

*Integrating Education for Sustainability into primary school systems, a Whole – School Approach
A comparative case study between Eco-Schools and non-Eco-Schools in the Netherlands*



Bachelor thesis:

Author: Marenthe Middelhoff (6011551)

Peer reviewed: Saré Geurts

Supervisor: Hens Runhaar

Second reader: Julia Spanier

Submission date: 26-06-2020

Number of words: 8449



Utrecht University

Samenvatting

Veel scholen hebben verschillende soorten programma's geïmplementeerd om duurzaamheid in hun scholen een plekje te geven. Die aanpakken verschillen echter in effectiviteit en inhoud. De Whole-School approach voor leren voor duurzame ontwikkeling (LvDO), is een veelbelovend concept rondom het integraal aandacht besteden van duurzame ontwikkeling op basisscholen. De Whole-School approach benaderd de school als een systeem waarbij de schoolgemeenschap, het educatieve programma, de praktijk (e.g. beleid) en de fysieke ruimte wordt meegenomen in het verduurzamen van de school. Eco-Scholen, een internationaal keurmerk, sluit zich aan bij deze ontwikkeling en probeert leerlingen actief mee te laten doen en denken in de verduurzaming van hun school. De vraag is echter of er wel een systemische verandering rondom alle vier factoren wordt ontwikkeld en zo niet wat houdt basisscholen dan tegen om een Whole-School approach voor LvDO te implementeren? Aan de hand van interviews met Eco-Scholen met een groene vlag en Non-Eco-Scholen in Nederland zijn de volgende conclusies getrokken: Eco-Scholen lijken gemiddeld meer samenwerking binnen de schoolgemeenschap te stimuleren dan Non-Eco-Scholen maar samenwerking buiten de schoolgemeenschap lijkt minder vanzelfsprekend. Ook op het gebied van het educatieve programma lijken Eco-Scholen meer aandacht te besteden aan LvDO maar ontwikkelingen in educatieve methodes voor bijvoorbeeld thematisch onderwijs onder Non-Eco-Scholen, zorgt ervoor dat het verschil in dit onderzoek niet ontzettend groot is. Een groter verschil is waargenomen in de praktijk dimensie, waar Eco-Scholen meer structureel bezig lijken te zijn met beleid voeren rondom de Whole-School approach voor LvDO. Ten slotte de plek dimensie, hoewel de maatregelen rondom de scholen om te verduurzamen niet veel van elkaar verschilde, werden bij Eco-Scholen de leerlingen meegenomen in het proces rondom de verduurzaming. Dit kan wellicht in de toekomst een positief effect hebben op leerlingen hun *action competence*; het probleemoplossend vermogen bij kinderen rondom duurzaamheidskwesties.

Als barrière voor beide groepen scholen werd het overvolle curriculum het meest benoemd. Bij Non-Eco-Scholen kwam ook nog: de politieke agenda die te veel focust op kwantitatieve geletterdheid en rekenvaardigheid en daardoor de focus op duurzame ontwikkeling in het curriculum en pedagogie lijkt weg te nemen'' naar voren. In dit onderzoek kwam de relatie tussen scholen en segregatie aan bod als een mogelijke versterker van beide barrières. Wat een mogelijke verduidelijking is van het feit dat er geen Eco-Scholen zijn in wijken met een lage sociaaleconomische status op dit moment.

Summary

Since the Rio Earth summit in 1992 many European countries have committed to promote Education for Sustainability, a concept connecting students to integrated sustainable issues into the formal and informal curriculum and actively supporting them to become autonomous, responsible students acting towards a more sustainable world. Though many countries have initiated programs there are still few examples of schools who do not teach sustainability on a stand-alone basis. The Eco-school program, an international quality mark, is being pointed as the exemplary long-term program in the Netherlands that provides certification on EfS in an

ambitious form; The Whole school approach to EfS, where not only the curriculum but the whole schools culture is changed. With Eco-Schools gives a list of primary schools in the Netherlands that should have implemented these ambitious school changes. However, questions are being raised if these schools have actually developed this full systemic change. This thesis researches which aspects eco-schools are implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS compared to schools who do not aim for this explicitly. This research is also an inquiry into the question what the barriers for further implementation can be. A comparative case study into Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools has been performed. A Whole-School approach to EfS framework from Eames, Wilson-Hill & Barker (2013) and Bar, Cross & Dunbar (2014) was adapted including four dimensions: (1) school community, (2) educational program (3) practice and (4) place. In addition, key barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS for schools with or without an Eco-School program as mentioned by Evans, Whitehouse & Gooch (2012) haven been researched. The analysis resulted in the conclusion that Eco-Schools seem to be more consistent in their implementation of a WSA to EfS though the results do not differ extremely.

Barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS do not differ that much between the Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools. The overcrowded curriculum and the political agenda seem to be the main barriers.

Table of contents

<u>1. Introduction</u>	5
<u>2. Theoretical framework</u>	8
2.1 <i>Key aspects of Education for Sustainability</i>	
1. <i>Relevant</i>	
2. <i>Holistic</i>	
3. <i>Values orientated</i>	
4. <i>Issue based learning</i>	
5. <i>Environmental Action</i>	
6. <i>Critical education</i>	
2.2 <i>The Whole-School Approach to EFS</i>	
1. <i>School community</i>	
2. <i>Educational program</i>	
3. <i>Practice</i>	
4. <i>Place</i>	
2.3 <i>Barriers</i>	
<u>3. Method</u>	16
3.1 <i>Data collection</i>	
1. <i>Sample</i>	
2. <i>Interviews</i>	
3.2 <i>Data analysis</i>	
<u>4. Results</u>	19
4.1 <i>Eco-Schools program on primary schools in the Netherlands</i>	
4.2 <i>Empirical results</i>	
1. <i>School community</i>	
2. <i>Educational program</i>	
3. <i>Practice</i>	
4. <i>Place</i>	
4.3 <i>Barriers</i>	
<u>5. Discussion</u>	27
5.1 <i>School community, educational program, practice and place</i>	

5.2 *Barriers*

<u>6.</u>	<u>Conclusion</u>	32
<u>7.</u>	<u>References</u>	31
<u>8.</u>	<u>Annex 1: Eco-Schools seven step plan</u>	36
<u>9.</u>	<u>Annex 2: Eco-Schools vision on implementing EFS in the school system</u>	37
<u>10.</u>	<u>Annex 3: Letter of permission</u>	38
<u>11.</u>	<u>Annex 4: letter of information for participants</u>	39
<u>12.</u>	<u>Annex 5: Interview guide</u>	40

1.Introduction

This thesis is a critical inquiry into the difference between primary schools who have a quality mark (Eco-Schools) integrating sustainability into their school systems (Whole-School approach) to schools who do not (Non-Eco-Schools). The focus of this research is an inquiry into the barriers of a Whole-School Approach in both Eco-schools and Non- Eco schools in the Netherlands. This will provide insight into the quality of the Eco-Schools program and the possibilities of a wider implementation of the Whole-School approach to Education for sustainability.

A number of programs and institutions have promoted the uptake of sustainability in primary school, though it is problematized that this is often on a stand-alone basis and does not always lead to desired student learning outcomes (Wals & Benevot, 2017). Among the most promising approaches is the Whole-School approach to Education for Sustainability (EfS): a systems approach that includes the Whole-School community and fosters action competence (Mogren, Gericke, & Scherp, 2019; Wals & Benavot; 2017; Tilbury, 2005). The Whole-School approach to EfS differs significantly from previous forms of environmental education, as it recognizes that students need to learn how to make change by practicing active participation in a safe space like school grounds (Wals & Benevot, 2017). Although its demanding institutional transformation, research on the impacts of the Whole-School approach to EfS shows that it can have an impact on the schools' environmental management, ethos and enable learners to become confident individuals, and caring responsible citizens (Hacking, Scott, & Lee, 2010).

As the sustainable education movement is moving forward from the Agenda 21 document (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, 1992) and the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable development (UNCED, 2018), countries and their respective educational institutions have been developing their own programs related to EfS. In the Netherlands this program is translated into the national governmental program *Duurzaam Door* (Continuing Sustainability), promoting projects, knowledge transfer and synergies between stakeholders (de Wolf & de Hamer, 2015). The Dutch liberalized, educational system provides significant liberty for schools to commit to a Whole-School approach to EfS, as there is freedom to choose pedagogy and curriculum (de Wolf & de Hamer, 2015). In spite of this liberty there are few reported cases of schools that have

integrated EfS fully into their curriculum, or in the everyday life at school, in the Netherlands and internationally (Bosevska & Kriewaldt, 2020; Leren voor Morgen, 2015).

Eco-Schools

The exemplary program Eco-Schools embodies this Whole-School approach to EfS by providing a program, network and certification (Mogenson & Mayer, 2005). Founded in 1994, the Eco-Schools program currently is introduced in 69 countries, of which the majority is in Europe, representing twenty million pupils around the world (FEE, n.d.). Eco-Schools has the intention to empower young students in a transformative and constructive approach to work towards obtaining the quality mark (Cincera, Boeve-de Pauw, Goldman, & Simonova, 2019). All the schools that chose to be part of it have to undergo a seven-step plan which takes around 2 years to accomplish. Since the adoption of the quality mark by the Netherlands in 2003 an increasing amount of primary schools have chosen to become part of the program (Leren voor Morgen, 2015). Gan, Gal, Könczey, & Varga, (2019), describe Eco-Schools as follows: “An Eco-School differs from the average school in the fact that the principles of sustainability are present not only in its educational activities but also in all fields of school life and behavior, on a higher level than in non-certified schools” (p.637).

Though Eco-schools should be very distinguishable from schools who do not have it, recent research by Gan, Gal, Könczey, & Varga (2019) and Chatzifotiou (2019) suggests that not all Eco-Schools have developed this full systemic change. This raises the question where Eco-Schools differ from schools who do not have this quality mark. Moreover, a further inquiry into what the barriers of the implementation of a Whole-School approach in both Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools truly are. Meanwhile research on the application of EfS practises in primary schools system has slowly progressed, both in the Netherlands and worldwide (Korkmaz & Yildiz, 2017).

This research aims to understand which dimensions primary schools are focusing on when working on implementing a Whole-School approach to EFS compared to schools which are not. A practical application will be to depict areas that perhaps are not considered by principals or teachers for a Whole-School approach, but are in fact contributing to it. Additionally, the research will aim to confirm and identify new areas that prohibit primary schools to invest and commit to a Whole-School approach to EFS.

The following questions are therefore examined:

- How does an Eco-Schools program compared to Non-Eco-Schools incorporate the implementation of a Whole- School Approach to Education for Sustainability in primary schools?
- What are barriers for including a “Whole-School Approach” to Education for Sustainability into primary school systems in the Netherlands?

Methods

This research is primarily based on an extensive literature review and semi-structured interviews with principals and teachers. This research is structured as follows: Firstly, the literature review will clarify the different concepts underlying the key dimensions of a Whole-School approach to EfS. Secondly, the Whole-School approach to EfS framework from Eames, Wilson-Hill, & Barker (2013) and Bar, Cross & Dunbar (2014) was adapted including four dimensions: (1) school community, (2) educational program (3) practice and (4) place, recognize on which dimensions Non- Eco schools and Eco schools are implicitly and explicitly implementing a Whole-School approach to EFS. In addition, key barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS for schools with or without an Eco-School program as mentioned by Evans, Whitehouse & Gooch (2012) are presented. The data obtained from the interviews will lead to a discussion and a conclusion. Gaining more knowledge on the barriers of schools to integrate this program could be beneficial for the Whole-School approach to EfS movement in the Netherlands.

By focusing on primary schools that have and have not actively tried to implement a Whole-School approach to EFS, there is the expectation that Eco-Schools will have a different set of barriers. The results therefore will also reveal some possible insights into different levels of integrating a Whole-School approach.

2. Theoretical framework

In order to formulate an answer to the research question, the different concepts will have to be explained. This next section will further elaborate on the theories and concepts behind this research. Through this process, a fitting analytical framework to answer my thesis will be developed.

2.1 Key aspects of Education for Sustainability

In order to understand the implementation of a Whole-School Approach to EfS, it is necessary to clarify the underlying concept of EfS itself. According to key author Tilbury (1995) there are six components that distinguish EfS. EfS is: Relevant, holistic, values orientated, issue-based learning, environmental action orientated, and it involves critical education. The terms will be briefly explained.

2.1.1 Relevant

EFS needs to be relevant for the students, by encouraging to think about contemporary sustainability issues and the major environmental and social challenges that lie before them. By aiming to connect their own personal lives with environmental problems, a deeper understanding of the world's problems can be fostered.

2.1.2 Holistic

The philosophical basis of EFS is holistic meaning that, acknowledging that environmental problems are not purely caused by biological or physical factors, but are also intrinsically linked to socio-economic, political, historical, cultural and aesthetic aspects. A holistic curriculum approach to EFS is not a subject that can take place on a stand-alone basis but throughout the whole curriculum where each subject highlights its own contribution to understanding the environment and contributes to the education of the *Whole Person*.

2.1.3. Values orientated

Research into the links between teaching knowledge, concern and attitude shows that there is little correlation between them (Boeve-de Pauw & Van Petegem, 2011). EfS acknowledges that for people to actively participate in sustainable practices, education needs to foster an

environmental ethic including social responsibility. However, EfS does not support teaching values but rather explores the values students have on issues concerning the environment like poverty or consumerism.

2.1.4. Issue based learning

EFS is committed to using exploration of sustainable issues as learning grounds for students, to understand the moral, social and political grounds required for developing an environmental ethic. Having a broad understanding of environmental and social issues, consider the impact, seeking solutions, carrying out actions and evaluating the impact of environmental actions taken.

2.1.5 Environmental action oriented

Taking responsibility for environmental actions and confronting students on a personal level can result into sustainable lifestyle changes. Students are encouraged to take care of their own environment by participating in conservation projects, and are also challenged to take a critical look at their own surrounding. Participating in democratic processes in order to become conscious, global citizens (Wals & Benevot, 2017).

2.1.6 Critical education

Fostering critical skills within children to understand the current flaws of the world system and actively reflect upon the questions why these problems exist and develop new strategies to move forward from the current state to a more sustainable future (Brundiers, Wiek, & Redman, 2010). This also involves a social and political critical skill necessary to challenge bias and support informed decision making and examine and solutions prospect of change.

2.2 The Whole-School approach to Education for Sustainability

Whole-School approach stems from a global call to include more systemic change of EFS into school systems (UNCED 1992, UNESCO, 2018). It has been found that even schools that do have an excellent teacher who includes EFS in the lessons, this often does not reach all the students and the impact is often not sustained (Ofsted rapport, 2018). Other types of

environmental education previous to EFS have focused more on the curriculum involving a sustainable subject or going outside into nature and other isolated activities.

Research by Brundiers, Wiek & Redman (2010) into learning strategies that want to engage students in real world problems, promotes the assumption that active participatory in changing the school has a positive influence on student learning. Consequently, the approaches that seek school system change need the involvement of key players and stakeholders and the establishment of collaboration within the school as well as outside the school with external partners (Henderson & Tilbury, 2004).

Another important aspect of the Whole-School approach, as research by Barth, Fischer, Michelsen, Nemnich & Rode, (2012) mentions, is the distinction between formal and informal learning. According to their paper a significant part of learning happens outside the classroom. Students in primary schools do not only learn from formal education but are also highly perceptive of the informal education. This underpins that what is needed now from educational institutes is a change in the school environment and not only in the curriculum.

In this research the Whole-School approach is defined as follows: ‘‘a school will incorporate teaching and learning for sustainable development not only through aspects of the curriculum, but also through sustainable school operations such as integrated governance, stakeholder and community involvement, long-term planning, and sustainability monitoring and evaluation’’ (Hargreaves, 2008, p.69).

Both Eames, Wilson-Hill, & Barker (2013) and Bar, Cross, & Dunbar (2014) developed an analytical framework which can help schools to identify what it could mean to implement a Whole-School approach to EFS into the school system. They also provide a means for schools that currently consider themselves to have a Whole-School approach to EFS to discuss and consider their approach and develop it further. The combined framework identifies 4 dimensions that have an effect on sustainability and student learning. The names of these dimensions have been adapted to fit this research better and are called: School community, curriculum, practices and place. The areas overlap in some places as they are sometimes intricately linked to one another. These four dimensions will be discussed in the next paragraphs and can be seen in the figure 1.



Figure 1 Theoretical framework Whole-School approach to Education for Sustainability

2.2.1 School community

Collaboration between schools and their environment is at the heart of the Whole-School approach to EFS. Giving students, staff and other members of the community ownership and including them into the decision making of sustainable practices at the school can result into sustaining change within a school (Kalnins, 2018). Collaboration also connects to the values-orientated and action-competence aspect of EFS. The Whole community evaluates its own stance on their environmental ethic and works together to be the solution for the problem at

hand. Cincera, & Krajhanzl (2013), argue that action competence mainly comes from students' perceived participation in schools' decision making. This is also very well possible with children from 4-12 years old according to Hart (1997): "From the age of four to twelve and older, children are able to move from simple domestic environmental management, to local and community based-projects, and then strategic ecological research" (p.370).

Multiple studies assign school leaders and local government support of implementing EFS in schools as a determining success factor (Hargreaves, 2008; Kadji-Beltran, Zachariou, & Stevenson, 2013). Enhanced leadership could be the drive for a more systematic implementation and create the governance structure necessary for longevity of the schools commitment to implementing a Whole-School approach to EFS, Arguably collaborating with the Whole community influences not only the perspectives of the individuals participating but builds a social environment where everyone socializes around that subject. An inevitable change of school leadership would then also not mean that all the efforts on EFS implementation disappear. Instead the school has created active networks that reinforce themselves by connecting on the same matter (Bar, Cross, & Dunbar, 2014). An often mentioned problem of schools trying to implement the Whole-School approach through an Eco-School program is that responsibility is with one person and the rest of the school lags behind (Cincera & Krajhanzl, 2013).

Finally, learning comes from peoples own experience. If there is a limited understanding of why a teacher teaches for sustainability there is a small chance the community will understand the reason why they are participating.

2.2.2 Educational program

The Whole-School approach to EFS recognizes the importance of formal but also informal learning. Formal education should include an integrated implementation of EFS in the school curriculum not as a one-off subject or project. This holistic approach seems necessary to foster a broader understanding of connectiveness, which can result in more lasting effects in student thinking (Harrison, 2007; Wals & Benavot, 2017). However only teaching *about* these issues is not considered to be the sole focus as pupils finish their education with knowledge but no action competence. Therefore, EFS takes a critical eye at *how* sustainability is being taught in.

This leads to informal learning and confronts traditional pedagogies in multiple ways. First of all, it puts emphasize on fostering action competence with pupils. Action competence

is seen by Kadji-Beltran, Zachariou, & Stevenson (2013) as the success factor of WSA to EfS programs. Action competence involves students with sustainability in a manner that not only fosters understanding but linking it to problem-solving approaches (Brundiers, Wiek, & Redman, 2010). This includes encouragement of taking initiative and responsibility over their own learning and for the environment. Cincera, & Krajhanzl (2013) links action competence to be determining in future pro-environmental behavior of pupils. Teachers are seen as facilitators of the learning process of pupils and they are supported in becoming autonomous, responsible, reflective citizens who can think for themselves and follow a course of action (Harrison, 2007).

This broad definition that characterizes a Whole-School approach to EfS needs to be understood by primary teachers to successfully integrate the principles into the curriculum (Chatzifotiou, 2019). It was mentioned in research that limited understanding of for example the social dimension of sustainability is a barrier to the implementation of a Whole-School approach to EFS (Chatzifotiou, 2019).

The Dutch government does not want to force schools to implement EfS in their curriculum though there are many different programs and methods available (De Wolf & de Hamer, 2015). Every four years, Dutch schools receive an audit by their inspectorate of education to evaluate if the requirements set by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science are being met. These requirements are referred to as the SLO (Stichting Leerplan Ontwikkeling; National Institute for Curriculum Development) targets (SLO, n.d.).

2.2.3 Practice

A comprehensive Whole-School plan is important to integrate EfS as the basis for school practices with clearly defined goals and operational intentions (Bar, Cross, & Dunbar 2014). Not only making sure that on a regular basis money is being spend on directing the school to sustainability but also from an ethos perspective the practise of a school is essential. Schools cannot only write about their intentions but need to make sure that their practices are aligned with their intentions. Making sure there is an organizational structure to facilitate collaboration is something that is embedded in the practise of a school implementing EfS (Henderson, & Tilbury, 2004). Eventually, continuous evaluating and monitoring, is a part of the learning process. As tracking the progress of the goals set in the Whole-School plan can

have improvements to as well the physical as the non-physical aspects of a school (Bar, Cross, & Dunbar 2014).

2.2.4. Place

Learning takes place in different forms in schools and the Whole-School approach to EFS recognizes that the build and natural environment can influence sustainability and student learning (Eames, Wilson-Hill, & Barker ,2013). Consequently, schools making use of the natural environments in their neighborhood and creating moments for students to interact outside of the classroom, is an important part of this dimension. The informal learning environment created within a school is important, schools can make choices in what kind of message they would like to send to their community and lead by example through environmental management. Dutch school buildings are owned by the state and therefore they have a lot of influence on environmental management practices like energy and waste management.

To conclude, the Whole-school approach builds on the foundation of EfS principles formulated in section 2.1. Giving schools the tools to understand and effectively maintain sustainable practices in all of the schools' operation. While still including an holistic approach moving forward by fostering action competence among students and by including a connection to the local environment (Eames, Barker, Wilson-Hill, & Law, 2010)

2.3 Barriers

A framework stemming from a comprehensive literature review by Evans Whitehouse & Gooch (2012) on the key barriers perceived by school leaders for implementing the Whole-School approach to EFS, was chosen. In this research barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EFS is defined as; “the difficulties principals and staff experience in implementing Whole-School sustainability” (Evans Whitehouse & Gooch, 2012, p.128). They identify three different types of barriers: (1) Grassroots barriers: the concerns of teaching staff on a daily basis. (2) Administrative barriers: barriers that focus on the constructive barriers that also include government support and decision making. (3) Conceptual barriers: barriers that can identify conflicts between sustainability education theory and school practices.

The following analytical framework from Evans, Whitehouse, & Gooch (2012) is presented in table 1:

Grassroots barriers	Administrative barriers	Conceptual barriers
Overcrowded curriculum	Lack of funding	Reconceptualizing the school system into a Whole-School approach to EfS
Insufficient teacher knowledge, and lack of training opportunities in sustainability education	Teachers taking time to initiate new programs during school hours needs to be funded	
oppositional attitudes from some staff and parents	political agenda that focuses on quantitative literacy and numeracy testing that tends to push sustainability education away from the central focus of curriculum and pedagogy	
unwillingness of teachers to explore controversial issues with their students lest it affect their relationships with student families and other staff members		

Table 1. Analytical framework; barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS (Evans, Whitehouse, & Gooch, 2012)

3. Method

In order to answer the research question, a qualitative research will be performed. This research is a comparative case study, comparing four Eco-Schools to four Non-Eco-Schools in the Netherlands. In addition, two interviews have been performed to include the expertise of the chair of the SKOSO schoolboard and the national executive of Eco-Schools for a more refined understanding of the Dutch school system and the Eco-Schools program. A comparative case study research typically involves analyzing differences, similarities and patterns across two or more different cases (Bryman, 2016). This is a reliable method to generalize how and why programs work or fail to work. A case study allows the reader to have a clearer picture on what the theory can look like in real life cases. Providing more descriptive and detailed data and, in this research, a greater depth of understanding of the current situation in The Netherlands around a Whole-School approach to EFS. This research does not however account for the EFS movement in the Netherlands in general as for this, more principals and teachers from more schools should be researched.

3.1 Data collection

3.1.1 Sample

In total, 8 schools participated in the study: 4 eco-schools and 4 Non-Eco-Schools. The participants were either a principal or teacher from the school and the amount is equally distributed. To control for regional differences in the sample, schools were selected on their location. An equal amount of schools in rural and urban environments are represented as rural schools often face different problems compared to urban schools, an example being rural schools that have a decreasing pupil population (Muijs, 2008).

All primary schools in this study are located in a more socio-economically advantaged or moderate area, in order to compare the two groups. The reason for this is noteworthy as there are no primary education Eco-schools in the Netherlands located in low socio-economic areas according to the national executive of Eco-Schools (H. van Nispen, personal communication, June 10, 2020). The pupils' socio-economic status (SES) of the schools was determined by a method formulated by the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) called: *schoolweging* (School staff workload indicator). The most recent index takes into account the education level of parents, the average education level of mothers, the country of origin, duration of stay of mothers in the Netherlands and parents who are in debt structuring. Nevertheless, this

percentage, two Non-Eco-Schools have indicated that they either are located in disadvantaged neighbourhoods or have a considerable amount of pupils with learning disadvantages therefore the results will also use these experiences.

The time limitation of this study has resulted in dispersion of Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools that are not in vicinity of each other. This means that specific regional differences are not accounted for. Nevertheless, extra attention to regional differences was a subject in the interviews. And could result in a wider geographical spread across the Netherlands. This study does not reflect the general primary school in the Netherlands. There is not enough representation in this sample and therefore should also not be considered as such. The sample does however show contrast between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools which is the aim of this thesis.

Only primary schools that have earned the Green Flag, the actual quality mark, have been included, one school was on the verge of receiving a Green Flag. An open source search engine from Eco-schools was used to determine which Eco-Schools fit the criteria ('Eco-Schools - Overzicht scholen', n.d.). From all the Eco-schools in the Netherlands that comply to these criteria, 25% is represented in this sample. The sample for Non-Eco-Schools is small due to time restrictions. Therefore, this study cannot be generalized to the entire population of primary schools in the Netherlands. The sample matrix in table 2 shows the divide.

Eco School	Non-Eco-School
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De Vlinderboom, Maastricht • De Sharn, Maastricht • Bosseschool, Middelharnis • De Bron, Oude Tonge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KSU Onder de Bogen, Utrecht • De Lingelaar, Arnhem • Touwladder, Sint-Michielsgestel • De Binnenstad, Arnhem
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Executive of Eco-Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKOSO (School board) Sint-Oedenrode

Table 2: Sample matrix

3.1.2 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were performed over Teams, a software for video calling online. It was rendered important to have semi-structured interviews as they have a flexible schedule that enables to cover the research agenda but also allows room for participants to bring in new issues on their own terms. The criteria presented in figure 1 were used into an interview guide revising each criterion into a question. This led to one set of standardized open-ended questionnaires which can be found in Annex five. The analytical tool PRISE (primary sustainable education), a survey that is used among Dutch schools as a reference point for evaluating sustainability, has also been consulted for Dutch educational jargon.

The Interviews took approximately an hour and the interviewees were approached through email and calls. All participants read the information letter and signed the letter of approval enclosed in Annex three and four.

3.2 Data Analysis

All the interviews were transcribed for the first and second question of this thesis. For the first question regarding school community, curriculum, practice and place the data coming from the interview guide was already structured in these dimensions so they only had to be assessed on the difference between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools. The difference between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools will be discussed on the base of a five-point scale for every dimension. The scale being: absent, preparatory, emerging, developing and well developed, a categorization made by Eames, Wilson-Hill, & Barker (2013) as a starting point for schools to discuss their current situation. Eventually, the average of all school in each group was calculated to see and presented in the result section.

The second question regarding barriers was analyzed by re-reading the transcripts where emergent and non-emergent codes were made to distinguish the two. Participants were asked to rate the emergent codes provided by Evans, Whitehouse & Gooch (2012). The rest of the data was color coded and after re-reading the transcripts noticing the complex, complete thoughts. The emergent and non-emergent codes will be discussed in the results section.

4. Results

4.1 Eco-Schools program in primary schools in the Netherlands

The responsibility of Eco-Schools in the Netherlands falls under a corporation called SME (Stichting Milieu Educatie; Foundation Environment Education) (SME, n.d.). Only around 1% of the 6.773 primary schools that are registered participate in an Eco-Schools program (SME, 2018). The website of Eco-Schools Netherlands states that the aim of the Eco-Schools program is to: “ help to unite separate projects under one flag and with this this promote a Whole-School approach”(ecoschools, n.d.).



Figure 2. Seven steps program and ten themes of the Eco-School program
(Source: <https://www.eco-Schools.nl/english>)

The seven-step plan and ten themes that the Eco-School program contains, outlined in figure 2, connect very well with the Whole-School approach to EfS principles (Ecoschools, n.d.). The first step is to establish an Eco-Team in the schools' organizational structure. In the Netherlands, eco teams consisting of students, teachers and sometimes other staff or parents, will then make an issue-based review of the school on two out of ten themes. These themes touch upon environmental as well as social dimensions. Within all the themes continuous improvements to the school made by students from the Eco-team are encouraged. The most important step is that the Eco-Team makes an action plan, which has the aim for learners to practice transformative competencies by questioning the status quo at the school and including students in decision making processes, to increase their action competence. Every year the progress of the schools is being monitored. They need to show improvements to

keep their Green Flag. Besides this the Eco-Schools sends teaching methods and ideas to the teacher that is assigned in the school.

To conclude: the program empowers students to be the initiative takers, including the local, natural environment in curriculum and stimulating not only the students who attend school but also their families and the Whole neighborhood (Hargreaves, 2008).

In a report on the current state of sustainable education in the Netherlands, four other quality marks and initiatives that focus on integrating more sustainable development within primary school, are mentioned (Leren voor Morgen, 2015). These quality marks are: Biologie Plus, Unesco scholen (working on the SDG's), Fairtrade scholen (focused on ethical consumption and production) and 'de vreedzame school' (a complete program for fostering democratic citizens and social competence) which are all long term projects but do not specifically work with EfS.

4.2 Empirical results

The results of this research will be presented in table four. For reasons of privacy the names of the participants will be kept anonymously, participants are numerically coded with a Q, with Q1-4 being Eco-Schools and Q5-9 being Non-Eco- Schools. The scores in table four are the average of scores of Q1-4 and Q5-9 schools

Dimension	Criteria	Eco-schools	Non-Eco-Schools
School community	Collaboration with Whole-School community	Developing	Emerging/Developing
	Whole-School engaging in participatory key decision-making	Developing	Emerging

	Teachers knowledge and understanding of EFS	Developing	Prepatory/Emerging
	School leadership	Emerging	Prepatory/ermerging
Educational program	Develop coherence between all learning areas and EFS	Emerging	Emerging
	Having an effective competence pedagogy to develop students action competence	Developing	Emerging
	Facilitating learning experiences in EfS within and outside the classroom in a variety of settings	Emerging	Emerging
Practice	Having a Whole-School plan for EfS	Developing	Absent
	Budgeting and purchasing procedures	Developing	Emerging
	Monitoring & evaluation	Emerging	Prepatory
	Organizational structure	Developing	Emerging
Place	New school buildings that benefit the environment and student learning	Prepatory	Prepatory
	Formal & informal learning	Emerging	Emerging

--	--	--	--

Table 4: Summary of results from interviews

4.2.1 School community

Eco-schools can be characterized as being collaborative with the staff, parents and pupils of their school Q3 being a prime example. The schools' vision of Q3 was made with the extensive input from pupils, staff (their input was demanded), parents and some external partners. Moreover, the future school building will also be co-designed. Pupils seem to be taken into account when making bigger decision like the design of playgrounds in the school of Q1 and Q4. However, when probing on how many initiatives came from the Eco-Teams pupils themselves, non-conclusive answers were given. Non-Eco-Schools on the other hand had more diverse responses, where in general there did seem to be a standard of collaboration between staff in so called expertise groups and commitment to include parents.

All the Non-Eco-Schools that participated in this study have a student counsel body. This can be compared to the Eco team of Eco-Schools as both groups have regular meetings with the principal. Both Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools emphasize that there is always room for staff and the student counsel to come with new initiatives in the school. Nevertheless, for Non-Eco-Schools it is unclear how much they are actually supported in taking these initiatives. Moreover, it seems as if some student councils have more freedom than others. For example, pupils in student councils in school Q6 have the main task to pick a charity each year to raise money for. In Q5's school the student counsel body is supported in taking initiative as they came up with idea themselves to plant fruit trees on the schools' playground and they were allowed to execute this idea, now to be enjoyed for all pupils in the future. Though what seemed to be a defining and recurring theme over all the interviews is captured by school Q7: "initiatives can be proposed but they need to be carried by the Whole-School and it has to fit our vision".

Even though the Eco-Schools that were interviewed seem to generally have a high quality of collaboration within their schools, not every Eco-school sees itself necessary to collaborate with the school community outside the school. When asked why Eco-school Q4 did not commit to any external relations, the reply indicated that there was no

Other Eco-Schools do not necessarily score very high on this aspect either (Q1) (Q2). However, every Eco-Schools did collaborate with the municipality and the designated

Culture and Nature department to some extent but not all are creating long lasting community bonds outside of that.

Relationships with external partners seemed slightly more common with Non- Eco Schools. Non-Eco-Schools Q7 is an example of that by trying to be involved with their neighborhood and regularly collaborating with so called “neighborhood teams” to clean up the area. Non-Eco-Schools Q5 was even depending on the neighborhood to watch children play after school hours. This in contrary to Non-Eco-Schools Q6 where hardly any external relations were noted.

A school board can influence these external collaborations as the school board member mentioned that they were involving schools with local businesses where pupils were able to do organic cooking at a local farm or visit a waste processing facility that gives workshops and institutions.

All Eco-Schools indicated that the intrinsic motivation of teachers to implement a more WSA to EfS in their curriculum was a barrier to some extent. According to school Q2 and Q1 all teachers have their own agenda: they are busy carrying the daily problems in their classes. The teacher responsible for the Eco-school program in school Q2 did not really feel supported by the rest of the team. Professional training on sustainability does occur but not everywhere, Q2 also thinks that more professional training would not help because the interest has to be intrinsic and not top-down. Non-Eco-Schools seem to deal with the same issues, upon request teachers can get professional training regarding sustainability subjects. In conclusion, Eco-schools generally have more collaboration with the school community via for example student boards, however Non-Eco-Schools seem to have a stronger link with external stakeholders like the neighborhood or municipality.

4.2.2 Educational Program

Some of the methods that Eco-Schools are using, seem to thematically address issues for sustainability but not all Eco-Schools have integrated sustainability in their curriculum. All four of the Eco-Schools use a method for taal (literacy) where it takes hot news items which sometimes include sustainable topics and makes them into a lesson, (Q1) also mentions that they have a conversation about what happened in the news. Two out of four Eco-Schools have developed coherence between EfS and their educational program. The other two still had to create its coherence. One Eco-School teacher suggested making sustainability a course because that would help to motivate other teachers to also pay attention to it (Q1), but most

Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools thought that defeated the point of sustainability (Q2)(Q3)(Q5)(Q8).

An interesting development within the Non-Eco-Schools was that many were either considering to change their method to start teaching thematically or have recently made the change. Thematic learning is focused on one subject and adapting all different learning fields to this subject. Q5 described the reason for starting to work thematically as wanting a more effective pedagogy for the children as a response to overcrowded curricula. 'This is what we would like to do in the future. Less from books and more from pupils themselves and themes and projects'(Q7). Thematic education was recognized as being developed in order to teach children relationships between courses according to both Eco-Schools as Non-Eco-Schools but the main reason for Non-Eco-Schools seemed to be ways for schools to effectively make pupils learn.

The action competence component within Eco-Schools seems to be developing and present in the whole sample. Some examples, one of the Eco-Schools believes that children should be individuals that take their role in society serious and form their own responsibility. Q3 defines action competence as: "The children are co-owners of their own learning process". Q2 talks about a new movement in schools and society how we deal with children. "Discussing and involving pupils and then taking that into account, that is new. So also talking to children about a new report, asking them what they think about it. That is going to happen a lot more often. When we take children seriously, we see a positive effect and as long as that continues we will continue too." In the past you had to do what the teacher said and now our approach has changed more into giving the children more responsibility" (Q2). Q1 also sees it more as a general development of how we look at education rather than something their school does exclusively. Q4 says he sees that he decided with his other schoolboard members that one of the main themes for improvement was motivation children in taking responsibility for their own learning process and taking initiative. Currently this is done too much by the organization.

The Non-Eco-Schools show more diverse data. The two schools that work with the Montessori and Da Vinci pedagogy are identified as paying attention to action competence, as it is engrained in the schools pedagogical history. Also the representative of the schoolboard sees that schools are paying more attention to their pedagogical assignment: "We are not a factory that teaches skills to children, but we are trying to let pupils develop themselves as humans. That a child knows it's seen and accepted and that it can develop their

own skills and talents. That is very close to a human vision that fits a sustainable vision where you are exploring, what do I find important in society, what do I find important in a human, that is that human development where they care about becoming happy instead of materialistic stuff”. However, one school (Q7) mentioned their pupil population came with a learning deficit. They would like to focus more on the action competence in their school, but they have to spend more time on teaching basic cognitive skills.

4.2.3 Practice

Eco-Schools have a Whole-School approach plan as they have to have one. Non-Eco-Schools on the other hand do not have a specific plan for a Whole-School approach to EfS but they do mention holism in their policy or vision which refers implicitly to Whole-School approach to EfS. Policy and vision statement is a recurring theme and determines many aspects in the school.

One interesting finding is that half of the Eco-Schools in this sample, did not have a regular evaluation with their principal on the progress being made from the program. Eco-Schools have to show some progress bi-annually but not necessarily within the school. Where two Eco-Schools were doing it irregularly one eco school didn't do it at all (Q1). This is similar to Non-Eco-Schools who have to have it in their policy to actually evaluate.

The organizational structure for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS was present in Eco-Schools but some teachers have indicated that they feel unsupported in their school and would like more support from other teachers (Q1) (Q2).

All the Non-Eco-Schools either indicated that they would like to have an organizational structure in the future that would allow for a Whole-School approach to EfS or that they already have it and it would fit perfectly if they chose to focus themselves on EfS.

4.2.4 Place

All school buildings seem to have the same sustainable management with a recent change of LED lights, automatic water taps or lights that switch off when nobody is there. A striking observation is that most of these changes in Eco-Schools have been initiated by pupils and in Non-Eco-Schools, principals or schoolboards have initiated this change.

Informal learning is a difficult concept to get more coherence on. In one Non-Eco-Schools they have a school farm with animals and in another Eco-school they have a community garden. In both cases the children are responsible for doing the task. Only Q3 seemed to give

a profound link between informal learning and EfS. Other schools lacked concise answer on the relation between the two concepts, perhaps there was no clear understanding of it.

4.3 Barriers

In general, the biggest barrier perceived by Eco-Schools in this sample is the *overcrowded curriculum* that stem from the SLO requirements. Whereas one school was completely against this and thought reconceptualizing was more important, the others were unanimously agreeing on this. Almost all schools in this sample agree that reaching the end goals set by the government is their main task as a goal. If there is a strong base on these goals, then schools can include sustainability as an extra.

Non-Eco-Schools saw a combination of an overcrowded curriculum, and the political agenda that focuses on quantitative literacy and numeracy testing that tends to push sustainability education away from the central focus of curriculum and pedagogy as the biggest barrier. Every school would like children to be individuals and autonomous people, though some schools have to pay so much attention on calculus and literacy that they feel there is no time for redefining the focus on that.

Teacher individual styles are very decisive for this on both Eco-schools as Non-Eco-Schools. Even at the best performing Eco school, it was considered difficult to make teachers (that have received and given education for many years in a certain way) understand the importance of giving more autonomy to children in class.

5. Discussion

In this section the results will be translated into a discussion. Even though the four dimensions are here discussed as separate, many of them are linked and influence each other. Therefore, they are discussed as a whole.

5.1 School community, educational program, practice and place

*The results in the dimensions **school community** and **educational program** seem more consistent with Eco-Schools than with Non-Eco-Schools. However, the dimension **place** seems*

similar between Eco-schools and Non-Eco-Schools. A bigger difference is noticed within practice where Eco-Schools have a structural plan and budget.

Both Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools can have high levels of collaboration within their schools, including student council, expertise groups, parent involvement, which are found to be key aspects of the Whole-School approach to EfS. Nevertheless, there are some differences to what extent student councils receive freedom to show initiatives. An example that ties into this is that the Eco-Schools' management of facilities (LED, Water, remote sensing, recycling) are not generally more sustainable but pupils did have more influence in changing these aspects in their school. This example, although seemingly small, does seem to reveal a crucial difference. Whereas in both Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-School there are developments to improve school management practices, Eco-Schools seem to involve pupils in the process more. This raises the question of who initiates these changes and if pupils are actually the owners of the ideas as well as the main executors. Krnel & Naglič mention that the role of facilitator of students' action competence is still difficult and teachers tend to take over projects (2019). This could also be the case in this sample but more research should be done to confirm this. More promising examples are the influence of school community on school playgrounds and the schools' vision. The fact that Eco-Schools pupils are taken into account with these decisions indicates some more serious involvement.

Even though collaboration within schools does seem to be more of a constant factor in Eco-Schools, this does not account for external collaboration. This is a surprising notion as including the community is an important aspect in the Whole school approach to EfS. This raises the question to what extent Eco-School actually promote this aspect in their program. The finding that EfS is not supported with all staff but is most of the times carried by enthusiastic teachers is confirmed by many Eco-Schools internationally facing the same problem with leadership (Krnel, Naglič, 2009). This means that Eco-Schools do not necessarily foster a "whole staff change" to include EfS in their teachings.

An interesting finding of this research is the general inclination from both Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools to adopt thematic education. The main motive for Non-Eco-Schools to adopt thematic education seems to be either pedagogical history or the search for more efficient learning strategies as a result from the lack of time often documented by school leaders (Wilson, 2012). In light of this, the motive of efficiency here is a possible advantage, in

contrary to Wals (2013) who sets efficiency as competing against re-orientating schools towards sustainability.

If efficiency is one of the main drivers for schools to adopt thematic education, the main barrier to the implementation of more sustainability in the school system would rather be the inclination to include EfS in the educational program rather than the overwhelming job of changing the entire curricular structure. This takes into consideration that the Non-Eco-Schools that were interviewed have developed organizational structures in place that could support a Whole School approach to EfS. This reaffirms an overall finding that schools allow change if it fits their vision. One of the main theories of system dynamics might give insight into what it takes to change a whole school system: “If every element within the system stays the same (i.e. people, budget, equipment), changing the purpose of the system will result in profound change. Purpose is the most crucial determinant of a system’s behavior” (Bar, Cross, & Dunbar, 2014, p.7).

The **practice** dimension seems to show the biggest dispersion between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools. A possible reason for Non-Eco-Schools to score low on both evaluation and having a Whole school plan is because they do not refer to sustainability directly in their policy and therefore do not evaluate it. Though some Non-Eco-Schools did indicate that their schoolboards recently included it into their own strategic plan, more research should be done if these commitments will also trickle downwards. Eco-Schools show a more convincing trend in the practise dimension, although evaluation between the responsible teacher for the Eco-team and the principal within half of the schools was still not present. This does raises questions on the structural implementation of sustainability in Eco-Schools.

To conclude, Eco and Non-Eco-Schools are occasionally similar in their approach to collaboration, organizational structures, and an inclination towards thematic education. All these elements could be included as aspects of a Whole-school approach to EfS; however, in Non-Eco-Schools the focus on sustainability is found to be less present. The vision, policy and historic background of a school and/or schoolboard can have a big influence on whether or not Non-Eco-Schools have integrated aspects of a Whole school approach to EfS.

5.2 Barriers

Overcrowded curriculum and political agenda

From the interviews it was apparent that the fear of schools being stamped a ‘weak school’ by the school inspection was reason for schools to put sustainability almost completely aside. The data suggests that teachers are mainly occupied with getting student learning to reach the SLO targets and that the schools reputation, the approval of parents, the schoolboard and the government are a driver for this.

This is interesting for two reasons. First, it gives a more broad explanation on why the teachers interviewed in this research and in the literature perceive the program as full even though the Dutch curriculum is considered to have a lot of liberty. Second, this explains perhaps why there are no Eco-Schools in area’s with a low socio-economic status.

It is generally assumed that children from parents with a lower education level fall behind academically more easily compared to children from parents with a higher education. The pressure of teachers becomes higher when they have to pay attention to children who still need to learn some of the basic reading and math skills. This became apparent from the interviews with the Eco-Schools that claimed to be situated in areas with a lower socio-economic status.

Therefore, it is reasonable that schools that are highly segregated have less opportunity of implementing a Whole-school approach to EfS and therefore have less opportunities to experience this type of education. Segregation in Dutch schools is a structural and growing problem, and in this research, it is considered as one of the main barriers for schools implementing a Whole-school approach to EfS.

Nevertheless, schools which considered themselves situated within a low socio-economic background, did have a connection with their neighborhood and payed more attention to the social aspect of sustainability, indicating that sustainability does not have to be omitted completely. One Non-Eco school shows that a school can overcome this barrier if the principal has a vision on collaboration and EFS and with children from both highly-educated parents and lower-educated parents. This finding implicates that less segregation in schools in the Netherlands could be beneficial to Whole-school approach for EfS movement.

6. Conclusion

Comparing the four dimensions between this sample of Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools has resulted in the conclusion that Eco-Schools seem to be more consistent in their implementation of a Whole school approach to EfS though the results do not differ extremely. The dimension of school community and educational program seem somewhat more consistent with Eco-Schools than with Non-Eco-Schools. However, the dimension of place is quite similar between Eco-schools and Non-Eco-Schools. A bigger difference is noticed within the practice dimension where Eco-Schools have a Whole-School plan and budget. The difference between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco in the school community and educational program dimension might be explained by a larger trend in the Dutch pedagogical and education environment that seems to have Whole-School approach to EfS elements. This trend could lead to more Non-Eco-Schools implementing aspects of the Whole-School approach to EfS.

Barriers for implementing a Whole-School approach to EfS do not differ that much between Eco-Schools and Non-Eco-Schools. As the overcrowded curriculum and the political agenda seem to be a governmental issue, change needs to come from them. In light of this research, the Dutch government should have a critical look at the SLO targets they set for primary schools. Schools situated within a low socio-economic background will probably have more difficult barriers to overcome when implementing a Whole-school approach to EfS than schools who do not.

The results of this study should be considered in light of their limitations. Even though 25% of the entire population of Dutch primary Eco-Schools with a green flag have been interviewed, the sample of regular primary schools is very low compared to the total. There are also other factors that the Whole-School approach to ESD in the Netherlands, local municipalities, NGO's have their own programs that support the movement. One of the limitations of this study is that it excludes other programs, initiatives, individuals teachers efforts within primary schools in the Netherlands that are contributing to the Whole-School approach to EFS. There are also more differences between primary schools in the Netherlands that could make a difference for the result of the answers for example pedagogical background or the population of teachers within schools. Extra attention needs to be paid to the differences between schools located in a low and high socio-economic area. These are interesting aspects for further research.

7. References

Front page picture: <http://thespoke.earlychildhoodaustralia.org.au/education-for-sustainability/>

Boeve-de Pauw, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). The effect of Flemish eco-schools on student environmental knowledge, attitudes, and affect. *International Journal of Science Education*, 33(11), 1513-1538.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.540725>

Barth, M. Fischer, D. Michelsen, G. Nemnich, C. Rode, H. (2012): Tackling the knowledge-action gap in sustainable consumption: insights from a participatory school programme. In: *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development* 6(2), 301–312.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0973408212475266>.

Bosevska, J. & Kriewaldt, J. (2020). Fostering a whole-school approach to sustainability: learning from one school's journey towards sustainable education, *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 29(1), 55-73. DOI: [10.1080/10382046.2019.1661127](https://doi.org/10.1080/10382046.2019.1661127)

Brundiers, K, Wiek, A. Redman, C. L. (2010). “Real-world learning opportunities in sustainability: from classroom into the real world.” *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 11(4), 308–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14676371011077540>

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Chatzifotiou, A. (2019). Beneficial or detrimental? The relationship between sustainability, EcoSchools and Ofsted reports. *Education*, 13(4), 1-13. DOI:

[10.1080/03004279.2019.1704814](https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2019.1704814)

Cincera, J., Boeve-de Pauw, J., Goldman, D., & Simonova, P. (2019). Emancipatory or instrumental? Students' and teachers' perceptions of the implementation of the EcoSchool program. *Environmental Education Research*, 25(7), 1083-1104.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2018.1506911>

Cincera, J., & Krajhanzl, J. (2013). Eco-Schools: what factors influence pupils' action competence for pro-environmental behaviour?. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 61, 117-121. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.06.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.06.030)

De Wolf M., de Hamer A. (2015). Education for Sustainable Development in the Netherlands. In: Jucker R., Mathar R. (eds) *Schooling for Sustainable Development in Europe*. *Schooling for Sustainable Development*, 6. pp 361-380

Dion, D. (2003). Evidence and inference in the comparative case study. *Necessary conditions: Theory, methodology, and applications*, 95-112.

Eco-Schools - Overzicht scholen. (n.d.). Retrieved 16 May 2020, from <https://eco-schools.nl/scholen/overzicht-scholen>

Ecoschools. (n.d.). Eco-Schools. Retrieved May 1, 2020, from <https://www.ecoschools.global/>

Ecoschools. 1. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2020, from <https://www.Eco-School>

Evans, N., Whitehouse, H., & Gooch, M. (2012). Barriers, successes and enabling practices of education for sustainability in far North Queensland schools: A case study. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 43(2), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2011.621995>

Eames, C., Barker, M., Wilson-Hill, F., & Law, B. (2010). Investigating the relationship between whole-school approaches to education for sustainability and student learning: A summary. *Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research*.

Eames, C., Wilson-Hill, F., & Barker, M. (2013). Exploring whole-school approaches to education for sustainability. set: *Research Information for Teachers*, 1, 12-19.

FEE. (n.d.). FEE Facts — Foundation for Environmental Education. Retrieved May 7, 2020, from <https://www.fee.global/fee-facts>

Gan, D., Gal, A., Könczey, R., & Varga, A. (2019). Do eco-Schools really help implementation of ESD?: A comparison between eco-School systems of Hungary and Israel. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 9(4), 628-653.

<https://doi.org/10.1556/063.9.2019.4.53>

Hacking, E. B., Scott, W., & Lee, E. (2010). *Evidence of impact of sustainable schools*. Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF).

Hargreaves, L. (2008). The Whole-School Approach to Education for Sustainable Development: From Pilot Projects to Systemic Change. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 6, 69-74.

Harrison, P. (2007). Holistic thinking and integrated care: working with black and minority ethnic individuals and communities in health and social care. *Journal of Integrated Care*, 15(3), 3. DOI:10.1108/14769018200700016

Hart, M. (1997). Life-affirming work, raising children, and education. *Convergence*, 30(2), 128.

Henderson, K., & Tilbury, D. (2004). Whole-School approaches to sustainability: An international review of sustainable school programs. *Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability: Australian Government*.

Higgs, A. & McMillan, V. (2006). Teaching through modeling: four schools' experiences in sustainability education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 38(1), 39-53. <http://doi.org/10.3200/JOEE.38.1.39-53>

Kadji-Beltran, C., Zachariou, A., & Stevenson, R. B. (2013). Leading sustainable schools: exploring the role of primary school principals. *Environmental education research*, 19(3), 303-323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2012.692770>

Korkmaz, A., & Guler Yildiz, T. (2017). Assessing preschools using the Eco-Schools program in terms of educating for sustainable development in early childhood education. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 25(4), 595–611.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293x.2017.1331074>

Kalnins, T. I. (2018). *The Development of a Whole School Approach to Education for Sustainability* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato). Retrieved from
<https://hdl.handle.net/10289/12050>

Krnel, D., & Naglic, S. (2009). Environmental literacy comparison between Eco-Schools and ordinary schools in Slovenia. *Science Education International*, 20, 5-24.

Leren voor Morgen. (2015). *Rapportage onderzoek Duurzaam Onderwijs*.
<https://www.lerenvoormorgen.org/images/Pleitbezorging/rapportage-onderzoek-duurzaam-onderwijs.pdf>

Mckeown, R., & Hopkins, C. (2003). EE p ESD: Defusing the worry. *Environmental Education Research*, 9(1), 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620303469>

Mogensen, F., & Mayer, M. (2005). Eco-Schools: trends and divergences. *A Comparative Study on Eco-Schools development processes in*, 13.

Mogren, A., Gericke, N., & Scherp, H. Å. (2019). Whole school approaches to education for sustainable development: A model that links to school improvement. *Environmental education research*, 25(4), 508-531.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2018.1455074>

Muijs, D. (2008). Widening opportunities? A case study of school-to-school collaboration in a rural district. *Improving Schools*, 11(1), 61-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480207086755>

Ofsted rapport. (2008). Schools and sustainability A climate for change? Retrieved May 19, 2020, from <http://esd.escalate.ac.uk/downloads/1768.pdf>

Rosenberg, E. (2008). Eco-Schools and the quality of education in South Africa: Realising the potential. *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education*, 25, 25-43.

SLO. (2020, 7 februari). *Over Slo*. Visited on 30 april 2020, van <https://slo.nl/over-slo/>

SME. (n.d.). Eco-Schools - SME. Retrieved May 1, 2020, from <https://sme.nl/werkveld/onderwijs/EcoSchools>

Symons, G. (2008). Practice, Barriers and Enablers in ESD and EE: A Review of the Research. *A Report for SEED: UK*.

Tilbury, D. (1995). Environmental education for sustainability: Defining the new focus of environmental education in the 1990s. *Environmental education research*, 1(2), 195-212.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992). Promoting education, public awareness and training. In Agenda 21, 221-227. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf>

UNESCO. (2018, September 3). UN Decade of ESD. Retrieved May 4, 2020, from <https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/what-is-esd/un-decade-of-esd>

Wals, A. E. (2011). Learning our way to sustainability. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development*, 5(2), 177-186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097340821100500208>

Wals, A. E., & Benavot, A. (2017). Can we meet the sustainability challenges? The role of education and lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education*, 52(4), 404-413. DOI: [10.1111/ejed.12250](https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12250)

Annex 1: Eco-Schools seven step plan

Figure 1 - The Seven Steps



Source:

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/552bcd30e4b02ed06b97c76d/t/5e4bb262190cbb27f15a2077/1582019198413/1.+Changing+Together+-+Eco-Schools+1994-2019_Introduction.pdf

Annex 2: Eco-Schools vision on implementing EFS in the school system

Features of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD)
Locally relevant: addressing local as well as global issues, and using the language (s) which learners most commonly use.
Applicability: the learning experiences offered are integrated in day to day personal and professional life. Interdisciplinary and holistic: learning for sustainable development embedded in the whole curriculum, not as a separate subject.
Value-driven: it is critical that the assumed norms – the shared values and principles underpinning sustainable development – are made explicit so that they can be examined, debated, tested and applied.
Critical thinking and problem solving: leading to confidence in addressing the dilemmas and challenges of sustainable development.
Participatory decision-making: learners participate in decisions on how they are to learn. Multi-method: using different pedagogies in which teachers and learners work together to acquire knowledge and play a role in shaping the environment of their educational institutions.

Annex 3: Letter of permission

Toestemmingsformulier

Ik heb de bijgevoegde informatief brief gelezen.

Ik begrijp dat:

1. Mijn participatie aan dit project vrijwillig is
2. Ik het recht heb om me op elk moment terug te trekken uit het onderzoek
3. Data wordt verzameld en misschien wordt gebruikt door mij in de specifieke manier beschreven in de informatiebrief. De data zal vertrouwelijk blijven en veilig bewaard.
4. De data die wordt verzameld gebruikt mag worden in het schrijven van de thesis, publicaties en presentaties die worden gegeven over de thesis.

Ik geef mijn toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek door middel van een kort interview. Voorbeelden uit het onderzoek kunnen worden gebruikt in de thesis, publicaties en presentaties.

Vragen hierover kunnen worden gesteld aan Marenthe Middelhoff, email: m.e.j.middelhoff@uu.nl

Ik geef toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek onder alle voorwaarden hierboven besproken

Naam: _____

Handtekening: _____ Datum: _____

Annex 4: letter of information for participants

Informatiebrief

Beste mevrouw, meneer

Ik schrijf u om toestemming te vragen om u op te nemen in mijn bachelors thesis voor Universiteit Utrecht. Deze studie betreft het analyseren van de ontwikkeling van de Whole school approach (holistische school aanpak) voor Education for Sustainable Development (leren voor duurzame ontwikkeling) op basisscholen in Nederland. Hierbij wordt er onder andere gefocuseerd op de kansen en barrières voor het integraal opnemen van meer duurzame ontwikkeling in het basisonderwijs. Er wordt hier een onderscheid gemaakt tussen directeuren en leraren van scholen die een Eco-schools keurmerk hebben en scholen die dat niet hebben om zo het verschil te kunnen identificeren tussen basisscholen die op lange termijn al bezig zijn met de ontwikkeling van een Whole school approach en scholen die dat niet zijn. Het analyseren van de percepties van directeuren en leraren op de integratie van een Whole school approach is een essentieel deel van het onderzoek aangezien hij of zij de kennis bezit waar de mogelijke kansen en barrières in de desbetreffende school bestaan. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om meer inzicht te krijgen hoe dit thema duurzaamheid in de toekomst op reguliere basisscholen en Eco-Scholen verder geïmplementeerd kan worden. Bovendien kan het onderzoek inzicht geven in barrières voor reguliere basisscholen om de WSA te implementeren in hun schoolsysteem door bijvoorbeeld te beginnen met een Eco-School keurmerk. Het interview zal ongeveer 45 minuten duren. U mag een kopie van het transcript van het individuele interview vragen. Elke discussie, notities gemaakt tijdens het opnemen, de opname die wij zullen voeren zullen alleen door mij en mogelijk mijn supervisor Hens Runhaar worden bekeken. De data die in het interview wordt verzameld, mogen worden gebruikt in het schrijven van de thesis, publicaties of presentaties. Ik zal niet uw naam of de naam van de school gebruiken in publicaties of presentaties als u dat niet wilt. Dus uw werk en ideeën zullen anoniem blijven. U kunt op elk moment stoppen met de betrekking bij mijn thesis, hierna zal er geen verdere informatie worden vergaard. Ik zou uw toestemming om mee te doen aan dit onderzoek zeer op prijs stellen. Voor meer details over het project kunt u me contacteren via email, m.e.i.middelhoff@uu.nl of via de telefoon, 0653475406. Als u toestemming om u te betrekken bij het onderzoek, vraag ik u het toestemmingformulier te ondertekenen en terug te sturen.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Marenthe Middelhoff

Annex 5: Interview guide

Interview vragen basisschool directeuren
1. Bent u bekend met de term Whole-School approach binnen leren voor duurzame ontwikkeling? Zo ja, wat verstaat u onder WSA?
2. Wat verstaat u onder leren voor duurzame ontwikkeling?
3. Wat is de stand van zaken ten aanzien van de visie van de school op het gebied van (Leren voor) duurzame ontwikkeling zoals ik die hierboven heb beschreven?
4. Wat is de stand van zaken ten aanzien van het beleid op het gebied van (Lv)D?
Curriculum
5. Op welke manier heeft (Lv)D een plek in het lesinhouden gekregen? En in het zaakvakkenonderwijs?
6. Waar vindt u dat (Lv)D een plek zou moeten hebben binnen het schoolsysteem en waarom?
7. Krijgen de leerlingen de kans om aspecten van/resultaten van (Lv)D in de praktijk te brengen? Waarom wel of waarom niet?
8. Hebben deze vakken betrekking op natuur en milieu- onderwerpen of worden daarbij ook sociale aspecten meegenomen. Waarom wel of waarom niet?
9. Is er op dit moment een evaluatie gaande over de vorderingen van (Lv)D binnen het schoolsysteem?
School Gemeenschap
10. Heeft u het gevoel dat er veel samenwerking is binnen uw school? Waarom wel waarom niet?
11. Heeft u het gevoel dat er op dit moment relaties tussen de school en de omgeving plaatsvinden ten behoeve van leren van de leerlingen? (bv milieucentra, wereldwinkel, zorgboerderij maar ook bijvoorbeeld de gemeente, provincie etc.)
12. Heeft u het gevoel alsof er consultatie is binnen de schoolgemeenschap als het gaat om grote beslissingen. Waarom wel, waarom niet?
13. Worden er op dit moment acties in de school ondernomen om hem duurzamer te maken?
14. Welke rol spelen directeuren in het ontwikkelen van een Whole school approach binnen (Lv)D op uw school, als u dat zou willen toepassen?
15. Krijgen leraren professionele ondersteuning om hun kennis op het gebied van duurzaamheid te verbreden? Heeft u het gevoel alsof dit nodig is?
Praktijk

16. Heb je het gevoel alsof duurzaamheid wordt meegenomen in de bedrijfsvoering, bijvoorbeeld binnen het budget?
17. Is er op dit moment een organisatorische structuur om een Whole school approach te bevorderen? Waarom wel waarom niet?
Plek
18. Heeft u het gevoel alsof het huidige schoolgebouw duurzaamheid reflecteert? Waarom wel, waarom niet?
19. Heeft u het gevoel dat de schoolomgeving plekken biedt voor formeel en informeel leren? Zo ja wat dan?
20. Streeft u naar meer (L)v(D) binnen het schoolsysteem? Wat houdt u et meest tegen denkt u? Wat zou het meest helpen denkt u binnen de school?
21. Geeft het huidige schoolsysteem/pedagogy u de ruimte om meer van dit soort veranderingen te implementeren? Waarom wel, waarom niet?
22. Bent u bekend met Eco-Scholen en zou u dit in uw school willen implementeren?

