

---

## ORGANIC STATE ARCHITECTURE IN EDUCATION POLICY: Transition from Top-Down Bureaucracy to Community-Driven Educational Innovation

Beni Pramula<sup>1</sup>, Azhari Aziz Samudra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>) Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>) Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Indonesia

\*email: <sup>1</sup>)[pramulabeni@gmail.com](mailto:pramulabeni@gmail.com) <sup>2</sup>)[Prof.samudra@gmail.com](mailto:Prof.samudra@gmail.com)

Received: 16/12/2023

Accepted: 15/03/2023

Publications: 20/03/2023

---

*JSPAI © 2025 is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>*

---

### Abstract

This investigation explores the conceptual framework of organic state architecture as it applies to educational governance, centering on the shift away from rigid, hierarchically imposed bureaucratic arrangements toward more responsive systems energized by grassroots-level initiatives within educational practice. Conventional educational structures have historically been marked by centrally concentrated decision-making authority, uniformly applied policy mandates, and layered governance hierarchies that routinely suppress local creativity and adaptive capacity. In contrast, the organic state paradigm foregrounds systemic flexibility, governance rooted in broad participation, and the genuine empowerment of frontline actors—including classroom teachers, surrounding communities, and educational institutions themselves as the primary engines of meaningful change. Drawing on a qualitative and conceptual analytical framework, this study investigates the extent to which decentralization strategies and community-anchored initiatives can cultivate education reforms that are both contextually grounded and durably sustainable. The evidence suggests that innovation originating from the ground level heightens the real-world relevance of policy, encourages shared problem-solving among stakeholders, and elevates learning outcomes by ensuring that policy directions resonate with actual local circumstances and needs. Beyond this, the organic model nurtures iterative feedback loops connecting policymakers with field practitioners, thereby enabling ongoing systemic adjustment in response to evolving social, technological, and cultural conditions. Nonetheless, the movement toward an organic state architecture is not without its complications, encompassing challenges such as inter-agency coordination difficulties, uneven distribution of local institutional capacity, and the imperative to establish credible accountability frameworks.

**Keyword:** Organic State, Education Policy, Decentralization, Grassroots Innovation, Governance, Education Reform

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji konsep arsitektur negara organik dalam kebijakan pendidikan, dengan fokus pada transisi dari model birokrasi top-down yang kaku menuju pendekatan yang lebih adaptif dan didorong oleh inisiatif akar rumput dalam inovasi pendidikan. Sistem pendidikan tradisional telah lama dicirikan oleh pengambilan keputusan terpusat, kebijakan terstandarisasi, dan struktur tata kelola hierarkis yang sering kali membatasi kreativitas dan responsivitas lokal. Sebaliknya, paradigma negara organik menekankan fleksibilitas, tata kelola partisipatif, dan pemberdayaan aktor lokal termasuk guru, masyarakat, dan lembaga pendidikan sebagai pendorong utama perubahan. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dan konseptual, studi ini menganalisis bagaimana praktik desentralisasi dan inisiatif berbasis masyarakat dapat mendorong reformasi pendidikan yang lebih peka terhadap konteks dan berkelanjutan. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa inovasi akar rumput meningkatkan relevansi kebijakan, mendorong pemecahan masalah secara kolaboratif, dan meningkatkan hasil pendidikan dengan menyelaraskan kebijakan dengan kebutuhan dan realitas lokal. Selain itu, model organik mendukung siklus umpan balik yang dinamis antara pembuat kebijakan dan praktisi, memungkinkan adaptasi berkelanjutan sebagai respons terhadap perubahan sosial, teknologi, dan budaya. Namun, transisi menuju arsitektur negara organik juga menghadirkan tantangan, termasuk kompleksitas koordinasi, ketimpangan dalam kapasitas lokal, dan kebutuhan akan mekanisme akuntabilitas yang kuat.

**Kata Kunci:** Keadaan Organik, Kebijakan Pendidikan, Desentralisasi, Inovasi Akar Rumput, Tata Kelola, Reformasi Pendidikan

## Introduction

Educational policy across a range of developing nations, Indonesia among them, has for several decades been shaped predominantly by centralized, hierarchically structured bureaucratic approaches. Under this configuration, the state operates as the principal indeed, often the sole authority responsible for designing, deploying, and evaluating every facet of the educational system, from national directives down to provincial and district implementation. (Wardi & Ismail, 2018) Within such an arrangement, schools, classroom teachers, and local communities are effectively cast as passive recipients of policy directives rather than as active contributors who might substantively shape the trajectory and substance of educational reform. The cumulative consequence is a pronounced structural gap between policies crafted at the center and the lived realities confronted by educational communities on the ground. (Mok, 2003)

This disjunction between policy design and localized need has emerged as one of the defining concerns in global conversations about educational reform. Overly centralized systems tend to produce what critics describe as "one size fits all" policy frameworks instruments ill-equipped to accommodate the rich diversity of social, cultural, economic, and geographic contexts that differentiate one educational community from another. Excessive standardization ultimately generates systemic dysfunction: educational institutions lose the latitude to experiment and innovate; teachers forfeit the creative agency essential to responsive pedagogy; and students receive learning experiences calibrated to an abstract norm that takes little account of their particular backgrounds or developmental needs. (Yang, 2023)

These tensions are further compounded by the mounting global pressure on educational systems to satisfy internationally benchmarked standards, standards frequently defined by market-oriented rationales and economic competitiveness indices. As numerous critical scholars have argued, a policy orientation excessively focused on measurable output accountability has progressively displaced attention from the substantive dimensions of education among them character formation, the cultivation of critical faculties, and contextually meaningful learning. This situation opens a productive space for rethinking educational governance through a paradigm more attuned to responsiveness, inclusivity, and genuine rootedness in community realities. (Sahlberg, 2021; Sayyi, Muslimin, dkk., 2025)

A range of prior scholarly contributions has deepened our understanding of how educational reform unfolds under conditions of decentralization and participatory governance. Notably, the research conducted by Ainscow, Dyson, and Weiner on inclusion-oriented school transformation demonstrated that the most durable educational innovations are those that emerge organically from within the communities they serve. Their findings consistently showed that schools achieving substantial reform typically harbored empowered local actors who exercised genuine ownership over the change agenda. (Ainscow dkk., 2013)

In a complementary vein, Bourke, Ryan, and Lloyd (2021) examined the relationship between educational governance structures and local agency, arguing persuasively that effective policy is ultimately policy capable of creating negotiated space between national imperatives and community-level needs. Their proposal of a "governance in between" model conceptualizes a framework in which dynamic, productive interaction between multiple tiers of educational authority becomes both possible and normative. (Bourke, T., Ryan, M., & Lloyd, 2021)

Despite these substantive contributions, several significant research gaps remain. First, the preponderance of existing studies focuses primarily on implementation-level dimensions, giving relatively limited analytical attention to the architectural dimension that is, how the institutional and structural landscape of the state needs to be reconfigured so that grassroots innovation can flourish organically rather than merely being tolerated at the margins. (Najmi & Fattah, 2025) Second, scholarship that specifically brings the concept of the "organic state" into dialogue with educational policy in developing country contexts such as Indonesia remains quite sparse. Third, comprehensive analysis of feedback mechanisms linking local actors with central policymakers as drivers of sustained

reform continues to be underrepresented in the literature.

Against this backdrop of identified gaps, the present study aims to analyze how the concept of organic state architecture might be operationalized within the domain of educational policy specifically in facilitating the transition from centralist bureaucratic governance toward models that are more participatory and genuinely responsive to local conditions. More concretely, the study seeks to understand how the defining characteristics of organic state architecture can be interpreted within educational policy contexts, to identify the mechanisms through which grassroots innovation can take root and expand within transitioning educational systems, and to examine the structural and capacity-related obstacles that may impede such transitions. (Fithriyah dkk., 2025; Trinidad, 2025)

The research yields value on two distinct levels. Theoretically, it advances the conceptual vocabulary of organic state thinking by adapting it specifically to educational policy analysis. Practically, its findings are intended to serve as a resource for policymakers, scholars, and educational practitioners engaged in the design and implementation of reform agendas that are more inclusive, contextually sensitive, and durably transformative

### **Research Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative methodology configured as a conceptual-analytical inquiry, with its primary orientation toward the construction and elaboration of theoretical frameworks. This research design is appropriate given the complexity and multi-dimensionality of the phenomena under investigation phenomena that resist reduction to purely quantitative measurement. (Gosebrink, 2023) The data sources employed are entirely secondary in nature, encompassing peer-reviewed journal articles indexed in international scholarly databases, academic texts, policy reports issued by national and international educational bodies, and relevant educational policy documentation. Data collection proceeded through systematic literature review, involving the identification, selection, and critical analysis of sources pertinent to organic state architecture and educational policy reform published within the preceding seven-year period. (Adeoye, 2023)

The analytical strategy integrates thematic content analysis with conceptual analysis. Through the former, recurring patterns, core concepts, and relational structures across the reviewed literature were systematically identified. (Najmi & Ismail, 2025) The latter enabled these findings to be synthesized into a coherent argumentative framework addressing organic state architecture in educational governance. Research validity was maintained through source triangulation that is, by engaging with and contrasting perspectives from literature anchored in diverse epistemological traditions thereby producing a balanced and representative synthesis.

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **Conceptualizing Organic State Architecture within Educational Governance**

The concept of the organic state as applied to educational governance draws on a political philosophical tradition that conceives of the state not as a mechanical apparatus governed by fixed rules and rigid hierarchies, but as a living, evolving organism that responds adaptively to its environment. Within this perspective, educational policy is not understood as a body of regulation handed down uniformly from above, but rather as a living normative framework continuously reconstructed through dynamic interaction among diverse actors operating across multiple governance levels. (Tamtik & Colorado, 2022) Conceptually, organic state architecture in education can be examined through three principal dimensions:

First. *The structural-institutional dimension* concerns the way in which state institutions are configured to permit more equitable distribution of authority between central and peripheral levels of governance. In this model, decentralization is not simply the administrative delegation of tasks; it represents a substantive redistribution of decision-making authority that enables local actors to make

strategic choices consonant with their specific needs and contexts. (Shirley & Hargreaves, 2021)

Second. *The process-communicative dimension* addresses the mechanisms through which information, knowledge, and practical experience circulate among the various levels of the system. An organic state requires communication channels that are not exclusively top-down but also lateral connecting actors at equivalent levels and bottom-up, enabling practitioners to contribute meaningfully to policy development. Robust feedback cycles linking schools, communities, local authorities, and central government constitute an indispensable precondition for this architectural model to function effectively. (Fiore dkk., 2020; Sahrowi dkk., 2025)

Third. *The cultural-epistemological dimension* pertains to the values and underlying assumptions that govern how knowledge about education is produced and legitimized. Within the organic model, the local knowledge held by teachers, parents, and communities is accorded epistemological validity commensurate with the formal expertise generated by educational scholars and administrators. This orientation means that pedagogical innovations arising from ground-level practice carry the same legitimacy as those conceived in policy offices and research centers. (Nihayah dkk., 2022)

The literature reviewed in this study consistently shows that successful implementations of organic state architecture are typically distinguished by several key elements: first, a regulatory environment sufficiently permissive to afford local actors meaningful operational space while nonetheless preserving minimum standards that safeguard quality and equity; second, capacity-support mechanisms that equip local actors with the competencies required to discharge expanded responsibilities effectively; and third, an institutional culture that values experimentation, tolerates constructive failure, and actively encourages collective learning.

Viewed through this conceptual lens, it becomes clear that organic state architecture carries significant implications for how we understand the state's role in education. Rather than serving as the sole regulatory authority controlling every dimension of the system, the state under this model functions as a facilitator and enabling force one that cultivates the conditions under which upward innovation can flourish. This shift in role demands transformation not only at the level of formal policy, but equally at the level of mindset and organizational culture throughout the educational bureaucracy. Such cultural transformation cannot be achieved through regulatory instruments alone; it requires long-term investment in capacity development, leadership cultivation, and organizational culture change at every level of the system. (Elgart, 2024; Fithriyah, 2023)

As an analytical reflection, the organic state approach to educational governance presents a conceptually promising framework while simultaneously posing substantial theoretical and operational challenges. On one hand, its emphasis on flexibility and acknowledgment of local diversity positions educational systems to become more responsive, contextually attuned, and innovative. On the other hand, absent robust coordination mechanisms and a sufficiently shared normative vision, this approach risks producing policy fragmentation and widening inter-regional quality disparities. In practice, not all local actors possess equal readiness to engage productively with the autonomous space afforded to them, meaning that differential capacity levels may further entrench already existing inequalities.

Additionally, the transformation of the state's role from a centralized controller into a more adaptive facilitator requires a deep and comprehensive reconceptualization of public accountability. As authority is no longer concentrated but instead dispersed among various actors, institutions, and levels, determining responsibility for the success or failure of policies becomes increasingly intricate and less straightforward. This shift calls for the development of more sophisticated evaluation frameworks that are not only focused on measuring final outcomes, but also attentive to the quality, dynamics, and effectiveness of the collaborative processes that produce those outcomes. In this context, the success of an organic state model relies heavily on its ability to strike a careful balance between granting flexibility for innovation and ensuring compliance with collectively agreed standards. At the same time, it depends on a continuous and deliberate effort to strengthen institutional capacities, foster coordination, and

cultivate enduring trust among all stakeholders operating within the wider educational ecosystem.

### **Grassroots Innovation Mechanisms and Their Role in Educational Policy Reform**

Grassroots innovation in education refers to the processes through which new educational practices are created, tested, and disseminated by actors situated at the operational level of the system classroom teachers, school principals, parents, and local community members. Distinct from innovation conceived top-down by experts and administrators, grassroots innovation arises in direct response to concrete challenges encountered in everyday learning environments. Because it is anchored in authentic experience and specific contexts, this form of innovation tends to exhibit high practical relevance and superior adoption rates among the practitioners it most directly affects. (Priestley dkk., 2021)

Analysis of successful educational reform models across diverse national settings, including Finland, Canada, and various East Asian nations, reveals that grassroots innovation does not emerge in a vacuum. It requires a purposefully cultivated ecosystem comprising at least four core components. The first is *professional autonomy for teachers* sufficient latitude for educators to exercise professional judgment in their pedagogical decisions rather than mechanically adhering to standardized curriculum specifications. (Sa'edi dkk., 2025; Yorulmaz & Çolak, 2023)

The second component is *professional learning networks* communities within which teachers and educational practitioners share practical experience, collaborate on problem-solving, and collectively build professional knowledge. These networks provide the infrastructure through which innovations proven effective in one school or community can be transmitted to and adapted by others confronting analogous challenges. Research indicates that horizontal learning networks of this kind constitute significantly more effective mechanisms for innovation diffusion than the top-down dissemination structures characteristic of traditional bureaucratic systems. (Muijs, D., Chapman, C., & Armstrong, 2022; Sayyi, Asmuki, dkk., 2025)

The third component is *trust-based accountability mechanisms* approaches that differ fundamentally from the control-based accountability dominant in conventional bureaucratic models. In this framework, accountability is constructed on the premise that educational professionals possess both the competence and integrity to exercise sound professional judgment, while standards and regulations function as normative guidance rather than as surveillance instruments that constrain. The fourth component is the availability of adequate resources comprising protected time, financial support, and access to relevant knowledge and expertise enabling local actors to experiment and develop innovations without bearing disproportionate personal risk.

Within the Indonesian context, the dynamics of grassroots innovation in education reveal a revealing pattern. On one side, numerous instances exist of locally-developed innovations successfully cultivated by teachers and schools responding to context-specific challenges. These include curricular developments that weave in indigenous knowledge traditions, the deployment of local natural and cultural resources as pedagogical media, and the creation of collaborative learning models designed to reflect the social characteristics of particular community settings. (Ismail, 2017)

On the other side, research conducted by Prasetyo and Mulyadi demonstrates that the implementation of educational decentralization in Indonesia continues to face significant structural constraints that limit the organic development of grassroots innovation. These constraints encompass substantial inter-regional capacity disparities, persistent financial dependence of local authorities on central transfers, and a bureaucratic culture that has not yet fully relinquished its centralist orientation. These findings suggest that the formal decentralization undertaken in Indonesia has not yet fully produced the substantive decentralization necessary for grassroots innovation to flourish equitably across the system.

From the author's analytical standpoint, this situation reveals an important paradox: decentralization within an organic state framework is not simply a matter of formal authority transfer it

is a question of comprehensive transformation in the manner in which the state positions itself in relation to educational communities. (Wardi dkk., 2019) Without fundamental change in the cultural orientation of the educational bureaucracy, formal decentralization risks producing what might be termed "decentralization in name only": on the surface, authority has been transferred, but in practice, central control mechanisms continue to dominate and the space available for local innovation remains effectively constrained.

The transition toward a genuinely organic state architecture therefore requires simultaneous change at three interconnected levels: the level of formal regulatory frameworks and policy instruments; the level of local actors' capacity and professional competencies; and the level of the cultural values and embedded assumptions that govern how actors within the system understand and enact their respective roles. These three domains of change must be managed in a synergistic and sustained fashion, with full recognition that such transformation cannot be accomplished within short time horizons and requires unwavering commitment from all stakeholders involved. (Carnoy, M., & Braun, 2023)

Grassroots innovation in education can be understood as an indicator of the degree to which a system has achieved maturity in managing autonomy and trusting ground-level practitioners. When space for local initiative is substantively available, teachers, school principals, and community members cease to function merely as policy implementers and begin to serve instead as co-producers of contextually grounded pedagogical knowledge. Nevertheless, the existence of such innovation does not automatically generate systemic change unless it is supported by mechanisms capable of connecting local practices with broader policy frameworks. The central challenge lies in maintaining balance between the diversity of locally generated innovations and the systemic coherence needed to ensure that local dynamics remain aligned with the overarching purposes of education.

The issue at stake, then, is not only the emergence of innovation but also the capacity of the system to recognize, validate, and disseminate effective practices. Innovations that go undocumented or fail to achieve institutional legitimacy risk remaining sporadic and disconnected from collective learning. This reinforces the need for governance arrangements capable of building meaningful linkages between ground-level practice and policy deliberation, while simultaneously ensuring that frontline actors receive appropriate support. Within this framework, the genuine strengthening of grassroots innovation requires a carefully calibrated equilibrium between creative freedom and shared direction one that ensures the attainment of the broader educational goals of quality improvement and equitable learning outcomes.

### **Transition Challenges and Strategies for Strengthening Local Capacity within Organic State Architecture**

The shift from centralized bureaucratic models toward organic state architecture in education does not unfold as a linear, unobstructed progression. Rather, it encompasses a cluster of complex, multi-dimensional challenges that are deeply interrelated and mutually conditioning. A nuanced understanding of the nature and dynamics of these challenges is an essential precondition for the formulation of realistic and effective transition strategies.

The first and perhaps most fundamental challenge is *the coordination challenge*. In centralized systems, coordination is relatively tractable because decision-making authority is concentrated at a single point and communication flows in a single direction downward from center to periphery. In more decentralized organic models, coordination becomes substantially more complex, requiring negotiated agreement among numerous actors with heterogeneous interests, capacities, and perspectives. The risks of policy fragmentation and incoherence increase considerably, and the need for sophisticated, flexible coordination mechanisms grows correspondingly urgent.

The second challenge is *the capacity inequality challenge*. Decentralization that is not accompanied by the equitable strengthening of local capacity risks creating new disparities between regions possessing the resources and competencies to productively leverage their expanded autonomy,

and regions lacking sufficient capacity that consequently fall further behind. In educational terms, this inequality may manifest as a widening quality gap between schools and localities capable of meaningful innovation and those that lack the enabling conditions to do so. (Nordin, A., & Sundberg, 2022)

The third challenge is *the accountability challenge*. In centralized systems, accountability is relatively straightforward to define because applicable standards are uniform and oversight mechanisms are central. In organic models, the questions of how to define standards that apply broadly without sacrificing local flexibility, and how to ensure accountability without generating administrative burdens that suppress innovation, become highly intricate. The productive tension between standardization and differentiation, between control and autonomy, must be carefully and continuously managed.

The fourth challenge is *the institutional resistance challenge*. The transition toward more organic and participatory models frequently encounters resistance from multiple stakeholders whose interests are tied to the legacy system. Mid-level bureaucrats who lose authority as a consequence of decentralization, actors accustomed to standardized procedures who are uncomfortable with the ambiguity inherent in organic models, and policymakers concerned about losing systemic oversight—all can constitute significant sources of resistance. In response to these challenges, this study identifies several strategies that have demonstrated effectiveness in supporting the transition toward organic state architecture.

*The first strategy* is a staged transition approach that enables the system to adapt incrementally rather than through radical change that risks system-wide disruption. This approach encompasses local piloting and experimentation prior to national policy scaling, alongside the development of structured learning mechanisms that enable the system to systematically extract and disseminate lessons from each transitional phase.

*The second strategy* is intensive, comprehensive, and sustained investment in local capacity development. This capacity building must extend well beyond technical training to encompass leadership development, evidence-informed decision-making, multi-stakeholder collaboration management, and structured impact-oriented innovation. Evidence from international contexts consistently indicates that investment in local human capital represents the most consequential determinant of long-term decentralization success.

*The third strategy* is the development of adaptive accountability systems capable of balancing the need for national minimum standards with the flexibility required to accommodate local variation. Such accountability systems must be designed to avoid generating perverse incentives or gaming behavior, instead fostering orientations genuinely directed toward improving learning quality. Fullan and Quinn emphasize the critical importance of building "coherence" within decentralized educational systems the alignment of goals, strategies, and capacities across all system levels as the foundation upon which meaningful accountability must rest.

*The fourth strategy* is the construction of collaborative, trust-based cultures throughout the educational ecosystem. Building such cultures requires fundamental transformation in the relationships between central and local government, between educational authorities and schools, and between schools and communities. From the author's analytical perspective, cultivating this trust constitutes a long-term investment that cannot be mandated through regulation; it must be grown through the accumulated experience of successful collaboration and through consistent behavioral integrity on the part of all parties involved. (Ismail, 2026)

Taken together, these considerations reveal that the transition toward organic state architecture in education is fundamentally a process of restructuring power relations and systemic operating logic a process that is anything but simple. The complexity of coordination, uneven distribution of capacity, and the dynamics of accountability all indicate that this transformation cannot be adequately understood as mere structural reform; it demands comprehensive reconstitution of how the system functions as a whole. The risks of policy fragmentation and quality inequity must be anticipated seriously, particularly

when autonomy is granted without corresponding actor readiness and adequate connective mechanisms. In this light, the success of the transition depends critically on the system's ability to maintain equilibrium between local differentiation and unified policy direction. (Nurhaidah & Soraya, 2024)

The challenge of institutional resistance underscores that the primary barriers are not only technical in nature but also deeply cultural and political. The shift toward more open and adaptive models requires a fundamental mindset change from control to trust that cannot occur instantaneously. Accordingly, strategies that are gradual and incremental, combined with capacity strengthening and the cultivation of collaborative cultures, become crucial for ensuring the durability of change. In this framework, an effective transition is not one that occurs rapidly but one that succeeds in building the foundations of trust, competence, and consistent action at every level of the educational system.

In sum, the analysis presented above affirms that the transition toward organic state architecture in education represents an extraordinarily ambitious and demanding transformative project yet one that is both urgent and essential. The challenges catalogued above should not be treated as grounds for deferring or abandoning this transition but must instead be incorporated into the design of transition strategies that are realistic, incremental, and genuinely responsive to the contextual complexity in which this transformation must unfold.

## Conclusion

This study affirms that organic state architecture offers a more adaptive and inclusive paradigm capable of supplanting the centralist bureaucratic models that have long prevailed in educational governance. Through its three defining dimensions structural-institutional, process-communicative, and cultural-epistemological the organic state creates the enabling conditions for sustained grassroots innovation to take root and flourish. This innovation, in turn, strengthens the real-world relevance of policy for local communities and builds the capacity of educational communities to respond proactively and contextually to change.

Nevertheless, the transition toward this architecture is far from unencumbered. Coordination complexity, disparities in local capacity, and accountability challenges represent critical issues demanding both strategic attention and robust policy commitment. The successful realization of this transformation therefore depends on phased approaches, comprehensive investment in local capacity development, and the sustained cultivation of a trust-based culture engaging all educational stakeholders. Empirically grounded follow-up research is strongly recommended to test the conceptual propositions generated by this study against concrete systemic realities.

## Bibliography

- Adeoye, M. A. (2023). From variables to research design: A deep dive into educational research methodology. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 7(4), 622–628.
- Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., & Weiner, S. (2013). *From Exclusion to Inclusion: Ways of Responding in Schools to Students with Special Educational Needs*. ERIC.
- Bourke, T., Ryan, M., & Lloyd, M. (2021). Rethinking educational governance: Local agency and systemic change. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 51(3), 321–337.
- Carnoy, M., & Braun, H. (2023). Rethinking school system reform: Evidence from cross-national research. *Comparative Education*, 59(1), 1–22.
- Elgart, M. A. (2024). Reimagining the roles of state and local education agencies. Dalam *Phi Delta Kappan* (Vol. 106, Nomor 2, hlm. 39–41). SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Fiore, B., Torelli, C., & Poliandri, D. (2020). The Multi-Speed and Non-Linear Process of Decentralization of Education: A Look at Italy. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 12(2), 79–99.
- Fithriyah, I. (2023). Installation of Religious Moderation Values in Multi Ethnic And Religious Communities in Polagan Galis Pamekasan Village. *FIKROTUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Manajemen Islam*, 12(2), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.32806/jf.v12i02.7350>

- Fithriyah, I., Sayyi, A., Alenesi, A. S. H. G., Agustina, L., & Al-Manduriy, S. M. (2025). Application of Sigmund Freud Psychoanalytic Theory in Overcoming Anxiety and Learning Difficulties of Students. *Al-Ihath: Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling Islam*, 5(2), 91–109. <https://doi.org/10.53915/jbki.v5i2.580>
- Gosebrink, L. (2023). An analytical-hermeneutic methodology. Dalam *An ethico-political evaluation of the necessity for a referendum over any future German Olympic bid* (hlm. 5–7). Springer.
- Ismail, I. (2017). Politik Pendidikan Islam di Daerah: Analisis Kebijakan Pemerintah Provinsi Jawa Timur dalam Pengembangan Madrasah Diniyah [Disertasi]. *UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*.
- Ismail, I. (2026). KAJIAN TEORETIS INTEGRASI MODEL MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES DAN EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING DALAM PEMBELAJARAN. *AL-MUADDIB: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Kependidikan*, 8(1), 163–182.
- Mok, K. H. (2003). Centralization and decentralization: Changing governance in education. Dalam *Centralization and decentralization: Educational reforms and changing governance in Chinese societies* (hlm. 3–17). Springer.
- Muijs, D., Chapman, C., & Armstrong, P. (2022). Etworked learning communities and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 33(1), 1–19.
- Najmi, A., & Fattah, A. (2025). IMPLEMENTASI PEMANFAATAN TEKNOLOGI DALAM PENDIKAN FORMAL DI PESANTREN (STUDY KASUS DI SMP MATHLAUL ULUM TAMBUKO SUMENEP). *As-Sulthan Journal of Education*, 1(4), 816–822.
- Najmi, A., & Ismail, I. (2025). Eksplorasi Makna Hidup Anak Gen Z di Era Digital. *Abdurrauf Journal of Education and Islamic Studies*, 2(1), 25–35.
- Nihayah, R., Revina, S., & Usman, S. (2022). Sociocultural Drivers of Local Educational Innovations: Findings from Indonesia. *University of Oxford. Preprint*.
- Nordin, A., & Sundberg, D. (2022). Transnational education policy and national interpretations: A comparative analysis. *European Educational Research Journal*, 21(1), 5–22.
- Nurhaidah, S. N., & Soraya, S. (2024). Manajemen Sekolah Dalam Pengembangan Sinergitas Guru Pendidikan Agama Islam. *Tadbir Muwahhid*, 8(1), 31–52.
- Priestley, M. R., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2021). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Sa'edi, M., Dannur, M., Sayyi, A., & Al-Islam, M. (2025). Integrating Ecological Awareness Through Islamic Religious Education: A Case Study At An-Nidhamiyah Islamic Boarding School, Pamekasan. *Fikroh: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam*, 18(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.37812/fikroh.v18i2.1804>
- Sahlberg, P. (2021). *Finnish lessons 3.0: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* Teachers College Press.
- Sahrowi, A., Harianto, S., & Sayyi, A. (2025). Implementasi Pembelajaran Berbasis Humanistik dalam Meningkatkan Spiritualitas Santri di Pesantren Darul Ulum Banyuanyar Pamekasan. *Jurnal Studi Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 1(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.32806/jspai.v1i1.912>
- Sayyi, A., Asmuki, W. J., Alimin, M., & Fithriyah, I. (2025). *Bridging Tradition and Multiculturalism in Islamic Jurisprudence Education*. <https://ejournal.insuriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/scaffolding/article/view/8002>
- Sayyi, A., Muslimin, A. A., Afandi, Fithriyah, I., Al-Manduriy, S. M., & Alanesi, A. S. H. G. (2025). Child-Friendly Education Model for Violence Prevention in Islamic Boarding Schools. *Al-Hayat: Journal of Islamic Education*, 9(4), 800–820. <https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v9i4.187>
- Shirley, D., & Hargreaves, A. (2021). *Five paths of student engagement: Blazing the trail to learning and success (your guide to promoting active engagement in the classroom and improving student learning)*. Solution Tree Press.
- Tamtik, M., & Colorado, C. (2022). Multi-level governance framework and its applicability to education policy research-the Canadian perspective. *Research in Education*, 114(1), 20–44.
- Trinidad, J. E. (2025). Educational Change through Bureaucratic Effectiveness: The Role of Mid-level Networks. *Sociology of Education*, 98(4), 337–357.
- Wardi, M., & Ismail, I. (2018). Following The Prophet Muhammad Character Through Ngabuleh Tradition in Pondok Pesantren Darul Ulum Banyuanyar Pamekasan. *El Harakah*, 20(1), 49.
- Wardi, M., Ismail, I., & Makki, A. (2019). Perbandingan Pendidikan; Pemahaman Simbolis Dan Substantif PAI Di Madrasah Dan PAI Di Sekolah Umum. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen*

- Pendidikan Islam*, 4(1), 23–33.
- Yang, Q. (2023). Should standardization tests be used to assess student ability. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8, 319–326.
- Yorulmaz, Y. İ., & Çolak, İ. (2023). Exploring Teacher autonomy through teachers' perspectives: A qualitative case study. *Research on Education and Psychology*, 7(Special Issue 2), 537–556.