

PIJ Panicgogy International Journal

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<https://nakiscience.com/index.php/pij>



Adiwiyata Program Management at
SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur:
Governance, Participation, and
Partnership

Sri Melly Mulyati^a, Ino Sutisno Rawita^b,
Rinda Noviyanti^c

^aUniversitas Terbuka, Jakarta, Indonesia,
srinely@student.ut.ac.id

^bUniversitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten,
Indonesia, inosutisnorawita@gmail.com

^cUniversitas Terbuka, Jakarta, Indonesia,
rinda@ecampus.ut.ac.id

To cite this article:

Mulyati, S.M., Rawita, I.S., & Rinda Noviyanti, R. (2025). Adiwiyata Program Management at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur: Governance, Participation, and Partnership. *Panicgogy International Journal*, 3(2), 54 – 63.

To link to this article:

<https://nakiscience.com/index.php/pij/>

Published by:

Nasir Al-Kutub Indonesia

Residential Street Kila Rengganis, Block I, Number 11, Labuapi, Indonesia, 83361

Adiwiyata Program Management at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur: Governance, Participation, and Partnership

Sri Melly Mulyati^a, Ino Sutisno Rawita^b, Rinda Noviyanti^c

^aUniversitas Terbuka, Jakarta, Indonesia, srिमelly@student.ut.ac.id

^bUniversitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, Indonesia, inosutisnorawita@gmail.com

^cUniversitas Terbuka, Jakarta, Indonesia, rinda@ecampus.ut.ac.id

*Corresponding Author: srिमelly@student.ut.ac.id

Abstract

This study investigates the management of the Adiwiyata School Program at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur, Rangkasbitung Sub-district, Lebak Regency, Banten Province—the first and only public primary school in Lebak Regency to attain Adiwiyata Provincial recognition. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach with a constructivist paradigm, data were collected through passive-participant observation, semi-structured in-depth interviews with twelve purposively selected informants (principal, Adiwiyata team coordinator, subject teachers, school staff, students, school committee members), and document analysis, during January–August 2017. Data were analysed using Miles et al.'s (2014) interactive model. Findings reveal that effective programme management operated across four Adiwiyata components: (1) an environmentally conscious school policy, including a 20% budget allocation from the School Activity and Budget Plan (RKAS) and revision of school vision–mission; (2) an environment-based curriculum integrating ecological values across all subjects and through the Cultivation and Crafts subject (“from waste to blessing” philosophy); (3) participatory environmental activities featuring a consistent Jumat Bersih (Friday Clean-Up) routine, monthly action on the 9th, and the innovative “environmental virus” peer-influence strategy; and (4) management of eco-friendly facilities used as dual-purpose learning media. Active student involvement was achieved through competitive three-stage selection for the Student Adiwiyata Team, school waste-bank entrepreneurship, and a zone-based duty system. School committee participation occurred at the strategic level of policy formulation and through facilitation of external partnerships with BLH Lebak, BPBD, and the Puskesmas. Success is explained by five determinants: transformational leadership, an organically formed environmental school culture, strong social capital, programme consistency, and creative resourcefulness under material constraints. These findings contribute to school management literature by demonstrating that social capital and transformational leadership can effectively compensate for material resource limitations in community-based environmental education programmes.

Keywords: Adiwiyata School Programme, Environmental Education Management, Student Participation, School Committee Partnership, Social Capital

1. Introduction

The global environmental crisis has emerged as one of the most pressing challenges of the twenty-first century. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2022) warns that the average global temperature has already increased by 1.1°C above pre-industrial levels, triggering cascading impacts on ecosystems, communities, and economies worldwide. Indonesia, as the world's largest archipelagic nation and one of the most biodiverse regions on Earth, is particularly vulnerable to these environmental threats. Data from the National Disaster Management Authority (BNPB, 2022) indicate that climate-related disasters in Indonesia have increased by more than 200% over the past decade, encompassing floods, landslides, droughts, and forest fires that annually affect millions of citizens.

The Indonesian government has responded to this crisis through various policy frameworks, among which the Adiwiyata School Programme stands out as one of the most comprehensive and long-running initiatives in environmental education governance. Established through joint regulation of the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Education in 2006 and subsequently revised through Regulation of the Minister of Environment No. 05/2013, the Adiwiyata programme mandates schools to develop environmentally conscious policies, implement environment-based curricula, conduct participatory environmental activities, and manage eco-friendly facilities (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2012). As of 2022, more than 15,000 schools nationwide have been designated as Adiwiyata schools at various levels—district, provincial, and national (KLHK, 2022); yet research consistently reveals that a significant majority of participating schools treat the programme primarily as an administrative exercise oriented toward achieving the award, rather than as a genuine transformative educational process (Landriany, 2014; Mufidah et al., 2019; Fajarisma, 2014).

This gap between formal programme adoption and authentic environmental transformation is especially pronounced in public primary schools (Sekolah Dasar Negeri/SDN) in non-metropolitan areas, which frequently contend with severe material resource constraints—limited budgets, inadequate facilities, and high teacher workloads—that are often cited as insurmountable obstacles to effective programme implementation (Andini & Sumarmi, 2021). Against this backdrop, SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur in Rangkasbitung Sub-district, Lebak Regency, Banten Province, presents a compelling paradox: a resource-constrained public primary school that achieved Adiwiyata Provincial recognition in 2014—becoming the sole public primary school in Lebak Regency to do so—while simultaneously earning the designation of High-Performing School (*Sekolah Kinerja*) at the provincial level. This achievement warrants rigorous scholarly investigation.

Extant literature on Adiwiyata programme management has largely focused on secondary schools (Landriany, 2014; Wahyuningtyas & Harsastro, 2013) or on documenting programme components without adequately theorising the mechanisms behind success or failure. Moreover, few studies have examined the specific contributions of student participation and school committee partnership to programme outcomes, despite both being explicitly mandated in the Adiwiyata guidelines. The present study addresses these gaps by conducting an in-depth qualitative investigation of how SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur manages its Adiwiyata programme across all four mandatory components, how it mobilises student participation in transformative ways, and how it leverages school committee partnership as a strategic resource. The study is guided by three research questions: (1) How is the Adiwiyata school programme managed at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur as assessed against the four programme components? (2) How does the school engage students to participate actively and meaningfully in the programme? (3) How does the school involve the school committee to actively support programme implementation?

The theoretical framework integrates Terry's (2010) POAC management functions, Day et al.'s (2016) transformational leadership model, Adler and Kwon's (2002) social capital theory, Sterling's (2010) transformative learning continuum, and Hart's (1992) ladder of children's participation. This multi-theoretical lens enables a nuanced analysis that connects management structures, leadership quality, community resources, educational outcomes, and participatory democracy within a single integrated framework. By generating rich empirical evidence from an exemplary case, this study aims to produce generalisable analytical insights—if not statistical generalisations—that can inform evidence-based policy and practice in environmental education management across Indonesia and similar developing-country contexts.

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design grounded in a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm. Qualitative research was chosen because the research

questions concern understanding how and why the programme functions as it does—questions that require exploration of subjective meanings, contextual processes, and interpersonal dynamics that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measurement (Creswell & Poth, 2018). A descriptive design was adopted to produce a systematic, accurate, and holistic account of the phenomenon as it naturally occurs, without experimental manipulation (Moleong, 2017). The constructivist paradigm positions the reality of programme management as socially constructed through the interactions and meanings attributed by programme actors, making their voices and perspectives the primary analytical resource (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

2.2 Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur, located at Jalan Ir. H. Djuanda No. 111, Rangkasbitung Sub-district, Lebak Regency, Banten Province. The site was selected through purposive site selection (Patton, 2015) based on its status as an information-rich case: as the only public primary school in Lebak Regency to achieve provincial Adiwiyata recognition, it offers unique insights into effective programme management under conditions of material resource scarcity. Data collection spanned January to August 2017, encompassing four phases: preparation (January–February), primary data collection (March–June), analysis (July), and report writing (August).

Participants were selected through purposive sampling guided by the principle of data saturation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Twelve to fifteen informants were engaged from the following groups: (1) the school principal (KS) as strategic decision-maker; (2) the Adiwiyata Team coordinator/teacher (GTA) as key informant with comprehensive programme knowledge; (3) subject teachers, specifically the Cultivation and Crafts teacher (GBP); (4) the school public relations officer (HUM); (5) five students (PD1–PD5), including the Student Adiwiyata Team chair; (6) the school committee representative (KOM); and (7) support staff including the cleaning officer (PKB) and administrative staff. Informant codes were used consistently to protect identity and ensure referential clarity.

2.3 Data Collection

Three complementary data collection techniques were employed to enable methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1978). First, passive-participant observation was conducted across multiple sessions throughout the data-collection phase, following a structured observation guide covering: (a) physical environment and eco-friendly facilities; (b) routine environmental activities; (c) classroom-based environment-integrated learning; (d) social interaction dynamics; and (e) cultural artefacts (slogans, posters, waste-sorting signage). Second, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted individually with each informant group using differentiated interview guides aligned with each group's role. Sessions lasted 45–90 minutes and were audio-recorded with participants' informed consent. Third, document analysis was conducted on: school RKAS (budget plans), Adiwiyata annual programme documents, revised vision–mission statements, lesson plans (RPP and syllabi), environmental activity reports, facility inventory lists, school committee meeting minutes, and award certificates.

2.4 Data Analysis

Data were analysed using Miles et al.'s (2014) interactive analysis model, comprising four concurrent and cyclical processes: (1) data collection—systematic gathering from multiple sources; (2) data condensation—selective coding and categorisation of verbatim transcripts using descriptive and inferential codes; (3) data display—organising condensed data into thematic narrative matrices; and (4) conclusion drawing and verification—inductively generating interpretations and verifying them against raw data through iterative review. Analysis was guided by the three research questions, and emerging themes were mapped against the theoretical framework.

3. Results and Discussion

Findings are presented in three sections corresponding to the three research questions, integrating empirical data with theoretical interpretation. Each finding is anchored in verbatim interview excerpts to maintain empirical grounding.

3.1 Management of the Adiwiyata Programme Across Four Components

3.1.1 Environmentally Conscious School Policy

Policy formulation at SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur was characterised by a participatory, collaborative process that involved the Adiwiyata Team, principal, treasurer, and school committee jointly. GTA, the programme coordinator, explained:

“What formulates it is the Adiwiyata Team and the principal. The main one is the Adiwiyata Team—I happen to be the vice-chair. Then for the RKAS, it is formulated by the principal, the treasurer, and the Adiwiyata Team too. The school committee also assists.” (GTA)

This collaborative policy formulation reflects the principle of distributed leadership (Spillane & Zoltners Sherer, 2004), which generates collective ownership and, consequently, stronger implementation commitment. The principal reinforced this with a statement about personal modelling:

“I always support, always encourage, always invite teachers and students to be environmentally conscious. Because if the principal does not support it, this programme will not work. The principal must be a role model first.” (KS)

The emphasis on role modelling aligns with the *idealized influence* component of transformational leadership (Day et al., 2016), in which the leader’s consistent behaviour creates informal norms that shape the expectations of all community members. The principal’s approach was not merely declarative: 20% of the RKAS was formally allocated to Adiwiyata activities, and the school’s vision–mission statement was revised to explicitly embed environmental values. As KS explained: *“Vision–mission is the school’s compass. If it already points to the environment, all school activities will be directed there.”* Strikingly, even students could spontaneously identify the environmental content of the school’s vision–mission (PD1), confirming that policy socialisation had penetrated to the deepest community layer—what Hargreaves and O’Connor (2018) term *collaborative professionalism*: shared values genuinely internalised across the organisation. Programme consistency was also institutionally anchored through a *tata tertib* (school code of conduct) that mandated seven environmental behaviours—including waste segregation, energy conservation, and a smoking prohibition—documented both in regulatory texts and in the physical artefacts (posters, signage) that saturated the school environment.

3.1.2 Environment-Based Curriculum

The school developed two complementary curricular approaches: cross-subject integration and a dedicated monolithic subject. GTA explained that environmental values had been integrated into all subjects since 2011—two years before formal Adiwiyata participation—demonstrating intrinsic rather than reactive motivation:

“Since 2011 it has been implemented, both in subjects and in daily life practice. In syllabi and lesson plans, every subject is integrated with environmental awareness—including Islamic Religious Education. Since I am Muslim, I insert it too, for example about clean living and frugality.” (GTA)

This practice exemplifies the transformative teacher competency identified by UNESCO (2017): the ability to contextualise sustainability perspectives across all knowledge domains. GBP described the philosophy underlying the dedicated Cultivation and Crafts subject: *“The focus of this subject is: from waste to blessing.”* This philosophy operationalises the principles of the circular economy (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019) at the elementary school level through hands-on practice. Learner testimonies confirmed multilayered impact. PD3 reported a fundamental shift in perspective: *“Beneficial indeed, because students’ outlook is not only fixed on Science or Social Studies but also oriented toward environmental care—as worthless goods can be processed and utilised to become valuable and marketable goods.”* PD2 added the

dimension of authentic economic experience: “*We once made compost, and the product could be sold.*” These testimonies collectively map onto Sterling’s (2010) transformative learning continuum: from behavioural change (making compost) to perceptual change (waste as opportunity) to paradigmatic change (environmental care as a core personal orientation).

3.1.3 Participatory Environmental Activities

The school operated a multi-layered system of environmental activities: weekly Jumat Bersih (Friday Clean-Up) targeting all staff; monthly whole-school action on the 9th; an Adiwiyata zone duty roster distributing responsibility across seven campus zones; observance of the Environmental Calendar; and participation in external environmental events. GTA articulated the ultimate goal of these activities: “*What is expected from inviting students in environmental action is awareness—self-awareness about the environment, to protect it without being told.*” This goal—environmental protection as autonomous internal motivation rather than compliance—corresponds directly to the concept of *deep character* distinguished from *surface compliance* in the character education literature (Arthur et al., 2017). The degree to which this goal had been achieved was documented in HUM’s testimony:

“In the past it was indeed difficult. Many had to be reminded repeatedly, even teachers. But now it is different. It has become a habit. Even now, if someone litters, their peers are the ones who reprimand them. That is what we wanted from the beginning.” (HUM)

The peer-to-peer norm enforcement described by HUM is precisely the phenomenon Bicchieri (2017) identifies as the hallmark of a genuinely internalised social norm: the community self-monitors without relying on formal authority. School engagement with external partnerships—BLH Lebak, BPBD, Puskesmas Rangkasbitung, the local government, and ten Adiwiyata-binaan (mentored) schools—further expanded the programme’s resource base and legitimacy. HUM noted the strategic character of these partnerships: “*Every time we have an activity, we include it in the budget plan. So the school programme plan exists, and partner targets are invited to provide resource persons.*” This proactive, needs-based mobilisation of partnerships reflects Lin’s (2017) strategic social capital management: leveraging network resources precisely and intentionally according to identified programme needs.

3.1.4 Management of Eco-Friendly Facilities

The school developed and maintained a range of eco-friendly facilities—including a green house, compost house, biopore installations, infiltration wells, a school medicinal plant garden (TOS), a waste bank, segregated three-stream waste bins, and a healthy canteen—on a constrained budget, by building and expanding them incrementally. KS articulated the dual-purpose philosophy: “*Facilities are not just for aesthetics; they are also for direct learning.*” This orientation instantiates place-based education (Sobel, 2004): physical facilities that simultaneously serve operational purposes and function as authentic learning media. Maintenance responsibilities were distributed across a permanent cleaning officer and students through the zone duty system, demonstrating adaptive management that transformed a resource constraint (insufficient maintenance personnel) into an educational asset. PKB described his specific responsibilities including the green house and sanitation infrastructure, evidencing clear role definition consistent with Terry’s (2010) organising function. The qualitative impact of this management approach was captured by GBP: “*Regarding the environment here, I feel it has received very great attention—the bathrooms are always drained, the garden and field are always swept. This is far better than conditions before the Adiwiyata programme.*” This within-subject comparative testimony constitutes strong programme-attributable evidence of environmental quality improvement (Weiss, 2016).

3.2 Student Engagement Strategies and Their Outcomes

3.2.1 Competitive Selection and Intrinsic Motivation

The formation of the Student Adiwiyata Team through a rigorous three-stage selection process yielded an extraordinary indicator: GTA reported that over 80% of Year 5 and Year 6 students applied for membership. This figure suggests that participation in Adiwiyata had

achieved high *attainment value* for students—meaning that membership had become integral to the student identity they desired (Wigfield & Eccles, 2020). The three stages—knowledge test on school identity, motivational interview, and fabrication of a recyclable-material artefact—collectively assessed knowledge, commitment, and creative competence, ensuring that the team comprised genuinely motivated individuals. The impact of this culture of motivated participation was witnessed in PD1’s description of a significant evolution:

“There used to be an Adiwiyata Unit, like an environmental police. If a friend littered, they were warned—like giving sanctions to violators. But now many are already self-aware, no need to be reminded any more.” (PD1)

This testimony documents a progression from external regulation to internal regulation that Ryan and Deci (2020) identify as the hallmark of authentic motivational internalisation. In the framework of Hart’s (1992) ladder of participation—updated by Tisdall and Davis (2004)—this transition represents advancement from rung 4 (“assigned and informed”) to rungs 6–7 (“shared decisions with adults” and “child-initiated with adult support”).

3.2.2 The “Environmental Virus” Peer-Influence Strategy

The most innovative student engagement strategy observed was what HUM termed the “environmental virus”: deploying behaviourally committed students as organic peer-influence agents to spread environmental norms throughout the school community. HUM explained:

“We formed the Adiwiyata Task Force and I spread the concept of a “virus”—meaning it should spread from student to student, even to teachers and staff, and hopefully reach outside the school.” (HUM)

HUM then illustrated the mechanism concretely: *“For instance, the Scouts, before practice they clean the school. On the field, there are students doing PE; seeing the Scouts clean up, they join in. This virus applies to teachers and staff too.”* This strategy operationalises the social contagion mechanism documented by Christakis and Fowler (2013): prosocial behaviours spread through social networks via the same mechanisms as biological contagion, with early adopters serving as transmission nodes. The choice of peers (rather than authority figures) as the primary influence agents is particularly significant: Rubin et al. (2015) demonstrate that peer influence is consistently more powerful than adult instruction in shaping behavioural norms among primary-age children.

3.2.3 Waste-Bank Entrepreneurship and Multidimensional Learning

Students were engaged not only in environmental action but also in managing the school waste bank as a genuine micro-enterprise: collecting, sorting, and selling recyclable materials, with proceeds managed by a student treasurer and reinvested into programme activities. GTA described the system: *“Every week a buyer comes to the school to collect the sorted waste, weigh it, and the proceeds are kept by the Adiwiyata management treasurer and can be used for Adiwiyata activities or to purchase cleaning equipment.”* Learner testimonies (PD4, PD5) confirmed the acquisition of knowledge, environmental skills, and entrepreneurial competence simultaneously. This integration realises what Leal Filho et al. (2021) identify as a high-impact approach in primary-level Education for Sustainable Development: bridging environmental literacy and economic competency through authentic experiential practice. The waste bank constitutes a lived demonstration of circular economy principles (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019)—arguably the most contextual form of environmental economics education available to young learners.

3.3 School Committee Partnership: Strategic Depth and Social Capital

SDN 3 Muara Cijung Timur engaged the school committee at three strategically significant levels that together constitute a comprehensive partnership model aligned with Epstein et al.’s (2019) school–family–community partnerships framework.

At the *planning and decision-making* level, the committee participated in formulating annual programme plans and providing advisory input on budget allocation—consistent with its legally mandated advisory function (Permendikbud No. 75/2016). GTA confirmed: *“The school committee also assists, providing input and considerations in drafting the programme.”* This

involvement created an *ownership effect* (Epstein et al., 2019) that translated into sustained active support during implementation. At the *physical participation* level, committee members (parents) joined students in Friday Clean-Up activities, creating intergenerational co-practice events with strong pedagogical value: when parents are seen voluntarily engaging in environmental stewardship alongside their children, they model the values the programme seeks to instil (Bandura, 2018). At the *network facilitation* level, the committee served as a bridge enabling access to external resources and partnerships. HUM summarised the range and depth of partnerships accessed:

“Apart from other schools, we also partner with BLH, BPBD, the Health Department, Puskesmas. Because every activity is always accompanied by workshop materials. From BLH we get facility assistance or resource persons for workshops or seminars.” (HUM)

The committee’s three-dimensional role is framed by Adler and Kwon’s (2002) social capital typology: *bonding* (strengthening internal community cohesion), *bridging* (connecting the school to peer institutions and NGOs), and *linking* (connecting the school to government bodies and formal authority). KOM confirmed this: *“We try to connect the school with various external parties who can help the programme. We also accompany the principal in various meetings with relevant agencies.”* The simultaneous fulfilment of all three social capital functions by a single community actor explains the amplified capacity of a materially resource-constrained school to achieve outcomes that well-resourced schools with weaker social capital fail to match.

4. Conclusions

This study has documented, through richly evidenced qualitative analysis, how SDN 3 Muara Ciujung Timur achieved remarkable Adiwiyata programme outcomes under conditions of material resource constraint. Three central conclusions emerge from the findings. First, effective Adiwiyata programme management at the primary school level requires the coherent operation of all four POAC management functions (Terry, 2010) within each programme component, with transformational, participatory leadership functioning as the integrating force. The principal’s role as role model, motivator, and resource mobiliser was the single most cited explanatory factor across informant groups, confirming Day et al.’s (2016) finding that school leadership exerts its strongest influence through organisational culture-building rather than through formal authority. Second, authentic student participation in environmental education requires a deliberate multi-strategy approach that simultaneously builds motivation, distributes responsibility, and creates authentic learning through practice. The school’s competitive selection, peer-influence strategy, waste-bank micro-enterprise, and zone duty system together produced evidence of genuine character internalisation—students acting pro-environmentally without external prompting—representing the highest level of programme success as theorised by Arthur et al. (2017) and Ryan and Deci (2020). Third, school committee partnership constitutes a critical strategic resource whose value extends far beyond formal compliance. When committees are engaged as genuine partners at the planning, physical, and network levels—simultaneously serving bonding, bridging, and linking social capital functions (Adler & Kwon, 2002)—they become force multipliers that enable materially constrained schools to access resources, knowledge, and legitimacy that dramatically exceed what the school budget alone could provide. A cross-cutting finding is what the authors term resourcefulness over resources: the capacity to achieve superior outcomes through leadership quality, social capital, creative adaptation, and consistent culture-building rather than material abundance, thereby challenging the dominant assumption in Indonesian educational planning that material resource adequacy is a prerequisite for programme quality.

The study is subject to limitations inherent in its qualitative, single-site design: findings represent analytical insights from a specific context rather than statistical generalisations. Future research should (1) conduct longitudinal studies tracking character change outcomes in Adiwiyata alumni; (2) undertake comparative studies matching high- and low-achieving Adiwiyata schools with similar resource profiles to isolate the relative contributions of leadership and social capital;

and (3) develop standardised instruments for measuring participatory quality and social capital in school environmental programmes to enable cross-site comparability.

5. References

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.5922314>
- Andini, T. M., & Sumarmi, S. (2021). Implementasi program Adiwiyata dalam membentuk karakter peduli lingkungan siswa sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 6(3), 370–379. <https://doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v6i3.14652>
- Arthur, J., Kristjánsson, K., Walker, D., Sanderse, W., & Jones, C. (2017). Character education in UK schools: Research report. Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, University of Birmingham.
- Bandura, A. (2018). Toward a psychology of human agency: Pathways and reflections. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), 130–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617699280>
- Bicchieri, C. (2017). Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social norms. Oxford University Press.
- Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2013). Social contagion theory: Examining dynamic social networks and human behavior. *Statistics in Medicine*, 32(4), 556–577. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5408>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2019). Completing the picture: How the circular economy tackles climate change. Ellen MacArthur Foundation.
- Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., Greenfeld, M. D., Hutchins, D. J., & Williams, K. J. (2019). School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action (4th ed.). Corwin Press.
- Fajarisma, A. B. (2014). Analisis implementasi kebijakan kurikulum berbasis lingkungan hidup pada program Adiwiyata Mandiri di SDN Dinoyo Malang. *Jurnal Kebijakan dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 2(2), 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jkpp.v2i2.1979>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). SAGE Publications.
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Solidarity with solidity: The case for collaborative professionalism. *Learning Professional*, 39(2), 20–24.
- Hart, R. A. (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship. UNICEF International Child Development Centre.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844>
- Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2012). Panduan Adiwiyata: Sekolah peduli dan berbudaya lingkungan. Badan Lingkungan Hidup.
- Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan. (2022). Indeks kualitas lingkungan hidup Indonesia 2022. KLHK.

Field Code Changed

- Landriany, E. (2014). Implementasi kebijakan Adiwiyata dalam upaya mewujudkan pendidikan lingkungan hidup di SMA Kota Malang. *Jurnal Kebijakan dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 2(1), 82–88.
- Leal Filho, W., Salvia, A. L., Frankenberger, F., Akib, M. N. A. M., & Will, M. (2021). An assessment of attitudes and perceptions of international students on sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(2), 197–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-09-2020-0353>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Lin, N. (2017). Building a network theory of social capital. In N. Lin, K. Cook, & R. S. Burt (Eds.), *Social capital: Theory and research* (pp. 3–29). Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif (Edisi revisi)*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mufidah, N., Supriadi, U., & Mubarak, A. (2019). Pengelolaan program Adiwiyata dalam meningkatkan karakter peduli lingkungan peserta didik. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 26(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jap.v26i1.17516>
- National Disaster Management Authority (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana/BNPB). (2022). *Data informasi bencana Indonesia 2022*. BNPB.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Peraturan Menteri Lingkungan Hidup Nomor 05 Tahun 2013 tentang Pedoman Pelaksanaan Program Adiwiyata [Regulation of the Minister of Environment No. 05 of 2013 on Guidelines for the Adiwiyata Programme].
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 75 Tahun 2016 tentang Komite Sekolah [Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 75 of 2016 on School Committees].
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Bowker, J. C. (2015). Children in peer groups. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed., Vol. 4). Wiley.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, Article 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Sobel, D. (2004). *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities* (2nd ed.). Orion Society.
- Spillane, J. P., & Zoltner Sherer, J. (2004). A distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadership practice as stretched over people and place. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Sterling, S. (2010). Transformative learning and sustainability: Sketching the conceptual ground. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(1), 17–33.
- Terry, G. R. (2010). *Dasar-dasar manajemen* (G. A. Ticoalu, Trans.). Bumi Aksara.
- Tisdall, E. K. M., & Davis, J. M. (2004). Making a difference? Bringing children's and young people's views into policy-making. *Children & Society*, 18(2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/chi.819>
- UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO.
- Wahyuningtyas, D., & Harsastro, P. (2013). Evaluasi program Adiwiyata di SMA Negeri 11 Semarang. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Weiss, C. H. (2016). How can theory-based evaluation make greater headway? *Evaluation Review*, 41(4), 309–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X16673410>

- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2020). 35 years of research on students' subjective task values and motivation: A look back and a look forward. In A. Elliot (Ed.), *Advances in motivation science* (Vol. 7, pp. 162–193). Elsevier.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.