Fun, 'Family' and Friends: Developing Pro-Environmental Behaviour among High School Students in Indonesia

Danau Tanu and Lyn Parker

'I love it, 'cause it's FUN! It's so 'family'. Seriously, it's so much fun. Composting, feeding the fish...'

—Meri, a member of a high school environmental club, January 2015

Meri's face beamed with excitement as she talked about her high school environmental club, the Adiwiyata Team. Among Meri and her club members, 'fun', 'family' and 'friends' were the most frequently used words to describe how they felt about the activities run by their club. Whether they were shovelling stinking compost or digging *biopori* holes in the muddy ground to improve drainage,¹ laughter was the defining feature of all these activities. Girls covered from head to toe in white shirts and ankle-length grey skirts – their school uniforms – would compete to get their hands dirty as sweat ran down their faces and neck, underneath their headscarves, as they laughed their way through their work. Environmental classes were boring, they would claim, and often they only partially understood why the activities they were doing were good for the environment, but both the girls and the boys loved being part of their club and defying social norms by getting dirty and sweaty.

While much of the research into environmental education (hereafter 'EE') has assumed that individual environmental awareness, knowledge and understanding must precede pro-environmental practice (e.g. Rickinson, 2001), direct observation of student behaviour in high school environmental clubs suggests otherwise.² Three months of immersive, participant observation of Meri and her peers in the Adiwiyata Team in Surabaya, Indonesia, shows that pro-environmental behaviour among youth can be fostered through sustained, direct experiences with nature that appeal to their emotions, such as a sense of belonging. This example does not exactly reverse the process of conventional EE, but instead starts with group environmental activities to raise environmental consciousness and get some environmental work done rather than environmental knowledge or understanding of human-environment interaction.³

¹ *Biopori* are cylindrical holes, about 10cm in diameter and 1 meter in depth, dug in the soil, reinforced by a resin pipe 15-20cm in length, and stuffed with dried leaves in order to improve water absorption, especially in cities where areas of bitumen and concrete are extensive.

² The research reported in this article was conducted as part of an Australia Research Council Discovery Grant project titled "Fostering Pro-Environment Consciousness and Practice: Environmentalism, Environmentality and Environmental Education in Indonesia".

³ Evaluation of the EE in senior high schools in Surabaya and Yogyakarta can be found in Prabawa-Sear (2018), Parker, Prabawa-Sear and Kustiningsih (2018) and Parker and Prabawa-Sear (In press).

Not only is such an approach to EE necessary when the quality of education and awareness of environmental problems are low,⁴ as in Indonesia, but also this approach is supported by a growing body of research on conservation psychology that shows the value of learning by doing (Chawla and Derr, 2012).

In Surabaya, Indonesia's second largest city, the female Mayor, Tri Rismaharini, has mandated that the city is to become a green city, and that EE must be taught in schools. Surabaya is one of the few places where EE is occurring. Most of the schools that are actively engaged in EE are carrying out activities facilitated by an environmental NGO (hereafter TENGO).⁵ The schools' EE activities are often also under the umbrella of a nationwide EE program in schools, known as Adiwiyata. TENGO and Adiwiyata take pro-environment activities as the 'stuff' or content of EE, and these activities are performed by groups of students. There is very little attention paid to explaining the purpose of the activities, or the processes to which the activities contribute. Scant attention is paid to knowledge, science or understanding of nature or of human-environment interaction. TENGO facilitates a very deliberate construction of a student group identity, which has at its heart the ethos of *kekeluargaan*. Students join in the activities because of this feeling of belonging to a group or 'family' of friends, who have a huge amount of fun doing environmental activities together.

This paper is one outcome of a large, team project that aimed to examine EE in Indonesia both formally, in schools and universities, and informally, for example in national parks and by NGOs.⁶ It begins by briefly outlining the literature on conservation psychology for youth before introducing the national Adiwiyata program of EE and the program of an environmental non-government organisation, called here TENGO, in schools in Surabaya. It contextualizes the role of TENGO in providing programs that act as a substitute to formal EE in the absence of both the capacity and willingness among schools to provide effective EE. It then outlines the methodology used to collect the data on which the paper is based. The body of the paper shows how the program in senior high schools circumvents the institutional lack of capacity to implement formal programs of their own and appeals directly to students to mobilize them for an environmental cause. It shows why students join it, and its appeal to young people: it is a club that fosters feelings of belonging and caring, and that runs activities that are always social and physically engaging. The club operationalizes the ethos of *kekeluargaan* (family-togetherness) as a means to encourage students to engage in environmentally-friendly activities through the fun of doing things together.

Learning by doing for the environment

Although it would take a brave environmental educator to claim that knowledge and understanding of environmental systems and interactions with socio-economic processes were not an essential part of EE, there is considerable angst over whether schools and conventional education systems have the capacity to transform understanding of the deep and complex processes that have created environmental problems into pro-environmental

⁴ The Indonesian Minister for the Environment wrote: 'We must acknowledge that our attention to and consciousness of environmental problems is still very low. This is caused by the fact that most people in Indonesian society have not yet awoken to a real perception of the environment' (Kementerian, 2004, p. ix) '[E]nvironmental values are not deeply embedded in [Indonesian] society' (The World Bank, 2014)

⁵ With the exception of the name of the Mayor of Surabaya, the names of schools, non-government organisations and individuals are pseudonyms to protect privacy in accordance with Human Research Ethics requirements.

⁶ See Introduction (Parker) of this Special Issue.

behaviour (e.g. Jickling 1992; Jickling & Wals 2013; Stevenson 2007). At its most basic, the conventional EE formula was:

Environmental Knowledge → Environmental Attitudes → Pro-Environment Behaviour (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002, p. 241).

Its flawed assumption that environmental knowledge and awareness would inevitably lead to pro-environmental behaviour has long been questioned. As a result, there has been considerable complication of this overly simple model, and a swing towards experiential EE and a sharper focus on learners and learning processes. Yet, research on EE has continued to overwhelmingly emphasize knowledge, attitude and skills rather than behaviour (e.g. Zint 2013).

In contrast, studies in the field of environmental and conservation psychology have shown that learning through action is the most effective way to develop pro-environmental behaviour (Chawla and Derr 2012). In particular, experiences of outdoor play in nature have a significant positive influence on pro-environmental behaviour with environmental activists citing it as influential at a rate of 65 to 100 per cent (Chawla and Derr 2012, p. 537):

Overall, the influence of formal education is small relative to all the categories of “free-choice learning” outside of school (Falk, 2005) that people refer to, including nature play and discovery, the shock of witnessing environmental destruction, outdoor interactions with family members and friends, participation in environmental organizations, and nature books or films.

Building on the work of Dewey on learning by doing (1938), Chawla and Derr’s (2012, p. 545-6) extensive review of the literature suggests three key elements to effective EE programs: that the programs occur over ‘an extended duration’; that they ‘connect learning to the real worlds of students’ homes, communities, or regions’; and that they ‘involve students actively’. The review finds that children and youth are most likely to develop pro-environmental behaviours when they learn through participating in (place-based) activities that bring them in direct contact with nature and in which they can see the impact of their actions on their local community. These activities are particularly effective when they occur over an extended period of time and are accompanied by social support, such as from mentors, friends or family members.

However, it is not contact with nature alone that can predict willingness to commit to protecting the environment. A study by Müller, Kals, and Pansa (2009) shows that direct experience of nature is important when it develops emotional affinity to nature, which was the strongest of the predictors studied, followed by awareness of environmental risks and indignation towards environmental destruction. The findings of the study confirm that ‘positive emotional experiences with nature are crucial for the development of affinity, especially if these experiences are accompanied with significant others’ (p. 65). In the context of children ‘learning democracy’ by practising it, Hart (1997) has suggested that such learning is effective when children feel heard and valued for their actions, which leads to a feeling of belonging. Meanwhile, Ojala (2011) uses psychological theory to argue that ‘constructive hope’, which includes trust in one’s own ability to have a positive impact and trust in other societal actors to affect climate change has a unique and significant influence on pro-environmental behaviour that cannot be replaced with knowledge-based EE. In short, the affective influences on pro-environmental behaviour cannot be underestimated.

It is through a focus on affective elements that this study contributes to the literature on the development of pro-environmental behaviour among teenagers. Among studies that focus on pro-environmental behaviour, most have been based on the research participants' self-reporting of their behaviour and very few have been based on direct observation or longitudinal studies of such behaviour. In contrast, this study is based on direct observation of student behaviours in situ over an extended period and its findings echo the growing literature on the effect of affect in the development of pro-environmental behaviour among children and youth.

Background

The Adiwiyata Program

The Adiwiyata Program is a nationwide, school-level, environmental education program that was developed in the Ministry of the Environment (MoE) in 2006.⁷ The impetus and continuing enthusiasm for the program lies with the MoE. The Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) plays a minimal role, providing only facilities. The absence of MOEC investment and interest in EE, and Adiwiyata in particular, is one of the main reasons for the lack of EE in schools nationally and the limited take-up of Adiwiyata.

The Adiwiyata program aims to 'create school citizens who are responsible for efforts for the protection and management of the environment through good school management to support sustainable development' (Kementerian 2010). There are two main principles. Adiwiyata schools should be:

1. Participative: the school community is involved in school management which covers the whole process of planning, implementation and evaluation in accord with its responsibilities and role; and
2. Sustainable: all activities must be done in a comprehensively planned and continuous way (Kementerian 2010).

Although this is supposed to be a nationwide program, by 2013 only around 1,000 schools were participating (Clearinghouse, 2015). The program had grown to include 7,278 schools of all levels from across Indonesia by 2017 (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan, 2017). There are about 260,000 schools in Indonesia (MOEC (Ministry of Education and Culture), 2016), so the coverage of the Adiwiyata Program can be described as very limited. There is a huge amount of paperwork involved in the program, and we have several instances of schools not joining for that reason.

Greening Surabaya

Surabaya began a greening program in 2006, largely in response to major flooding. The program received a large boost from the election of Tri Rismaharini, affectionately known as 'Bu Risma',⁸ as Mayor from 2010. She is now internationally known as an award-winning, can-do mayor with a deep commitment to making Surabaya 'Clean and Green' (Fionna, 2017 esp. pp.12-15). Bu Risma has the training for, and a serious commitment to, improving the environment of Surabaya, and is famous for her hands-on approach, explosive anger when people desecrate public parks, and energy to get things done. She is often mentioned by both the TENGO staff and high school students as a role model for the way she clean toilets herself and for her willingness to step into black canals in her rolled-up trousers to help clean

⁷ Now the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

⁸ 'Bu' is short for 'Ibu', which is literally 'mother', but is a common way to address adult women.

them – both of which are activities that are usually relegated to lower class workers such as maids in middle-class homes or street sweepers. Bu Risma is extremely popular in Surabaya, has an almost legendary reputation, and was re-elected in 2015 in a landslide win.

The Surabaya government is happy to rely on TENGO to implement Bu Risma's mandated EE in schools.⁹ There is a strong feeling that TENGO has the expertise, flexibility and effective service delivery that the schools lack. TENGO runs the Adiwiyata program in many schools, deciding on programs and target quantities (x kgs of compost to be made, x number of salad vegetable pots to be grown) and teaching students in the Adiwiyata and other environmental clubs how to do the work. However, as an NGO with fewer than ten staff and volunteers at any time, only one staff member with a university education, and hundreds of schools to reach across Surabaya, TENGO's ability to conduct effective EE is curtailed by staff incapacity, logistics and funding.

As a result, only a few students from each of the schools they work with can attend TENGO workshops at any given time, making it difficult to disseminate environmental knowledge. Although students take turns to attend such workshops, only a few learn directly from TENGO staff while the rest must hear the information secondhand from their peers. The knowledge imparted is inevitably diluted in the manner of Chinese whispers as the information gets passed on by word of mouth. For example, at two of the schools, the environmental club leaders were able to explain that it is important to dig *biopori* holes in order to replenish the depleting groundwater in urban areas and help prevent flooding, that they need to use a pipe to hold the mud walls of the hole back to ensure the hole does not collapse, and that they must then place leaves in the holes as bait for worms so that as the worms travel to the leaves they will create pathways that will allow rainwater to travel further into the ground. But most of the rest of the club members can only provide half the explanation (usually they do not know what the leaves are for), while the youngest and newest members believe that the holes are merely to prevent flooding. Such logistical difficulties in providing knowledge-based EE are further exacerbated by the limitations of Indonesia's educational system.

Education and environmental awareness

The city's reliance on TENGO's efforts needs to be understood within the broader context of the formidable problems that exist in Indonesia's education system, and the low level of environmental awareness among the populace. Indonesian students perform poorly on international tests, such as PISA, and such results reflect the poor quality of classroom teaching. The 2013 tests placed Indonesia the second lowest of all 72 countries tested (at 71). The PISA tests assess 15-year-old students in the three core subjects of science, mathematics and reading. The Indonesian government is well aware of the poor quality of the education that is offered to students and has dramatically increased teacher salaries and requirements for teacher qualifications, but there has not been any real movement in Indonesia's PISA scores since (OECD, 2016a, 2016b).

The problems include teachers' low knowledge base, limited pedagogy and continuing reliance on rote learning for exams. Another major problem is that many teachers become teachers in order to become civil servants, because of the secure salary, virtually guaranteed

⁹ TENGO is a long-lived NGO. It has a local energy supplier as a major sponsor, and another private sponsor which supplies the house which accommodates TENGO's office. It enjoys a long relationship with another environmental NGO in Perth, Western Australia.

promotion and old-age pension (Bjork, 2004, 2013). Many teachers lack confidence in their own knowledge and rely solely on textbooks as the teaching resource; while the Internet is increasingly used, it is usually only accessed by mobile phones, not computers, and neither students nor teachers are trained in how to use the Internet effectively or critically. In a grade 11 biology class, students were to find the nutritional content of a packaged food on the Internet and write it down for a class on digestion. Afterwards the teacher said that the lowest mark was 82 percent while the highest mark was 90 percent. She explained that the higher marks were given because the 'packaging is nice' as she pointed out how the student had used pink and purple pens, which she felt was evidence that they had put some effort into making the assignment presentable.

It was painfully obvious during fieldwork that the teaching staff were not equipped to teach EE. For example, one of the EE classes for final year students was being taught by an economics teacher who was due to retire in the middle of the semester and was neither equipped to nor interested in teaching the class. When Tanu asked for permission to observe the class, the teacher, Mrs Esti, insisted that Tanu teach the class instead. Mrs Esti openly confessed that she did not understand the content of the EE classes (Field notes, 20 January 2015). On another occasion, when Tanu asked which classes were ideal for observing EE, one of the teachers, who was second in charge of the school's environmental club, repeatedly suggested maths classes. In response, the student leader of the club, who was a high achiever, politely pointed out that maths classes do not have EE incorporated into their lessons and suggested choosing more suitable classes for the researcher to observe, such as sociology or natural science.

Compounding the issue of low quality education is the alarmingly low awareness regarding the environment. It has been widely reported that Indonesia is the #3 producer of greenhouse gases in the world (World Bank, 2016) and the #2 producer of marine plastics pollution (Jambeck et al., 2015). Rubbish is ubiquitous in the streets and rivers in Indonesia, and this is not just because local councils do not provide adequate rubbish collections. One civics teacher lamented that she would often have to start the class by asking students to pick up the garbage around them and place it in a garbage bin. It was common to see rubbish littering the classroom floors. In Indonesia, picking up garbage and throwing it in a bin is commonly seen as a job reserved for those occupying the lowest ranks of the socio-economic hierarchy, as evidenced by the fact that members of school environmental clubs who sometimes went around picking up rubbish were often teased for being like street sweepers.

It was within this unsupportive context that TENGO would often bypass school authorities to engage directly with students to encourage and mobilize them to form environmental clubs before seeking the school's support. Once they were able to engage the students, TENGO would often then persuade school authorities to support the student initiatives by offering rewards through competitions (see Prabawa-Sear 2018). While the strategies used to engage school authorities are worth analysis, this paper will focus on how students are mobilized at all in the absence of social and institutional support and what it is that draws them to environmental activities. The answer to this could potentially be applied in other Indonesian contexts as a means to bypass the formidable obstacles faced by institutional failure to implement EE.

Methodology

The main data for this paper are detailed field notes from three months of intensive ethnographic fieldwork in Surabaya, January to March 2015, conducted by Danau Tanu.¹⁰ In addition, one of the PhD students on the team, Kelsie Prabawa-Sear, conducted 12 months of ethnographic fieldwork in schools in Yogyakarta and Surabaya, and this paper draws on her thesis where indicated below. The second author (and supervisor of Prabawa-Sear), Lyn Parker, has been researching school culture in Indonesia since 1980. The project decided to focus on senior high schools (rather than primary or junior high schools) because the students, aged 16-18 years, are articulate in Indonesian; have long been exposed to the values inculcated by schools, families and communities; and have some awareness of community values and political issues.

Tanu mainly attended two senior high schools in Surabaya, one public (called The State School here) and one private (called The Catholic School), following EE activities. The State School had an environmental club called the Adiwiyata Team, which came under the national Adiwiyata program and was funded by the state. The Catholic School ran the Environmental Team, which came under the school's extracurricular sports club and was privately funded by the school. Most of the data come from The State School. At first, Tanu attended classes, as she had been told that EE was incorporated into lessons, but finding little evidence of that, she turned to the Adiwiyata/TENGO activities. These were not restricted to the school campus or to school hours. For example, there was a weekend 'green camp', which included a visit to a traditional market to collect scrap vegetables left on the ground and in the gutters to be composted back at the campus, and out-of-hours activities such as potting and making compost.

Our two fieldworkers in Surabaya relied on TENGO for entrance to the schools, and initially relied on its wealthy sponsor for accommodation at his house and transport. TENGO was actively involved in the research: they facilitated meetings with government officials who were interviewed; they were sometimes present during interviews; they introduced the researchers to school principals and teachers, and accompanied them to events. Tanu soon found her own accommodation and transport and became more independent of TENGO, but there is no doubt that the two fieldworkers worked closely with TENGO. The researchers were fully aware of the possible bias that this would introduce to the way people perceived them, and the content of the data they collected. However, they felt that without the patronage of TENGO they would not have gained access. This is a very Indonesian way to operate: it is important to have connections, and gaining access to power is all about knowing the right people. The researchers believe that this avenue gave them insights into the articulation of government, NGO and schools. Prabawa-Sear wrote: 'I was often introduced as a friend of [TENGO] which I believe made the interviewees feel more relaxed and candid and made for more valuable conversations' ().

The Strategy: Fostering Fun, Family and Friendship

In the first instance, TENGO would draw students to their environmental activities by presenting their work as fun and 'cool'. An important aspect of working with TENGO, which helps to explain its success, is that the senior male activists of TENGO, who worked with the high school students, were young (in their mid-20s to early 30s) and charismatic. (The younger female activists worked mainly with primary school children.) Also, they used a high-tech van with a large, flat-screen TV – an unusual sight in Indonesia. TENGO's van,

¹⁰ Tanu was employed as Research Associate by the project.

dubbed the 'eco-mobile' or EMO, was colourfully painted with trees, animals and cartoon-like people tending to a garden. It was often used to approach schools for the first time and to attract the general public at events. The back door opens upward to show a mobile home theatre set, and the side door opens upward to show a library of books on the environment. This set-up is usually supplemented by a gigantic environmental 'snakes and ladder' tarpaulin that is spread on the ground and doubles as a carpet for children to sit on while watching a show on the home theatre. For the high school students, the chance to work with TENGO's young, male, charismatic crew was attractive in itself. In one instance, a female student leader from a school that was newly approached by TENGO, visibly sought the attention of a male TENGO worker through friendly joking. Also, Fauzi, the former president of the Adiwiyata Team at The State School, often shadowed TENGO by joining in off-campus activities unrelated to his own school and later acted as an intern. Needless to say, TENGO staff acted as mentors and role models for the students.

As for managing the environmental clubs once they were running, TENGO's model was to encourage students to foster a sense of family within the clubs as TENGO did among their own workers and those associated with them. Tanu and Prabawa-Sear met with TENGO workers for the first time at the house of their patron, Mr Emil, located inside a gated community for the upper class. The TENGO workers had just returned from a holiday to Bali with Mr Emil, his wife, children, and a few others. The group had taken several cars to travel to Bali as an entourage, using walkie-talkies to communicate between the cars. Apart from a garage that can fit ten cars, Mr Emil's property also accommodates a large house, a pool, a separate *musholla* (prayer room), and a three-storey building that houses orphans and economically disadvantaged children. TENGO's leader and workers always refer to Mr Emil as 'family'. When Mr Emil's mother fell ill and was hospitalised, TENGO workers were some of the first to visit her in hospital.

It did not take long for Tanu to experience the '*rasa kekeluargaan*' (family feeling) first hand. TENGO had had a long day organising The State School's two-day Green Camp. At the end of the first day they went to a nearby *warung* (road-side stall) for a simple dinner and Tanu asked Nia why she volunteers with TENGO:

'Cos it's like this, right?' Nia said in reference to the community feel, the sense of belonging that TENGO offers. She said it as though it should be plain for all to see. Indeed, here we were eating and joking in the tiny *warung* like family. (Field notes, 10 January 2015)

There was much bantering over dinner. Halfway through dinner, Fauzi, the former head of the Adiwiyata Team at The State School, dropped by with a friend to join in the banter. As they finished the meal, Reza, TENGO's leader, paid for all the meals, like a father or a big brother does in Indonesia. Most of the activist workers are introduced to and join TENGO through friends. They say they work seven days a week, sometimes for long hours, because they enjoy the work.

The sense of family-togetherness was not the only ethos that they fostered among themselves. 'Fun' was also part of their vocabulary. As they walked back to the campus after dinner, one of TENGO's younger workers, Riska, told Tanu about their activity called, '*gerebek pasar*', which roughly translates to 'market raid':

Full of enthusiasm, Riska said that the first time she did it, 'It was super FUN!!! Fun!! So, so much fun!! [*SERU sekali!!! Seru! Seru banget!!*] She was almost jumping off the ground from excitement. (Field notes, 10 January 2015)

In interviews and during activities, student members of Adiwiyata at The State School were asked why they had joined Adiwiyata. Many students answered that they 'liked nature' or 'liked the environment', that they had been active in Adiwiyata in junior high school, that they had a friend in it, or that they liked sport and physical activities. Typical of answers are the opening quote and the following:

Ani says, 'It's FUN!' She's been with Adiwiyata since grade 10.¹¹ She joined when she saw the demonstrations at the orientation for extracurricular activities. Ani 'likes the environment'. 'Composting, even though it smells, it doesn't bother us. 'Cause it's like a challenge. It's really fun when it's challenging.' (Field notes, 14 January 2015)

Later in the same conversation, the students were asked how they encourage others to care for the environment.

Ani: We invite them to do things together.

Meri: In a family kind of way (*cara kekeluargaan*). If there's rubbish, we don't tell them, 'Hey, clean it up!' Not 'You must,' but 'Let's do it together'. There's no need to get angry about something so trivial. (Field notes, 14 January 2015)

It was apparent that the sense of family and fun present in TENGO's activities and among its workers was reproduced in the high school Adiwiyata Team that operated with TENGO's guidance.

Belonging to the Adiwiyata Family

Students from The State School use the word 'family' unsparingly to describe what the Adiwiyata Team means for them. They reference 'the family' as a positive and egalitarian group: they emphasise the group togetherness of activities, the fun of doing things together, and the sharing of the load. Zocori explained that he likes the club because doing things together, such as cleaning up the garbage on the shores of Kenjeran beach,

can create a family bond within the organisation. So it is as though you have your own family in the organisation. If, for example, one kid in the organisation gets sick, then we'll feel horrible if we don't visit them. So we are like a close family. (Interview, 13 February 2015)

An egalitarian family

The Adiwiyata Team members' vision of 'the family' is that of a caring, cooperative, egalitarian family unit in which different voices are heard and arguments proposed, some sort of consensus is derived, and members pull together. It is one to which students want to belong.

¹¹ Grade 10 is the first year of senior high school in Indonesia.

Although students are usually initially drawn to join because of a friend, it is the egalitarian ‘family feel’ that keeps them in the Adiwiyata Team. Langit initially did not feel comfortable in the club because he did not know any of the other students, and ended up leaving. Later, Fauzi, who was in the year above Langit, asked him to join the Team again and introduced him to the others. It was after Langit got to know the others that he ended up staying. In fact, when Fauzi had almost given up leading the team, because he found it difficult to encourage the others to participate and ‘care’, it was Langit who persuaded Fauzi to keep on going. Fauzi and Langit were proud of the way the Adiwiyata Team allows junior students to voice their opinion to their seniors – a characteristic that they felt was lacking in other clubs. Other members agreed that one of the defining characteristics of the Adiwiyata Team was the way they defied the social norms prevalent in Indonesian schools by allowing members a more equal voice without discriminating based on seniority.

Fauzi explained that he made sure the Adiwiyata Team has no strict ‘seniority’. Usually senior students are ‘*jaim*’ (*jaga imej*) or careful to guard their image as seniors. They would not, for example, be the first to say hello to their juniors because they see it as their juniors’ job to show respect and say hello. But Fauzi would take the initiative to say hello to his juniors – a gesture that was well received by them. One afternoon, Tanu was walking with Fauzi, a twelfth grader, towards the school mosque. A few tenth grade girls from Adiwiyata called out to Fauzi to tease him about his feet being dirty and needing to wash his feet before entering the mosque. Fauzi had laughed and played along. Fauzi later explained that it was uncommon for younger students to joke so casually with older students like this. For example, when Tanu asked the girls why they had not told her to wash her feet, they claimed that Tanu was clean, but Fauzi was dirty. The girls had been more casual with Fauzi not only because they had known him for longer, but also because he had allowed them to break the social norms of treating those who are older with a sense of distant deference. Andi, who was in eleventh grade and a year below Fauzi, claimed that he had a ‘relaxed’ relationship with Fauzi and had no qualms about teasing Fauzi. Ideally, Andi wished that the tenth graders, who are a year below Andi, would also be as relaxed with him as he is with Fauzi: ‘If we are family, then we should [act like] family. We shouldn’t need to feel *sungkan* (reluctant to do something on account of another person’s higher status)¹² towards our seniors.’

Another factor that made students perceive that the Adiwiyata Team was egalitarian was that the members had similar socio-economic backgrounds, which were lower than those of the members of more popular clubs (e.g. the cheerleading team). While some of the more ‘popular’ kids owned the newest iPhones, which were expensive, none of the Adiwiyata kids did. The latter tended to use older versions of the cheaper brands such as ASUS or Huawei, with the older versions of Samsung being the most expensive that some of them owned. Meri explains:

The thing is, our Team is really family. So we don’t discriminate, like, you are this and you are that, or you are Muslim and you are whatever. We’re integrated. So if we joke, we joke together. If we have fun, we have fun together. If we eat, we eat together. If one of us is lacking, then we will share with them. ... Plus, Adiwiyata never picks places that are really ‘high’, as in we don’t go to restaurants. We always go to places that are nearby and cheap. But ‘famous’ [popular] kids prefer fancy places, and they

¹² H. Geertz identified *sungkan* as a peculiarly Javanese emotion, and says it “refers to a feeling of respectful politeness before a superior or an unfamiliar equal, an attitude of constraint, a repression of one’s own impulses and desire, so as not to disturb the emotional equanimity of one who may be spiritually higher.” (Geertz, 1959, p. 233).

would never wanna go if we asked them to eat in normal places. Never. Like, roadside stalls selling *bakso* [meat balls], places like that. (Interview, 5 February 2015)

Having similar socio-economic backgrounds meant that none of the Adiwiyata Team members had to feel inferior or excluded when they went out together.

Students talk about the family feeling is often warm, affectionate and appreciative. Yenny, for instance, mentions that

The feeling of family-ness (*rasa kekeluargaan*) is nice. You can get help if you have troubles. When you're really tired from composting, it doesn't matter because everyone is just laughing and your stress just disappears. (Interview, 11 February 2015)

A family of friends

The Adiwiyata club provides an instant scaffold for the 'family of friends', providing structure, activities and a variety of peers. Some students do not have particular, close friends in Adiwiyata, and they just get along with everybody. But some students 'follow a friend' and join Adiwiyata; sometimes a friend will leave Adiwiyata and then a student is left 'high and dry'. Niko, for example, used to be a member of the Islamic Club but left it when his friend moved away to another school. This was a common pattern. On the one hand, it contributed to a strong sense of belonging and family because the activities were fun when done with friends; on the other hand, students were dependent on friends and not committed to the purpose of the clubs.

The students in Adiwiyata work hard to keep the channels of communication open. On one occasion, some of the girls in Grade 10 experienced conflict where one girl felt left out by the others who had already known each other from before they joined the Adiwiyata Team. So the Grade 11 committee members decided to hold and mediate an 'Open Forum' to openly discuss the issue and resolve it. They spent two hours, during which time some cried, to ensure that all those involved felt '*ikhlas*' (sincere, holding no resentment). When asked why they were so intent on resolving the issue, Fauzi explained that there had been a dispute a year or two ago between the two leaders, himself and a girl. It had ended in a massive falling-out after which the other leader left Adiwiyata and half the members left with her. Fauzi explained that they wanted to avoid repeating the same mistake by resolving the issue before it escalated to affect the Team as a whole.

Niko further explained they want to avoid the forming of cliques within the Team:

The important thing is that we are family. We should not look down on anyone in the organisation. We don't allow people to form 'gangs' in Adiwiyata. If that ever happened, it'd break the organisation apart. There are a lot of school organisations where some support this faction and some support another faction. We don't have that in Adiwiyata. We focus on being like a family, on being one without having separate cliques. (Interview, 5 February 2015)

The sense of belonging that the students feel in the Adiwiyata Team is strong. One Friday afternoon, after Scouts training, 26 Adiwiyata Team members spent two hours repotting about 50 plants while singing, joking, and laughing non-stop. At the end, Fauzi, the former Adiwiyata leader, stopped by and invited everyone to his house. His grandmother had passed

away, and his family had opened their house that day so that visitors could pay their respects. The others thanked him and said they would come over after they cleaned up. No sooner had Fauzi left the scene than one of the tenth grade girls, Martha, buried her face in her hands and started to cry. Her friends stood around her consoling her. Martha badly wanted to join the others to visit Fauzi's house because an invitation from the most senior student to his house was rare. But she had already asked her father to come and pick her up at school. It was too late to ask her father to cancel as it would have been disrespectful. Martha could not go to Fauzi's house.

An emotional 'comfort zone'

The students in Adiwiyata identify that their behaviour in Adiwiyata is different to that in other situations. They say that they are more themselves in Adiwiyata.

Fauzi explained that the boys act differently inside and outside of Adiwiyata. They are opposite.

Tanu: What do you mean by opposite?

Fauzi asked me whether I thought Langit was quiet. I said no, he's always joking. That's exactly what he meant, Fauzi said. Langit is quiet in class, but in Adiwiyata he can be a joker because he feels comfortable. Fauzi then asked me what I thought of Zocori – Is he serious?

Tanu: Nooooo. He's never serious! He's always joking, even in meetings.

Fauzi: See. But in OSIS [*Organisasi Siswa Intra Sekolah*, Student Council], he's serious...

Tanu: Oh yeah....he is! I saw him, he's serious in OSIS.

Fauzi: Because he has a 'position'.

Tanu: Yeah, he's got responsibility.

But in Adiwiyata he's silly, Fauzi explained. It was true. I remember being struck by how serious Zocori was during an OSIS meeting. But in Adiwiyata he's permanently silly...

Rachmad asked me what my impression was of him. I honestly told him that I didn't notice him until some weeks after because he's sort of in the background and not loud like Niko or Zocori. Rachmad did a half nod. Fauzi tells me that Rachmad is talkative in class. 'He is?' I said, feeling incredulous. Fauzi continued, 'But not in Adiwiyata.' Rachmad explained that he is talkative in class because he wants the teacher to like him so he can get good grades. But in Adiwiyata, he doesn't need to do this. (Field notes, 24 March 2015)

Adiwiyata is their comfort zone, where they feel safe, accepted, and can be their 'authentic' selves.

Student-Driven, Democratic Decision-Making

One factor which fosters ‘belonging’ is the way The State School leaves it to the students to organise themselves. Tanu attended all student meetings that she heard about at the two schools and at The State School in particular was struck by the way the students called and ran meetings by themselves. While the two teachers in charge may occasionally meet with the committee members of the Team on the sidelines, or be present at the Green Camp as a chaperone, they and other adult figures, apart from the researcher, were never present at the formal meetings.

All high schools in Indonesia have Student Councils called OSIS, which generally consist of elected student representatives who are serious, responsible, ‘good’ students, usually civic-minded, natural leaders. OSIS are generally student-run, but have strong support and guidance from teachers. Besides OSIS, there are usually other extra-curricular clubs such as Scouts, ROHIS (Islamic Student Club) and Nature Lovers.

During one of the OSIS meetings, Tanu was impressed by the firm leadership that the student leaders, Sofyan and Zocori, showed: they ‘got things done despite the talking and joking’ (Field notes, 20 January 2015). It was also democratic in that every student who had an opinion seemed to have their say. This characteristic was even more pronounced in the Adiwiyata team meetings. At one meeting, they needed an action plan to reach the unrealistic target that the Principal had set for them: to dig 1,000 bioporis. They sarcastically joked that the school would sink if they dug 1,000 holes on the tiny campus, but proceeded to discuss how many to dig that day (50), where to dig (north side of the school), and why (that side is often flooded during the rainy season). The meeting was completely student-driven.

However, this student driving and student leading was a feature of Adiwiyata at The State School, but not at The Catholic School. At the latter, a single devoted teacher, Dr Lusi, drove the program. There were other significant differences between the two schools due to the disparate wealth of the schools and parents. The Catholic School was patronised by wealthy, mostly ethnic Chinese parents, and the School employed many more general staff to clean up, keep environmental activities going (when students left plants unwatered, rubbish to be cleaned up, and so on), and actually do the environmental activities when students were called to study. The students themselves claimed that they liked the environmental activities because they were ‘fun’. But Tanu felt that it appeared a lot less fun for students doing environmental activities at The Catholic School than for the Adiwiyata kids at The State School, mainly because it was not student-driven and was more structured (Field notes, 16 January 2015).

The ‘family feel’ also enables students to become more aware of their responsibilities without being told from the top down. According to Fauzi, the Adiwiyata Team operates under the principle that ‘nothing is forced’ (*tidak ada paksaan*) nor are they ‘bound’ to anything (*tidak ada keterikatan*); that members will come to ‘their own realisation’ or become ‘self-aware’ (*kesadaran diri*) that they should actively participate in the Team if they want to be a part of it; and that if they participate they do so ‘willingly’ and ‘sincerely’ (*keikhlasan*). Likewise, Niko believes the best way to promote a sense of family among Adiwiyata clubs at other schools is to emulate their strategy of ‘not forcing’ it upon students: ‘If they join Adiwiyata without being forced, they will like it more’. This characteristic sets the Adiwiyata Team apart from other clubs. The freedom to participate at their own pace is particularly important

for environmental clubs because they are usually seen as ‘uncool’ compared to other more popular clubs.

At The State School, many Adiwiyata members belong to more than one student organisation. These members say they get different things from each organisation. Zocori, who was the Vice President of OSIS (in effect, Vice School Captain or Deputy Head Boy), a committee member for Scouts and the Islamic Club, and a member of Adiwiyata, differentiated between the four organisations as follows in terms of what he gets out of them:

OSIS – learning about organisation and structure

Islamic Club – religiosity

Adiwiyata – family (*kekeluargaan*)

Pramuka – learning how to be self-sufficient (*kemandirian*) (Interview, 13 February 2015)

The student-driven nature of the clubs in part reflects the weak institutional support for environmental activities from teachers and TENGO’s limited capacity. It also explains why TENGO prefers to engage the students directly rather than through the schools.

Fun: the more the merrier

Some aspects of the socialising during environmental activities are common to socialising among Indonesian young people generally, and indeed Indonesians generally. Many anthropologists have commented that Indonesians enjoy the quality of *ramai*: busy, crowded places or events (e.g. Mead 1942; Parker and Nilan 2013, p. 127). Landscapes devoid of people, isolated farmhouses, neighbourhoods where one cannot see one’s neighbours – these are generally not desired. ‘The more the merrier’ is a universal truth in Indonesia. All the EE activities, in both schools, occurred within a constant buzz of joking, play-acting, fooling around and teasing, some slapstick, singing, and easy socialising.

Fredi explained that the ‘family factor’ (*faktur kekeluargaan*) defines Adiwiyata – the joking and wisecracks: Many other extra-curricular activities are based on force. ‘Like OSIS,’ he said, ‘we are forced by our parents.’ He tried OSIS, but it didn’t suit him – ‘they have a different mindset. They try to pull everyone down. So I joined Adiwiyata. There’s lots of joking around. OSIS is serious. You can’t discuss ideas – people will put you down. But in Adiwiyata, if there’s an idea, we’ll try it out first.’ (Field notes, 23 January 2015)

At The State School, the Adiwiyata kids were digging *biopori*. It’s hot, tough work – the students usually strike rocks or roots and their diggers jam.

There’s lots of shouting. Niko does some digging. Then he puts his phone inside the hole and pulls it out. He pretends he found it in the hole and yells: A phone! A phone! He laughs.

Earlier Niko was sweeping leaves into the bin. They brought the bin for the compost filling for the biopori.¹³ There are now 24 people: 12 boys and 12 girls. Some of the girls were in dress shoes. But they went ahead digging anyway. There’s lots of

¹³ Students often did not distinguish leaves from mulch or compost. Leaves, mulch, compost and fertiliser were often considered interchangeable.

shouting. Girls have their hands covered in mud. They sometimes stick their hands in the hole to bring up the loose mud made loose by the turning digger...

One of the boys picks up a shovel, horizontally. The shovel end is full of electronic goods – a battery charger, phone, etc. He pretends to dump it in one of the holes.

Niko is being silly again: he takes his hand out of one of the bins. There's a mobile phone in his hand that was previously hidden inside the bin: I found a phone!

The other boy with the shovel: Throw the rubbish there!

He holds the shovel over one of the bins and pretends to dump the electronic goods in the bin.

Another boy picks up the end of the broken digger: Whose is this?

Then he feigns tears, as though heartbroken over the broken digger. Three other boys join him in feigning tears.

Later the same afternoon, the kids pretend they are in a TV show, like a cooking show, or a game show, and use the *biopori* tools as props. (Field notes, 19 January 2015)

Humour and laughter have often been overlooked in academic literature, having been considered unscientific even though they serve significant social functions (Martin 2007; Swinkels and de Koning 2016). Laughter is mainly a social phenomenon and humour is a powerful social tool that can be wielded in positive or negative ways – often to include or exclude 'others' from a group. One of the positive functions of humour is its creation of meaningful connections by acting as a social 'glue' and by easing emotional tensions (Dean & Major 2008; Moran & Hughes 2006; Rowe & Regehr 2010). Shared laughter contributes to nurturing a sense of community and belonging (Carty & Musharbash, 2008). Among teenagers in Adiwiyata, being able to laugh together means they are sharing something – even if it's nonsense – and this makes them feel included, which gives them a sense of belonging.

Daring to be dirty (*berani kotor*)

Melati and the other Adiwiyata girls are at the aloe vera potting area. Melati's hand is covered in mulch. She loves it. (Field notes, 23 January 2015)

The students at The State School in particular revel in getting dirty – it is a big part of the appeal of Adiwiyata activities for many of them. They often express the significance of being dirty in the words '*berani kotor*': daring to be dirty is part of the appeal of Adiwiyata. Being dirty is usually positively valued in Adiwiyata, but students recognise different types of dirtiness. For instance, Andi complained that the school toilets were *kotor* (dirty) and *jijik* (disgusting), and described how he tried not to use them, and if forced to, resorted to buying bottled water to clean himself (most Indonesians use water rather than toilet paper), rather than using the water supplied because 'It's the students who are dirty (*kotor*): they throw their cigarette butts and all that in there...' (Field notes, 20 January 2015). Similarly, one day a student was ransacking the garbage bins for empty plastic bottles; a teacher made some comment, and Niko replied in jest:

'Even though we are Adiwiyata kids who love getting dirty, we think twice when it's this kind of dirty' – implying that their love of getting dirty applies mainly to mud, but not to rummaging through garbage. (Field notes, 16 February 2015)

Before their clean-up of the market, their leader, Fauzi, warned the students not to complain out loud about how disgusting it was to handle rotting vegetables with slime and grossness from the open sewers. He said that that would be rude because the people there (the sellers and workers in the market) have to handle it every day. We argue then that ‘dirt’ is a complex, multivalent symbol in the context of environmentalism in Indonesia, and that students’ frequent invocation of *berani kotor* signifies radical inversions or transgressions.

If one has to be brave, to ‘dare’, to get dirty, that means that the normal, respectable way to be in the world is to be clean. To be dirty is already to transgress the norms of polite society. Student participants in Adiwiyata seemed to enjoy the actual contact with dirt, mud or compost, as a novel, tactile sensation. They freely admitted that their work of compost-shovelling, *biopori*-digging and garbage clean-up was dirty, smelly work. Planting mangrove seedlings in the mangrove swamps was often identified by the Adiwiyata kids as fun because it is so muddy (Field notes, 16 February 2015). Sometimes this ‘fun’ had a gender dimension: girls talked about liking to get dirty more often than boys. This ‘dirt’ behaviour constitutes a very radical rejection of ideal femininity: in Indonesia, girls should be decorous, beautiful, gentle, polite, self-controlled and clean. This positive identification with implicitly ‘untouchable’ substances seemed quite an empowering action for students, and particularly for female students – a ‘naughty’ but enabling move, which is illustrated in this scene of students shovelling compost after school:

The girls’ *jilbab* (head-scarves) are getting dirty. Meri is covering her nose with her necktie. There’s compost on my notebook. I’m in the compost room and it’s raining compost. Hot, stinking, wet, green, rotting compost rain. In the hot, humid, tropical weather under the Surabaya sun. ...

At one point, there were 11 people in that tiny little 3 by 3 compost room...

Dhimas shows up dancing. This is exactly the atmosphere of all these activities. Fun, fun, fun. A celebration with laughter, joyful shouts and singing.

Most of the boys go barefoot on top of the big black pile of compost, sometimes switching feet quickly to avoid the heat, especially when they had taken off the top, cooler layer of compost. The girls mostly stayed near the door and shovelled from there straight into the mulching machine. ... Though they weren’t as strong as the boys, neither their gender nor their long skirts and *jilbab* matter in terms of their willingness to shovel. (Field notes, 14 January 2015)

Their Adiwiyata work often entailed stigmatisation by socio-economic class. They often handled disgusting, decomposing material, and doing hard manual labour made their bodies dirty and smelly. Sometimes this meant that they were teased and called names like *pasukan kuning* (lit. ‘yellow brigade’), i.e. the street sweepers who wear yellow sweatshirts and are employed (sometimes in welfare jobs) by local councils. In Indonesia, street sweepers are considered very lowly workers, and this was clearly a label that had been attached to several Adiwiyata kids, particularly when they were engaged in cleaning up rubbish on campus. In ‘daring to be dirty’, there is a sense in which students feel they are making themselves vulnerable to derogatory labelling and stigmatisation based on class. Although Indonesia’s education revolution has meant that enrolments in senior high school have risen very rapidly in the last few years, more than one-third of eligible-age young people do not attend senior high school.¹⁴ In contrast, students in senior high school in Indonesia belong by definition to

¹⁴ In 2013, 63.55% of boys aged 16-18, and 64.15% of girls, attend senior high school. (Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak, 2016, p. 37)

the aspirational middle classes. Such students are not aiming for employment involving menial, manual labour. They are aiming for white-collar jobs – as professionals, para-professionals (such as police, nurses), business people, or otherwise in the private sector (Nilan et al 2011).

Some students at both the studied schools mentioned having been teased as *pasukan kuning*, or as ‘coolies’ (*jadi tukang/kuli*) when they had built little huts (*gubuk*), or shovelled compost. This was sometimes identified by Adiwiyata kids as their ‘image problem’. It is not the ‘coolest’, most popular kids at school who join Adiwiyata, because of this image problem. At an OSIS meeting, there was discussion of the resistance to joining Adiwiyata and one of the students noted that ‘At primary school level, they’re still innocent (*lugu*), it’s easy to get them to come along. But at SMA [senior high school] level, kids are preoccupied with *jaim*’ (Field notes, 20 January 2015). ‘*Jaim*’ is a slang compound of two words, *jaga* – to mind, guard, be careful about, and *imej* – image. However, the Adiwiyata students rose above this stigmatisation, finding ways to make the work fun and meaningful and built a positive, shared self-identity. In a country where even the middle classes regularly employ maids to clean the house, being able to mobilize students to engage with ‘dirt’ and even garbage is exceptional.

Students use ‘dirt’ in a strategy of destigmatisation to invoke and upturn rules of social hierarchy based on respect: the researcher was perceived as clean and respected, while Fauzi, the respected student leader of Adiwiyata, was teased (in jest) for being dirty and fat. Fauzi had previously been disrespected by younger fellow-students by having some compost pitched over his head. Given that in Indonesia, it is a *faux-pas* to even touch someone’s head, this action amounted to a considerable insult. In these binaries, ‘dirt’ is used as a vehicle for social distinction, and in the case of students pitching compost at Fauzi’s head, as a way to not only transgress but actually invert normal social hierarchy. Fauzi chose to interpret the compost-pitching as a humorous and acceptable strategy by fellow students to challenge his position of power (Holmes 2000). Even though Fauzi said he chased the students, he later explained the incident as a trigger for him to introduce a more egalitarian and democratic ethos in the Adiwiyata club. He interpreted the deployment of ‘dirt’ as an instrument of power aimed at social inversion.

‘Daring to be dirty’ implies some level of disagreement with national discourses of modernity and progress. In Indonesia, the development discourse has prevailed virtually unchallenged since the early 1970s. It is a discourse about Indonesia becoming modern and developed, through de-agrarianisation and urbanisation, through improved education, higher credentialing of the labour force and the development of the industrial and service sectors. This loops back to the remarks above about the employment aspirations of young people: they aim for white-collar employment, not farming (Nilan et al. 2011). The modernity discourse does not entail a return to the village, the iconic, supposedly idyllic, ‘essence’ of Indonesia, with its associations of green terraced rice fields, strong community ties of mutual assistance, and agricultural self-sufficiency (Parker 2002, 2003).

‘The environment’ does not really play a role in the development/modernity discourse. In government imaginings, as represented in school curricula and textbooks, the environment is most often represented as natural resources which are to be exploited to create prosperity (Parker 2016b). In images of modern Indonesia, cities such as Surabaya are presented as ideal living spaces, and they are to be ‘clean and green’. ‘Clean and green’ conjures up images of fenced city parks, green median strips planted with trees in rows running down multi-lane

freeways, and manicured suburban gardens replete with roses and fake waterfalls. Many, but not all, of the Adiwiyata activities, contribute to this rather sanitised version of ‘the environment’: the constant repotting of pot plants, the greening of school campuses, the construction of decorative rooftop gardens, plants in pots, trees in rows. There is not much room in the ideal clean, green Surabaya for dirt and disorder. Adiwiyata kids’ delight in ‘daring to be dirty’ thus constitutes something of an inversion of what ‘clean and green’ implies.

Conclusion

Surabaya is indeed becoming a clean and green city – parks and gardens abound, rubbish is being collected and sorted into green waste and landfill, green waste is being made into mulch and compost, flood mitigation works are well under way, mangroves are being replanted, and so on. And school students are participating in some of this work – sometimes, it would seem, as free labour for the city councils.

The EE that is implemented in Surabayan high schools through ENGOs is activity-centred. The single most crucial aspect of this program is that the students participate together, feeling a strong sense of belonging to the Adiwiyata family. Tellingly, at the end of Tanu’s time at The State School, the students gave her a frame with photographs of their time together with a hand-drawn picture in one corner that included the words: ‘We are family’.

The activities give them a chance to hang out and have fun with their friends; they feel included and cared for; and they enjoy the relatively autonomous, democratic and egalitarian quality of the student environmental ‘family’. The fun feeds further participation: the students feel good as a result of joking, laughing and singing with their friends while they do sometimes quite menial, hard and unpleasant work. In some ways, the actual content of the activity is not important – certainly there are many times when students cannot see an environmental reason for the activity, and the researchers were often hard put to see any connection between the nature of the activities and educating young people about how to sustain the environment. However, as we saw with regard to Adiwiyata kids liking to get their hands dirty, this ‘daring to be dirty’ is a key aspect of their group identity, and the transgressive nature of being dirty empowers them to do the sometimes ‘gross’ work.

It is instructive to return to the three ‘key elements’ of effective EE identified by Chawla and Derr (2012): that students experience EE over an extended period, connect learning to their ‘real worlds’ of human and community, and are actively involved. There was no shortage of enthusiasm to engage in activities that contributed directly to their school, neighbourhood (planting trees and digging *biopori* across the street from the school), and city (planting mangroves by the shore or cleaning up the city’s beaches). During the three months of fieldwork, the Adiwiyata Team were engaged in some form of pro-environmental activity almost every week, and often several times a week, mostly immediately after school but sometimes in the evenings or during the weekends. The activities included planning and budgeting for other activities, procuring plants to pot or leaves for the *biopori* from shops, religious organizations or city agencies, grinding compost, creating recycled products, and selling partially organic food at the Sunday markets. The Adiwiyata Team leaders said that sometimes, when they are too busy with their academic or other responsibilities to initiate club activities, the junior members repeatedly ask them about the next activity until they relent and organize one. While it would require a follow-up longitudinal study to see whether the majority of the students have maintained their pro-environmental behaviours since, we do know that one Team leader joined TENGO after he graduated. In terms of developing pro-

environmental behaviour through affective influences, TENGO's programs and the Adiwiyata Team at The State School provide a good example of the effectiveness of learning by doing in which young people have direct experience of nature (though within the confines of an Indonesian city), over a sustained period of time, in the company of supportive friends; to a lesser extent, they can see that their activities contribute to the amelioration of local environmental problems, and feel valued for their contribution to the environment.

The difficult educational context – with the Ministry of Education and Culture uninterested in the environment, the teachers mainly uninterested and lacking the knowledge and incentive to inspire young people with environmentalism, and the community at large unaware of environmental issues – means that the environmental NGOs have an uphill battle to run effective EE programs. TENGO focuses on 'green' activities, with attendant emotions of belonging and togetherness, the production of feel-good feelings towards one's peers and humanity more broadly through fun and laughter, and through braving adversity such as teasing, and the value of egalitarian participation. Thus, positive emotions feed pro-environmental action. Environmental knowledge and understanding are in the "too-hard" basket for now.

References

- Bjork, C. (2004). Decentralisation in Education, Institutional Culture and Teacher Autonomy in Indonesia. *International Review of Education*, 50, 245-262.
- Bjork, C. (2013). Teacher Training, School Norms and Teacher Effectiveness in Indonesia. In D. Suryadarma & G. W. Jones (Eds.), *Education in Indonesia* (pp. 53-67). Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Carty, J., & Musharbash, Y. (2008). You've Got to be Joking: Asserting the Analytical Value of Humour and Laughter in Contemporary Anthropology. *Anthropological Forum*, 18(3), 209-217.
- Chawla, L., & Derr, V. (2012). The Development of Conservation Behaviors in Childhood and Youth. In S.D. Clayton (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental and Conservation Psychology* (pp. 527-555). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clearinghouse, S. S. P. a. C. (2015). Adiwiyata School Program in Indonesia. Retrieved from <http://www.scpclearinghouse.org/c/11-scp-asia-and-the-pacific/scp-initiatives/790-adiwiyata-school-program-in-indonesia.html>
- Dean, R. A. K., & Major, J. E. (2008). From Critical Care to Comfort Care: The Sustaining Value of Humor. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 17(8), 1088-1095.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone Press.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Ark Paperbacks.
- Fionna, U. (2017). *Investigating the Popularity of Surabaya's Mayor Tri Rismaharini*. Retrieved from Singapore:
- Hart, R. (1997). *Children's Participation*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Holmes, J. (2000). Politeness, Power and Provocation: How Humour Functions in the Workplace. *Discourse Studies*, 2(2), 159-185.
- Jambeck, J. R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T. R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., . . . Law, K. L. (2015). Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science*, 347(6223), 768-771. doi:10.1126/science.1260352
- Jickling, B. (1992). Why I don't want my children to be educated for sustainable development. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 23(4), 5 - 8.
- Jickling, B., & Wals, A. E. J. (2013). Probing Normative Research in Environmental Education: Ideas about Education and Ethics. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Environmental Education* (pp. 74-86). New York and London: American Educational Research Association
- Kementerian, L. H. E. M. (2004). *Kebijakan Pendidikan Lingkungan Hidup (Environmental Education Policy)*. Retrieved from Jakarta:
- Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup (Ministry of the Environment). (2010). *Panduan Adiwiyata. Sekolah Peduli dan Berbudaya Lingkungan 2011 (Guide to Adiwiyata. Schools that care and have an environmental 2011)*. Jakarta.: Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup.
- Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan. (2017, 02/08/2017). Rayakan Hari Lingkungan Hidup 2017, KLHK Berikan 65 Penghargaan untuk Masyarakat, Sekolah dan Pemerintah Daerah. Retrieved from http://ppid.menlhk.go.id/siaran_pers/browse/678
- Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2016). Data dan Indikator Gender di Indonesia. Buku Saku Indonesian Tahun 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.kemenpppa.go.id/index.php/page/read/27/1023/buku-saku-indonesia-tahun-2015>
- Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239-260.
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: an integrative approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

- Mead, M. (1942). Balinese Character. In G. Bateson & M. Mead (Eds.), *Balinese Character: a photographic analysis* (pp. 1-48). New York: Academy of Sciences New York.
- MOEC (Ministry of Education and Culture), C. f. E. D. a. S. a. C. (2016). *Indonesia. Educational Statistics in Brief 2015/2016*. Retrieved from http://publikasi.data.kemdikbud.go.id/uploadDir/isi_AA46E7FA-90A3-46D9-BDE6-CA6111248E94_.pdf.
- Moran, C. C., & Hughes, L. P. (2006). Coping with Stress: Social Work Students and Humour. *Social Work Education*, 25(5), 501-517.
- Müller, M. M., Kals, E., & Pansa, R. (2009). Adolescents' emotional affinity toward nature. *Journal of Developmental Processes*, 4(1), 59-69.
- Nilan, P., Parker, L., Bennett, L., & Robinson, K. (2011). Indonesian youth looking towards the future. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14(6), 709-728.
- OECD. (2016a). *Education GPS. Indonesia - Student Performance (PISA 2015)*. Retrieved from <http://gpseducation.oecd.org/CountryProfile?primaryCountry=IDN&treshold=10&topic=PI>
- OECD. (2016b). *Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) Results from 2015: Indonesia*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/education/pisa-2015-results-volume-i-9789264266490-en.htm>
- Ojala, M. (2012). Hope and climate change: The importance of hope for environmental engagement among young people. *Environmental Education Research*, 18(5), 626-642.
- Parker, L. (2002). The subjectification of citizenship: Student interpretations of school teachings in Bali. *Asian Studies Review*, 26, 3-37.
- Parker, L. (2003). *From subjects to citizens: Balinese villagers in the Indonesian nation-state*. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies press.
- Parker, L. (2016a). Pouring out One's Heart: Close Friendships among Minangkabau Young People. In K. Robinson (Ed.), *Youth Identities and Social Transformation in Modern Indonesia* (pp. 94-112). Leiden: Brill.
- Parker, L. (2016b). Religious environmental education? The new school curriculum in Indonesia. *Environmental Education Research*. doi:10.1080/13504622.2016.1150425
- Parker, L., and Nilan, P. (2013). *Adolescents in Contemporary Indonesia*. New York: Routledge.
- Parker, L., Prabawa-Sear, K. and Kustiningsih, W. (2018) How young people in Indonesia see themselves as environmentalists: Identity, behaviour, perceptions and responsibility. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, **this issue**
- Parker, L., and Prabawa-Sear, K. (In press). *Environmental Education in Indonesia: Creating Responsible Citizens in the Global South*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Prabawa-Sear, K. (2018) Winning beats learning: Environmental education in Indonesian Senior High Schools. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, **this issue**
- Rickinson, M. (2001). Learners and Learning in Environmental Education: a critical review of the evidence. *Environmental Education Research*, 7(3), 207-320.
- Rowe, A., and Regehr, C. (2010). Whatever Gets You Through Today: An Examination of Cynical Humor Among Emergency Service Professionals. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 15, 448-464. doi:10.1080/15325024.2010.507661
- Stevenson, R. B. (2007). Schooling and environmental education: contradictions in purpose and practice. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(2), 139-153.
- Swinkels, M., & de Koning, A. (2016). Introduction: Humour and anthropology. *Etnofoor*, 28(1), 7-10.
- The World Bank. (2014). *World Bank and Environment in Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/indonesia/brief/world-bank-and-environment-in-indonesia>
- Tilbury, F. (2007). 'We are Family': The Use of Family Tropes in Refugee/Advocate Talk. *Social Identities*, 13(5), 627-649.

World Bank. (2016). *Project performance assessment report. Indonesia. Indonesia Climate Change Development Policy Loan (IBRD- 71950)*. Retrieved from http://ieg.worldbank.org/Data/reports/PPAR_Indonesia.Clmt_.ChgDPL.pdf

Zint, M. (2013). Advancing environmental education program evaluation: Insights from a review of behavioral outcome evaluations. In J. Dillon, A. Wals, M. Brody, & B. Stevenson (Eds.), *International handbook of research in environmental education*. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Above it's entered as in:

Jickling, B., & Wals, A. E. J. (2013). Probing Normative Research in Environmental Education: Ideas about Education and Ethics. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Environmental Education* (pp. 74-86). New York and London: American Educational Research Association