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**Abstract**: This article aims to describe the students' learning creativity profile reviewed from school's accreditation status. The method in this study was a survey method by distributing a questionnaire of students’ learning creativity through google form. Participants in the study were grade VIII students in public schools with National Standard School accredited status, schools with A accredited State Junior High School (JHS), and B accredited State Junior High School (JHS). Based on the results of data processing, there was a significant average difference in learning creativity on indicators the ability to deal with learning problems between public schools with National Standard School accredited status and schools with A accredited State JHS. The average ability to deal with learning problems is also significantly different between schools with A accredited State JHS, and B accredited State JHS. A significant difference in average is also shown in the indicators of interest in learning creations and indicators of the ability to develop in learning between public schools with National Standard School accredited status and schools with A accredited State JHS. The results of this study can be used as empirical data for research on guidance and counseling programs to develop students' creativity in schools.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Creativity has important role in human’s life (Runco, 2014). Nowadays, creativity still becomes key aspect which determines someone’s success in learning, business, and psychological well-being (Susanto et al, 2018). Creativity is seen as capacity to develop new and useful argument, behavior, or product and complex capacity which is related to mix individual, situational, and cultural variables (Martinsen, 2011; Eysenck & Eysenck, 2009).

Study about creativity is an interdisciplinary study which reflects on current researches about behavior, clinic, cognitive, development, economic, education, evolution, history, organization, personality, and social perspective (Runco, 2014). Other research shows creativity as an important aspect of educational performance especially creativity design and development as the goals of most design education programs (Chang et al., 2015).

 In line with current developing research, students’ creativity becomes one of national education goals in terms of students’ development to be citizens who are believe in God, have noble character, healthy and knowledgeable, competent, creative, independent, democratic, and responsible (Republic of Indonesia Constitution, 2013).

 National education goals have central position as main reference for education providers in Indonesia, as a result, all of national education activities are substantially based on national education goals (Noor, 2018). Therefore, teaching and learning practice at school starts from planning, process, result, and evaluation are directed to national education goals achievement especially students’ creativity development.

 Individual’s creativity potency actualization occurs in formal, informal, and non-formal education scopes. There are supporting and inhibiting factors related to individual’s creativity potency actualization in those three education scopes (Supriadi, 1989). Furthermore, Supriadi (1989: 6) stated that those supporting and inhibiting factors make guidance and counseling service is very needed. In one hand, guidance and counseling is in charge of enriching intern and extern factors which support students’ creativity potency actualization; in the other hand, guidance and counseling service is supposed to minimize factors which inhibit students’ creativity potency actualization.

 In fact, teaching and learning practice at school is more focused on intelligence development (cognitive) than creativity development, whereas, both creativity and intelligence are significant aspects to achieve learning success. Learning process at school is more focused on students’ knowledge and ignores students’ creativity development (Hasanah et al., 2018). A study conducted by Listyowati et al. (2013) whose participants are grade VIII students of SMPN 1 Mantingan shows that only 52.17% students who passed creativity test. It means that there are many uncreative students who did not pass creativity test.

 Moreover, the results of the observation on SMPN 2 Padang and interview with 2 guidance and counseling teachers reveal: (a) Students creativity traits are less shown as there are a lot of students who could not develop their creativity maximally in learning and extracurricular activities; (b) During teaching and learning process, students indicate low motivation and anxiety in asking questions because of monotone teaching methods used by the teachers; (c) There are several students who copy other students’ work (Hasanah et al., 2018).

 Based on the assumption that school quality gives big support to teaching and learning program at school, poor quality school will obstruct teaching and learning process. Education quality assurance is systemic and integrated activity by education unit or program, education unit or program organizer, regional government, government, and society to raise nation’s intelligence trough education (Safitri, 2015).

 Accreditation, similar with evaluation and certification, according to Article 2 Paragraph 2 Government Regulation no. 19 of 2005 about national education standard (NES), is held to ensure and control education quality (Karyanto et al., 2015). Accreditation is done by comparing school condition to eight standard criteria of school (Awaludin, 2017). In educational context, Sallis (2005: 21—22) states that education quality mentioned before is based on relative concept, especially related to clients’ satisfaction.

 Education clients consist of two aspects, namely (1) intern clients and (2) extern clients. Intern clients are headmaster, teacher, and other school staff. Meanwhile, extern clients consist of three groups, namely primary extern clients (students), secondary extern clients (parents and government), and tertiary extern clients (market and society) (Karyanto et al., 2015). Education quality with good accreditation school will determine students’ quality by assumption that different education quality standard will differentiate students’ quality.

 Based on the urgency of school accreditation as national education standard and students’ creativity development as national education goals and empirical data which illustrates the students’ lack of learning creativity criteria, the current study aims to describe the comparison of Junior High School students’ creativity in *Sekolah Standar Nasional* accredited State Junior High School (SMPN-SSN), A accredited State Junior High School (SMPN Akreditasi A), and B accredited State Junior High School (SMPN Akreditasi B).

**Literature Review**

 Creativity is an ability to create new combination based on data, information, and existing elements. Creativity also means an ability to create new things or combination of existing elements (Munandar, 2009). Creativity is a process of expressing ideas freely which leads to an ability to think widely and formulate various solutions of a problem (Page & Page, 2018).

 Meanwhile, learning means someone’s effort to get whole behavior change as a result of his interaction experience with cognitive and settled environment (Surya, 2004; Syah, 2011).

 Based on learning and creativity definitions above, it can be concluded that learning creativity is someone’s ability to achieve behavior change in learning process creatively. Learning as behavior change process involves experience and interaction with problem, so that he will be able to solve that problem by thinking creatively.

**METHOD**

 This study used qualitative approach with survey as the research method. The research population was all grade VIII students year 2020-2021 in SMPN-SSN, SMPN Akrediasi A, and SMPN Akreditasi B. The total populations from those three schools were 458 students and 194 students were selected as the research sample through purposive sampling method.

 In order to get students’ learning creativity profile in every school, a questionnaire about students’ learning creativity formulated by Ramadhan Weda Yoga (2013) which has been tested for its validity and reliability was used in this study. The students’ learning creativity questionnaire consists of 23 items which used to reveal students’ learning creativity level involving ability to solve learning problems (items number 2,3,7,9,10, and 23); learning development ability (items number 8, 14, 18, and 22); depth of thinking in learning (items number 4, 15, and 20); ability to evaluate learning outcomes (items number 12, 16, 19, and 21); and learning creation interest (items number 1, 5, 6, 11, 13, and 17). After validity test, there are two invalid items (items number 10 and 16), so, those items were not used in this study.

 The next questionnaires were spread through Google form to all grade VIII students as the participants of this study. There were 120 SMPN-SSN students, 43 SMPN Akreditasi A students, and 31 SMPN Akreditasi B students (194 students in total) who became participants of this study.

 In order to acquire data about learning creativity variable tendency, the data was categorized using ideal average score (Mi) and ideal standard deviation score (SDi) with the following formula:

Mi = ½ (highest score – lowest score)

SDi = 1/6 (highest score – lowest score)

 Tendency level of each variable was categorized through three categories namely high, medium, and low (Mardhapi, 2008). Meanwhile to assess average difference of each learning creativity indicator, the data was analyzed using parametric statistical analysis through ANOVA test as the sample after being tested for homogeneity are normally distributed.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

A. Findings

Findings of this study were based on the survey result using learning creativity questionnaires which spread to 120 grade VII SMPN-SSN students, 43 grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi A students, and 31 grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi B students. Learning creativity instrument that has been tested for its validity and reliability reveals indicators of the ability to solve learning problems, learning development ability, learning creation interest, ability to evaluate learning outcomes, and the depth of thinking in learning. The following are the descriptions of learning creativity profile in each indicator:

*a.Learning Creativity of Grade VIII SMPN-SSN Students*

Description of SMPN-SSN students’ learning creativity is based on learning creativity indicators which consist of: A. ability to solve learning problems, B. learning development ability, C. learning creation interest, D. ability to evaluate learning outcomes, and E. the depth of thinking in learning are shown in the following graph:

Graph 1. SMPN-SSN Students’ Learning Creativity

Graph 1 above illustrates indicator of the ability to solve learning problems in high category is 0%, medium category is 62.50%, and low category is 37.50%. Whilst in terms of the learning development ability in high category is 5.83%, medium category is 67.50%, and low category is 26.67%.

The depth of thinking in learning demonstrates 10% in high category, 59.17% in medium category, and 30.83% in low category. The ability to evaluate learning outcomes indicates 0% in high category, 56.67% in medium category, and 43.33% in low category. Whereas learning creation interest indicator displays 19.17% in high category, 53.33% in medium category, and 27.50% in low category.

1. *Learning Creativity of Grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi A Students*

Description of SMPN Akreditasi A students’ learning creativity is based on learning creativity indicators which consist of: A. ability to solve learning problems, B. learning development ability , C. the depth of thinking in learning, D. ability to evaluate learning outcomes, and E. learning creation interest are illustrated in the graph 2 below:

Graph 2. SMPN Akreditasi A Students’ Learning Creativity

Graph 2 above shows indicator of the ability to solve learning problems in high category is 27.91%, medium category is 69.77%, and low category is 2.33%. Meanwhile in terms of the learning development ability in high category is 0,00 %, medium category is 39.53%, and low category is 60.47%. The depth of thinking in learning illustrates 100% in low category. The ability to evaluate learning outcomes indicates 53.49% in high category, 39.3% in medium category, and 6.98% in low category. Whilst learning creation interest indicator demonstrates 16.28 % in high category, and 41.86% in medium and low category.

1. *Learning Creativity of Grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi B Students*

Description of SMPN Akreditasi B students’ learning creativity is based on learning creativity indicators which consist of: A. ability to solve learning problems, B. learning development ability, C. learning creation interest, D. ability to evaluate learning outcomes, and E. the depth of thinking in learning are shown in the graph 3 below:



Graph 3. SMPN Akreditasi B Students’ Learning Creativity

 Graph 3 above demonstrates indicator of the ability to solve learning problems in high category is 12.90%, medium category is 87.10%, and low category is 0,00%. Whereas in terms of the learning development ability in high category is 0.00 %, medium category is 58.06%, and low category is 41.94%.

The depth of thinking in learning indicator illustrates 12.90% in high category, 61.29% in medium category, and 25.81% in low category. The ability to evaluate learning outcomes shows 51.61% in high category, 41.94% in medium category, and 6.45 % in low category. Meanwhile learning creation interest indicator displays 16.13% in high category, 58.06% in medium category, and 25.81% in low category.

1. *Learning Creativity Indicators Comparison Test Results of Grade VIII SMPN-SSN Students, Grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi A Students, and Grade VIII SMPN Akreditasi B Students*

Learning creativity indicators comparison test was using SPSS-25 program. Before comparison testing, homogeneity testing was done and the result was all research variable is homogeneous. In consequence, comparison testing in every learning creativity indicator was using parametric test by learning creation interest and learning development ability. The test result was portrayed in the table below:

d.1 Ability to Solve Learning Problems Indicator



Table 1. Comparison Test Result of the Ability to Solve Learning Problems Indicator

Table 1 above indicates that there is significant comparison average of the ability to solve learning problems between SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A students with comparison average 1,189. Besides, there is significant comparison average of the ability to solve learning problems between SMPN Akreditasi A and SMPN Akreditasi B students with comparison average 1,375.

d.2 Learning Creation Interest Indicator

****

Table 2. Comparison Test Result of the Learning Creation Interest Indicator

Comparison test result on the table 2 above shows that there is significant comparison average of the learning creation interest indicator between SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A with comparison average 1,301.

*d.3 Learning Development Indicator*



Table 3. Comparison Test Result of the Learning Development Ability Indicator

Table 3 above illustrates significant comparison average of learning development indicator between SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A with comparison average 1,811 and there is also significant comparison average between SMPN Akreditasi A and SMPN Akreditasi B with comparison average 1,779.

*d. 4 Ability to Evaluate Learning Outcomes and the Depth of Thinking in Learning Indicators*

According to the comparison test using LSD, there is no significant difference between SMPN-SSN, SMPN Akreditasi A, and SMPN Akreditasi B in terms of learning creativity based on ability to evaluate learning outcomes and the depth of thinking and learning indicators.

**B. Discussion**

Based on learning creativity data analysis result on the ability to solve learning problems indicator in SMPN-SSN, it can be concluded that students’ learning creativity belongs to medium category. It is in tune with the study conducted by Putra (2018) about measuring creative thinking skills of SMP Cimahi students which results show that the majority of the students have creative thinking skills in the medium category/66.67% (Putra, et al., 2018).

Meanwhile, learning creativity indicators in SMPN Akreditasi A Indicated various results. Only ability to solve learning problems indicator which belongs to medium category and learning development indicator mostly belongs to low category (60.47%). Significant result is shown on the depth of thinking in learning category which 100% belongs to low category. As the depth of thinking in learning refers to creative thinking skills, SMPN Akreditasi A should implement a strategy to increase students’ capability into self-actualization or creative thinking skills (Rahmah, 2016).

On the other hand, SMPN Akreditasi B showed its potential indicators (ability to solve learning problems, learning development, the depth of thinking in learning, and learning creation interest indicators) in medium category. Meanwhile, the ability to evaluate learning outcomes indicator demonstrated bigger percentage of high category.

According to the findings above it can be concluded that generally SMPN Akreditasi B students’ learning creativity belongs to medium category. In consequence, SMPN Akreditasi B needs development to become SMPN Akreditasi A which refers to superior school development strategies as follow: emerging collective mindset to strive for the development of superior school quality; creating school innovation which highlights its superiority; utilizing information technology and involving parents in school activities are smartest steps in developing high quality learning system (Rahmah, 2016).

Furthermore, good and conducive school environment will create fun learning place by providing adequate learning facilities and infrastructures. School environment which suits national education standard (NES) will create learning atmosphere that increase students’ creativity (Setyo, 2017).

The statement above is in line with the data analysis result using LSD test which indicated that environment (accreditation status) influences learning creativity comparison average in terms of the ability to solve learning problems indicator. The comparison average of SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A is 1.189, while the comparison average of SMPN Akreditasi A and SMPN Akreditasi B is 1.375.

The statement above is also in tune with creativity research conducted by Sugiyanto (2018) which analyzed creativity culture in concept and development and indicated that external aspects are 63% more dominant in determining individual’ creativity encouragement. External aspects consist of environment, social, culture, politic, and belief (Susanto, 2017).

In terms of learning creation interest indicator, the comparison average of SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A is 1.301. It means that school quality influences students’ learning creation interest which directly effects their learning achievement (Setyowati & Widana, 2016).

Moreover, in terms of learning development indicator, the comparison average of SMPN-SSN and SMPN Akreditasi A is 1.811. Whereas the comparison average of SMPN Akreditasi A and SMPN Akreditasi B is 1.779. This fact is strengthen the statement that school quality influences students’ learning creativity (Koharudin Jayadiningrat, 2021).

The comparison test using LSD indicated that there is no significant comparison average between SMPN-SSN, SMPN Akreditasi A, and SMPN Akreditasi B in terms of the ability to evaluate learning outcomes and the depth of thinking in learning indicators. The cause of this finding is because the ability to evaluate learning outcomes and the depth of thinking in learning indicators are not directly influenced by school environment and possibly influenced by other variables such as gender, social and economy status, family order, city and village environment, and intelligence (Hurlock, 1998).

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

Conclusions

1. There is significant comparison average on the ability to solve learning problems, learning creation interest, and learning development indicators between SMPN-SSN and SMP Akreditasi A. There is also comparison average between SMPN Akreditasi A and SMPN Akreditasi B in terms of the ability to solve learning problems and learning development indicators.
2. In general, all learning creativity indicators in SMPN-SSN, SMPN Akreditasi A, and SMPN Akreditasi B belong to medium category.

Suggestions

1. The findings of this study can be used as empirical data for research on guidance and counseling program especially about developing students’ learning creativity at school.
2. Hopefully school is able to maintain and develop school accreditation based on national education standard in order to increase students’ learning creativity.
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