

Duality of Agency and Structure in Building Cultural Ecology: Case Study on Adiwiyata School Program in Malang, Indonesia

Ida Wahyuni¹, Ishomuddin^{2*}, Akhsanul In'am³, Wahyudi⁴

¹Doctoral Candidate of Sociology, University of Muhammadiyah, Malang

²Professor of Sociology, University of Muhammadiyah, Malang

³Professor of Education, University of Muhammadiyah, Malang

⁴Doctor of Sociology, University of Muhammadiyah, Malang

***Corresponding Author:** *Ishomuddin, Professor of Sociology, University of Muhammadiyah, Malang*

Abstract: *This research was carried out against the background of a real condition in the field, namely all things related to the culture of caring and loving the environment and how to document the Adiwiyata school from planning, implementation, monitoring data to school profiles, both photos and videos. This will be shown in the duality of agency and structure in building cultural ecology. The purpose of this study is to examine three main problems, namely: 1). Analyzing the school community (agency) in producing and reproducing structures to build cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program in schools; 2). Analyzing the structure in providing space and time to school members for the ongoing cultural ecology-oriented actions in the Adiwiyata Program in schools; 3). Analyzing the sustainability/sustainability of the agency and structure duality process in building cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata Program in schools. This research is a descriptive qualitative research. This type of research uses a case study research model with an Emik Paradigm approach to social definition. Determination of subjects and informants in the study using multi-site "purposive sampling technique". The data collection used in this research is observation, FGD, in-depth interviews, and documentation, as well as data analysis used in this study using rational choice analysis from Coleman.*

Keywords: *Duality, Agency, Structure, Cultural Ecology, Adiwiyata*

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's progress in all fields affects the state of the environment and its citizens. Facing the problem of environmental crises, in general, the Qur'an has indicated that the problem will repeatedly befall humans due to their own actions and actions against nature (Cholil Zuhdi, 2015). The government is aware that there must be an effort to save the environment so that it can be passed on to the next generation. The school adiwiyata program is a critical part of the success of implementing programs in an effort to save and care for the environment. When viewed from the perspective of the sociology of education, that is, sociology is used to solve very fundamental problems faced by education (Amrullah & Susilo, 2019; Fitria & Samsia, 2020; Hatika et al., 2019). Education is concerned with the development of knowledge, behavior, and attitudes of students. Education is closely related to the transmission of knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, skills, and other aspects of behavior to the younger generation. Education is a process of learning and teaching patterns of human behavior according to what is expected by society (Nasution, 2010).

The Ministry of Environment in 2006 developed an environmental education program at the primary and secondary education levels through the Adiwiyata program. The Adiwiyata Program is one of the

Ministry of Environment's programs in order to encourage the creation of knowledge and awareness of school residents so that it becomes a culture of environmental care in an effort to preserve the environment. Environmental Regulation No. 05 of 2013 and refined into Ministerial Regulations No. 52 and 53 of 2019 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of the Adiwiyata Program Article 1 states that Adiwiyata Schools are schools that care and are environmentally cultured. This program of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry is targeted at schools where schools are under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Synergy between the two ministries is certainly very

necessary in the success of all programs with the support of partners, both public and private. School is a system of social interaction of an organization as a whole consisting of personal interactions linked together in an organic relationship. School is the second environment where children practice and develop their personality. Zanti Arbi in Pidarta, (2006). School is an institution or place for learning such as reading, writing and learning to behave well. This good behavior is addressed to families, schools, communities and concern for the environment (Atmodiwirio, 2000).

At present, there are many schools that have succeeded in bearing the title of Adiwiyata schools starting at the city, provincial, national and independent levels. The level of achievement of the predicate if it has reached independent Adiwiyata is considered to have succeeded in shaping the character of caring for the environment widely because the school is able to have an impact on schools. fostered as a condition of the achievements obtained when going forward as an independent Adiwiyata school (Desfandi, 2015; Hidayat, 2014; Martini, 2019). Adiwiyata schools that have independent predicate still have the opportunity to achieve even higher predicate at the Asean level in the Asean Eco School event which is held every three years. The Adiwiyata program is expected to shape the character of students who care and love the environment. These hopes and goals can be implemented and developed in schools as character education. The characters that are strengthened are mainly 5 characters, namely: religious, nationalist, independent, mutual cooperation, and integrity. Schools as educational units for developing student character, strive to integrate, deepen, expand, and at the same time harmonize various character education programs and activities that have been implemented, including education about the environment (Martini, 2019; Novitasari et al., 2020).

The Adiwiyata program is expected to shape the character of students who care and love the environment. These hopes and objectives can be implemented and developed in schools as character education and are expected to foster a spirit of learning and make students happy at school as a friendly home with an environment and infrastructure that supports growth and development. Evaluation of the implementation of character education programs is carried out by teachers, school leaders and even parents. Innovation and creativity must always be carried out in order to improve the quality of character education even though it is currently entering the era of the covid-19 pandemic. The school adiwiyata program is very important in building cultural ecology in schools and in the environment around where they live.

Schools in Malang City have started to participate in and have received Adiwiyata school awards since 2010. According to Hidayat (2014) schools that have implemented the Adiwiyata program in its implementation can be reflected in the behavior of school residents who care about the environment. The city of Malang as a city of education which is dominated by schools with the title Adiwiyata school with a caring and environmentally cultured character appears in the school community. Researchers assess there are symptoms of changes in the value of caring and cultured environment, this can be seen from several aspects based on the components of the Adiwiyata program. Environmentally sound policies appear to be less strong in program development. The implementation of the environment-based curriculum has decreased in its implementation. Efforts to realize which means: 1) making tangible (there really is); 2) declare; implement (actions, ideals, these) 3) explain (show) with concrete objects for the Adiwiyata school not all teachers want to seek integration of caring and cultured environment in the learning process. Participatory-based environmental activities in schools are seen as still many students do not play an active role. The management of environmentally friendly supporting facilities has not been well maintained, biopores are not maintained, nurseries are not treated properly. The things mentioned above are indications of inconsistencies in the implementation of the Adiwiyata program.

In this study, the theoretical framework used is the structuration of Anthony Giddens. This framework was chosen because it is considered comprehensive to understand the reciprocal interactions (duality) that occur in agencies, namely school members in producing and reproducing structures. Based on Giddens' theory of structuration, the interweaving of structure and agency in social practice is a duality. Structural theory rejects dualism (opposition) and tries to find a link between the two. Subjects are determined, influenced and produced, by social forces that exist outside of themselves as individuals. Giddens calls it the Duality of Structure (Barker, 2011), the core of structuration theory,

namely the concepts of structure, system and structural duality. One of the main propositions of structuration theory is that the rules and resources used in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time a means of system reproduction (structural duality).

Observing the problems that have been described in the background, there are many phenomena that require explanations/answers, how to get answers to the problems mentioned above, then the problems to be studied include understanding, meaning, and motives for the actions taken by the school adiwiyata team. The research problems to be studied are as follows: (1). How do school members (agency) produce and reproduce structures to build cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program in schools? How does the structure provide space and time for school members to take action that is oriented towards cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program at school? And (3) How is the continuity/sustainability of the agency and structure duality process in building cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata Program in schools?

To be able to know well what is the subject matter of the problem, this study aims to: Analyze the school community (agency) in producing and reproducing structures to build cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program in schools. Analyzing the structure in providing space and time to school members for cultural ecology-oriented actions to take place in the Adiwiyata Program in schools. and analyze the sustainability/sustainability of the duality process of agency and structure in building cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata Program in schools.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Concept of Adiwiyata

According to the Adiwiyata Guidebook, the word Adiwiyata comes from 2 Sanskrit words: "Adi" and "Wiyata". Adi has the meaning of great, great, good, ideal, or perfect. Wiyata has the meaning of a place where a person gets knowledge, norms and ethics in social life. When the two words are combined as a whole "Adiwiyata" has the meaning or meaning as a good and ideal place where all knowledge and various norms and ethics can be obtained that can be the basis of human beings towards the creation of our welfare and towards the ideals of sustainable development.

Based on the law that regulates the Adiwiyata program is the Regulation of the State Minister of the Environment Number 02 of 2009 concerning guidelines for the implementation of the Adiwiyata program article 1 paragraphs 1 and 2, what is meant by Adiwiyata is a good and ideal school as a place to obtain all knowledge and various norms and ethics which can be the basis of human beings towards the creation of a prosperous life and the ideals of sustainable development. The Adiwiyata Program is one of the national scope work programs managed by the State Ministry of the Environment in order to realize the development of environmental education. The Adiwiyata program is one of the national scope work programs managed by the State Ministry of the Environment in order to realize the development of environmental education in Permendiknas. In this program, it is hoped that every school member will be involved in school activities towards a healthy environment and avoid negative environmental impacts.

According to the Adiwiyata Guidebook, efforts to accelerate the development of Environmental Education (PLH), especially formal education at the primary and secondary education levels, on the Adiwiyata program was launched, with the aim of encouraging and forming schools that care about the environment and are environmentally cultured that are able to participate and carry out efforts to preserve the environment and sustainable development for the benefit of present and future generations. According to Widiyaningrum, the Adiwiyata school program aims to instill the school community's love for their environment, including instilling attitudes and behaviors that care and are environmentally cultured. The form of school concern is reflected in the efforts of school residents in realizing the management of the school environment with environmentally friendly principles. The school community is starting from the Principal, Teachers, all students, janitors, security officers and the School Committee.

Adiwiyata is applied in the world of education because in the world of education it is easier to learn and apply all knowledge and various norms and ethics to achieve the ideals of sustainable development. According to the Adiwiyata Guidebook, the implementation of the Adiwiyata Program

is based on the following two basic principles: a) Participatory: The school community is involved in school management which includes the entire planning, implementation and evaluation process according to responsibilities and roles. b) Sustainability: All activities must be carried out in a planned and continuous manner in a comprehensive manner. The advantages of participating in the Adiwiyata program according to the Adiwiyata Guidebook are as follows: a) Supports the achievement of basic and secondary education competency standards/competencies and graduate competency standards (SKL). b) Increasing the efficiency of the use of school operational funds through saving and reducing consumption of various resources and energy. c) Creating togetherness of school community and teaching and learning conditions that are more comfortable and conducive. d) Become a place of learning about the values of good and correct environmental maintenance and management for school residents and the surrounding community. e) Improving efforts to protect and manage the environment through pollution control activities, damage control and preservation of environmental functions in schools.

In this study, the theoretical framework used is the structuration of Anthony Giddens. This framework was chosen because it is considered comprehensive to understand the reciprocal interaction (duality) that occurs between school community agencies in producing and reproducing structures to build cultural ecology to realize the Adiwiyata program in schools. Based on Giddens' theory of structuration, the fabric of structure and agency in social practice is a duality. Structural theory rejects dualism (opposition) and tries to find a link between the two. Subjects are determined, influenced and produced, by social forces that exist outside of themselves as individuals. Theoretical frameworks are theories that are considered relevant for analyzing the object of research. As a tool, the theory is chosen which is the most adequate, most appropriate, good and relevant to the existing problems. To choose the most relevant theory, Nyoman Khuta Ratna is of the view, that based on the nature of the object, he means that the object determines which theory is relevant.

B. Structural Theory from Anthony Giddens

Structural theory is a theory that rejects dualism (contradictory) and tries to find links or links after a sharp conflict between functional structure and phenomenological constructionism. Giddens is dissatisfied with the structural-functional theory of view, which according to him is trapped in a naturalistic view. The naturalistic view reduces actors in structure, then history is seen as mechanical, and not a product of the congruence of agent activities. But Giddens also disagrees with phenomenological-constructionism, which for him is referred to as ending in subject imperialism. Therefore, he wants to end the claims of the two by bringing the two schools together.

Giddens resolves the debate between two theories that state or hold that human action is caused by external drives and those who advocate the purpose of human action. According to Giddens, structure is not external to individuals but is in a sense more internal. Regarding this internal aspect, Giddens relies on his exposure to a subject who has an autonomous nature and has a role in controlling the structure itself.

Giddens (2011) explains that structure is not equated with constraint but always constrains and empowers. This does not prevent the structural properties of social systems from extending into space and time beyond the control of individual actors, and it does not compromise the possibility that the theories of social systems the actors help to re-establish in their activities can realize those systems. Humans take actions intentionally to accomplish their goals, at the same time, human actions have unintended consequences (unintentional consequences) from setting structures that have an impact on subsequent human actions. Humans according to this theory are purposeful agents who have reasons for their activities and are able to describe those reasons repeatedly. It is possible that the reasons described by humans repeatedly have goals based on what they want to need in different dimensions of space and time. It can be said that the actions of an agent often influence the structure in which they are carrying out their work. These human social activities are recursive in nature with the aim that these social activities are not carried out by social actors but are created to express themselves as actors or actors continuously by utilizing all their resources. In and through their activities, agents reproduce the conditions that make them possible. Human action is likened to a continuous flow of behavior such as cognition, support or even break as long as reason is still bestowed on it (Giddens, 2011).

According to Barker (2011) structuration contains three dimensions, namely as follows: First, understanding (interpretation / understanding), which states how agents understand something. Second, morality or proper direction, which states the way how something should be done. Third, power in action, which states how the agent achieves a desire. The case in favor of the conception of the subject as an active and knowing agent has consistently been put forward by Giddens, who is Foucault's most vocal critic because he removes the agent from the historical continuum. Giddens takes the view of Garfinkel (1967), argues that social order is constructed in and through everyday activities and provides an explanation (in language) of skilled and experienced actors or members of society. The resources taken by the actor, and constructed by him are social characters, and indeed social structures (or regular patterns of activity) socially disseminate resources and competencies, which, in contrast to being the subject of action with all kinds of individuals, operate to structure what actors are. . For example, patterns of expectations about what it means to be a key person, and practices related to ethnicity, construct a key person as an entirely different subject. Subjectivity that focuses on ethnicity in turn empowers us to act on certain social facts. In line with that, the problems of how an actor can influence the situation or even the quality of the environment inevitably become a contemporary study which can also be studied on a micro and then a macro basis.

Just to emphasize that structuration theory is centered on the way agents produce and reproduce social structures through their own actions. Regular human activities are not manifested by individual actors, but are continuously created and repeated by them through the way they express themselves as actors. Thus, in and through activity, agents reproduce a number of conditions which make such activities possible. After being formed as a key person by a number of expectations and practices combined with shared awareness, after learning and internalizing the values and rules, then we act according to those rules, reproducing the rules again. Where the binding rules again make the surrounding community participate in institutionalizing restraints even though in the end the emergence of power is able to penetrate the rules they make themselves.

Structure is to say as a complement to the explanation of the agent. According to Giddens, structure is related to the following: Structure is a structured trait that binds space and time in a social system. These traits may be the same social practice seen as lasting beyond the space-time span which lends it to it in a systemic form.

Structure is the true order of transformative relations, which means a social system because the social practices that are reproduced do not have a structure, but rather show the structural properties and existence of that structure as the presence of space and time, only in its depiction as in social practices. And as a memory that finds direction in the recognizable behavior of human agents. (Susilo, 2008). We can also understand the structural properties of hierarchical organizations in terms of the space-time development of the practices that they repeatedly organize. The very deep and inherent structural nature is indirectly related to the reproduction of the totality of society. Giddens called them structural principles. These practices have a very large space-time development. It can be concluded that structure is defined as structured properties (rules and resources). The properties that enable similar social practices can be explained to take place across space and time and these two processes make the forms of relationships systemic. So, the structure will only be realized if there are rules and resources. Both are essential for reproducing social systems. Therefore, the structure is incarnated in the memory of people who have a lot of knowledge (Waters and Jary, in Susilo, 2009).

Giddens states that there are three major structural clusters. The first is the structure of signification or significance which involves symbolic sekamata, meaning, mention and discourse. Second, the structure of domination or domination which includes the schemata of control over people (politics) and goods or things (economics). Third, the structure of justification (legitimacy) concerning the schemata of normative regulations revealed in the legal system. It is easy for us to understand that living in society requires many things to be recognized for its existence. We live in a social environment, where decisions and things that happen are also determined by other parties. We cannot live alone, because many things will help us and at the same time many things will limit our steps. We are certainly proud to be called productive people or as successful figures or in short as people in power. Our prestige will increase if everyone gives appreciation and recognition. Likewise, when we can control a number of people, enter ideas into them so that our happiness will increase. Being a

leader means that facilities, authority, legitimacy and other facilities are attached. Likewise, being a subordinate will of course bear a much more unpleasant risk. Subordinates do not understand the rules of the game, even often become the newspaper of the game's rules. In that sense, as explained repeatedly, Giddens offers a large social world view of patterns of interaction, but they are also seen as structures. The structure here is systematic, orderly, permanent, as long as the agent reproduces it in the future. Structure has a dual capacity, both curbing and encouraging (providing resources) human agency. Structure can be a tool (media) and a consequence of human actions (Susilo, 2008). According to structuration theory, when agents have the power to produce actions, it also means when they reproduce in the context of living everyday social life. One of the main propositions of structuration theory is that the rules and resources used in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time a means of system reproduction (structural duality).

C. Duality of Structure

(Giddens, 2011) Structure as a set of rules and resources that are organized recursively, outside of space and time, stored in coordination and immediacy as memory traces marked by the absence of a subject. On the other hand, the social system in which he recursively implies the structure consists of the activities of human agents in certain situations which are reproduced in space and time. Analyzing the structure of social systems means examining the modes in which such systems are produced and reproduced in interactions based on the main activities of agents in a given place using rules and resources in various contexts of action. Most important in the notion of structuration is the duality of structure which is logically implied in the arguments presented above. The formation of agents and structures is not two separate clusters of phenomena, namely dualism, but describes a form of duality. According to the idea of duality, the structural properties of social systems are both media and the result of the practices they organize recursively. Structure is not external to individuals, as traces of memory and as embodied in social practices, but in a certain sense it is more 'internal' than external to their activities in Durkheim's sense of social fact. Structure is not equated with restraint but is always confining and liberating. This, of course, does not prevent the structured properties of social systems from extending into space and time beyond the control of individual actors, nor does it compromise the possibility that the social systems of actors helped to be redefined in their activities could realize the system. -that system. The reification of social relations or the discursive naturalization of historically dependent conditions on the products of human action is one of the main ideological dimensions of social life (Giddens, 2011).

The duality of structure has always been the main basis for continuity in social reproduction in space and time. This, in turn, requires reflexive monitoring of agents and as such in the course of daily social activities. However, the range of human knowledge is always limited. The flow of an action always produces unintended consequences for the actors and those undesired consequences may also form conditions of action that are not recognized in a feedback loop. Although human history is created by deliberate activities, it is not a desirable project, human history has always avoided attempts to lead it on the path of consciousness. But such efforts are constantly being carried out by humans, who work under the threat of the promise that they are the only creatures who make history by paying attention to the above facts.

More or less the duality of structure has given us information about how agents and structures integrate and build their new identities which are also supported by knowledge of background, space and time that have certain characteristics. It does not stop there, the conception of legitimacy is very appropriate for us to be involved in the unification of agents and structures that build their new identities. Legitimacy is closely related to acceptance and awareness. Where the intensive communication of agents and structures is continuously recognized and ultimately reproduces new rules, values and norms. This idea is indeed more rational when social encounters and resources become opportunities to control social conditions are wanted to change based on agents who are smart in seeing the situation.

3. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Paradigm

Understanding paradigm according to Thomas Khun in Veeger (1992) is a fundamental view of the subject matter. According to Harmon Moleong (2018) a paradigm is a fundamental way of

understanding, thinking, and assessing something specific about reality. Meanwhile, according to Beker Moleong et al., (2004) paradigm is a set of rules to explain, define boundaries, and explain how something should be done. In social theories there are three kinds of paradigms, namely; social facts paradigm, social definition paradigm and social behavior paradigm. Therefore, the paradigm is a scientific window to see the social world, both from the perspective of social facts, social definitions, or social behavior. In this study, the social definition paradigm was used.

The social definition paradigm is an attempt to see the thought process of a person/individual in defining (giving meaning) in the context of social action. Because this action originates from one's own will and is not influenced by social institutions, in essence this social reality (in many ways) is more subjective. (The characters are, Max Weber, Peter L. Berger, Thomas Luckman, George H. Head, Herbert Blumer, and Anthony Giddens).

B. Research Approach

This type of research is descriptive research (descriptive research) with a qualitative approach. According to Koentjoro (Herdiandyah, 2011) descriptive with a qualitative approach is research that aims to understand social reality, namely seeing the world from what it is, not the world it should be, so a qualitative researcher must have an open minded nature. Qualitative research according to Creswell (Herdiandyah, 2011) is a scientific research process that is intended to understand human problems in the context presented, report detailed views from information sources, and is carried out in a natural setting without any intervention from the researcher. The definition of qualitative research according to Maleong (Herdiandyah, 2011) is research that intends to understand the phenomenon of what is experienced by the research subject, for example behavior, perception, motivation, action and so on. This means that a phenomenon in a social context can be understood critically and deeply with the assurance that what is described can be accounted for for its validity.

According to Denzin & Lincoln (2009) qualitative research has the following characteristics: (1) it has a natural setting as a direct data source and the researcher as the main instrument, (2) is descriptive, that is, the collected data are in the form of words, pictures, not images. numbers, even if there are numbers, are only as supporting data, data obtained through interviews, field notes, photos, documents and others, (3) emphasizes more on the process, (4) tends to use an inductive/qualitative paradigm, and (5) puts emphasis on meaning.

Furthermore, the qualitative approach also involves descriptive principles that can be used for interpretation and understanding of the facts in depth. As revealed by Denzin & Lincoln et al., (2009) that qualitative research, among others, is descriptive, the data collected is more in the form of words or pictures than numbers. Qualitative research emphasizes more on the process than on the product, therefore the analysis is more directed at answering "why" the action was taken rather than "what" was done let alone questioning the results.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The research location consists of data exposure of SMPN 8 Malang, SMPN 13 Malang and SMPN 3 Malang in different predicate levels as the research sample also describes interesting things to study. Meanwhile, the description of the curriculum vitae of the research subjects will be ordered proportionally according to the urgency and the amount of each contribution in providing data and information related to the existence of the three public junior high schools.

SMPN 8 Malang Located in the middle of the city on the edge of the highway surrounded by office buildings, shopping places, culinary places, schools, mosques, and the Gajayana stadium, although it is relatively quiet because the vehicles passing by are not too crowded, so it doesn't cause too much pollution either susra and air. Even though it is located in the middle of the city, environmental conditions are the focus of our attention. Therefore, various environmental-based programs have been arranged through reforestation activities in the Adiwiyata program. SMP Negeri 8 Malang, has now received the title as the Adiwiyata School of East Java Province, which continues to improve to equip itself towards the National Adiwiyata School.

Efforts to improve the self-competence of educators and education personnel are continuously carried out through various activities, so that learning activities become more creative, attractive and innovative. Equipped with various adequate infrastructure facilities, especially, a clean, beautiful, cool

environment, neatly arranged, a calm and conducive atmosphere, and green will be fun, increasing human resources for educators and education personnel, togetherness of every existing stake holder, is expected to make SMP Negeri 8 Kota Malang as one of the quality schools, environmentally friendly, multi-media-based, which can lead students to become human beings who excel in various aspects of life and have noble character.

SMP Negeri 13 Malang is a school that is committed to creating a school that is culturally environmentally in accordance with the school's vision and mission. In 2014 SMP Negeri 13 succeeded in achieving city level adiwiyata, since then all school residents have begun to make improvements to change the behavior of all school residents to be more concerned about the environment. Change, of course, requires a process and is not as easy as turning the palm of the hand. After going through the process and mutual cooperation from all school members, school committees and parents of students, in 2016 SMPN 13 Malang was able to achieve provincial adiwiyata and national adiwiyata in 2019.

In 2021, SMP Negeri 13 Malang will submit to the independent Adiwiyata level. All preparations to go there have been carried out involving the entire school community. Of course, the title of adiwiyata school at the city, provincial, national and independent levels is not a championship like in a competition, but it is hoped that with this title, school residents, especially students, can have the behavior to care and love the environment.

SMP Negeri 13 Malang is located on Jalan Sunan Ampel II, Dinoyo Village, Lowokwaru District, Malang City. This school is located in well-known universities in the city of Malang, Malang University, Brawijaya University, UIN and University of Islam Malang. Established in 1983 and has a very large area of 11,502 m² with a building area of 4625 m². The number of students is 818 with 27 groups consisting of grades 7, 8, 9. Here is the location of SMPN 13 Malang based on google earth.

SMP Negeri 13 Malang is a state school that has been around for a long time, namely in 1984, so now it is 37 years old. The school environment is located in the west of Malang City and is close to UIN, Univ. Brawijaya, UNISMA, and UM. In addition, SMPN 13 Malang is a school with a fairly large area in the city of Malang, namely 11,502 m², so it has a very wide green open space which is comfortable for a learning atmosphere. The number of green plants is certainly very important to meet the oxygen needs of school residents. Another advantage of SMP Negeri 13 is that it is located far from the highway or other public facilities so that the atmosphere is calm and far from air and noise pollution. The source of water at SMPN 13 Malang uses wells and PDAM so that it is abundant and meets the needs of the school.

Communities around SMP Negeri 13 Malang are classified as people who have a middle to upper economy, who have jobs as civil servants, traders, and independent entrepreneurs. The housing around the school is not too crowded, from the highway to Jalan Sunan Ampel to SMP Negeri 13 Malang, there are only approximately 25 houses, where each house has plants, both flowers and fruit trees which are quite green.

The students of SMP Negeri 13 Malang come from the villages of Tlogomas, Dinoyo, Ketawanggede, Sumbersari and Merjosari and a small part from Malang district. So the students of SMP Negeri 13 Malang come from elementary schools from some of these villages. Most of the students' parents come from families with lower-middle income levels, but are quite concerned about the education of their children. However, students' problems are quite varied, especially during this pandemic there are some students who are less responsible in collecting assignments. Some parents also pay less attention to their children because they are busy at work.

The curriculum used at SMP Negeri 13 Malang is the 2013 curriculum for all levels. The number of groups is 27, each level has 9 groups. Learning is carried out from 07.00 WIB to 15.00 WIB for offline and from 07.30 until 13.00 for online learning. Online learning using google classroom created by the homeroom teacher and the homeroom teacher invites subject teachers in the class to join. Since March 16, 2020 learning has been carried out online due to the covid 19 pandemic. Students also take part in extracurricular activities that are carried out after learning. There are 17 extracurriculars whose coaches collaborate with outside communities.

Facilities and infrastructure at SMP Negeri 13 Malang are used to support the learning process, starting from fulfilling ATK, internet networks, books, rooms to the need for environmental cleanliness. Facilities and infrastructure are also provided to solve environmental problems. SMP Negeri 3 Malang is one of the Dutch heritage schools located in Malang City. Mulo Wilhelmina was the forerunner of the school. This school was established on March 17, 1950. In 1960, the name of the Mulo Wilhelmina School was officially changed by the government of the Republic of Indonesia to SMP Negeri 3 Malang with the motto Bina Taruna Adiloka (Bintaraloka). Bina Taruna Adiloka (Bintaraloka) is taken from the Sanskrit language, namely 'bina' which means to educate, 'cadets' which means the younger generation, 'adi' which means the best, and 'loka' which means gym/place. Based on the motto chosen by the predecessors, it is clear that SMP Negeri 3 Malang is a place for forging the younger generation to become the best human beings. To realize the motto of Bina Taruna Adiloka (Bintaraloka) in real activities at SMP Negeri 3 Malang, the entire academy community of SMP Negeri 3 Malang actualizes the motto in the breath of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of SMP Negeri 3 Malang.

The land area which reaches 7,241.83 m², makes SMPN 3 Malang included in the category of a school that is not too broad. Land expansion can be said to be difficult, this is due to the location of SMPN 3 which is located in the middle of the city and is also flanked by various public offices. However, this did not reduce the enthusiasm of SMPN 3 residents to take part in the Adiwiyata program. The lack of SMPN 3 in terms of land has actually become a challenge in itself to innovate in the environmental development program.

Before qualifying to become one of the city-level Adiwiyata schools in Malang City, SMPN 3 was classified as a school that was very minimal in the field of green land conservation. This is one of the consequences of the lack of available land. This has caused SMPN 3 to become a hot and arid school. With a large number of students, which is more than 800 students per year, the need for oxygen at SMPN 3 Malang is something that needs to be considered. The imbalance between the ideal number of people and trees in schools makes the surrounding air feel less fresh.

Meanwhile, in terms of cleanliness, before bearing the title as one of the city's adiwiyata schools, the situation at SMPN 3 was classified as clean. However, most of the cleanliness was created not because of the participation of all citizens, but because of the diligent cleaning staff at SMPN 3. This became a challenge for the school. About how to inspire the students of SMPN 3, who generally come from middle to upper economic families, to want to be directly involved in efforts to improve environmental conservation and cleanliness.

Adiwiyata is one solution to the problems experienced by SMP Negeri 3 Malang. Programs that must be made in a series of adiwiyata process will direct schools to become better, especially in the environmental field. Starting with the addition of greenery in the school environment. The problem of aridity in SMPN 3 has begun to be resolved. Not only green, but because the available land is very minimal, it makes residents have to innovate in reforestation. Among them with hydroponic media and vertical gardens. So, apart from being refreshing, the reforestation at SMPN 3 can also add to the beauty of the school.

Although reforestation has begun to be intensified in schools, this does not mean that all environmental problems in schools have been resolved. Another problem faced by SMPN 3 is the waste problem. The trash cans at SMPN 3 are divided into 3 types, namely organic, inorganic, and hazardous waste bins. Organic waste in schools comes from leaves and food scraps around the school. Inorganic waste comes from plastic and bottles around the school. Meanwhile, hazardous waste in schools consists of glass waste and canned bottles. If the accumulation of garbage continues, it will disrupt the environmental conditions of SMPN 3 Malang.

Some actions that have been taken by schools to tackle the accumulation of organic waste include recycling, composting, and biopori. Meanwhile, the actions that have been taken to reduce the accumulation of inorganic waste are recycling, the establishment of a healthy canteen and also a plastic-free movement. This waste problem has actually begun to decrease due to habituation of attitudes to care for the environment, but as is well known, nothing is instant in this world, everything requires a process. But over time, all the good activities that have been attempted are expected to become habituation.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. School residents (agency) produce and reproduce structures to build cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program at school, where the results of field research at SMPN 8 Malang, SMPN 13 Malang and SMPN 3 Malang show that if the Adiwiyata Program planning is carried out by involving all school residents as agents, through several stages, namely 1) the formation of the Adiwiyata team 2) carrying out environmental studies by analyzing school conditions to environmental action plans 4) carrying out environmental actions as evidenced by authentic evidence such as activity documentation 5) the last stage is conducting evaluation and monitoring the program is likely to be able to run optimally.
2. The structure provides space and time for school members to take action that is oriented towards cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata program at school. Field research at SMPN 8 Malang, SMPN 13 Malang and SMPN 3 Malang showed that the implementation of evaluations by teachers and principals on a regular basis and there was regular monitoring by teachers regarding environmental education would most likely be able to run optimally.
3. The continuity/sustainability of the duality of agency and structure processes in building cultural ecology in the Adiwiyata Program at SMPN 8 Malang, SMPN 13 Malang and SMPN 3 Malang shows that the implementation of the program is in accordance with the planning that has been neatly arranged during the planning stage, involving all school residents. , with a participatory and sustainable principle, and the implementation of the Adiwiyata program involves 4 program components, namely 1) in character education applying environmentally friendly policies, 2) participatory-based curriculum, 3) implementing participatory environmental actions, 4) Managing environmentally friendly facilities and infrastructure. Teachers and school principals actively monitor the habituation activities of the Adiwiyata program implementation in character education that will run smoothly and achieve goals.

REFERENCES

- Amalia, N. H. (2015). Upaya Pelestarian Lingkungan Hidup Melalui Program Adiwiyata sebagai Sumber Belajar bagi Peserta Didik (Studi Kasus SMP Negeri 2 Depok). [http://103.229.202.68/dspace/bitstream/123456789/29231/1/SKRIPSI WATERMARK.pdf](http://103.229.202.68/dspace/bitstream/123456789/29231/1/SKRIPSI%20WATERMARK.pdf)
- Amrullah, F., & Susilo, M. J. (2019). Identifikasi sarana dan prasarana pendukung pelaksanaan sekolah adiwiyata di SMA Negeri Kota Yogyakarta. *Symposium of Biology Education (Symbion)*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.26555/symbion.3554>
- Atmodiwirio, S. (2000). *Manajemen Pendidikan Indonesia*. Adadizya Jaya.
- Cholil Zuhdi, A. (2015). Krisis Lingkungan Hidup dalam Perspektif al-Qur'an. *Mutawatir*, 2(2), 140. <https://doi.org/10.15642/mutawatir.2012.2.2.140-162>
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Research Design. Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed*. Pustaka Belajar.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2009). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (Sage Handbooks)* (4th ed.). Pustaka Belajar.
- Desfandi, M. (2015). Mewujudkan Masyarakat Berkeadilan Peduli Lingkungan Melalui Program Adiwiyata. *SOSIO DIDAKTIKA: Social Science Education Journal*, 2(1), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.15408/sd.v2i1.1661>
- Fitria, H., & Samsia, S. (2020). Peran Kepala Sekolah Dalam Mewujudkan Program Sekolah Adiwiyata. *JMKSP (Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, Dan Supervisi Pendidikan)*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v5i1.3541>
- George Ritzer, Douglas J. Goodman, *Teori Sosiologi Modern*, (Jakarta;Kencana, 2011), hal. 22.
- George Ritzer, *Teori Sosiologi (Dari Teori Sosiologi Klasik Sampai Perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial Postmodern)*, (Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana, 2011), 91.
- George Ritzer, *Teori Sosiologi (Dari Teori Sosiologi Klasik Sampai Perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial Postmodern)*, (Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana, 2011), 93
- Giddens, Anthony. 2011. *Teori Struktural: Dasar-dasar Pembentukan Struktur Sosial Masyarakat*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Gunawan, Z. (2016). Pengembangan Program Adiwiyata Dalam Mewujudkan Sekolah Peduli dan Berbudaya Lingkungan. In *Pedagogik, Jurnal Pendidikan* (Vol. 3, Issue 2, pp. 82–95).
- Hatika, R. G., Afri, L. E., Aida, W., & Siregar, P. S. (2019). Implementasi Program Adiwiyata Sebagai Stimulus Sekolah Berbasis Lingkungan Sma Negeri 2 Rambah Hilir. *JMM (Jurnal Masyarakat Mandiri)*. <https://doi.org/10.31764/jmm.v0i0.1123>
- Hidayat, N. dan E. S. (2014). Integrasi Nilai Karakter Peduli Lingkungan Hidup Dalam Pembelajaran Akidah Akhlak Di MI Nur. *AL-BIDAYAH: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Islam*, 06, 93–112.
- I.B Wirawan, *Teori- Teori dalam Tiga Paradigma*, (Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group, 2013), 18.
- John Scott, *Teori Sosial: Masalah-masalah sosial dalam sosiologi*, (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2012), 80.
- Jones, *Pengantar Teori-Teori Sosial* (Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2009), 123
- Manza, Y. (2016). Penerapan Metode Smart dalam Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Pemberian Penghargaan Adiwiyata Untuk SMP Negeri di Medan [Universitas Potensi Utama]. <http://repository.potensi-utama.ac.id/jspui/handle/123456789/1456>.
- Martini. (2019a). Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Lingkungan dengan Perilaku ProLingkungan Sekolah Adiwiyata. *Rang Teknik Journal*, 2(1).
- Martini, M. (2019b). Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Lingkungan Dengan Perilaku ProLingkungan Sekolah Adiwiyata (Studi Kasus SDN 21 Taluak Kab. Agam). *Rang Teknik Journal*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.31869/rtj.v2i1.1072>
- Miles, H. ., Huberman, A. ., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A. Methods Sourcbook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publicationians.
- Mutakhir *Teori Sosial Postmodern*, (Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana, 2011), 93.
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif* (3rd ed.). PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nasution, S. (2010). *sosiologi pendidikan*. PT. Bumi Aksara.
- Novitasari, R., Fadilah, Y., & Rahaju, S. (2020). Sekolah Adiwiyata sebagai Pengembangan Masyarakat Desa Kedewan dalam Meningkatkan Potensi Wilayah. *Jurnal Pusat Inovasi Masyarakat*, 2(4).
- Nugraheni, R. A. S. (2015). Pengaruh Contextual Teaching And Learning (Ctl) Terhadap Sikap Peduli Lingkungan Siswa Kelas IV di SD Negeri Selang Kecamatan Wonosari Kabupaten Gunungkidul. *Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 14(IV), 1–7.
- Pickering, Mary., “Comte, A. (1798-1857). (2006). French Theorist” dalam Austin Harrington (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. Routledge.
- Pidarta, M. (2006). *Landasan Pendidikan: Stimulus Pendidikan Bercorak Indonesia*. Rineka Cipta.
- Pitirim, A. S. (1928). *Contemporary Sociological Teories*. Harper and Brothers.
- Ratna Kusumawardani, A. S. (2019). Implementasi Metode Simple Additive Weighting (Saw) Untuk Pemilihan. 1(August), 1–6.
- Ritzer, G. (2014). *Sosiologi Ilmu Pengetahuan Berparadigma Ganda*. Rajawali Press.
- Ritzer, George. (2004). *Teori Sosiologi*. Kreasi Wacana.
- Sargent, R. G. (1998). *Verification And Validation Of Simulation Models*. Winter Simulation Conference.
- Sma, D. I., & Klaten, N. (2015). *Implementasi Program Adiwiyata Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta*.
- Steward, Julian H. *Teori Perubahan Budaya* . University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Susilo, Y. Eko Budi, *Menuju Kesadaran Lingkungan, Memahami Sikap Teologis Manusia terhadap Pencemaran Lingkungan*, Malang: Averreod Press, 2003.
- Soemarwoto, O. (2008). *Ekologi, Lingkungan dan Pembangunan*. Dambatan.
- Soerjono, S. (2003). *Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif dan R & D* (XIII). Alfabeta.
- Sumarlin. (2013). Persepsi dan Kepedulian Siswa terhadap Pengelolaan Lingkungan melalui Program Adiwiyata. In *Majalah Geografi Indonesia* (Vol. 27, Issue 1, pp. 38–55).
- Umi Sulbiah, *Islam Radikal Dan Pluralisme Agama*, (Malang: Badan Litbang Dan Diklat Agama RI, 2010), 47.

- Veeger, K. J. (1992). Pengantar Sosiologi: Buku Panduan Mahasiswa. PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Wahyuningtyas, D., Harsastro, P., & Supratiwi. (2013). Evaluasi Program Adiwiyata Di Sman 11 Semarang. In Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan (pp. 1–6).
- Weighting, S. A., & Keputusan, S. P. (2011). 1. 272. 272–278.

Citation: *Ida Wahyuni et al. "Duality of Agency and Structure in Building Cultural Ecology: Case Study on Adiwiyata School Program in Malang, Indonesia" International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE), vol 9, no. 11, 2022, pp. 71-82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0911009>.*

Copyright: © 2022 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.