LSESC and Achievement Based Students’ Learning Outcome, Is There Any Different?
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Abstract. Student who have low socioeconomic status will get certificate that named LSESC (or SKTM in Bahasa). In the admission of high school student in Indonesia, there is student acceptance using LSESC that will be prioritized to be accepted. A high school accept students from LSESC and achievement based who will get same learning process. Because there are LSESC and achievement based, learning outcomes research is needed. This study aims to show the difference of LSESC and achievement based students’ learning outcome. This study is a descriptive explorative research using qualitative approach. Data were collected using learning outcome test and interview. Participants of this study were 18 LSESC based students, and 50 achievement based students. The result of the study showed that achievement based students’ learning outcome is higher than LSESC based students’ learning outcome.

1. Introduction
Student acceptance using LSESC based are applied in Indonesia, in addition to receipt with LSESC there is acceptance with achievement based. The impact of the LSESC based is that students with low score but having LSESC can be prioritized or accepted in a school rather than students who have higher score but without LSESC. Achievement based is that student who accepted based on their score and usually have higher socioeconomic status. This acceptance has become a problem and debate, when LSESC based will be accepted in a school that should accept student who got high score than them.

Because the LSESC based has just been implemented where this can be a matter of how the learning outcomes of students entering through the LSESC based are compared with the achievement based and the factors that influence the achievement of student learning outcomes. The purpose of this study is to describe student learning outcomes with LSESC based and achievement based and factors that influence the learning outcomes.

Learning outcomes is the ability of the student after receiving learning or material in school. Learning outcomes can be displayed from students' behaviour and knowledge by providing a more realistic picture that aims to measure student learning abilities. Learning outcome is an assessment of the results of learning activities that are expressed in the form of symbols, numbers, and letters that can reflect the results achieved by each student in a certain period [1]. Learning achievement as a
result of an interaction of learning actions and teaching actions [2]. From the teacher's side is a teaching act and ends with a process of evaluating learning outcomes. In terms of students is the end of the cut and the peak of the learning process.

Learning outcome is one indicator that describes the achievement or learning success of students. Learning outcome is the level of success of students in learning the subject matter in school which is expressed in the form of scores obtained from the test results on certain subject matter [3]. Learning outcome is a proof of learning success or the ability of a student in conducting learning activities in accordance with the weight achieved [4]. Both opinions above, although different in terms of language used, but refer to the same purpose, namely that learning achievement is a form or form of success benchmarks for students who are represented or converted in the form of scores or weights in a certain value range.

Learning outcome is the result of an educator's assessment of the learning process and results of students who describe students' mastery of subject matter or behaviour that is relatively settled as a result of the learning process experienced by students in a certain period of time [5]. This opinion is relevant with Permendikbud 2016 Number 23 concerning Assessment Standards that assesses the learning outcomes of educators to monitor and re-evaluate the process, progress of learning, and learning achievement of students on an ongoing basis. In this case, based on this definition it can be concluded that learning achievement is not only as a benchmark for students' learning success or as a consideration of the importance of evaluation and follow-up decision making, but learning outcome must be marked by changes[6]. Learning outcome must be marked by a change in behaviour in students after completing the learning process in the form of positive changes in knowledge, attitudes and psychomotor skills [7].

Based on the above notions, it can be concluded that learning outcome is the result of a learning process or the level of student ability after learning in the cognitive aspects. A person's learning outcome is in accordance with the level of success in learning a subject matter that is expressed in the form of values for each subject. Learning outcome can be known after an evaluation. The results of the evaluation can show the high and low student achievement. In this study, the learning outcome measured is the cognitive aspect through learning achievement tests after receiving mathematics learning.

Learning outcome is the level of success of students in learning the subject matter in school which is expressed in the form of scores obtained from the test results on certain subject matter. There are several factors that influence learning outcome, such as social factors, internal factors of students, learning processes and others. Students 'internal factors are influenced by students' social background, previous students 'abilities, students' psychological factors. The social and psychological factors of students are shaped by how family life, economic conditions [8].

The difference of LSESC based and achievement based are, the achievement based is the entry path that makes the final exam score, the entrance test score and the award achieved at the previous level as a reference. While the LSESC based is a special route for underprivileged students, where for 2018 the school is given a special direction to prioritize students with LSESC with a view to providing learning opportunities for students who have a weak economic life. The background of the new student admission system allows the emergence of the diversity of character and abilities of students where this should be a material consideration of the teacher in providing treatment or learning to the students concerned. In fact, students who are accepted with the two different paths are given the same treatment by the teacher. This raises the question of whether, is there gap between achievement based students and LSESC based students learning outcome?
2. Method

2.1. Research Subject
The research subject is a public vocational school student there are 18 LSESC based students, and 50 achievement based student.

2.2 Data Analysis
This is a descriptive explorative research using qualitative approach that data collected using learning outcome test presented using diagram, and interview to describe learning outcomes factors.

3. Result and Discussion
The result of learning outcome test will be shown on figure 1.
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**Figure 1.** Learning outcomes score

Based on figure 1, it can be seen that the results of learning outcomes by students, students who are accepted through achievement based, are better than students with LSESC. This is a matter of further observation, the problems student learning outcomes.

Students with LSESC who have economic barriers must be considered by the teacher in carrying out the learning process because the student has characteristics and problems that are slightly different from other students. The economic problems that afflict students with LSESC sometimes get less attention because they feel the economy does not affect learning outcomes directly. However, based on the interview, economic factors become significant obstacles.
Student from LSESC based develop academic skills slower than student from higher socioeconomic status [9]. They are related to poor cognitive skill and development, memory and socioemotional processing [10]. Then, LSESC based student have less access to learning materials such as book, computer, or other learning resources [11], because of they have limited budget to get the facilities. They have to share the money that is owned with their sibling, that make it difficult to buy books, or stationery. The parents are affecting on students’ financial, the LSESC based students are higher risk to have loan debt [12] especially to fulfil their school needs, and some of them have unhealthy family dependents so that income earned by the family is focused on the health of the person, and the time taken to care for so that there is a lack of time to study. Sometimes, they get part-time jobs, to help their family financial.

Because of the burdens, they will be easy to get stress and give impact on their learning behaviour that are linked to decreased educational results [13] affected emotional distress/depression in students and their academic outcomes [14] because LSESC based students in science and mathematics skills is lower that higher socioeconomic status background [15]. LSESC based students complete almost all of house chores, because their parents do not have time to do it that also related to their disinterest, inattention, and lack of cooperation in school, beside they are difficult to show their learning behaviour problem [16].

Nevertheless there are two LSESC based students who got good learning outcomes, they get highest score on exam 2 and exam 3 based on the interviews, the factors that support them to get good scores are:
1. Parents prioritize education so that it does not force it to help with house chores.
2. Awareness of the costs incurred for school isn’t cheap, they try to get optimal results.
3. Good motivation.
4. Good time management so that it has a relatively longer time for studying.
5. Getting high learning outcome is necessity.
6. Pay attention to teacher’s learning.

It is a consideration of how student learning outcomes are influenced by various factors, such as economic factors, self-awareness, motivation and parents. One of reasons getting high learning outcome LSESC based student is motivation, student’s motivation is significant factor in achieving learning outcome, teachers collaboration with student have to develop student’s motivation [17], motivating factor for LSESC students is creating a better life [18]. These results are taken into consideration in the teacher managing the class, as well as collaboration with parents to support the students’ learning process and optimize learning outcome. Teacher have to engage in self-management and consultation, tracking their usage of classroom management skills and developing action plans to modify their practices based on condition [19] the combination of background characteristics that influences an individual’s chance of completing higher education [20]. In this case there are LSESC based students, and achievement based student must become consideration. For example teacher is able to think about whether a classroom discussion should be pursued or not, and adept at recognising learning outcomes that may emerge in the practical realities of teaching [21].

4. Conclusion
Achievement based student got higher learning outcome than LSESC based student. There are factors that caused LSESC based student get lower learning outcomes such as slower at developing academic, poor cognitive skill and development, memory and socioemotional processing, less access to learning materials such as book, computer, or other learning resources because of limited budget to get the facilities get stress and give impact on their learning behavior that are linked to decreased educational results, their disinterest, inattention, and lack of cooperation in school, beside they are difficult to show their learning behavior problem.
There are some LSESC based students who got high learning outcomes, it has to be motivation to other LSESC based students to achieve higher learning outcomes. Beside teacher have to engage in self-management and consultation, tracking their usage of classroom management skills and developing action plans to modify their practices based on condition the combination of background characteristics that influences an individual’s chance of completing higher education. In this case there are LSESC based students, and achievement based student must become consideration. For example teacher is able to think about whether a classroom discussion should be pursued or not, and is adept at recognising learning outcomes that may emerge in the practical realities of teaching.
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