al. (2018) reported that there was no significant difference when they compared student's attitude at two universities (one represents as the green university, while the other does not). Contrarily, it is expected that sustainable universities will contribute more to the sustainability since in fact, committed universities (e.g., which have signed declarations or initiatives about SD) tend to involve more in the implementation of SD compared to uncommitted universities (Lozano et al., 2015). This claim was confirmed by Ulkhaq et al. (2019a) who stated that students from greener university have higher attitudes than students from less green university. As further research is necessary to explain more about these conflicting findings, this study then aims to compare the attitude of students in relation to the campus sustainability at three universities in Sweden which have different environmental management system (EMS) status: GU with two EMS certifications, CU with one certification, and JU with none. This difference in EMS certification status is expected to result in a different finding towards student's attitude among those three universities.

We argue that the difference of students' attitudes at these three universities is not because of the difference in EMS certification. Notice that the result of this study reveals that GU which has two EMS certifications performs relatively the best among others, while JU which has none performs relatively the worst. By looking at the statistics only, one might mislead to jump to a conclusion that the difference is due to the EMS certification status. We then provide a detailed discussion towards these findings to explore the reasons why the student's attitude at each university might be similar or different for each indicator of campus sustainability.

...

=====

#Reviewer 3

Thank you for this opportunity to read and review this interesting and timely manuscript, "Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability: A Comparison among three Universities in Sweden".

Abstract:

An abstract should include the following sections: background/motivation, aim, methodology, principal findings and conclusion/significance.

You did not provide the study's methodology.

=====

Thank you for this comment. We add the methodology in the Abstract.

=====

Abstract

The role of higher education institutions (HEIs) in promoting and supporting sustainability has outstretched over the past decades as a result of various declarations and commitments related to the need for sustainability in HEI. As a consequence, HEIs tried to achieve campus sustainability by integrating sustainability concept into their projects, partnerships, assessments, programs, curricula, and research. Accordingly, achieving campus sustainability is not feasible without the involvement of students as the biggest stakeholders of HEI. The students have a substantial impact on sustainability by contributing to and supporting campus sustainability. This research aims to compare and analyse the attitudes of students towards campus sustainability in relation to the influence of the university. The research is conducted at three universities in Sweden which have different environmental management system certification status. A questionnaire-based survey is employed to collect the data from students at these three universities. It aims to investigate the university's efforts to support sustainability and students' awareness towards those efforts; also, to measure students' attitudes towards campus sustainability. The (one way) analysis of variance is then used to investigate whether there is any difference (statistically) among the means of students' attitudes at these three universities. The result shows that there is a statistically significant difference in these universities. Analysis and discussion are also provided to identify the reasons behind the result.

=====

Introduction & Theoretical Framework

Both the introduction and literature review are full of other researchers' work. I suggest authors modify the introduction and literature review by adding the current situation of Campus Sustainability, Hypothesis and research questions will help readers to follow more and give more interest in reading the manuscripts,

=====

Thank you for this comment. We have provided the framework and dimensions of campus sustainability that we used in this research in Section 2.2. However, due to confidentiality and sensitivity issues, we cannot provide a more

detailed information regarding the current situation of campus sustainability in these three universities under investigation. We can only reveal that these three universities have different EMS certification status. GU was environmentally certified according to ISO 14001 and registered under EMAS; CU has been certified according to ISO 14001; and JU has none.

Regarding the research question, we integrate this into the introduction section as follows. Research hypothesis is included in Section 3.3. Statistical analysis (will be described later on).

=====

1. Introduction

...

The objective of this research is therefore to compare the attitude of student in relation to the university's influence towards campus sustainability. A case study is conducted to assess and compare three universities in Sweden, namely, CU, GU, and JU. The rationale behind choosing these three universities is due to the environmental management system (EMS) certification status. GU was environmentally certified according to ISO 14001 and registered under eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS); CU has been certified according to ISO 14001; and JU has none. This difference in the EMS certification status is expected to result in the different finding towards students' attitudes among these three universities. The research question is then formulated as "Is there any difference in students' attitudes at universities that have different EMS certification statuses?"

...

=====

Instruments and Measurements

This paragraph it doesn't look suitable for the this section, "The objective of this research is to compare and analyse the attitude of student towards campus sustainability in relation to the influence of the university. A case study was conducted to assess and compare three universities in Sweden, namely, CU, JU, and GU. The rationale behind choosing these three universities is due to the EMS certification status. The certification requires systematically improvement and organization of activities related to sustainability. It tends that certified universities are constantly improving their operations with a view to reduce any negative environmental impact and support the positive effects for SD through research, education, and cooperation with the surrounding society. Two well-known international EMS certifications are ISO 14001 and eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS)".

This section "Instruments and Measurements" needs extensive revision for meaningful understanding, please add information in a sequence, making it easier for the reader to understand.

I would suggest re-writing this part with different sub-headings and making reader orientation easier, such:

3-1 Procedure, How did you collect the data...

3-2 Participants

3-3 Measurement tools

3-4 Statistical analysis strategy is missing; how will you analyze the results? Tell your readers in detail and add a few examples of your process (coding).

You can also add how this data was collected, and when this data was collected, how much time take to complete the questionnaire.

Does informed consent was taking?

The Ethics Committee of the local university approved the study?

Details of the questionnaire can be attached in the appendix.

=====

Thank you for this comment. We have included your suggestions in the manuscript. First, we change the heading from Instruments and Measurements to Research Design. Second, we compile your suggestion of adding 3-1 and 3-2 be 3.1. Data Collection. Third, as your suggestion, we name the questionnaire development part as 3.2. Measurement. Lastly, the statistical part of this study is added under the heading 3.3. Statistical Analysis.

=====

3. Research Design

The objective of this research is to compare and analyse the attitude of students towards campus sustainability in relation to the influence of the university. A case study is conducted to assess and compare three universities in Sweden, namely, CU, GU, and JU. These three universities have different EMS certification status. The certification requires systematically improvement and organization of activities related to sustainability. It tends that certified universities are constantly improving their operations with a view to reduce any negative environmental impact and support the positive effects for SD through research, education, and cooperation with the surrounding society. Two well-known international EMS certifications are ISO 14001 and EMAS.

ISO 14001 standard is the main international reference developed by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) which is intended for an organization aiming to implement EMS and obtain an environmental certification process. On the other hand, EMAS that was developed by the European Commission in 1993, enables an organization to assess, manage, and continuously improve its environmental performance. It is similar to ISO 14001 in its components and requirements. Nevertheless, unlike ISO 14001, EMAS is more rigorous in instructing the organization to reduce environmental impacts (Sulzer, 1999).

GU was environmentally certified according to ISO 14001 and registered under EMAS. CU has been certified according to ISO 14001, but this university has no EMAS certification. On the other hand, JU has none. This difference in EMS certification status is expected to result in a different finding towards students' attitudes among these three universities.

3.1. Data collection

A questionnaire-based survey is employed to collect the data. The requirement to participate in this survey is only

the fact that s/he is a student of these three universities. The potential respondents are first approached and asked if they agreed to participate in the survey. There are two types of data collection in this research. The first is a fieldwork survey using off-line (printed version) questionnaire, where the researchers collect the data by approaching the potential respondents and asking them to fulfil the questionnaire. To raise the response rate, we provide a trivial present for the respondents who have completed the survey. The second is a web-based survey using an online questionnaire. It is a low-cost technique and the respondents who are not reachable can be reached conveniently. The online questionnaire is currently gaining popularity since it is fast, cheap, and effortless. The duration for data collection is about two months.

3.2. Measurement

In this study, student's attitude towards campus sustainability refers to the degree to which a student has a favourable or unfavourable evaluation towards campus sustainability. The attitude is directly proportional to the salient belief and subjective evaluation. Since the attitude is the antecedent of human behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), it implies that to behave in a sustainable manner, the student must have a good (or high) attitude towards it. Students' attitudes towards campus sustainability are assessed by using the questionnaire. The questionnaire is divided into four main sections. The first section aims to collect demographic data of the respondents (i.e., the students of CU, GU, and JU), such as name, nationality, age, gender, school or faculty. All of those are required to be filled but the name is optional (anonymity is kept). The information that the students have taken any courses related to sustainability (mandatory or voluntary) is also required to identify whether the students are familiar with the sustainability concept or not.

The second section aims to investigate the university's efforts to support sustainability and student's awareness towards those efforts. It comprises of five questions. The first is whether the university informed the students (through leaflet, banner, notification, or announcement) about: to leave the computer on standby mode when it is no longer used (Q1.i), to turn off the lights whenever it is not necessary or when leaving the room (Q1.ii), to close the windows and the door when leaving the room (Q1.iii), to turn off the taps to save water usage (Q1.iv), to dispose waste in trash bin (Q1.v), and to avoid printing when it is not necessary (Q1.vi). Second question is whether the university encouraged student's attitude by providing: separate trash bins to sort the waste (Q2.i), digital materials to avoid printing on paper (Q2.ii), environmentally friendly products (e.g. recycled materials, reused products, organic foods, etc.) (Q2.iii), kitchen room and/or facility to reheat and refrigerate foods (Q2.iv), special care and assistance to the handicap and people with special needs (Q2.v), and free transportation to go to the university (Q2.vi). Third question is whether the university showed any involvement/partnership/cooperation: with government agencies, private sectors, and/or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in supporting sustainability (Q3.i), in promoting gender and racial equality (Q3.ii), with local communities that are working towards sustainability (Q3.iii), with alumni in supporting sustainability (Q3.iv), and with students association or community to promote sustainability (Q3.v). Fourth question is whether the university has: workshops, seminars, meetings, and/or conferences on sustainability (Q4.i), programs (i.e., undergraduate or graduate) related to sustainability (Q4.ii), courses or classes related to sustainability (Q4.iii), research group related to sustainability (Q4.iv), and events promoting sustainability (Q4.v). The fifth question is asking whether the university is easily accessible by public transportation or not (Q5). There are three options to answer those questions, i.e., "yes", "no", and "I have not heard of it". "Yes" answer means that the students are sure that the university does it; "no" answer means that they are sure that the university does not do it; and "I have not heard of it" answer means that they are not sure whether the university does it or does not do it.

The third and fourth sections aim to measure student's attitude towards campus sustainability. Twenty-three indicators generated from three dimensions of campus sustainability framework by Alshuwaihat and Abubakar (2008) were used. As discussed previously, the attitude is directly proportional to the salient belief and subjective evaluation of campus sustainability indicators. The indicators are similar to the second section, but different wording was used in these sections. The belief indicates how important each campus sustainability indicator to the students. It is measured by using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important). A sample question is: "How important is it to you for the university to have partnership/cooperation with students' association to promote sustainability?" (Q3.v). The subjective evaluation indicates students' perspective of perceived consequences for each indicator. It is measured by using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (very unlikely/never) to 5 (very likely/always). A sample question is such: "It is ... that I would involve in workshops, seminars, meetings, and/or conferences on sustainability if the university conducts it" (Q4.i). The detailed of the questionnaire is available upon the request.

3.3. Statistical analysis

The collected data is first tested its (convergent) validity by using the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The rules of thumb given in Hair et al. (2014) are used to validate the convergent validity. First, the standardized factor loadings estimates should be 0.5 or higher; second, the average value explained (AVE) should be 0.5 or greater. Next, to check the internal reliability, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) is calculated. In practice, the coefficient of at least 0.70 has been suggested to indicate adequate reliability (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). To test the research question, i.e., whether there is any difference in the attitudes of students at CU, GU, and JU, the null and alternative hypotheses are formulated as follows

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$$

$$H_1 : \text{at least two group means are not equal,}$$

where μ_j is the mean of group j ($j = 1, 2, 3$)—group means the university. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to test this hypothesis (see the statistical textbooks for more detailed discussion).

Suppose that after performing the ANOVA, the null hypothesis is rejected; hence, there is difference between the groups but groups(s) which is(are) different is(are) not specified. The ANOVA is an omnibus test statistic; it means that it only tells that the groups are equal or at least two groups are not equal. To determine which specific groups differed from each other, a post hoc analysis has to be conducted. In this sense, we wish to compare only pairs of means, to be precise, μ_1 vs μ_2 , μ_1 vs μ_3 , and μ_2 vs μ_3 :

$$H_0 : \mu_i = \mu_j \text{ (} i = 1, 2, 3; j = 1, 2, 3, i \neq j \text{)}$$

$$H_1 : \mu_i \neq \mu_j, \text{ for all } i \neq j.$$

In this research, the Gomes-Howell test is used since this test is designed for unequal variances and unequal sample sizes.

=====

Results

What was your research design? How did you recruit the samples? Which sampling did you use and why? Add more details (The methodology part is missing).

=====

We have included this methodology part in Section 3. Research Design as we answer your previous suggestion.

=====

=====

Discussion and Conclusion

I would suggest adding the originality, limitation and contribution of this manuscript. It may interest readers to know more about the theoretical and practical implications and why this paper should be published and read by researchers.

=====

Thank you for this suggestion. We add the contributions in the Section 1. Introduction together with the response to Reviewer #2. The limitations of the study are included in Section 6. Conclusion. The practical implications as suggestions for the universities have been included in Section 5. Discussion, as has been suggested by Reviewer #1.

=====

6. Conclusion

...

The limitations of this study are as follows. This study is conducted at universities in Sweden. Since Sweden is regarded as one of the most sustainable countries, it somehow shapes the attitudes of people there, with no exception for the students. Although three universities being investigated have different EMS certification statuses and the students' attitudes are different, the discrepancies are not much substantial. Therefore, it is of interest to study the attitudes of students at non-sustainable university located in less sustainable country. Comparing the result with this research is a fascinating area to be pursued. Second, as has been mentioned in the discussion section, the universities do have similar initiatives regarding campus sustainability, but the attitudes of students vary. We explore the reason behind this difference by looking at student's awareness. However, it is of interest to complement the analysis by not only investigating universities' efforts or student's awareness, but also any other factors constitute to this issue, for example, the economic, social, and cultural status of the students, as well as the demographic information of the students.

Close

To: "M. Mujiya Ulkhaq" ulkhaq@live.undip.ac.id
From: "Environment, Development and Sustainability (ENVI)" suganthi.duraisingam@springernature.com
Subject: Your Submission ENVI-D-21-03162R1

Dear Mr. Ulkhaq,

Your resubmitted manuscript entitled "Students' Attitudes towards Campus Sustainability: A Comparison among three Universities in Sweden" has been accepted for publication in Environment, Development and Sustainability.

You will be contacted by Author Services in due course with a link to complete the grant of rights. Please note that you will receive your proofs after the publishing agreement has been received through our system.

Following return of your proofs, your manuscript will be published online (after which no changes can be made) and placed in a print issue of the journal at a later date. We cannot give an exact print publication date, as we do not assign articles to issues in advance. If you have any questions about the publication of your paper, please contact the Production Office.

In addition, if you or any of your co-authors would be willing to serve as an occasional referee for manuscripts submitted to Environment, Development and Sustainability, please let us know and send us a list of key words that summarize your areas of expertise. Your help with manuscript review would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for selecting Environment, Development and Sustainability for publication of your research.

With kind regards,

Luc Hens

Editor in Chief

Environment, Development and Sustainability

Please note that this journal is a Transformative Journal (TJ). Authors may publish their research with us through the traditional subscription access route or make their paper immediately open access through payment of an article-processing charge (APC). Authors will not be required to make a final decision about access to their article until it has been accepted.

Authors may need to take specific actions to achieve compliance with funder and institutional open access mandates. If your research is supported by a funder that requires immediate open access (e.g. according to Plan S principles) then you should select the gold OA route, and we will direct you to the compliant route where possible. For authors selecting the subscription publication route our standard licensing terms will need to be accepted, including our self-archiving policies. Those standard licensing terms will supersede any other terms that the author or any third party may assert apply to any version of the manuscript.

[Find out more about compliance](#)

This letter contains confidential information, is for your own use, and should not be forwarded to third parties.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at <https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy>. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/envi/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.