

Original Paper

The Correlation between School Accreditation and Students' English Achievement of Public Senior High Schools

Chuzaimah D. Diem^{1*}, Popi Darusmiyati² & Margaretha D. Sitinjak¹

¹ Lecturers of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, South Sumatera, Indonesia

² Teacher of SMPN 1 Jebus, West Bangka, Indonesia

* Chuzaimah D. Diem, Lecturer of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, South Sumatera, Indonesia

Received: January 8, 2021

Accepted: January 21, 2021

Online Published: March 20, 2021

doi:10.22158/sll.v5n2p17

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sll.v5n2p17>

Abstract

The objectives of the study were (1) to find out whether or not there was a significant correlation between accreditation and students' English achievement of public senior high schools in Palembang, and (2) to find out whether there was a contribution of accreditation to students' English achievement. The population of 18 accredited state senior high schools in Palembang in 2016 with 3556 students of 12th grade were selected to be the sample of the study by using the purposive sampling technique. The data of the accreditation list and students' English national examination scores were taken from BAP S/M (The Education Accreditation Board) and Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia. To analyze the data, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. The results showed that there was no significant correlation between school accreditation and students' English achievement (r -obtained 0.406 and p -value 0.095). However, there was 16.4% contribution of school accreditation to students' English achievement.

Keywords

senior high schools, school accreditation, students' English achievement

1. Introduction

Every country has its own way to develop education for its citizen with its own differences and perspectives. One of the most popular quotes by Nelson Mandela is that "education is the most powerful weapon to change the world" (The Washington Post, 2013). Therefore, people who are involved in education have the important role to change a country. Agreeing with Mandela's statement,

Moore (2009, p. 9) believes that the change of society can be reflected by the educational system. It means that a country will be great when its educational system could give impact on its people.

However, education is still a problem in Indonesia. The survey from Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report that was held by UNESCO in 2012 shows that Indonesia was ranked in the 64th out of 120 countries and in 2011 Indonesia was ranked in 69th out of 127 countries. These facts reveal that the quality of education in Indonesia is still low.

School is the place where education is given to the students. According to King (1998), schools have the important role as the key institution to shape the community or socialize the future generation into a national identity. Therefore, schools are the second home for students to learn and grow up. It is the government obligation to give every citizen a qualified education. Unfortunately, the government still faces the struggles in giving the qualified education to its citizens. In 2011, the School Participation Rate (*Angka Partisipasi Sekolah*) of 16 to 18-year-old students of senior high school level was in 64.66% (SUSENAS, 2013). Therefore, education in Indonesia needs to be improved. One of the ways that the government has done to cope with this problem is by building more state-owned public schools because the data from *Kemendiknas* (2011) showed that 69.73% students chose state senior high schools while 30.27% of them chose private senior high schools. This means that most people prefer state-owned schools to the private ones. Susanti (2010) found that many students and families believe that the state-owned schools are better in qualities comparing to the private schools. Indonesian people prefer continuing their study in state schools rather than in private schools. Furthermore, not only in Indonesia, the citizens from other developing countries, such as Taiwan and India, also believe that state schools are better than private schools because they assume that state schools are more qualified than private schools (Huang, Yuan, & Huang, 2008; Rubinstein & Sekhri, 2011).

In this globalization era, education has become the challenge for the country and its society. In order to face the challenge in the future, the improvement of the quality of education becomes the new paradigm in the future education (Syafaruddin, 2002). One of the solutions that has been made by the government of Indonesia is through school accreditation, as the process to increase the quality of education that has been stated in *Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*, Number 20 Year 2003, Chapter I, article 1, and section 32. It says that accreditation is the process of assessment used in educational institutions in order to know the quality level of the schools based on the criteria that have been set by the government. It can provide relevant information on whether or not the school is eligible to carry out the teaching and learning activities. In other words, according to Government Regulation No. 19 Year 2005, accreditation is one of the important points to control and eventually increase the quality of education.

Accreditation has become important factor in education. Due to its importance, it is wise if we also see what has been practiced in a developed country, such as USA concerning accreditation. For example, in the state of Indiana, all state schools must be accredited in which 'school accreditation' has been added

in their administrative code. It is also added that non-state schools can also get the accreditation if they reach the criteria needed because to be accredited, a school must obey the relevant legal standards and reach the criteria of performance with the state's students-centered accountability system (Indiana Department of Education, 2017). Therefore, some important steps must be followed and considered before a school can be stated as an accredited school.

Accreditation also plays a prominent role in Indonesian educational system. In 2014, the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Education (*Renstra Kemendiknas*) states that every school should be accredited as the assessment tool to measure the schools' quality. However, school accreditation still becomes a problem in Indonesian educational system. Ahmad's study (2010) shows that in South Sumatera, for example, out of the 498 senior high schools, there are only 277 schools that have been accredited with 19.5% (54 schools) had the A accreditation status, 54.87% (152 schools) received B accreditation, 24.55% (68 schools) achieved C accreditation, and 1.08% (3 schools) were not accredited yet. Ahmad also states that the data of accreditation in 2010 did not fulfill the components of the standards of National education (*Standar Nasional Pendidikan*). For the senior high school level, his study also shows that out of the 86 schools, the problems of the accreditation are in both facilities (*Fasilitas Pendidikan*) and graduate competence (*Kompetensi Kelulusan*) standards. In 2016, the data from BAN (Badan Akreditasi Nasional) shows that in Palembang, out of 222 senior high schools, there are only 18 state, 22 private, and 5 vocational senior high schools which have been accredited. This means, accreditation is a must and continuously conducted in the educational system using valid accreditation instruments.

There are eight National standards that must be fulfilled to measure whether or not the schools are accredited. One of the standards is the standard of the graduate competence. In this standard, the score of students' National examination, is counted and the teaching and learning process can be influenced by results of the examination. Athanasou and Lamprianou (2002) state that every teaching and learning activity is followed by another activity that cannot be separated, such as examination that is used to find out the result of students' achievement and the effectiveness of teaching and learning activity. Popham (2003, p. 125) states, "achievement tests attempt to measure students' skills and knowledge." Therefore, through National examination, the information of students' competence will be nationally detected.

National examination is the process of measurement and assessment of the graduate competence in certain subjects (*Kemendikbud*, 2015). One of the subjects that students must pass in the national examination is, English. Therefore, the role of national examination is important in Indonesia's educational system.

To make a country great, every government will try its best to make the country equal to other countries. Nuh (2013) said that curriculum can be the factor of what the future education will be. He believes that there will be no progress if there is no change in education. Curriculum 2013 is set-up to be the answer

of the educational issues in Indonesia and become a bridge for a better education system. In curriculum 2013, Indonesian language, mathematics, science, and English are the subjects tested in national examination. Since English is one of the subjects that is assessed nationally, it is important for students to master it.

English is one of the most widely used languages in this globe. It is the language, which can connect people all over the world to communicate, the role of which has increased rapidly. Kachru (2009) confirms that English is used as a foreign language in China, Indonesia, and Thailand. He also claims that the total number of English users are 1,132.9 million comprising of 408 million inner circle users (UK, US, Australia, New Zealand), 418 million outer circle (India, Philippines, Pakistan, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Hong Kong, Singapore, Sri Lanka), and 306.9 million expanding circle users (China, Japan, Indonesia, Thailand, South Korea, Vietnam, Myanmar, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos). Sawir (2005) found out that there are approximately 1.7 million Asian's students who take their educational studies in English speaking countries and half of them do not speak English as their first language. Most of them come from China, Indonesia, Japan, Vietnam, Korea, etc. Therefore, they have to be able to use English in order to survive academically and socially.

Learning English has the important role in educational system. Since English is a global language to connect people all over the world, it is worthwhile to be implemented in educational system. In Indonesia, English is one of the subjects taught in schools. In Curriculum 2013, it is stated that one of the subjects to be learned by secondary school students is English. Since the materials given in senior high school is harder than those given in junior high school, this will give impact on students' English achievement. Because English is not the first language used in Indonesia, Indonesian students still have problem in learning English. Based on research conducted by EF-EPI 2016, it is found that Indonesia is ranked in 32nd position out of 72 countries (The Jakarta Post, 2016). This proves that students still face problems in mastering English. Not only in Indonesia, in another Asian country such as Malaysia, people also face the problem in learning English even though English has been their second language. Jalaludin, Awal, and Bakar (2008) show that Malaysians have difficulties in learning English and students still face problem even though they have learned English for eleven years. They found out in their research that 315 students reflect that the most obvious weaknesses lay in the area of grammar.

Furthermore, Indonesia has implemented the national examination for students for a long time to measure their competence at the end of each program of secondary education and they have to pass this exam and English has become one of the subjects tested. In addition to this, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia (*Kemendikbud*, 2015) also states that the school itself must be accredited in order to be able to carry out the national exam. Therefore, school accreditation is a must and can be the device to evaluate every school performance and the results of students' National examination has been one of the indicators of the graduate competence included in the eight Standards of National Education.

Finally, based on the review of the literature above, this study is aimed to describe whether school accreditation and students' English achievement are significantly correlated and whether each standard of school accreditation partially contributes to students' English achievement.

2. Method

2.1 The Design of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out whether or not there was a correlation between school accreditation and students' English achievement of public senior high schools in Palembang, South Sumatra. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001), there are three broad classifications of the quantitative research: descriptive, experimental, and causal comparative. Since the descriptive research approach examines the situation that exists in its current state, this study used the descriptive quantitative correlation research design.

2.2 Procedure and Participant

In this study, the population involved was the 2016 accredited public senior high schools in Palembang. Out of 27 senior high schools, only 18 state schools had received the accreditation status and therefore were selected, and all the 12th grade students of those schools became the sample of this study. To get the data for the accreditation of public senior high schools this study used the documentations of South Sumatra Province of Education Accreditation Board (BAP-S/M, 2016) and for the students' scores of their national examination, the data from the office of the Ministry of Education and Culture in Palembang were taken. The reliability and validity of the tests used by the sample schools had been validated by the national team.

2.3 Statistical Analyses

To analyze the data, correlation and regression analyses were used. The correlation analysis was used to find out whether or not there was a correlation between the two variables, namely school accreditation and the students' English achievement. Meanwhile, the regression analysis was used to find out whether or not there was a significant contribution of school accreditation to the students' English achievement. The two statistical analyses applied were those in SPSS Version 22.

3. Results

Based on the information about the method, this study collected the data from the documents of public senior high schools' accreditation and the 12th graders' English scores of the national examination in 2016. The first step to count for the finding was to categorize the scores using the interval score of accreditations obtained from BAP S/M. The table below shows about the interval score of school accreditation.

Table 1. The Interval Score of Accreditation

No.	Interval Score	Category	Accreditation Status
1.	86-100	A	Excellent
2.	71-85	B	Good
3.	56-70	C	Average

Source: Adopted from BAP-S/M, 2016

Based on Table 1, the accreditation status is divided into three categories. A school had *excellent* status if the total score obtained ranges from 86 to 100, *good* if the range interval is 71 to 85. Meanwhile, a school receives *average* status if the interval range is 56 to 70 and if the school achieves the score below 56, it is not accredited. In this study none of the schools involved obtained the score <56.

To get into the process of the accreditation, each item of the measurement of any of the 8 standards included in the instruments must be rated. Each item would get A if it is rated 4 by the assessor or rater. Meanwhile, it would get B if the score is 3 and C if the score is 2. All of the scores were counted to find out the final results in deciding whether or not the schools were accredited and had excellent, good, or average status.

Based on all the 8 standards used, Table 2 shows that out of 18 schools, 87.5% is rated A, 12% rated B (5.6%) and 0.07% is rated C. Therefore, the accreditation status of the whole schools involved in the study is somewhat very good.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of School Accreditation Based on 8 Standards

Category of Accreditation Status	Average Percentage of Each Standard of National Education								
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	Ave.
A	94.4	88.9	89	88.9	72	88.9	88.9	88.9	87.5
B	5.6	11.1	5.5	11.1	28	11.1	11.1	11.1	12.0
C	-	-	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	0.07
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: Data were analyzed based on BAP-S/M in 2016

Tables 3 to 10 below will describe the percentage and total score obtained by each of the National Education Standards (from standard one to standard eight).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of *Contents Standard*

Score Category (1)	Percentage (2)	Frequency (3)	Total Score (1x3)
4 (Excellent)	94.4	17	68
3 (Good)	5.6	1	3
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.94

In the standard of *contents*, most of the schools (94.4%) received the average of excellent score and only 5.6% had the good score. Since the average total score for *the standard of contents* is 3.94, it could be said that for this standard, the schools are excellent (see Table 3).

Table 4. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of *Process Standard*

Score Category (1)	Percentage (2)	Frequency (3)	Total Score (1x3)
4 (Excellent)	88.9	16	64
3 (Good)	11.1	2	6
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.88

Table 4 shows that the percentage of *the standard of process* is excellent. Specifically, 88.9% or 16 schools were categorized as excellent and only 11.1% or 2 schools are categorized as good. Since the average total score for the standard of process is 3.88, it could be said that for this standard, the schools have excellent record of process.

Table 5 shows the results of the standard of graduate competence. It indicates that 89% or 16 schools are categorized as excellent. Meanwhile, one school (5.5%) is categorized as good, and one school (5.5%) is categorized as average. In short, based on the total score received by the standard of graduate competence (3.83), it is concluded that this standard is very good (see Table 5).

Table 5. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of *Graduate Competence Standard*

Score Category (1)	Percentage (2)	Frequency (3)	Total Score (1x3)
4 (Excellent)	89	16	64
3 (Good)	5.5	1	3
2 (Average)	5.5	1	2
	100	18	3.83

Table 6. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Educators and Educational Staff Standard

Score Category	Percentage	Frequency	Total Score
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1x3)
4 (Excellent)	88.9	16	64
3 (Good)	11.1	2	6
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.88

Table 6 shows that 16 schools (88.9%) are categorized excellent and two schools (11.1%) are categorized as good. This means that the standard of educators achieved by these schools is excellent (3.88). Therefore, there is no doubt to say that the educators teaching in the schools are great.

The standard of facilities as shown in Table 7 indicates that only 13 schools (72%) are categorized as excellent while 5 schools (28%) are categorized as good and because the total average score of the standard of facilities is 3.72 it is categorized as good enough.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Facilities Standard

Score Category	Percentage	Frequency	Total Score
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1x3)
4 (Excellent)	72	13	52
3 (Good)	28	5	15
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.72

Meanwhile, *the standards of management, funding, and evaluation* all reach the same percentage of achievement. These standards get the average total score of 3.88 each which is excellent. So, they are all excellent standards. (See Tables 8, 9, and 10).

Table 8. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Management Standard

Score Category	Percentage	Frequency	Total Score
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1x3)
4 (Excellent)	88.9	16	64
3 (Good)	11.1	2	6
2 (Average)	0	0	0
		18	3.88

Table 9. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of *Funding Standard*

Score Category (1)	Percentage (2)	Frequency (3)	Total Score (1x3)
4 (Excellent)	88.9	16	64
3 (Good)	11.1	2	6
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.88

Table 10. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of *Evaluation Standard*

Score Category (1)	Percentage (2)	Frequency (3)	Total Score (1x3)
4 (Excellent)	88.9	16	64
3 (Good)	11.1	2	6
2 (Average)	0	0	0
	100	18	3.88

In summary, among all of the eight standards evaluated in this study, 6 standards have excellent category, one standard holds very good category, and one has achieved only good category. It is found that the standard of *contents* has the highest average total score 3.94 among all the six excellent standards, and the lowest one is shown by the standard of *facilities* that receives the total score of only 3.72. However, based on the criteria used by BAP/SM 2016 to measure the quality of the schools in South Sumatra, the schools involved in this study deserve the status of *very good schools*.

Table 11. The Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Students' English Achievement Interval Score

Interval Score	Range	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Excellent	85-100	0	0	
Good	70-85	0	0	
Average	55-70	7	39.1	51.94
Poor	<55	11	61.3	
Total		18	100	

Source: The data taken and analyzed based on the report from Kemendikbud, 2016

After the total scores of Students' English Achievement (SEA) of each school were calculated, 39.1% schools achieved average scores and 61.3% of them had poor scores (see Table 11). Therefore, it is clear that the students' English achievement of the 18 schools still ranges from poor to average.

To find out the normality of the data, One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Z test in SPSS 22 was used. The results show that the p-value of school accreditation was 0.169 which is higher than significant level (0.05). It was also found that the p-value of students' English achievement as measured by National examination was 0.200. This means that both data were normally distributed.

Since the coefficient correlation is 0.406, it means that there was a fair correlation between school accreditation and students' English achievement. The correlation was fair because it was between the range of 0.25--0.50. However, the correlation is not statistically significant because the p-value 0.095 is higher than 0.05. In other words, there is no significant correlation between the two variables studied (See Table 12).

Table 12. Correlation Analysis: School Accreditation and Students' English Achievement

Variables		R (Pearson Correlation)	Sig. 2 tailed (p < 0.05)
School Accreditation	Students' English Achievement	0.406	0.095

To find out how much the contribution of school accreditation to students' English achievement, the regression analysis was used. See Table 13.

Table 13. Regression Analysis: School Accreditation and Students' English Achievement

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R-Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	.406 ^a	.164	7.596	.164	.095

Table 13 shows that the R square value is .164 (Sig. F = .095). Therefore, the contribution of school accreditation to students' English achievement is only 16.4%. Then, partial correlation of each standard of accreditation was then correlated with national examination to find out whether there was a significant correlation between each standard and students' English achievement (SEA). It was found that only standard of *funding* that was significantly correlated with SEA (see Table 14).

Table 14. Correlation Analysis between Funding Standard and Students' English Achievement

		Funding	SEA
Funding	Pearson Correlation	1	.476*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.046
	N	18	18
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Table 14 shows that the correlation is significant because it was lower than 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that the standard of funding was correlated significantly with the students' English achievement. Meanwhile, table 15 shows about the contribution of *funding* to students' English achievement in which R Square value is 0.226 (Sig. F = 0.46). Therefore, the contribution of funding to students' English achievement was 22.6%.

Table 15. Contribution of Funding Standard to Student's English Achievement

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R-Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	.476	.226	7.309	.226	.046*

*Significant at or less than .05 level

The results of this study showed that school accreditation as seen from 8 standards achieved by the schools had high performance. In contrary the students' English achievement as measured by national examination had low performance which was considered as below average. It means that English still becomes the problem for most of the students. This fact needs discussion because there is a discrepancy between better school accreditation and their students' performance which should have been in line.

4. Discussion

In school accreditation, the standard of contents has the highest score among the whole standards while the standard of facilities has the lowest score. It is true that the contents of teaching and learning have the important role for teachers and students. BSNP (2006) stated that all curriculum, lesson plan, framework of education, burden of learning, and academic year calendar, are included in standard of contents. This statement is in line with the statement made by Borich (2007) which explains that among other elements, lesson plan can be an important element in the process of meeting national contents standard. Therefore, the teaching and learning process can be affected by lesson plan. If the lesson plan has fulfilled the need of curriculum, then the teaching and learning process in achieving the standard of contents might also be successful.

To achieve better students' English achievement, facilities can also be one of the reasons that cause students' low achievement in English teaching and learning process. According to UU No. 23 section 45, article 1, every formal or informal educational institution should provide facilities that fulfill its purpose in accordance with its potential growth and development, physically, intellectually, emotionally, and socially. At the same time, according to Sanjaya (2013), the facilities will help educators to hold the teaching and learning process. It means that facilities are the important components that influence students' achievement in learning. In this study, it was found that facilities obtained the lowest mean score among other standards. Based on the instruments of accreditation, it was found out that most

schools did not have language laboratory to support students in learning English. Meanwhile, the language laboratory is one of the foundations of language instruction (see Mambo, 2004). Therefore, to develop students' achievement in learning a language, the use of laboratory is importantly needed. In learning English, students will be able to know and practice their listening comprehension as well as pronunciation. The use of laboratory also can motivate students to have interest in learning English because laboratory can provide videos and other listening materials as developed or spoken by native speakers of English. This is supported by Richard (2001) in which, to get the sensibility of the sounds and rhythm of a language, people have to hear the best models of all spoken language. Meanwhile, Hammond (2014) agrees that the language lab provides access to native-speakers to help foreign students learning in normal speed. Therefore, the language lab can show the best examples of a language. Hence, schools should not underestimate the use of language lab and need to consider it instead.

Although not all standards of national education were significantly correlated with students' English achievement, based on the result of the study it was found out that funding standard was correlated significantly with students' English achievement as measured by national examination. In one of the instruments of accreditation, BSNP (2006) states that schools should use the finance to students' prosperity. Fortunately, some schools had used their fund for that purpose. Related to students' English achievement, the schools had used their funds to develop teachers' quality based on *RKA-SM (Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran or The Work Plans and Budgets)*, for example by sending the teachers to join the seminar to develop the programs for teachers or to give teachers chance to join teacher training or *PPG (Pendidikan Profesi Guru)*. By joining those activities, it could help teachers to improve their professionalism. Sulipan (2007) states that someone is considered as professional if she/he can do all tasks based on the professionalism ethics. In these ways, they can be independent, productive, effective, efficient, and innovative. Therefore, giving the chance for teachers to join seminar or PPG will help them to be more professional.

That the other seven standards of national education were not significantly correlated with students' English achievement need discussion. Those standards were standard of contents, process, graduate competence, educators, facilities, management, and evaluation.

In the standard of contents, the correlation was not significant probably because some schools had not applied the same minimum standard score to evaluate the students' English achievement. In the requirement standard suggested by BAP-S/M, the minimum criterion was 75. However, there were still some schools that had not had 75 as their minimum standard score (*KKM*). Another reason that the standard of contents was not significantly correlated with students' English achievement is that some teachers did not give the students the *structured assignments*. Winkel (1996) states that learning is a mental and psychological activities that happens in an active interaction with the environment that gives effect on knowledge, understanding, skills, values, and attitudes. Through learning in schools,

teachers can give students structured assignments to improve those aspects. Salim (2011) states that structured learning is useful in learning process by giving the assignments to students. Therefore, giving the structured assignments could help students to work by themselves to solve the problem in order to improve their understanding of learning materials given. Possibly, some teachers in the schools involved only explained the material to students without giving them a challenge to check their own performance (self-assessment). Therefore, they might forget about what they had learned easily.

In standard of process, one of the reasons that caused this standard was not significantly correlated with students' English achievement, was because of the *lesson plan*. Spratt, Pulverness and Williams (2005) point out that lesson plan is useful to provide the direction for teachers about how to teach students and what kind of materials to be taught. Therefore, it can become the tools for teachers to have a successful teaching in class, such as in teaching English. However, the problem appears that in some schools, some teachers had not taught students based on the lesson plan they made. Possibly, it happened that the teachers might have not delivered the materials based on the lesson plans which lead students to not achieving better grades.

The standard of graduate competence also was not significantly correlated with students' English achievement. Based on the instrument of accreditation result, this may have happened because of the learning resources which are not available in the schools. Learning resources can be useful to meet the need of teaching and learning process. Sudjana (2001) theorized that learning resources could ease students to master the subjects. Therefore, with enough learning resources, the materials of the subject might be delivered easier to students based on their interest. Learning resources may include messages, people, materials, device, technique, and environment. When the learning resources vary, students will feel facilitated to understand the subject easily (Warsita, 2008). However, learning resources still became the problem for students to master the materials. In English class, students might only learn from one learning resource and the schools did not provide enough learning resources to support various topics when needed. It is very common that in English teaching and learning process, students only learned from one textbook and did not learn from any other learning resources because of the scarcity of the books owned by the schools. Another reason for this problem came from *KKM* as the criterion for students' graduate competence. In English, the four skills such as in listening, speaking, reading, and writing are equally important and related to each other and students have to be able to master those four skills. Uma and Ponnambala (2001) confirms that by integrating the four English skills, students can determine their communicative competence in the target language. *KKM* can be the device to measure students' achievement of the English subject. According to the instrument used by BAP-S/M, 75 should be the minimum criterion of the target score. Unfortunately, some schools still had not applied the requirement and used the score below 75. Due to this, the students had never reached the minimum criterion of English and this was one of the reasons why it was not significantly correlated with English achievement.

In the standard of educators, some reasons affected to why this standard was not significantly correlated with students' English achievement. One of the reasons is due to *teachers' qualification*. Teachers' qualifications could give impact on students' understanding in class. Qualified teachers are related to experience, further education to graduate programs, and regulating through mechanisms of licensure, certification, and promotion based on the requirement (Hammond, Berry & Thorenson, 2001; Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002). Teachers who have longer experience in teaching, have upgraded themselves to graduate programs (such as D4 or S1), and have received their certification could be considered as qualified. Unfortunately, in some schools, the teachers were not qualified enough. Some of them were not the graduates of D4 or S1, and some others had not had their certificate of teaching either. Ferguson (1991), states that good teachers have an impact on students' exam scores. If a teacher is a good teacher with a great qualification, students can reach the needs of knowledge in a subject that they learned. For example, in English class, if a teacher knows what to teach and how to teach, the students also know how to deal with the materials given. Henceforth, teachers have to improve their professionalism to make them qualified teachers.

In the standard of management, schools should have managed their school environment to be conducive for students to learn better. Students' achievement can be influenced by external and internal factors. A non-conducive environment can affect the students' achievement. Dalyono (2012) argued that an environment is like a family where it can be the place for children to grow up, play, and get to know with everything around them. If a school can manage a good environment, students will feel more motivated to study.

In the standard of evaluation, there was no significant correlation with students' English achievement. One of the causes was *the assignment given* to students. Giving assignment or homework to students can be the tool for them to measure their understanding. According to Djamarah (2006), giving assignment is the solution for teachers to measure students' understanding in limited time. The teachers may give the assignment in class or let the students work on it as the homework. Therefore, by giving assignment or homework to students, students will feel motivated to work for better grades. For example, in English class, teachers can give students a working paper and when they collect their work, teachers give them their feedback including score. Both comments or feedback and score will be helpful to motivate students because they would feel appreciated. Hammond (2008) asserts that feedback can be useful if it is used continuously because it can give incalculable implications for effective teaching and learning. Therefore, the use of feedback can be a tool for teachers to push students to work hard to master English. Unfortunately, the fact showed that some teachers in some schools only seem to teach without trying to help students to reach and improve their achievement. They did not give any comment or feedback, or without any score to let students know which materials they should learn more. Hence, students did not feel motivated to learn about the subject that teachers taught.

To summarize, out of eight standards of national education, it was found that only one standard that was correlated significantly with students' English achievement that is funding. Meanwhile, based on the average percentage achieved by the schools, the highest one was in standard of contents and the lowest one was the standard of facilities. As a whole, there was no significant correlation between school accreditation and students' English achievement.

Acknowledgement

This paper was based on one part of the research project headed by Diem, a senior lecturer of the Language and Arts Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia in 2018.

References

- Ahmad, H. S. (2010). *Akreditasi sekolah muara peningkatan mutu pendidikan*. Palembang, Indonesia: BAP-S/M, Provinsi Sumatra Selatan.
- Analoui, F. (2000). What motivates senior managers? The case of Romania. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 324-340. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010330984>
- Athanasou, J., & Lamprianou, I. (2002). *A teacher's guide to assessment*. New South Wales, UK: Social Science Press.
- Badan Akreditasi Nasional. (2016). *Akreditasi sekolah tingkat SMA*. Palembang, Indonesia: BAP-S/M, Provinsi Sumatra Selatan.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP). (2006). *Standar nasional pendidikan*. Retrieved from <http://bsnp-indonesia.org/standarnasional-pendidikan/>
- Borich, G. D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods: Research based practice* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Dalyono. (2012). *Psikologi pendidikan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta.
- Department of Education and Culture. (2003). *PP nomor 19 tahun 2005 tentang akreditasi sekolah*. Jakarta, Indonesia: The Department of Education and Culture.
- Department of Education and Culture. (2003). *The minister of national education number 20, year 2003*. Jakarta, Indonesia: The Department of Education and Culture.
- Djamarah, B. S. (2002). *Psikologi belajar*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta.
- Education First English Proficiency Index. (2016). *Indeks kecakapan bahasa Inggris*. Retrieved from <https://www.ef.com/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/fullreports/v6/ef-epi-2016indonesian.pdf>
- Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report. (2012). *The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education*. Washington, DC: UNESCO.
- Ferguson, R. F. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters.

- Harvard Journal of Legislation*, 28, 465-498.
- Hammond, D. L. (2014). *Powerful learning: What we know about teaching for understanding*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Hammond, D. L., Berry, B., & Thorenson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(1), 57-77.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737023001057>
- Hammond, D. L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 286-302.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053004002>
- Huang, C. E., Yuan, Y., & Huang, C. F. (2008). Differences between public and private institutions of Taiwan's HTVE system in determinants of competitiveness. *US-China Education Review*, 5(7), 1-12.
- Indiana Administrative Code. (n.d.). *School accreditation*. Retrieved from <file:///C:/Users/ACER%20Z1401/Downloads/A00061.PDF>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2017). *School accreditation*. Retrieved from <https://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/school-accreditation>
- Jalaludin, N. H., Awal, N. M., & Bakar, K. A. (2008). The mastery of English language among lower secondary school students in Malaysia: A Linguistic analysis. *European Journal of Social Science*, 7(2), 106-119.
- Kachru, B. (2009). English: World Englishes. In K. Brown, & S. Ogilvie (Eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of languages of the world*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ktiguru.org/index.php/profesiguru>
- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional. (2011). *Daftar tabel data pendidikan SMA tahun 2009/2010*. Palembang, Indonesia: Kemendiknas, Provinsi Sumatra Selatan.
- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional. (2014). *Renstra Kemendiknas: Akreditasi*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional.
- Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2015). *Kebijakan perubahan ujian nasional*. Retrieved from <http://mtelkom-bjp.sch.id/web/wpcontent/uploads/2015/01/Ujian-Nasional-2015v0.4.pdf>
- Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2016). *Infografis ujian nasional*. Retrieved from <https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2016/03/infografis-ujian-nasional-2016>
- King, D. Y. (1998). Reforming basic education and the struggle for decentralized educational administration in Indonesia. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 83-95.
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Moore, K. D. (2009). *Effective instructional strategies: From theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand

- Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Mambo, B. E. (2004). Language laboratories and the challenges supporting of communicative approaches in language instruction. *Journal of Educational Computing and Design and online Learning*, 5.
- Nuh, M. (2013). The future of this nation depends on the new curriculum. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/02/19/future-indonesia-depends-newcurriculum-minister.html>
- Popham, W. J. (2003). *Test better, teach better: The instructional role of assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Salim. (2012). *Pembelajaran dengan metode penugasan melalui pemberian tugas secara terstruktur*. Retrieved from <http://20and/Yaxis%Toa/Downloads/Dunia%Kreatifitas%Pembelajaran,Dengan%metode%Penugasan%20melalui%Pemberian%Tugas%Terstruktur.html>
- Sanjaya, W. (2013). *Perencanaan dan desain sistem pembelajaran*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kencana Prenadamedia.
- Sawir. (2005). Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effect of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal*, 6(5), 567-580.
- Susanti, D. (2010). Privatization and marketisation of higher education in Indonesia: The challenge for equal access and academic values. *The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 61(2), 209-218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9333-7>
- SUSENAS. (2013). *Angka partisipasi kasar menurut provinsi tahun 2003-2011*. Retrieved from http://www.psp.kemdiknas.go.id/uploads/Publikasi%20Pendidikan/apk%20%20apm/apk.apm_sm_kabkot_0910.pdf
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2005). *The TKT course*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sudjana, N. (2001). *Teknologi pengajaran*. Bandung, Indonesia: Sinar Baru.
- Syafaruddin. (2002). *Manajemen mutu terpadu dalam pendidikan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Uma, J., Chitra, A., & Thiagarajan, P. (2001). Teaching writing skill through silent movie: An experiment. *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, 10(1), 93-99.
- Warsita, B. (2008). *Teknologi pembelajaran*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Washington Post. (2013). *Nelson Mandela on the power of education*. Washington, DC: The Washington Post.
- Winkel, W. S. (1996). *Psikologi pendidikan dan evaluasi belajar*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT. Gramedia.