



## Enhancing Teacher-Students Interaction in Urban and Rural Schools in Pekalongan

Indah Handayani,<sup>✉</sup> Zulfa Sakhiyya, Abdurrahman Faridi

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article History:

Accepted 30 March 2023

Approved 8 June 2023

Published 23

December 2023

#### Keywords:

Teacher-student interaction, urban schools, rural schools, SETT framework.

### Abstract

Urban and rural contexts often present different challenges and dynamics in education. There is a gap in terms of infrastructure, resources, teacher training and student backgrounds between urban and rural schools. The research focuses on understanding the differences and similarities in teacher-student interactions between urban and rural schools in Pekalongan, Indonesia. The research uses a qualitative approach and employs the SETT framework proposed by Walsh (2006) for data analysis. Two schools, one from an urban setting and another from a rural setting in Pekalongan, were selected as the research settings. The findings indicate that all four classroom modes (managerial, material, skill and system, and classroom context) are present in both urban and rural school lesson. Teachers in both settings engage in various interactional features. However, the use of interactional features in urban school needs to be improve to enhance student engagement. The study's significance lies in providing valuable insights for educators, policymakers, and curriculum developers in Pekalongan and similar settings. It highlights the importance of teacher-student interactions in improving English language learning experiences and outcomes for students. By addressing the disparities in education quality between urban and rural contexts, this research can contribute to enhancing the overall quality of education in both settings. In summary, this research sheds light on the crucial role of teacher-student interactions in urban and rural schools, offering a pathway to address educational disparities and improve learning experiences for students in Pekalongan and similar environments.

<sup>✉</sup>Correspondence Address :

Jl. Kelud Utara III No.15, Kel. Petompon, Kec. Gajahmungkur, Kota

Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50237

E-mail: indahhandayani@student.unnes.ac.id

**p-ISSN 2087-0108**

**e-ISSN 2502-4566**

## INTRODUCTION

Teaching English as a foreign language is a challenging task both in urban and rural areas in Indonesia. As stated by Endriyati et al. (2019), educating students in English at both rural and urban schools involves unique difficulties related to the students themselves, the educators, and the available resources. Further, the teachers should have the ability to encourage the students to have a good attitude, enthusiasm, and motivation to learn English. However, Rural schools face more numerous challenges, including poor working conditions, inadequate teacher competence for rural settings, isolation, and inadequate rewards, as observed by (Shikalepo, 2020). Additional challenges for EFL teachers in rural schools such as classroom management, educational materials, teaching methods, learners' English skills, motivation, learning support facilities, internet connectivity, and parental support (Ahmad & Triastuti, 2021; Daar & Nasar, 2021; Ikram & Rosidah, 2020; Kusuma, 2022; Mudra, 2018)

In the context of education, the interaction between teachers and students plays a crucial role in determining the quality of the learning and teaching process. Pratiwi (2018) stated, that teacher talks are a crucial factor because teachers construct or obstruct learner participation in classroom interaction through their choice of language. Moreover, Salehi (2019) stated, that teacher and student interaction and even lesson programs as an important components of a school for achieving goals. Student interactions improve the development of classroom inclusiveness (Sembiring, 2018; Suhaili & Haywood, 2017).

Moreover, there are many studies on classroom interaction, these studies sought to identify the characteristics of teachers' students' language use and classroom interaction strategy (Al-zahrani & Al-bargi, 2017; Matra, 2014; Nisa, 2014; Prastowo et al., 2023; Rido & Sari, 2018; Sundari et al., 2017; Tiwari, 2021; Yu, 2019; Yulia & Budiharti, 2019; Yulyana, 2015).

This interaction occurs in every educational setting, but there are distinct nuances

that differentiate experiences in urban and rural schools. These differences not only reflect geographic and demographic diversity but also highlight how social and cultural environments influence educational approaches. As Ling et al. (2020) said that teaching location is significantly related to the socio-demographic condition.

Furthermore, several studies utilizing the SETT framework for analyzing classroom interaction have been conducted. In the study conducted by (Junior et al., 2021), they observed limited use of classroom context mode. Another study by (Hartono et al., 2021) revealed that teachers predominantly employed two modes, namely managerial mode and skill and system mode, both of which played essential roles in helping teachers achieve their teaching objectives. Additionally, Hariri et al. (2022) mentioned in their research that teacher-student interactions align with the SETT framework, effectively guiding students toward achieving pedagogic goals. It can be seen that The SETT framework comprehensively assesses teacher-student interactions, its structured approach, and its applicability in various educational contexts.

The research identified several critical gaps in the existing literature. These gaps include the need for a more detailed exploration of how challenges in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) education impact teacher-student interactions, a limited comparative analysis between teacher-student interactions in urban and rural school settings, the necessity for a deeper examination of the application of the SETT framework, and a comprehensive understanding of how different interaction modes influence pedagogic goals in diverse educational settings.

To address these gaps, the research attempts to examine how teachers and students interact during English lessons at urban and rural schools in Pekalongan and investigate the differences in teacher and students' interaction during the English lessons between urban and rural schools in Pekalongan. This research aims to provide valuable insights for educators, policymakers, and curriculum developers in Pekalongan and similar settings, ultimately

enhancing English language learning experiences and outcomes for students.

## **METHOD**

This research employed a qualitative approach, a case study. This research was carried out at two different schools: a school, representing an urban school, and a school, representing a rural school. The participants in this research included 11th-grade students of an English class at an urban school, along with their English teacher (T1), and 11th-grade Science students of an English class at a rural school, along with their English teacher (T2). Several instruments were utilized to collect data and gain a comprehensive understanding of teacher-student interactions in both urban and rural school settings such as observation, recording, interview, and document analysis. The instrument was developed from the SETT Framework by Walsh (2006).

In this research, several data collection methods were employed to gather a comprehensive understanding of teacher-student interactions in both urban and rural school settings. Firstly, classroom observations were conducted, and interactions between teachers and students during English lessons were accurately recorded. Secondly, interviews were carried out with both teachers, namely T1 and T2, allowing for valuable insights into their perspectives and teaching approaches. Lastly, document analysis played a crucial role as documents related to the English lessons, including teaching materials and lesson plans, were carefully examined. After all the data had been gathered, the data was transcribed and analyzed.

The data analysis in this research followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach, involving a systematic six-phase process. Initially, researchers immersed themselves in the data through repeated readings of source materials and transcriptions of interviews. Subsequently, initial codes were generated to identify underlying constructs within the dataset. The focus then shifted to seeking themes within these

initial codes, involving a comprehensive reading of all transcriptions to gradually identify and examine individual themes. These themes were reviewed and organized, facilitated by the SETT framework, guiding the analysis of classroom interaction. In the next phase, conclusions were drawn, patterns and relationships among themes were identified, and connections to the overarching research question were made. Finally, the process concluded with the production of a report, incorporating a verification step to ensure the validity of findings, resulting in a concise and evidence-based presentation tailored to the initial research question.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This section delves into the research findings and their corresponding discussions. The study involved two teachers, identified as Teacher 1 (T1) from an urban school and Teacher 2 (T2) from a rural school. The research was guided by the SETT Framework by Walsh (2006) that there are four distinct modes that teachers can employ during their lessons. The following sections will provide a detailed explanation of each finding.

### **Teacher and students' interaction in urban school**

The research conducted in an English class at urban schools in Pekalongan, particularly in class XI-6, revealed that teacher-student interactions were significantly influenced by the teacher's adeptness in implementing four specific modes: managerial mode, materials mode, skills and systems mode, and classroom context mode. These modes are crucial for aligning teachers' pedagogic goals with the interactional features used in class to ensure effective teaching. The result of interactional features can be seen below.




Figure 1 Interactional features of urban school

Based on Figure 1, 'Seeking Clarification' which refers to the attempts made by students and teacher to ask for clarification occupies the highest frequency in an urban school setting. This type of interaction received 48 (18, 39%) responses. This pattern highlights a strong emphasis on understanding and transparent communication, evidenced by the students' frequent requests for explanations and the teacher's efforts to ensure comprehension. Other significant interactional features included extended teacher turn and teacher echo, which reflect the teacher's role in elaborating information and reinforcing student contributions supported by referential questions being used by T1 to encourage the students to participate. As Pratiwi (2018) said, Teacher talks are a crucial factor because teachers construct or obstruct learner participation in classroom interaction through their choice of language. The interaction between the teacher and students during the English lesson in XI-6 in the urban school setting can be further understood by examining four distinct modes. The four modes, aligned with their interactional features and typical pedagogic goals, are presented below.

### 1. Managerial Mode

The managerial mode appeared at the beginning, middle, and end of teaching-learning process.

#### Extract 1

- 1 T1: Good afternoon, everyone,
- 2 Ss: Afternoon mam, how are you?
- 3 T1: Good, fine, oke
- 4 T1: Oke let me check your attendance.  
Apin, andre, nadi, Nailah, Sabrina, Shakira
- 5 T1: The last time i asked you to write about analytical exposition Text. I have read. I have already read some of them. I just read. I haven't taken any score may next week. Some of you did good. But today we are not gonna talk about it. Mam baru baca-baca saja. Kayaknya juga banyak yang hanya copy paste dari internet. Ada yang sudah bagus mengembangkan poin argumennya. Ada yang copast saja. Oke, saya hargai usaha copy-pastenya kalian.
- 6 Ss: Haha
- 7 Ss: Aku ga mam,
- 8 T1: Oke for today We still diiscussing about analytical exposition text.  
So today we will have reading activity. I have shared the text on your whatsapp group. Can you open the text for me. This is again of the example of analytical exposition Hari ini kita akan membaca dan ada aktivitas berkelompok nanti dalam reading comprehension atau pemahaman bacaan. Have you? Sudah semua dibuka Teksnnya?
- 9 Ss: Sudah

In the extract above, the teacher began the lesson with a warm greeting like in line 1 "Good afternoon, everyone", which was reciprocated by the students. The teacher also called out names for attendance, ensuring all students were present. This process was essential for maintaining order and accountability in the classroom. It helped the teacher to track participation and engagement, which were key aspects of effective classroom management. T1 seamlessly transitioned into outlining the learning objectives. This managerial mode was characterized by her ability to organize the learning space, efficiently manage time, and

smoothly navigate between various learning activities.

Besides, at the beginning of class, managerial mode appeared in mid of teaching-learning process.

**Extract 2**

124 T1: *ya. Sekarang yang 6, Saya tunjuk Ketuanya. Ketuanya adalah. Satu, Basir. Silahkan maju. Maju Basir. Rifki, Rifki, kelompok dua. Ayo maju. Tadi berapa kelompok?*

125 Ss: 5

126 T1: *5 ya. Baser sini. Refki sana. Terus Naila. Ketua. Iya, tepuk tangan buat ketuanya. Nanti sebentar. Emm si Apin. Satu, dua, tiga, empat. Kurang satu lagi. Si cewek satu lagi, Sakira. Nah, kamu sana ra fin. Nah, sekarang sebagai ketua kelompok, karena kita menerapkan Merdeka Belajar, kalian silakan bebas cari anggota, terserah kalian mau dipilih yang mana saja. Boleh mau perempuan semua, tapi yang jelas Itu terserah ya, karena itu akan mempengaruhi kegiatan kalian nanti. Karena disini ada beberapa yang harus kalian kerjakan. (2)*

*Oke, kita mulai dari Basir dulu.*

127 S4: *Amar. Amar.*

128 T1: *Terus? Jangan Jangan circle-nya kamu ajar ya di luar circle. Next, second? Enggak, enggak. Basir Basir dulu.*

129 S10: *Jidin.*

130 T1: *Oke. Amar, jidin, Terus? Next?*

131 S4: *Andre.*

132 T1: *Amar Jidin. Andre Next?*

133 S4: *Meilandri.*

134 T1: *Oke, next? Melandri, oke. Satu lagi?*

135 S4: *Yosef*

136 T1: *oke. Silahkan kamu ke lompok sendiri. Silahkan yang sudah ditunjuk ketuanya, Basir.*

In the extract 2, the managerial approach seems to organize the learning environment. The way the teacher formed groups and assigned leadership roles provided a clear example of how students can be actively encouraged to participate and take on responsibilities in a classroom. T1 played an active role in guiding group formation, encouraging students like Amar, Jidin, Andre,

Meilandri, and Yosef to join specific groups. This approach struck a balance between giving students autonomy and providing structured guidance. In this section, T1 frequently used teacher echo and confirmation checks for confirmation and clarification purposes, aligning with Walsh's (2011) idea that the teacher's echoing reinforces the truth and strengthens the learner's contributions to the entire class.

The managerial mode also appeared at the end of class where the teacher concludes the learning activity. It is in line with Walsh (2011) that managerial use for summary or conclude activity.

In summary, the use of pedagogic goals in managerial mode resonates with Walsh's (2011) assertion that the principal pedagogic purpose is to manage learning, encompassing task setup, summarization, and feedback provision. The interactions involved elements like scaffolding, evident in the teacher providing task-related information, turn completion for enhancing students' responses, and referential questions to prompt text engagement. Additionally, the extended teacher turn was prominent in the teacher's comprehensive explanation of previous assignments and the current reading activity. Understanding the nuanced application of managerial mode contributes to effective teaching practices. this study emphasizes the importance of a dynamic and adaptive managerial approach in fostering positive learning environments. The findings can guide educators in enhancing their pedagogical strategies for optimal student engagement and participation.

**2. Material mode**

Further, in her teaching, the teacher frequently utilized the Material Mode, which emphasized the content related analytical exposition texts.

**Extract 3**

180 T1: *May I have your attention please? Biar duduk dulu teman-temannya.*

*Later you are supposed to answer some questions. I have this worksheet for you. Attention please.*

*Later you are supposed to choose some questions.*

181 T1: *There are score 10, 20, 30, 40, And 50*

In the extract above, the teacher's use of a worksheet with questions of varying difficulty levels (scored from 10 to 50) fell under the Material Mode. This mode was characterized by interactions that revolved around specific learning materials. The worksheet served as the central focus of the activity, guiding the students' engagement with the content. The task encouraged active participation and critical thinking. Students were not just passive receivers of information; they were actively engaged in the learning process by choosing questions and associating them with scores. This aligned with the concept of scaffolding (especially extension and modeling), as it encouraged students to extend their thinking and understanding beyond the basic level.

#### **Extract 4**

226 S10: *Mana Well educated? Ya, explain gak sih?*

227 S11: *Ini bagaimana?*

228 T1: *Ada tulisan explain gak? Gak ada ya berarti enggak. Tapi hati-hati ya bisa lower dari 40. Come on, Jidin. Ini yang ngambil ini tadi siapa ya? Lepas ya dari sticky note nya?*

229 S: *Ya, soalnya gak nempel.*

230 T1: *Come on, second question come on. Ya, ambil lagi dong. Apa itu*

231 S12: *Kurang setuju. Kurang (they have discussion)*

232 T1: *Kurang setuju kenapa?*

233 S12: *Kurang setuju karena ini itu kurikulum merdeka the best education sistem. Aku jawabnya kurang setuju*

234 T1: *The best education system, berarti yang terbaik. Sistem pendidikan yang terbaik, karena disitu bukan good tapi best. Yang terbaik itu berarti diantara yang baik, berarti yang paling keren, yang paling bagus.*

235 S12: *Pasti ada kelemahannya,*

236 T1: *Oke. Kalau kamu ga setuju argumenmu apa?*

The interaction above, allowed for extended learner turns, where students express their viewed in multiple utterances such as (S12's) explanation of why they disagree with the

statement). Teacher echo was found when the teacher repeated or summarized the students' points to reinforce their contributions or to clarify them for the class. Seeking clarification was also evident "*Kurang setuju kenapa?*" where the teacher asks students to elaborate on their responses, promoting deeper engagement with the topic. Moreover, T1 provided feedback on the students' content rather than the language used. This is seen when the teacher clarified the meaning of "the best education system" and prompted the student to think about the implications of this description. T1 encouraged students to not only state their opinions but also to provide reasons and arguments.

In conclusion, the teacher's engaging and thought-provoking activities by using reading chains, and differentiated worksheets, were employed to stimulate active student involvement and foster critical thinking. This mode was marked by a consistent use of IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) patterns. Here, the teacher-initiated discussions elicited student responses, and provided constructive feedback, thereby creating a dynamic learning environment. The design of the tasks was particularly noteworthy, as they were crafted to engage students interactively with the material. These activities encouraged students to delve deeply into the subject matter, promoting critical analysis and the practical application of their newfound knowledge. As suggested by (Walsh, 2011), maintaining a balanced approach in IRF sequences is essential for effective learning. The classroom interactions observed, with 'Seeking Clarification' being a significant aspect, reflect this balance adeptly. The frequent use of scaffolding, content feedback, and extended learner turn resonates with the interactional patterns described in Walsh's (2011) highlights how these interactional features can enhance understanding and pedagogical effectiveness. Students were not passive recipients of knowledge; rather, they actively initiated dialogues through their questions. This not only demonstrated learner autonomy but also indicated a high level of student engagement a pivotal element in the learning process.

### 3. System and Skill mode

Moreover, in Skills and System Mode, the teacher focused on developing students' language skills, particularly through reading activities. It can be seen below.

#### Extract 5

- 44 T1: *A Good? Kalau God, O nya Satu. Ha Ha ha*  
 45 T1: *Haiyer*  
 46 S7: *A good education tends to lead to a higher paying job, as well as provide you with the skills needed to get there. Halimah*  
 47 S8: *In order for the entire world*  
 48 T1: *Entaya (correct student error)*  
 49 S8: *In order for the entire world to really become equal, it needs to start with education. If everyone was provided with the same opportunities to education, then there would be less gaps between social classes. Everyone would be able to have an equal chance at higher paying jobs — not just those that are already well-off.*  
 50 T1: *Haiyer. Halimah, oke.*  
 51 S8: *Everyone would be able to have an equal chance at higher paying jobs — not just those that are already well-off. Vega*

The reading chain exercise was a notable example, enhancing students' listening and reading skills. The teacher provided scaffolding by modeling the reading and corrected pronunciation, when necessary, which was essential for practicing language accuracy. This mode was critical for building language proficiency and comprehension skills. The teacher uses scaffolding techniques to build upon students' existing knowledge and understanding. Feedback was not limited to correctness but also included content comprehension and language use. Teacher Interruption provided by T1 to correct students' errors.

### 4. Classroom Context Mode

The teacher's ability to connect classroom content with students' personal experiences and aspirations was a highlight of this mode. By engaging students in discussions about their future careers and relating these discussions to the lesson's content, the teacher made the learning

experience more relevant and enjoyable. The interaction can be seen below.

#### Extract 6

- 85 T1: *Next, the third argument ya, argumen ketiga. If you can dream it, you can achieve it. Education is the most powerful weapon you can possibly have and with it you can make all your dreams come true. Maksudnya? Maksudnya?*  
 86 S8: *Pendidikan menjadi senjata yang paling kuat*  
 87 T1: *Senjata yang paling kuat untuk apa zel?*  
 88 S8: *Mencapai masa depan atau mimpi kalian.*  
 89 T1: *Yaa. Apa cita-cita kalian?*  
 90 S8: *Pengusaha,*  
 91 T1: *Oke. Ada yang mau jadi artis? Ada Ada yang mau jadi artis?*  
 92 S24: *Jian mam jian*  
 93 T1: *Jian mau jadi artis?*  
 94 T1: *Sekarang pekerjaan yang sedang in sekarang itu jadi influencer ya? Nah, content creator. Mungkin nanti Jihan mau jadi seorang content creator ya. Kita doakan aja.*  
 T1: *Ada yang mau jadi guru gak?*  
 95 Ss: *Gakkkk*  
 96 T1: *Ya. Kenapa gak mau jadi guru? Kenapa? Kenapa?*  
 97 S24: *Oh, because ya, because we have a bad temper person.*  
 98 S20: *Kamu emosinya Setipis tisu.*  
 99 Ss: *Haha*  
 100 T1: *Jadi kalau muridmu gak mengerjakan tugas, terus kamu?*  
 101 S24: *Paling KDRT*

In this classroom excerpt, the teacher was facilitating a discussion about the third argument presented in a reading passage on education. The teacher asked students to interpret the meaning of a quote about education encouraging them to think critically about the text and express their understanding. S8 responded by summarizing the quote in their own words, indicating engagement with the content. The teacher then personalizes the discussion by asking about the students' aspirations "Apa cita-cita kalian?" ("What is your dream?"), making the topic more relatable and engaging. It indicated transition from skill and system mode into classroom context mode. The conversation shifts to different career aspirations,

with the teacher mentioning contemporary roles like 'influencer' and 'content creator'. This approach kept the discussion lively and relevant to the students' interests.

This segment of the class demonstrates an engaging and student-centered approach to teaching. The teacher effectively uses various strategies to maintain student interest, foster critical thinking, and encourage personal connections to the material. The integration of humor and personalization makes the learning experience more enjoyable and meaningful for the students.

### Teacher and students' interaction in rural school

This analysis of English lessons in a rural school setting in Pekalongan found that teacher-student interactions were significantly influenced by factors such as student motivation and the teacher's skill in implementing various classroom modes: Managerial, Materials, Skills and Systems, and Classroom Context. These modes, crucial in aligning with the teacher's pedagogic goals, reflect the interactional features utilized in the class. It resonates with (Ahmad & Triastuti, 2021; Daar & Nasar, 2021; Ikram & Rosidah, 2020; Kusuma, 2022; Mudra, 2018), but in this context, it found a disparity where T2 chose material related to the students' lives to make students easier in catch the material. The interactional features can be seen below.




Figure 2. Interactional fetures of rural school

In Figure 2, it can be seen seeking clarification was 31 (14.35%). This was the most frequent interactional feature, demonstrating a strong focus on ensuring understanding through questions and clarification from both students and the teacher. The second place was extended teacher turn 30 (13.89%). This indicated that the teacher took considerable time to explain concepts or instructions, which suggests a teacher-centered approach at times. The third was scaffolding, the numbers were 27 (12.5%). This indicated that the teacher actively provided support to build upon students' responses to enhance their learning. And is followed by the display questions. As Walsh (2011) stated teachers who seek clarification can maximize their learning potential than those who do not but rather than following by referential questions, T2 often used display questions. The interaction between the teacher and students during the English lesson at rural school setting can be further understood by examining four distinct modes. The four modes, together with their interactional features and typical pedagogic goals, are presented below.



### 1. Managerial mode

The managerial mode appeared at the beginning, middle, and end of teaching learning process at rural school.

#### Extract 7

19 T2: *Oke class kemarin kita sudah belajar tentang apa ya? Masih Masih ingat enggak?*

20 Ss: *Song, lagu*

21 T2: *Oke, Meaning Through song. Terus hari ini kita masuk ke topik yang baru. Today we will study about explanation text. Pernah dengar enggak?*

22 Ss: *Ekplanasi, pernah*

The teacher in this interaction initiated the discussion by prompting students to recall the previous lesson. A transition was made to introduce the new subject, allowing students to mentally prepare. The teacher inquired about students' prior knowledge, aiding in assessing their starting point. This approach aligns with the Managerial Mode of the SETT framework, specifically in transitioning between topics and setting the stage for new learning. T2 effectively utilized scaffolding features, sought clarification, and took an extended turn to smoothly transition from the previous lesson to the new topic.

### 2. Material Mode

In the Materials Mode, the teacher effectively utilized various resources to facilitate learning. However, the observed student responses were typically short and straightforward. This aligns with Walsh (2002) observation that display questions often elicit shorter responses, limiting opportunities for extended student interaction. It can be seen in the extract below.

#### Extract 8

92 T2: *Oke, I have a picture. Look at me please. What is the picture about? Kira-kira Kira-kira gambar ini tentang apa?*

93 Ss: *Proses terjadinya hujan.*

94 T2: *Kalian tau, pelajaran apa sih kalau proses terjadinya hujan itu?*

95 S8: *Biologi*

96 T2: *Iya benar biologi kan?*

97 Ss: *Iya. Fisika, biologi.*

In extract 8, the teacher initiated the material mode by presenting a visual media. This visual element engaged students and served as a tangible material for discussion and enhancing the learning experience. T2 extends the interaction by asking about the subject of the lesson related to the picture and acknowledging correct responses. It showed a display question, by asking, "What is the picture about?" the teacher encouraged students to observe, analyze, and make inferences based on the visual material.

### 3. Skill and System Mode

The Skills and Systems Mode was evident through the teacher's focus on language proficiency. The teacher's efforts in providing feedback and reinforcing correct language usage, as illustrated in the extract below.

#### Extract 9

331 T2: *Ya itu explanation text. Terus social functionnya, fungsi socialnya apa? Yang tadi masih banyak bingung.*

332 S3: *Menjelaskan sesuatu yang kenapa suatu hal terhjadi.*

333 T2: *Dalam bahasa Inggris. English English please.*

334 S1: *Explain Why or how something happend*

335 T2: *Terus strukturnya apa saja?*

336 Ss: *Title, genral statement, closing*

The teacher engaged students in an interactive dialogue, prompting them to respond in English to reinforce language skills. The teacher corrected and provided feedback as students attempted to express themselves in English. This corrective feedback was essential for refining language skills, ensuring that students grasp the nuances of using English in the context of explanation texts. The interaction aligns with the Skills and Systems mode as T2 focuses on language skills (expressing social function and identifying structural components) related to understanding and producing explanation texts. Walsh (2002) notes the importance of minimizing error correction during oral fluency activities to

maintain interaction flow, a balance observed in the teacher's approach.

#### 4. Classroom Context Mode

The Classroom Context Mode was effectively employed, connecting lesson content with students' external factors like beliefs and cultural contexts. The teacher's use of real-life examples and cultural references, as seen in

##### Extract 10

40 T2: *Tapi Kalian pernah gak bertanya-tanya, kenapa ya Petung Kriono itu dingin banget? Kenapa ya di Petong Kriono itu sering hujan tiap hari? Padahal di tempat lain itu jarang hujan, tapi kenapa ya di Petong Kriono itu sering hujan tiap hari? Padahal Padahal di tempat lain itu jarang hujan. Tapi Tapi kenapa ya di Petungkriyono itu hujannya hampir tiap hari?*

T2: *Terus kalian pernah enggak bertanya-tanya, emang hujan itu gimana sih proses terjadinya hujan? Pasti pernah ya tanya-tanya kayak gitu kan? Nah, terus selain kayak gitu nih misalkan kayak gini, kalian pernah gak ngerasain kalau seusia kalian kan pernah ngerasain jatuh cinta kan? Falling in love. Tapi kalian pernah gak sih bertanya how atau why we fall in love?*

T2: *Kenapa ya kita kok bisa ngerasain rasanya jatuh cinta itu gimana? Kayak gitu. Cuman ngerasain aja, tapi gak tau alasannya gimana. Atau gimana sih sampai kita bisa ngerasain perasaan kayak gitu. Kayak Kayak gitu ya.*

41 Ss: yaa

The teacher asked students to reflect on local phenomena, like the weather in Petungkriyono which was their environment. It is in line with the teacher's statement "Their English skills are still low; their vocabulary is limited so they have to take it slow. Usually, I use vocab that is familiar to them as it relates to the environment where they live so they have a reference in their heads" (T2. Int 10). Additionally, the teacher incorporated relatable experiences, such as falling in love, to encourage personal reflection, making the lesson more relatable. Through casual and relatable questions, the teacher bridges potential language and

cultural gaps. By incorporating local cultural references and using everyday language, the teacher ensured that students felt comfortable expressing themselves and sharing their experiences.

#### Differences between urban and rural school

To compare the interactions during English lessons in urban and rural school settings in Pekalongan, distinct approaches and dynamics emerge in the teaching and learning processes. These differences are influenced by various factors, including the teacher's experience, class size, session duration, and available resources.

The differences between urban and rural teachers were clearly seen in using L1/L2 during the lesson. The portion of rural teacher and their students in L1 was higher than urban teacher and students. T2 said in her interview "Generally, I use the GTM (Grammar-Translation Method). I don't use pure English. If I use full English, the students can't understand". Yet Instead of using the GTM (Grammar-Translation Method), the teacher more often uses Indonesian. However, the use of GTM method will make the students get used to being familiar with the vocabulary used. The students in rural areas need special treatment because they have limited English skills and only some students who can attend college (Monk, 2007).

Furthermore, In the urban school, the T2 possessed 18 years of teaching experience and managed a larger class of 36 students, whereas the rural T2 had around 5 years of experience with a smaller class of 24 students. Additionally, the session duration in the urban school was 90 minutes, while it was 60 minutes in the rural school. The long experience of T1 makes her skillful in managing the classroom.

Regarding interactional features, the urban school teacher employed a diverse range of strategies, including seeking clarification, extended teacher turns, teacher echo, scaffolding, referential questions, extended learner turns, and content feedback. These features indicated a strong emphasis on ensuring student understanding, providing support, and encouraging active student participation. In

contrast, the rural school teacher predominantly utilized seeking clarification, extended teacher turns, scaffolding, teacher echo, and turn completion, suggesting a more teacher-centered approach to guide student learning.

Furthermore, teaching modes differed between the two settings. T1 adopted a balanced mix of Managerial, Material, Skills and System, and Classroom Context Modes, fostering a dynamic and student-centered learning environment. Activities such as reading chains and group discussions were incorporated. In contrast, the rural school teacher T2 employed diverse modes but leaned toward a more teacher-centered approach, focusing on guiding student understanding through scaffolding, extended teacher explanations, and personalized discussions.

In terms of classroom engagement and resources, the T1 stood out for its highly engaging classroom environment, featuring interactive activities and effective use of media resources. The rural school, while maintaining engagement, had a more teacher-centered approach with elements of display question. T2 often used display questions rather than referential questions in teaching-learning process. Whereas Matra (2014) stated the questions in classroom interaction given by the teachers will lead the students' interest and curiosity. This strongly corroborates Walsh's (2002) assertion that display questions usually elicit brief or less complex responses from students, potentially impeding the learning process. To enhance learning situations, it is advisable to complement display questions with additional techniques like seeking clarification and referential questions. Employing such follow-up strategies can stimulate discussions and contribute to the enhancement of students' oral fluency.

Lastly, the urban school demonstrated adaptability in teaching methods and integrated technology, using platforms like WhatsApp for text sharing. In contrast, the rural school did not incorporate technology due to challenges related to its geographical location, where unstable internet signals and limited connectivity were prevalent issues. It is in line with previous studies

by (Ahmad & Triastuti, 2021; Daar & Nasar, 2021; Ikram & Rosidah, 2020; Kusuma, 2022; Mudra, 2018). They identified multiple obstacles for EFL teachers in rural schools. These obstacles, learning support facilities, and internet connectivity. In summary, these differences highlight the diverse approaches to teaching and learning in urban and rural school settings. While both settings employed effective teaching strategies, the urban school's larger class size and longer session duration allowed for more varied use of interactional features and teaching modes. Conversely, the rural school, with its smaller class size and shorter duration, focused on teacher-led interactions but maintained student engagement through personalized discussions and real-world relevance. These findings underline the importance of adapting teaching strategies to suit the specific needs and contexts of students in urban and rural areas.

## CONCLUSION

The findings highlight that these interactions are significantly influenced by the teacher's use of various classroom modes. In urban schools, teachers employed a dynamic and interactive teaching approach, demonstrating a balanced use of these modes. On the other hand, rural teachers, while also utilizing these modes, tended to lean towards a more teacher-centered approach. This difference in teaching approaches was influenced by factors such as student motivation and the availability of resources. The research underlined the critical importance of effective teacher-student interaction in creating engaging and productive learning environments, regardless of the geographical context. Urban schools exhibited a wider variety of interactional features and teaching modes, driven by factors like larger class sizes and longer session durations. In contrast, rural schools, while maintaining student engagement, faced challenges related to limited resources and shorter session times, which impacted their interaction dynamics. These findings emphasize the necessity for context-sensitive teaching approaches in diverse educational settings.

Adapting teaching methods to suit the specific needs and constraints of urban and rural schools can help create more effective learning experiences for students.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, P., & Triastuti, A. (2021). EFL teachers' experiences during the pandemic: stories from rural area in Tungkai Ilir district. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 8(2), 297–308.
- Al-zahrani, M. Y., & Al-bargi, A. (2017). The impact of teacher questioning on creating interaction in EFL: a discourse analysis. *English Language Teaching*, 10(6), 135–150.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Daar, G. F., & Nasar, I. (2021). Teachers challenges in the learning process during the covid-19 pandemic in rural areas. *JINOTEP (Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pembelajaran)*, 8(2), 186–193.
- Endriyati, Prabowo, Abasa, & Akmal. (2019). Challenges in teaching English at rural and urban schools and their solutions. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 8(10).
- Hariri, A., Safriyani, R., Rusnalasari, Z. D., Al-Hikmah, S., Sunan, U., & Surabaya, A. (2022). From initiation to feedback: Unravelling teacher-student interaction in English language activities. *Eternal*, 8(2), 217–235.
- Hartono, R. P., Setiawan, S., & Mintowati, M. (2021). The implementation of self evaluation teacher talk (SETT) in teaching english: A case study. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 10(2).
- Ikram, F. Z., & Rosidah. (2020). Rural vs urban: teachers' obstacles and strategies in mathematics learning during covid-19 pandemic. *Southeast Asian Mathematics Education Journal*, 10(2), 69–74.
- Junior, S. R., Rukmini, D., & Yuliasri, I. (2021). Walsh's classroom modes and interactional features of teacher talk in science class at DCS Semarang. *English Education Journal*, 11(4), 608–618.
- Kusuma, I. P. I. (2022). EFL teachers' online teaching in rural schools during the covid-19 pandemic: Stories from Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 203–221.
- Ling, Z., Na, J., Yan-Li, S., & Sriyanto, J. (2020). School culture and professional development of school teachers from urban and rural areas in China. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(3), 609–619.
- Matra, S. D. (2014). Teacher questioning in classroom interaction. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 14(1).
- Monk, D. H. (2007). Recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers in rural areas. *The Future of Children*, 17(1), 155–174.
- Mudra, H. (2018). Pre-Service EFL teachers' experiences in teaching practicum in rural schools in Indonesia. *Qualitative Report*, 23(2), 319–344.
- Nisa, S. H. (2014). Classroom interaction analysis in Indonesian EFL speaking class. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 124–132.
- Prastowo, A., Fritrianti, S. W., & Widhiyanto, W. (2023). Evaluating the quality of teacher's talk in English classroom interaction at SMPIT Cahaya Bangsa Semarang. *English Education Journal*, 13(3), 380–390.
- Pratiwi, W. R. (2018). Teacher talk and instructional language choice: Two problems encountered in efl classroom. *Exposure Journal*, 7(2), 214–227.
- Rido, A., & Sari, F. M. (2018). Characteristics of classroom interaction of English language teachers in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 40–50.
- Salehi, A. (2019). Teacher and student interactions and characteristics from critical theorists school. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8(2), 313–317.

- Sembiring, L. T. A. B. (2018). Researching Students' Interaction in Collaborative Learning Class. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 2(2), 125.
- Shikalapo, E. E. (2020). Challenges facing teaching at rural schools: A review of related literature. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, IV(V), 211–218.
- Suhaili, W. S. H., & Haywood, J. (2017). A student-centered approach to ideas generation for projects: Is it a threat to creativity and innovation? *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 2(1), 13–26.
- Sundari, H., Rafli, Z., & Ridwan, S. (2017). Interaction patterns in english as foreign language classroom at lower secondary schools. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(1), 147.
- Tiwari, T. D. (2021). Classroom interaction in communicative language teaching of public secondary schools in Nepal. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 5(2), 373–386.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3–23.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Taylor & Francis.
- Yu, Y. (2019). Problems in and solutions to oral english teaching in rural middle school- A case study in Zhaocheng middle school. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(2), 372–382.
- Yulia, Y., & Budiharti, F. R. (2019). HOTS in teacher classroom interaction: A case study. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 4(2), 132–141.
- Yulyana, Y. (2015). Code switching analysis in classroom interactions in Husnul Khotimah Islamic senior high school. *Journal of English Education*, 1(1), 104–113.