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ABSTRACT
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis interaksi pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia pada siswa sekolah dasar. Sampel penelitian adalah siswa kelas V SD yang berjumlah 51 siswa. Penelitian ini bersifat deskriptif. Data penelitian dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan metode observasi, wawancara, dan dokumentasi. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan adalah lembar observasi, dan pedoman wawancara. Data yang telah terkumpul kemudian dialisis menggunakan Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa, guru berbicara memiliki persentase 55,04%, siswa berbicara 31,41%, diam memiliki persentase 12,59%, rasio respon guru 43,83%, rasio inisiatif siswa 8,19%, rasio respon langsung guru 61,06%, rasio perputaran konten sebesar 59,36%, dan rasio tetap siswa sebesar 0%. Gaya belajar siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia yaitu visual (46%), auditori (18%), dan kinestetik (35,33%). Gaya belajar siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia termasuk dalam kategori baik dengan sebaran frekuensi yaitu 31,4% dalam kategori sangat baik, 54,9% dalam kategori baik, dan 13,7% dalam kategori sedang.

1. Introduction
Learning is a mandatory activity carried out by teachers systematically and programmed in instructional design. Learning will create interactions between teachers and students and between students (Laksana et al., 2019; Nugraheni et al., 2021; Surya et al., 2017). Learning aims to create changes in students’ behavior and thinking in the learning environment (Kim, 2018; Kuo et al., 2014; Wang, 2020). Learning is characterized by changes in students’ self (Ferreira et al., 2018; Subiyantari et al., 2019). Another definition also states that learning is a permanent change in behavior due to experience (Devi et al., 2016; Hidayati et al., 2020). One sign that a student has learned something is a change in his behavior. These behavioral changes involve changes in knowledge (cognitive), skills (psychomotor), as well as those concerning values and attitudes (affective(Mayub et al., 2020; Noohidawati et al., 2015; Purpura & Schmitt, 2019). Learning includes subjects and mastery, habits, perceptions, competencies, social adjustments, skills, and ideals. Learning is essentially a process of interaction between students and their environment, resulting in a change in behavior for the better. During the learning process, the teacher’s most important task is to condition the learning environment to support behavior change for students (Low et al., 2019; Obergriesser & Stoeger, 2020). Learning is a two-way communication process. The teacher carries out teaching as an educator while students or students carry out learning. The learning process cannot be separated from its components, such as students, teachers, learning objectives, material/content, methods, media, and evaluation (Astawa et al., 2020; Muizzuddin, 2019; Nissa & Haryanto, 2020). One of the methods obtained by elementary school students is Indonesian.

Indonesian language learning activities are carried out to master the Indonesian national language. The main objective of learning Indonesian is to improve students’ skills in Indonesian (Friantary & Martina, 2018; Khaırunnisa, 2021). Language knowledge is taught to show students are skilled in language, namely skilled in listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Wibowo & Rahmayanti, 2020; Yuanta, 2017). Indonesian language learning activities will be successful if the teacher adapts the learning to the students’ abilities. These adjustments must be designed in an integrated manner with the objectives of learning Indonesian. Studying Indonesian also aims to have mastery of language skills or the ability to communicate through the language they use (P. A. P. Sari, 2019; Susunti et al., 2018). This ability involves two things: first, conveying messages, both orally (through speaking) and in writing (through writing) (Pramesti et al., 2018; Wikanengsih et al., 2015). Second is the ability to understand, interpret, and receive messages, whether delivered orally (through listening activities) or in writing (through reading activities)
(Angga et al., 2020; Kurniawan et al., 2020). Language skills can be mastered with continuous practice and getting used to it. Indonesian language subjects are programs to develop language skills and positive attitudes towards language, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills (Disi & Hartati, 2018; Widyari et al., 2018).

The problem that occurs today is that students feel bored with learning Indonesian. The findings of previous studies stated that there were still many students who were passive in learning Indonesian (Artini, 2016; Susmiati, 2020). Other studies also state that inappropriate learning models cause students to be bored with learning (Asna & Mimi, 2016; Oya & Budiningsih, 2014). Other research also states that a teacher-centered learning model will make students feel passive in learning (Dewi et al., 2019; Putera & Shofiah, 2021). In addition, the lack of media also causes students to have difficulties in learning (Dewi et al., 2019). It is what affects students’ interest in learning Indonesian. The level of development of elementary school-aged children who are still in the preoperational category with the characteristics of children starting to receive various stimuli that are still limited. The child's language ability begins to develop. However, the mindset is still static and unable to think abstractly, the perception of time and place is still limited, and at the concrete operational stage, the child has started to reason. In this stage, tasks such as arranging, folding, separating, merging, lining up, and dividing can be done by children (Trianingsih, 2016; Yuanta, 2017). It causes teachers to develop appropriate learning for students, especially in Indonesian.

The pattern of interaction in learning is also essential to note. The learning process allows the direction of reciprocal communication. The direction of communication can occur from teacher to student, student to student, and student to teacher (Iswardhany & Rahayu, 2020; Jailil, 2016). In learning, teachers and students give each other a reciprocal response so that learning activities become fun. In addition, student interaction activities with other students form discussions in learning and do not deviate from the teaching material. It is why the interaction pattern is multidirectional. The interaction of teachers and students takes place in a bond for educational and teaching purposes. In the interaction process, the teacher can provide and develop motivation and reinforcement for students to carry out learning activities optimally (Siregar, 2017; Ulil et al., 2020). At the time of interaction, the teacher does not only transfer knowledge to students, but the teacher only acts as a facilitator. Teachers must create an enabling learning atmosphere so that students can take the initiative to solve these problems (Iswardhany & Rahayu, 2020; Suprihatin, 2015). Thus, the teacher provides stimulation so that students can dare to express their opinions so that the problems given can be solved. With this, learning will become more active (Hasma, 2017). In addition to the pattern of interaction in learning, the teacher must understand the characteristics of students so that students have no difficulty in learning.

Learning style is a combination of how students absorb knowledge and organize and process the information or knowledge obtained (Noervadila et al., 2020; Sari, 2014). In addition, learning style is the tendency of students to adopt specific strategies in their learning as a form of responsibility to get a learning approach that is by the demands of learning in the classroom/school as well as the demands of the subject (Farid, 2014; Mashurwati, 2018). In general, human learning styles are divided into three major categories: visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (Jampel, 2016; Syarifuddin et al., 2021). Visual learning style is a learning style by seeing, observing, and gazing (Laksana et al., 2019; Wahyuni, 2017). The strength of this learning style lies in the sense of sight. The eye is the most sensitive tool for students who have this style to capture any learning symptom or stimulus. Auditory learning style is a learning style by listening (Laksana et al., 2019; Wahyuni, 2017). Students with this learning style are more dominant in using the sense of hearing to carry out learning activities. Kinesthetic learning styles are learning styles by moving, working, and touching (Laksana et al., 2019; Wahyuni, 2017). Students with this learning style can easily catch the lesson when they move, touch, or take action. The teacher must know each student’s learning style so that it is easy for the teacher to determine the right learning strategy or media for students.

The findings of previous studies also state that learning styles significantly affect the learning activities favored by students (Çolak, 2015; Nurasma’ Shamsuddin & Kaur, 2020). Other research also states that it is essential for teachers to know students’ learning styles to significantly increase student interest and learning outcomes (Prayekti, 2018; N. Shamsuddin & Kaur, 2020). Other findings also state that the interaction pattern in learning is also essential for teachers to pay attention to increase learning success (Pebriana, 2017; Septian et al., 2020). There is no study on the study of Indonesian language learning in elementary schools: interaction and student learning styles. This study aims to analyze the interaction of learning and learning styles of Indonesian in elementary school students.
2. Methods

This type of research is qualitative research. Qualitative research is directed at providing symptoms, facts, or events systematically and accurately regarding the characteristics of a particular population or area (Suharsaputra, 2018). The methods used to collect data are observation, interviews, and documentation. The observation method in this study is passive participatory observation. The researcher is where the student activities are observed but are not involved in the activity. The interview method used in this research is structured interviews with resource persons to provide information about the factors that influence learning outcomes. The document study method is used to strengthen the findings of the research. The research instruments used were observation sheets, interview guidelines, and documentation. The observation sheet is carried out by observing three indicators. Each indicator has a sub-indicator, namely (1) the physical indicator consists of two sub-indicators, namely the state of health and body condition. (2) the psychological indicator consists of four sub-indicators: attention, interest, talent, and readiness to participate in learning. (3) the school indicator consists of seven sub-indicators: curriculum, teaching methods, student interaction, discipline in schools, learning tools, and building and library conditions. The interview guide in this study contains a description of the research in the form of a list of questions to ensure that the interview process can run well. The documentation in question is photos of learning. Research data that has been collected in the form of factors that affect learning outcomes and learning outcomes of Indonesian is then analyzed descriptively.

This research took place in SD Cluster VI, Abang District. The samples in this study were all grade I, II, and V group VI students. The sampling technique in this study used a purposive sampling technique. The data analysis used in this study is a descriptive statistical analysis by calculating the mean and standard deviation converted into a five-scale LAP, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Criteria for Benchmark Reference Assessment (PAP) Scale Five on Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skor Range</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 – 100</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 89</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 79</td>
<td>Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 54</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tegeh & Kirna, 2013).

3. Findings and Discussion (Heading 1)

Result

Based on the results of the analysis of learning interactions at the first, second, and third meetings, it can be seen that the percentage value of teachers in motivating students has decreased from the first, second, and third observations. In the first observation, the percentage of teachers motivating students was 9.90%, decreased in the second observation by 4.69% to 5.21%, and decreased by 0.39% to 4.82% in the third observation. The data shows that at each meeting, the percentage of motivation given by the teacher is not always the same, depending on the situation and conditions at the time of learning. The praise category has increased from the first, second, and third observations. The praise category in the first observation, which is 0.99%, has increased in the second observation by 2.14% to 3.13%. And in the third observation, it increased again by 1.69% to 4.82%. The data shows that teachers often give praise to motivate students to move forward. It is evidenced by the continuous increase from the first, second and third observations. The category of accepting students’ ideas has increased in the first, second, and third observations. In the first observation, the category of accepting students’ ideas has a percentage of 0.99%. The second observation increased by 0.05% to 1.04%, and in the third observation, it increased again by 0.16% to 1.20%. The data shows that teachers try to accept, clarify, build, or develop students’ ideas at every meeting during Indonesian language learning.

The question category in the second observation has the highest percentage compared to the first and third observations. In the second observation, the questioning category has a percentage of 25%, while the first and second observations in the questioning category are 20.79% and 21.69%, respectively. The data shows that the teacher often asks questions in learning activities, although the percentage of asking questions for the first, second, and third observations is different. The teacher asking questions has the most significant percentage during observation compared to other activities. The teacher always asks questions to provoke students to express their opinions in answering questions. The teaching categories in the first, second and third observations have different percentage values.

In the first observation, the teaching category is 6.93%, the second observation is 5.21%, and the third is 7.23%. The data shows that the percentage of teachers teaching at each meeting is not always the
same, depending on the materials/materials presented during the learning process. The categories leading to the first, second, and third observations have different percentages. In the first observation, the directing category as a percentage of 12.87%. The second observation decreased to 10.42%, and in the third observation, it increased to 13.25%. The data shows that the percentage of teachers directing at each meeting is not always the same, depending on the situation and conditions at the time of learning. The category of criticizing/giving reasons for the first, second, and third observations has different percentages. In the first observation, the category of criticizing/giving reasons has a percentage value of 2.97%. In the second observation, it increased by 0.16% to 3.13%. At the same time, the third observation decreased by 1.93% to 1.20%. The data shows that the percentage of teachers criticizing at each meeting is not always the same, depending on the situation and conditions at the time of learning. The results of the data analysis of teacher and student activity observations I, II, and III are presented in Table 2.

### Table 2. Teacher and Student Activities Observation I, II & III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observation I</th>
<th>Observation II</th>
<th>Observation III</th>
<th>Observation III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept student ideas</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>12.87%</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize / give reasons</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student response</td>
<td>27.72%</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>28.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Initiative</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet / crowded</td>
<td>11.88%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analysis of the activities carried out by students, it is known that the percentage of student activity in the first observation in responding to the teacher is lower at 27.72% compared to the second observation, which has increased by 4.57% to 32.29%. The third observation decreased by 3.37% to 28.92%. These data indicate that the response shown by students to the teacher is not always the same, depending on the stimulus given by the teacher and the conditions during the learning process. The percentage value of students expressing their initiative in the first observation was the highest at 4.95% compared to the second observation, which was 2.08%, and the third observation was 3.61%. The data shows that the students’ initiative in speaking is almost the same from the first to the third meeting. The percentage value of the crowd or silence in the first observation is lower at 3.3% compared to the percentage value in the second and third observations, which are 12.50% and 13.25%, respectively. The data shows how much noise is created when learning Indonesian takes place. The results of the analysis of the interaction variables of Indonesian learning in the first observation are presented in Table 3.

### Table 3. Results of the Analysis of Indonesian Language Learning Interaction Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interaction Characteristics</th>
<th>Observation I</th>
<th>Observation II</th>
<th>Observation III</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Speech Teacher (GB)</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>54.22</td>
<td>55.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Student Talk (SB)</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>31.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Silence (K)</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teacher Response Ratio (RRG)</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Student Initiative Ratio (RIS)</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teacher Direct Response Ratio (RRLG)</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>61.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Content Replacement Rate (RPK)</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>59.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Student Fixed Ratio (RTS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data regarding the interaction variables of Indonesian language learning in class II SDN 1 Pidpid above, it can be described that the proportion of teachers speaking (GB), Students speaking (SB), and Silence (K) shows the proportion of different activities between teachers and students. The speaking teacher (GB) has a percentage of 55.04%. It indicates that during the learning process, the interaction is centered on the teacher, namely the teacher, who is more active in the classroom than the students. Teacher activities include oral and written activities. The student’s speaking score (SB) is 31.41%. This value indicates the interaction spent by students during the lesson. These data indicate that students in learning tend to be more passive than teachers. On the other hand, the value of silence has a percentage of 12.95%. This value indicates that the noise and silence created in the learning process have a lower percentage than the percentage of speaking teachers and students. The data shows that teachers and students do a lot of activities related to the material compared to activities outside the material.

The teacher Response Ratio (RRG) of 43.83% indicates the tendency of teachers to react to student ideas. Teachers are pretty responsive in interacting with students. The teacher repeats the students’
answers to show their agreement. Sometimes teachers also give praise to students’ answers. The Student Initiative Ratio (RIS) indicates the proportion of student initiative in starting a conversation. The value of the Student Initiative Ratio (RIS) is 8.19%. It shows that students have little desire to express their ideas. It usually occurs in teacher-centered interactions where the teacher has power in the classroom, and students follow instructions. It indicates that students’ questions are only the result of the teacher’s stimulus (material explained by the teacher).

When students are silent, the teacher spontaneously provides stimulus to students by praising or uniting students’ ideas for discussion in class. It is indicated by the Teacher’s Direct Response Ratio (RRDG) value of 61.06%. This value indicates that the teacher is quite active in building the atmosphere. The teacher guides the class well by giving other material or questions that attract students to participate in the lesson. The content turnover ratio (RPK) shows how significant the teacher’s role is in directing the content of the conversation. The content turnover ratio value is 59.36%, indicating that teachers tend to direct students to specific topics. At the time of observation, the teacher uses statements and questions in providing information to students. After explaining, the teacher provides modeling so that students can understand what the teacher is saying. If the students’ ability to understand the material is good, then the teacher evaluates the students. The evaluation is carried out in the form of questions by asking questions related to the material that has been presented. The evaluation is used to determine the extent to which students’ ability to understand the material that has been given. Student Fixed Ratio (RTS) is an index of the speed of teacher-student interaction. The student’s fixed ratio value is 0%. This value indicates that there is no fast interaction between teachers and students.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the interaction pattern that occurs in learning is multidirectional, namely teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student interactions. Interaction in low-grade learning is teacher-centered, meaning that the teacher has the most significant power in learning, and students become the object of interaction. In learning to read children’s poetry, teachers and students give mutual responses, while student interactions with other students do not deviate from the teaching material. It is why the interaction pattern is multidirectional. Data on the results of Determining Student Learning Styles in Indonesian Language Learning were obtained from a questionnaire consisting of three aspects of learning styles, namely (1) visual learning styles, (2) auditory learning styles, and (3) kinesthetic learning styles. The respondents of this questionnaire were 51 students from three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District. The results of the analysis of determining student learning styles in Indonesian language learning conducted at SDN 1 Pidpid, SDN 1 Nawa Kerti, and SDN 1 Kesimpar are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LEARNING STYLE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the analysis in Table 4, it is found that the student’s learning style in Indonesian language learning that is most dominantly owned by students at SDN 1 Pidpid is a kinesthetic learning style, with a frequency distribution and percentage of each student, namely 4 students (25%) in visual learning styles, 4 students (25%) in the auditory learning style and 8 students (50%) in the kinesthetic learning style, at SDN 1 Nawa Kerti is the visual learning style, with the frequency distribution and the percentage of each student, namely 17 students (63%) in the learning style visual, 5 students (19%) in auditory learning style and 5 students (19%) in kinesthetic learning style, at SDN 1 Kesimpar is a visual learning style, with a frequency distribution and percentage of each student, namely 4 students (50%) in visual learning, 1 student (12.5%) in auditory learning style and 3 students (37.5%) in kinesthetic learning style, in Gugus VI, Abang sub-district, Karangasem district, is a visual learning style, with the distribution of the average results of the three study style r in cluster VI, Abang sub-district, Karangasem regency, namely visual (46%), auditory (18%) and kinesthetic (35.33%).

The findings were obtained from interviews conducted with fifth-grade teachers at SDN 1 Pidpid. From the dominant kinesthetic learning style used at SDN 1 Pidpid, various factors influence these students to use their learning styles, such as physical, psychological, family, and school factors. Associated with physical factors, when students experience illness (physical or spiritual), the student’s condition will weaken from this situation, which will undoubtedly affect students’ interest in learning Indonesian. Besides, it is inseparable from the psychological factors of students, which also significantly affect the
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tendency of kinesthetic learning styles at SDN 1 Pipid. According to the informant, the psychological factors of students are good, the enthusiasm for learning increases, and vice versa. When the psychological factors of students are low (attention), then the passion for learning tends to decrease. Furthermore, family and school factors have a massive role in supporting students’ abilities in the learning process and honing the learning styles that students tend to use.

The findings were obtained from interviews conducted with fifth-grade teachers at SDN 1 Nawa Kerti. From the dominant visual learning style used at SDN 1 Nawa Kerti, various factors influence these students to use their learning styles, such as physical, psychological, fatigue, family, and school factors. Regarding physical factors, when students are sick, their condition will automatically weaken, and students’ concentration will also decrease automatically. Students will not focus on learning. This situation will affect the learning style that students dominate in learning Indonesian. Besides that, it is inseparable from the psychological factors of students, which also significantly affect the tendency of kinesthetic learning styles at SDN 1 Nawa Kerti, namely, when the psychological factors of students are good, the student’s enthusiasm for learning increases and vice versa when the psychological factors of students are low (attention) then the passion for learning tends to decrease. Furthermore, family and school factors have a very big role in supporting students’ abilities in the learning process and honing the learning styles that students tend to use.

The findings were obtained from interviews conducted with fifth-grade teachers at SDN 1 Kesimpar. From the dominant visual learning style used at SDN 1 Kesimpar, various factors influence these students to use their learning styles, such as physical, psychological, fatigue, family, and school factors. Associated with physical factors, factors significantly affect the visual learning style of students. If students’ physical and spiritual health is disturbed, students will find it difficult to accept learning. Moreover, this situation will affect the dominant learning style that students choose to learn Indonesian. Besides that, it cannot be separated from the psychological factors of students, which also significantly affect the tendency of kinesthetic learning styles at SDN 1 Pipid, namely, when students’ psychological factors are good, students’ enthusiasm for learning increases and vice versa when students’ psychological factors are low (attention) then their passion for learning tends to decrease. Furthermore, family and school factors have a very big role in supporting students’ abilities in the learning process and honing the learning styles that students tend to use.

Data on factors that affect learning outcomes are based on three indicators, where each indicator has a sub-indicator. First, the physical indicator consists of two sub-indicators, namely the state of health and the state of the body. Second, the psychological indicator consists of four sub-indicators, namely attention, interest, talent, and readiness to take part in learning. Third, the school indicators consist of seven sub-indicators, namely curriculum, teaching methods, the interaction between students, discipline in schools, learning tools, building and library conditions in Indonesian language learning, obtained through an analysis observation sheet for fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang sub-district consisting of 51 students. The analysis of the observation sheet shows that the factors that influence the learning outcomes of Indonesian in three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, obtained different analysis results in each elementary school. The analysis results show that SDN 1 Pipid is 46.68 in the very influential category, SDN 1 Nawa Kerti has an average value of 42.15 in the influential category, and SDN 1 Kesimpar has an average value of 35.00 in the moderate category. Take effect. More specifically, the data on the results of the factors that influence the learning outcomes of Indonesian on the three indicators with sub-indicators are also described with the results of further analysis on each of these indicators. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of Data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Sub indicator</th>
<th>SDN 1 Pipid</th>
<th>SDN 1 Nawa</th>
<th>SDN 1 Kesimpar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3 (influence)</td>
<td>3 (influence)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body State</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>3.51 (very influential)</td>
<td>3.04 (influential)</td>
<td>2.63 (quite influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talent</td>
<td>3.25 (influential)</td>
<td>2.52 (quite influential)</td>
<td>2.13 (less influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>3.63 (very influential)</td>
<td>2.97 (influential)</td>
<td>2.63 (quite influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>psychic</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Method</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3.50 (very influential)</td>
<td>2.96 (influence)</td>
<td>2.50 (less influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>Learning Tools</td>
<td>3 (influence)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>3 (influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building Condition</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>2 (less influential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>4 (very influential)</td>
<td>2 (less influential)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, the analysis of Indonesian learning outcomes obtained from documentation studies in the form of archives of Indonesian language learning outcomes at three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, obtained different analytical results in each of these elementary schools. The analysis results are that SDN 1 Pidipid is in the high criteria with an average value of 81, SDN 1 Nawa Kerti is in the medium criteria with an average value of 71, and SDN 1 Kesimpar is in the low criteria with an average value of 64. Result data Research on student difficulties in learning to read fast for fifth-grade students at three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, was obtained from observations in class. Analysis of the observation sheet was carried out to get an overview of students’ difficulties in learning to read fast in general and the factors that influence the difficulty of reading quickly in three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, which was carried out by grouping per indicator of difficulty reading speed which consisted of three indicators, namely, 1) do not mumble, (2) focus on reading, (3) do not move the head, only the eyes move. In addition, it also describes the efforts made by the teacher in overcoming the difficulty of reading speed for fifth-grade students at three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, which was obtained from the results of interviews with the fifth-grade teacher.

Discussion

Students learning to read and write beginning are multidirectional. Multi-way interaction means that teachers and students respond to each other in interacting. Even students with one another also can have interactions that do not deviate from the learning material (Ariyani & Kristin, 2021; Iswardhany & Rahayu, 2020). The Teacher Response Ratio (RRG) value indicates that the teacher is quite responsive in responding to students’ ideas and initiatives. In contrast, the Student Initiative Ratio (RIS) value indicates that the proportion of students speaking in responding to the teacher and expressing ideas/initiatives is very high. The interaction of one student with another student occurs in the form of discussion. In learning, the teacher is very concerned about the situation and atmosphere in the classroom. It increases students’ learning motivation (Fanani, 2018; Pratiwi et al., 2021; Sutrisno & Siswanto, 2016). If students feel bored with learning, the teacher always does special tricks to make students excited again by making the atmosphere of the learning process fun for students. One of them is playing games. Learning while playing can also increase students’ learning motivation (Dewantara et al., 2019; Nurwahidah et al., 2021; Setyaningsih, 2019). The pattern of interaction that occurs in learning is multidirectional, namely teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student interactions. Multidirectional interaction is the same as multidirectional interaction. The direction of communication can occur from teacher to student, student to student, and student to teacher (Mulyana, 2017; Sucia, 2017). In learning, the teacher and students give each other a reciprocal response, while the interaction between students and other students is in the form of discussion. That is, the interaction of teachers and students takes place in a bond for educational and teaching purposes (Khayati et al., 2020; Salmia & Yusri, 2021). In the interaction process, the teacher can provide and develop motivation and reinforcement for students to carry out learning activities optimally (Musyarofah, 2018; Nisa & Sujarwo, 2020). So, the teacher-centered multi-way interaction pattern and the characteristics of teacher learning are fun and consistently provide opportunities for students to express ideas/initiatives that can improve reading and writing skills.

Students’ learning styles in learning Indonesian fifth-grade students at three elementary schools in cluster VI, Abang District, and Karangasem Regency have different learning styles. Students have visual, auditory, or kinesthetic learning styles (Noervadila et al., 2020; Sari, 2014). No student has the same learning style. There must be differences. Previous research also stated that not all students have the same way of learning, each showing differences (Farid, 2014; Mushurwati, 2018). In general, it can be seen from the description of the data on the learning styles of students in Indonesian learning that most of them are in the good and very good categories. In general, students’ learning styles can be seen by how much they use their learning styles. It is in line with previous research, which stated that student learning styles are closely related to students’ personalities (Ningrat & Sumantri, 2019; Noervadila et al., 2020). It causes the teacher to be aware of the existence of different types of students. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that students’ learning motivation in learning Indonesian is different in the three elementary schools. Different analysis results are obtained in each indicator of learning motivation, which consists of being diligent in doing assignments, being tenacious in facing difficulties, getting bored quickly with routine tasks, and being happy to find and solve problems. It cannot be separated from the role of teachers who always try to guide and direct their students to take part in Indonesian language learning well according to the plans that have been designed by the teacher (Ulya et al., 2016; Widiash et al., 2018). It can be interpreted that each fifth-grade teacher in three elementary schools in Cluster VI, Abang District, Karangasem Regency always tries to play themselves as a learning motivation booster in learning Indonesian. The critical role of motivation in learning is: first, determining things that can be used as learning reinforcement when students are faced with a problem (Awe & Benge, 2017; Dania et al., 2020).
Second, clarifying the learning objectives, namely, students will be interested in learning something if what is learned is at least known by students. Third, determine the persistence of learning. If the child is motivated, then the student will try to learn something well and diligently.

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known the factors that influence student learning motivation. On the psychological indicator, the curiosity sub-indicator, obtained from the observations of fifth-grade students at three Elementary Schools in Group VI, Abang District, Karangasem Regency, showed high curiosity in following the learning process, especially in learning Indonesian. The findings of previous studies also state that two factors influence learning outcomes, namely, internal factors (internal) and external factors (Fujiyanto et al., 2016; Ge, 2019; Moll-Khosrawi et al., 2021; Widiasih et al., 2018). First, internal factors can be grouped into physiological and psychological factors (Friantary & Martina, 2018; Ulya et al., 2016). Physiological factors that can affect learning outcomes, such as the state of health and the state of the body, are physical factors. Psychological factors that affect learning outcomes include attention, interest, talent, and readiness. The readiness of students to learn is the initial knowledge that students have in participating in learning (Faidiban & Sombok, 2019; Riwayhty, 2015). Second, external factors affecting student learning outcomes include the curriculum, methods, facilities and infrastructure, and learning media. The findings of previous studies also state that appropriate learning material is needed so that students can master and understand the learning material (Sari et al., 2020; Sheth et al., 2020). Other findings also state that suitable learning methods significantly affect student learning outcomes (Kusumayani et al., 2019; Rachmawati, 2018). Other findings also state that facilities and infrastructure affect learning activities (Basuki, 2017; Miski, 2018). Learning media can also support the success of learning activities (Hartini et al., 2017; Saripudin et al., 2018; Yusuf & Widyaningsih, 2020). It was concluded that many factors influence student success in learning. Teachers must pay attention to each of these factors so that the learning difficulties experienced by students are reduced.

4. Conclusion

Based on this description, the conclusions of this research are the first factors that influence the learning outcomes of Indonesian, namely internal and external factors. Internal factors include physical factors and psychological factors. External factors are school factors such as curriculum, teaching methods, the interaction between students, discipline in schools, learning tools, building conditions, and libraries. Difficulty in speed reading for fifth graders in Cluster VI, Abang Sub-district, based on three indicators: not mumbling, mind focused on reading, not moving the head, and only moving eyes.
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