

Analysis of School Climate of Senior High Schools in Jember: A Case Study of Student in History Lesson

Akhirul Ariyanto

Department of History Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Jember, Indonesia

Nurul Umamah*

Department of History Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Jember, Indonesia

Sumarjono

Department of History Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Jember, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper analyzed of the school climate of senior high school students in Jember in the history lesson context. The purposes of this study are: (1) analyzing the school climate of senior high school students in Jember in the history lesson context; (2) examining the difference of school climate of senior high schools in jember. The total samples involved were 375 students. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the difference by using SPSS 23 for windows program. The results showed that the mean value of school climate of SMA 1 Jember 3.66; SMA 2 Jember 3.47; SMA 3 Jember 3.20; SMA 4 Jember 3.39 and; SMA 5 Jember 3.40. The result of the ANOVA test showed that there was a significant difference of school climate of the senior high school students in Jember in the history lesson context ($f = 4.789$; Sig.0,001). The largest difference of significance level was shown by the sample group of SMA 1 Jember and SMA 3 Jember (mean differences = 0.46611). The school climate of SMA 1 Jember has very significant difference compared to the school climate of SMA 3 Jember.

Keywords: School climate; History Lesson.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

School climate is one indicator of the quality of education as well as a significant effect on the learning outcomes (Brankovic, 2017; Martinez, 2014; Samuelsson and Lindblad, 2015), The school climate conditions that are likely to be positive can improve the productivity of educators, as well as the productivity of learners (Jerald, 2016), Increased productivity of all elements of school affects the improvement of learning outcomes.

School climate describes the atmosphere of academic and non-academic in the school environment (Berkowitz, 2016; Maxwell, 2017). Academic performance of students in the subjects of history generally did not show an increase in critical thinking skills (Cowan, 2014; Majiet, 2016). Learners do not accustom to discuss actively and comprehensively, so that interactions among learners do not improve the success of the study. The learning environment in schools needs to be improved in order to support the creation of a positive school climate.

The readiness of educators in designing learning independently often finds fundamental difficulty. Generally, on the history subject, the difficulty comes from the developing a general draft of instructional design by the educators (in particular, learning outcome assessment instruments) with a scientific approach (Umamah, 2014). This difficulty is feared will reinforce the notion that the subjects tend to just show the history of past facts as stated by Supriatna (2011) and Najmi (2012). The history learning has not been able to make the learners draw the deepest meaning of past events.

A history subject has an important role in the formation of national identity (Amri, 2015) and fostering human values (Sumardiansyah, 2015). History which is taught in schools became strategic step in the effort to build a national character. The argument became the theoretical basis that learning history can be an establishment media for learners' attitude which fit with the character of the Indonesian. Practically, this objective will not be achieved if the teaching of history simply just shows the reality of the past. The learning process has not demanded the students to think critically about historical events.

History learning process becomes effective when it makes learners connect directly to the needs of the present (Umamah, 2017). Learning history needs to adjust to its development. Need for in-depth study to analyze the underlying problems in the subjects of history to suit the characteristics of the current generation. It is urgent to improve learning outcomes, especially on the history subjects. Improved learning outcomes can begin to fix basic things such as school climate issues.

Past research has proven the positive influence school climate to the learners' achievement (Dulay and Karadağ, 2017; Gage, 2016; Maxwell, 2017). Some arguments which support this statement include: (1) The school climate is able to be a predictor of socio-academic competence and behavior of learners (Gage, 2016); (2) there was a significant positive correlation between school climates with teacher commitment (Raman, 2015). School climate

conditions can be a predictor of achievement of learners. In addition, a positive school climate that tends to become a benchmark of the high responsibility of educators in order to have optimal educational services.

School climate is influenced by a variety of dimensions (Loukas, 2007; Rapti, 2016; Valentine, 2016), Multidimensional factors merged to form the cultural conditions of a school organization. Broadly speaking, the dimensions of school climate forming factors are divided into two groups, namely the physical dimensions (school appearance, school size, safe and safety, etc.) and intangible (social and academic performance). Recent literature review add socio-economic background factors as one aspect of forming school climate (Berkowitz, 2016), Learners have the cultural patterns that vary by socio-economic background of the family. Socioeconomic conditions have affected one of them by a factor of uneven development (inequality). This has an impact on the diversity of socio-economic patterns of learners. In the end, the various shades of the implications of the differences in school climate conditions from the perspective of learners.

Measurement of school climate can be assessed through two different viewpoints (ASSC, 2016), Alliance for the Study of School Climate (ASSC) states that the measurement of school climate can be done in 2 ways. The first way is based on the general perspective. The second way is based on student perspective (ASSC, 2016), The second difference lies in the way above types of respondents used in the study. This condition has implications for the different indicators and data collection instruments.

Measurement of school climate conditions in a manner based on general perspective, it could be done if the respondents consist of school principals, teachers, staff, and the community around the school (the committee) (ASSC, 2016). The indicators used are: (1) faculty relations; (2) student interactions; (3) leadership; (4) discipline environment; (5) learning and assessment; (6) attitude; (7) community relations and; (8) physical appearance.

The measurement which is based on student perspective eliminates the indicators faculty relations and leadership. ASSC do not include in both because these two indicators are structural-formal. The schools managers understand the most about the faculty relations and the leadership. So it does not need to be assessed from the perspective of learners in order to obtain more relevant results.

Researchers are interested to assess school climate based on differences in school which learners as the respondents. The reason behind the theme choice is that the school climate research by comparing schools does not massive yet. In fact, this kind of research can be the theoretical basis of design development of school climate to suit the characteristics of each school. The selection of the students as the respondents of this research is expected to address the fundamental problems in the learning process, in particular the teaching of history subject.

The problems discussed in this study are: (1) how are the school climate of senior high school students in Jember in the context of history subjects ?; (2) Are there any differences in school climate of senior high schools in Jember in the context of history subjects ?. Based on the previous explanation, the purposes of this study are: (1) analyzing the school climate of senior high school students in Jember in the context of history subjects, and; (2) examining the difference between the school climate senior high schools in Jember in the context of history subject.

2. Method

This type of research is descriptive comparison. The study compared the school climate of the variables of the senior high schools in Jember. Researchers did not perform a specific action to change the state of the research subject, so this research is included in the category of ex post facto.

2.1. Sample Research

The samples in this research used random sampling techniques. The sample included the students of class X, XI, and XII specialization Social Sciences (IPS) at the senior high schools located in Jember, they are SMA Negeri 1 Jember, SMAN 2 Jember, SMA Negeri 3 Jember, SMAN 4 Jember, and SMAN 5 Jember. Number of students involved as samples in this study were 375 people with the following details.

Table-1. Sample Research

No.	School name	number of Samples						Total	percentage
		class X		class XI		class XII			
		L	P	L	P	L	P		
1	SMA Negeri 1 Jember	8	17	8	17	10	15	75	20%
2	SMAN 2 Jember	7	18	9	16	8	17	75	20%
3	SMA Negeri 3 Jember	12	13	7	18	13	12	75	20%
4	SMAN 4 Jember	12	13	8	17	9	16	75	20%
5	SMAN 5 Jember	15	10	13	12	16	9	75	20%
total		54	71	45	80	56	69	375	100%

2.2. Data Collection Instrument

School climate data retrieval process in this research used instruments School Climate Assessment Instrument - Secondary Student Version (SCAI-SS) developed by the Alliance for the Study of School Climate (2016). The instrument consists of 6 components of school climate that are student interaction, discipline, environment, learning and assessment, attitude, community relations, and physical appearance. The researcher adapt in the form of translation before the instrument is used to retrieve and collect the data as well. American Institute for Research

(2012) instrument developed by the Alliance for the Study of School Climate fulfills the validity and reliability, making it ready to use.

Table-2. Instrument reabiliti test

No.	Component	Statement	Cronbach Alpha
1.	Student Interaction	item 1	0.764
		item 2	0.762
		item 3	0.765
		item 4	0.763
2.	Discipline Environment	item 1	0.765
		item 2	0.758
		item 3	0.755
3.	Learning and Assessment	item 1	0.766
		item 2	0.763
		item 3	0.757
		item 4	0.754
4.	Attitude	item 1	0.763
		item 2	0.759
		item 3	0.755
5.	Community Relations	item 1	0.750
		item 2	0.757
6.	physical Appearance	item 1	0.770
		item 2	0.768

2.3. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by using SPSS 23 for Windows. The requirements to meet the parametric statistical tests was to test the normality and homogeneity. The test for normality used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, while the homogeneity test used Levene test. Assumptions of normality and homogeneity can be fulfilled if the results of the two tests are more than 0.05.

Table-3. Normality Test

School name	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	statistics	Df	Sig.
SMA Negeri 1 Jember	0.072	75	0.200
SMAN 2 Jember	0.049	75	0.200
SMA Negeri 3 Jember	0.091	75	0.200
SMAN 4 Jember	0.079	75	0.200
SMAN 5 Jember	0.069	75	0.200

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results are shown in the significance column in the table above 0.2 for the entire group of samples. The assumption of normality has been met ($0.2 > 0.05$). Thus, the entire data sample groups can be inferred normal distribution.

The next was test of homogeneity with Levene test. The Levene test result in this study can be seen in the following table.

Table-4. Test of Homogeneity

Levene Statistic	DF1	DF2	Sig.
1,124	4	370	0.345

Results of homogeneity test showed that significance value of 0.345. The assumption of homogeneity has been fulfilled ($0.345 > 0.05$). Thus, all the data used in this study can be concluded from the group of homogeneous samples / equivalent. Furthermore hypothesis test used the test one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to answer the problem formulation in this study.

3. Results

The data were presented based on the results of measurements of the mean value of the variable of the school climate in the research areas. The scale used to measure the mean value was the Likert scale 1-5. The result of the calculation of the mean values of each group of samples were then interpreted based on the opinions of Moidunny (2009) where there are five levels of the range of the mean value are very low (very low), low (low), medium, high (high), and very high (very high).

Table-5. Interpretation of Mean Values

Mean value	Interpretation (Category)
1.00 to 1.80	Very low
1.81 to 2.60	Low
2.61 to 3.20	Medium
3.21 to 4.20	High
4.21 to 5.00	Very high

Here are the results of research that include descriptive statistics mean value of the entire group of school climate samples. It is also presented the results of the research hypothesis testing.

Table-6. School Climate SMA Se-Ex Kotatif Jember

NO.	School name	School Climate		Interpretation
		mean	sd	
1.	SMAN 1 Jember	3.66	0.715	High
2.	SMAN 2 Jember	3.47	0.617	High
3.	SMAN 3 Jember	3.20	0.605	Medium
4.	SMAN 4 Jember	3.39	0.662	High
5.	SMAN 5 Jember	3.40	0.703	High
Total		3.42	0.675	0.675

No.	Component	N	Min	Max	mean	sd
1	Student Interaction	375	1.50	5.00	3.97	0.716
2	Discipline Environment	375	1.00	5.00	3.48	0.995
3	Learning and Assessment	375	1.00	5.00	3.83	0.842
4	Attitude	375	1.00	5.00	3.78	0.996
5	Community Relations	375	1.00	5.00	2,68	1,331
6	physical Appearance	375	1.00	5.00	2,78	1,309
4	mean Total	375	1.72	5.00	3.42	0.675

No.	School name	Component	mean	sd
1.	SMAN 1 Jember	Student Interaction	4.09	0.758
		Discipline Environment	4.09	1.052
		Learning and Assessment	4.09	0.901
		Attitude	4.09	0.967
		Community Relations	4.09	1.514
		physical Appearance	4.09	1.297
2.	SMAN 2 Jember	Student Interaction	3.91	0.637
		Discipline Environment	3.91	0.949
		Learning and Assessment	3.91	0.798
		Attitude	3.91	1.017
		Community Relations	3.91	1.190
		physical Appearance	3.91	1.297
3.	SMAN 3 Jember	Student Interaction	3.84	0.745
		Discipline Environment	3.84	0.952
		Learning and Assessment	3.84	0.772
		Attitude	3.84	0.965
		Community Relations	3.84	1.106
		physical Appearance	3.84	1.283
4.	SMAN 4 Jember	Student Interaction	4.10	0.631
		Discipline Environment	4.10	1.055
		Learning and Assessment	4.10	0.770
		Attitude	4.10	0.919
		Community Relations	4.10	1.287
		physical Appearance	4.10	1.292
5.	SMAN 5 Jember	Student Interaction	3.93	0.778
		Discipline Environment	3.93	0.912
		Learning and Assessment	3.93	0.931
		Attitude	3.93	1.086
		Community Relations	3.93	1.267
		physical Appearance	3.93	1.349

The total value of the average variable school climate of senior high schools in Jember was 3.42. Based on the interpretation of the mean value as a reference table 4, the average value of the variable of school climate for senior high schools in Jember was included in the category of high. In detail, the schools that received high category were SMA Negeri 1 Jember (3.66), SMAN 2 Jember (3.47), SMAN 4 Jember (3.39), and SMAN 5 Jember (3.40). While SMA Negeri 3 Jember gained medium category (3.20).

The next hypothesis test was to conclude significant difference of the school climate of senior high schools in Jember. The null hypothesis (H0) in this research is: there is no difference of the school climate among the senior high schools in Jember. The hypothesis is accepted if one way ANOVA test results greater than 0.05, otherwise if the result indicates the number is less than 0.05, then the hypothesis is rejected. Here are the results of hypothesis testing through one way ANOVA test.

Table-7. One Way Anova Test Results

School Climate	df	F	Sig.
	4; 370	4.789	0.001

		Sum Of Squares	Df	mean Square	F	Sig.
Student Interaction	Between Groups	3,921	4	0.980	1.92	0:10
	Within Groups	188 085	370	0.508		
	Total	192 006	374			
Discipline Environment	Between Groups	10 812	4	2.703	2.78	0:02
	Within Groups	359 781	370	0.972		
	Total	370 593	374			
Learning And Assessment	Between Groups	5,698	4	1.425	2.03	0:09
	Within Groups	259 610	370	0.70		
	Total	265 308	374			
Attitude	Between Groups	6,331	4	1.58	1.60	0:17
	Within Groups	364 916	370	0.98		
	Total	371 246	374			
Community Relations	Between Groups	56 571	4	14.14	8.62	0:00
	Within Groups	606 773	370	1.64		
	Total	663 344	374			
physical Appearance	Between Groups	11 824	4	2.95	1.73	0:14
	Within Groups	629 533	370	1.70		
	Total	641 357	374			

Multiple Comparisons

dependent Variable	School name	School name	mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Discipline Environment	Sma 1 Jember	Sma 2 Jember	0:21	0.16	1.00	-0.24	0.66
		Sma 3 Jember	0:37	0.16	0.19	-0.07	0.83
		Sma 4 Jember	0:47 *	0.16	0.03	0:02	0.93
		Sma 5 Jember	0:13	0.16	1.00	-0.32	0:58
	Sma 2 Jember	Sma 1 Jember	-0:21	0.16	1.00	-0.66	0:24
		Sma 3 Jember	0:16	0.16	1.00	-0.29	0.61
		Sma 4 Jember	0:26	0.16	1.00	-0.19	0.71
		Sma 5 Jember	-0:08	0.16	1.00	-0.53	0:37
	3 SmaJember	Sma 1 Jember	-0:37	0.16	0.19	-0.83	0:07
		Sma 2 Jember	-0:16	0.16	1.00	-0.61	0:29
		Sma 4 Jember	0:09	0.16	1.00	-0.35	0:55
		Sma 5 Jember	-0:24	0.16	1.00	-0.69	0:21
	Sma 4 Jember	Sma 1 Jember	-0:47 *	0.16	0.03	-0.93	-0:02
		Sma 2 Jember	-0:26	0.16	1.00	-0.71	0:19
		Sma 3 Jember	-0:09	0.16	1.00	-0.55	0:35
		Sma 5 Jember	-0:34	0.16	0.34	-0.79	0:11
5 SmaJember	Sma 1 Jember	-0:13	0.16	1.00	-0.58	0:32	
	Sma 2 Jember	0:08	0.16	1.00	-0.37	0:53	
	Sma 3 Jember	0:24	0.16	1.00	-0.21	0.69	
	Sma 4 Jember	0:34	0.16	0.34	-0.11	0.79	
Community Relations	Sma 1 Jember	Sma 2 Jember	0:21	0.20	1.00	-0.37	0.80
		Sma 3 Jember	1:08 *	0.20	0.00	0:48	1.67

		Sma 4 Jember	0.76 *	0.20	0.00	0:16	1:35
		Sma 5 Jember	0.66 *	0.20	0.01	0:07	1:25
	Sma 2 Jember	Sma 1 Jember	-0.21	0.20	1.00	-0.80	0:37
		Sma 3 Jember	0.86 *	0.20	0.00	0:27	1:45
		Sma 4 Jember	0:54	0.20	0.09	-0.04	1:13
		Sma 5 Jember	0:45	0.20	0.30	-0.13	1:04
	3 SmaJember	Sma 1 Jember	-1.08 *	0.20	0.00	-1.67	-0.48
		Sma 2 Jember	-0.86 *	0.20	0.00	-1.45	-0.27
		Sma 4 Jember	-0.32	0.20	1.00	-0.91	0:27
		Sma 5 Jember	-0.41	0.20	0.48	-1.00	0:17
	Sma 4 Jember	Sma 1 Jember	-0.76 *	0.20	0.00	-1.35	-0.16
		Sma 2 Jember	-0.54	0.20	0.09	-1.13	0:04
		Sma 3 Jember	0:32	0.20	1.00	-0.27	0:91
		Sma 5 Jember	-0.09	0.20	1.00	-0.68	0:49
	5 SmaJember	Sma 1 Jember	-0.66 *	0.20	0.01	-1.25	-0.07
		Sma 2 Jember	-0.45	0.20	0.30	-1.04	0:13
		Sma 3 Jember	0:41	0.20	0.48	-0.17	1:00
		Sma 4 Jember	0:09	0.20	1.00	-0.49	0:68

Based on the test results in Table 6, it is obtained the significance value of 0.001. This figure is less than 0.05 (0.001 < 0.05). F count obtained at 4.789. This figure is greater than F table with df (4; 370) which is equal to 2.42 to 2.39. Thus, in this study the null hypothesis (H₀) was rejected. The conclusion is that there is a difference between the school climates of senior high schools in Jember on the context of history teaching.

4. Discussion

The results of this study reinforce the findings Jovinius (2015) stated that school climates in inter-institutional school can vary significantly based on the certain demographic and the geographic factors. Some researches results which support the findings of this study are: (1) the accomplishment of students' academic achievement is supported by the geographical environment factors where the school is located (Ellah and Ita, 2017); (2) The school is located in the central area of activity (non-rural areas) tend to have sufficient resources compared to schools in the edge region (rural or suburban) (Mersch, 2012). Learning resource availability allows the educational process can be done well. Thus, school climate school located in the capital area is generally better than the schools located in rural areas.

Some of the arguments in favor of school climate differences in capital area and the rural area are as follows: (1) access to learning resources more easily reached in the schools in the capital area compared to schools in the rural areas (Vito, 2015); (2) students in the capital area can be more easily adapt to the learning environment (Acahrya and Deshmukh, 2012). Schools in the capital area have the facilities to learn more qualified. Moreover, the level of adjustment of students to the school environment is also faster in the capital area.

School climate differences between schools can be understood by looking at the condition of their geographical environment of the school. Students in urban school tend to show better academic performance than students in rural school (Opoku and Siaw, 2015). There is a significant positive correlation between the variables with Student Achievement school climate. Sunday and Phillias (2015) also concluded that there are significant differences of achievement of learners in an urban school with a school that is located relatively at the edge of town. Differences were influenced by the distribution of resources uneven, supporting facilities, as well as the qualifications of educators who do not fit the needs. The results of this study reinforced by research Stavropoulus (2013) which states regard the achievement of learners with the location of the school. Stavropoulus et al consider aspects of network availability information on the school grounds.

Some of the findings of previous studies that reinforce the statement that the school climate can predict student Achievement. That is, student achievement in a school can be determined by looking at the school climate conditions. Some of the above results into a theoretical basis that the difference in student achievement in a region illustrate the differences school climate in the region.

The results of post hoc Tukey HSD test methods conclude the existence of a significant difference between the mean values of SMA Negeri 1 Jember with SMA Negeri 3 Jember. In this context, SMAN 1 Jember represents the capital area, while SMA Negeri 3 Jember as a rural school. The test results are in line with research results of Bosede and Emilejo (2013) and Opoku and Siaw (2015). Students in urban school tend to show better academic performance than students in rural school (Opoku and Siaw, 2015). The difference is influenced by several factors, disclosed Jovinius (2015) as follows: (1) the socio-economic status of parents; (2) the condition of the family cultural and environmental, as well; (3) the level of parental education.

Based on some of these opinions, it is understood that the difference between the school climates throughout former public SMA is caused by city factors of Jember school location (geographic environment) and demographic factors. The different layout / geographical location affect school success in organizing the educational process, so that the climate of school achievement between schools located in the city center with schools located on the banks. The most dominant demographic factor is the family situation of learners. Some of the factors support school climate differences can be classified as follows: (1) the distribution of resources is uneven; (2) The learning facilities are not

the same; (3) the qualifications of educators; (4) the family situation of learners (guardian) economically, socially, and culturally, as well; (5) the availability of access to information and communication networks.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion of research that has been described previously, it can be concluded as follows.

The average value of school climate for SMA Negeri 1 Jember amounted to 3.66 (high category), SMAN 2 Jember amounted to 3.47 (high category), SMA Negeri 3 Jember of 3.20 (medium category), SMAN 4 Jember 3.39 (high category), and SMAN 5 Jember amounted to 3.40 (high category). Overall, the school climate component that obtain high category is student interaction (3.97), discipline environment (3.48), learning and assessment (3.83), and attitude (3.78). Components that tend to be low is a community relations (2.68) and physical appearance (2.78).

There are differences in school climate throughout former public senior high school in Jember (sig. = 0.001 at significance level of 5%). Based on the test results of the post hoc tests, significant differences were found in a sample group of SMA Negeri 1 Jember with SMA Negeri 3 Jember (mean differences = 0.46611). Schools in the city center (capital area) tended to show the average value of school climate that is higher than schools located in the area outside the city center (rural area).

References

- Acharya, P. B. and Deshmukh, M. R. (2012). Self-esteem and academic achievement of secondary school students. *International Referred Research Journal*, 3(29).
- American Institute for Research (2012). Measuring school climate for gauging principal performance, A review of validity and reliability of publicly accessible measure. A quality school leadership. *American Institute for Research*.
- Amri, S. (2015). Pembelajaran sejarah, Masalah dan solusinya. *Jurnal Edukasi Musi Rawas*, 3(1): 150–71.
- ASSC (2016). *Alliance for the study of school climate assc school climate assessment instrument secondary student version*. ASSC: California. 0–5.
- Berkowitz, d. (2016). A research synthesis of the associations between socioeconomic background, Inequality, School climate, And academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 10(10):
- Bosede and Emilejo (2013). Rural and urban differential in student's academic performance among secondary school students in ondo state. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3(3).
- Brankovic, N. (2017). Determination of indicators of school culture in primary schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(20):
- Cowan, d. (2014). *Engaging students to think critically in a large history class*. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario: Toronto.
- Dulay, S. and Karadağ, E. (2017). *The effect of school climate on student achievement*. In, Karadağ e. (eds) *the factors effecting student achievement*. Springer: Cham.
- Ellah, K. E. and Ita, P. M. (2017). Correlational relationship between school location and students' academic performance in English language in nigerian secondary schools. *Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 7(9).
- Gage, d. (2016). Student perceptions of school climate as predictors of office discipline referrals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(3).
- Jerald, B. C. D. (2016). *The hidden curriculum*. Centre for CSRI: Washington DC.
- Jovinius, J. (2015). An investigation fo the effect of geographical location of schools to the students' academic performance and climate of the school, A case of public secondary schools in muleba district, (University of Tanzania).
- Loukas (2007). Naesp , What is school climate? *Leadership Compass*, 5(1): 1-3.
- Majiet, A. K. (2016). Improving the critical thinking skills of learners in a grade six history classroom, An action research approach.
- Martinez, D. (2014). School culture and american indian educational outcomes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116: 199–205.
- Maxwell, d. (2017). The impact of school climate and school identification on academic achievement, Multilevel modeling with student and teacher data. *Frontiers in Psychology*: 8.
- Mersch, R. (2012). Student academic achievement in rural vs. Non-rural high schools in wisconsin.
- Moidunny, K. (2009). The effectiveness of the national professional qualification for educational leaders, npqel.
- Najmi, R. (2012). Pembelajaran sejarah, Permasalahan dan solusinya, Sejarah, Kebudayaan, Dan pendidikan. *Jurnal Bakaba*, 1(1).
- Opoku, A. and Siaw, A. O. (2015). *Rural–urban disparity in students'academic performance in visual arts education, Evidence from six senior high schools in kumasi*. SAGE Open: Ghana. 1-14.
- Raman, d. (2015). Relationship between school climate and teachers' commitment in an excellent school of kubang pasu district, Kedah, Malaysia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3).
- Rapti, D. (2016). School climate as an important component in school effectiveness. (69): 110–25.
- Samuelsson, K. and Lindblad, S. (2015). School management, cultures of teaching and student outcomes, Comparing the cases of finland and Sweden. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 49: 168–77.

- Stavropoulos, d. (2013). Recognizing internet addiction, Prevalence and relationship to academic achievement in adolescents enrolled in urban and rural greek high schools. *Journal of Adolescence*: 36.
- Sumardiansyah (2015). Paradigma pembelajaran sejarah kontroversi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah*, 11-88.
- Sunday and Phillias (2015). Student performance in rural and urban areas education essay. Uk essays.
- Supriatna, N. (2011). Konstruksi pembelajaran sejarah yang berorientasi pada masalah kontemporer pembangunan. 1(27).
- Umamah, N., 2014. "Kurikulum 2013 dankendala yang dihadapi pendidikdalam merancang desain pembelajaran sejarah." In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional 2014, Pembelajaran Sejarah di Tengah Perubahan*.
- Umamah, N. (2017). *Pembelajaran sejarah kesiapannya menghadapi tantangan zaman. Kapita selekta (pendidikan) sejarah indonesia*. Ombak: Yogyakarta.
- Valentine (2016). *School culture survey factors and items*. MLLC Missouri Edu. 35.
- Vito, d. (2015). Kesenjangan pendidikan kota dan desa. Prosiding ks. *Riset Dan PKM*, 2(2).