Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics

Vol. 6(2), 2022
www.ijeltal.org
e-ISSN: 2527-8746; p-ISSN: 2527-6492

Learning Loss in ELT: Impact of Google Classroom for the Secondary School Students During Pandemic

Teguh Budiharso[1], Bulent Tarman[2], Imroatus Solikhah[3]

[1] *Mulawarman University, Indonesia. e-mail: teguhbudiharso@staff.ac.id*
[2] *Turan University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. e-mail: btarman@gmail.com*
[3] *UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Indonesia. e-mail: iimqueenoslo@gmail.com*

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Google classroom, online learning, pandemic, covid-19, learning loss

DOI:
http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i2.1433

ABSTRACT

This research explores the impact of implementing google classroom on online learning for secondary school students in learning English during the pandemic outbreak. This research used cyber ethnography and content analysis. Three schools, 12 English teachers and 15 students were involved in this study. Checklist and interview were used to collect data. Cyber ethnography analysis was used for data analysis. Results show that Google classroom activities are restricted to apply g-meet as a consequence of limited infrastructure and internet access. Google classroom practices are perceived unsatisfied by teacher and students, making the teaching quality is low. Barriers in the application of google classroom are indicated by hardware barriers, software barriers, school barriers, electronic and IT barriers. The learning loss occurs in four different concerns: seasonal breaks, absence from school, covid-19 outbreak, low quality of teaching, and school service. This study has its novelty because it involves learning loss theory and implements cyber ethnography methods.

How to cite:
Budiharso, T., Tarman, B., & Solikhah, I. (2022). Learning Loss in ELT: Impact of Google Classroom for the Secondary School Students During Pandemic. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 379-395

1. Introduction

COVID-19, discovered in late 2019 in Wuhan, China, becomes a global pandemic on March 11, 2020 (Shereen, et., al., 2020). The Corrona Virus-19 outbreak disrupted education practices all over the world, causing nearly 1.6 billion students in more than 200 countries. More than 94% of students in the world are influenced by the closures of schools (WHO, 2020; Shereen, et., al., 2020). WHO (2020) announced the virus expand to 213 states, including Indonesia and other Asian countries. COVID-19 and its prevention assessment influence various organizations and the global education system. The Indonesian education system is not an

exception (WHO, 2020; Bailey & Lee, 2020). Furthermore, external factors such as an unplanned pandemic appear to be a serious problem to solve as a result of learning loss (Neisbit, 2021; Azhar & Iqbal, 2018). Thus, this study is unique in combining learning loss theory and cyber technology.

To reduce risk, many Indonesian universities have adopted WHO assessment, for example, social distancing in densely populated areas and schools. In March 2020, 46 countries closed their schools nationwide due to social distancing, including Indonesia (Huang, et. al., 2020). By then, the virus had killed 4291 people in 114 countries (WHO, 2020). The virus pandemic was noticed on March 2, 2020, in Indonesia, when a dance instructor and her mother tested positive for the virus. They were infected by a Japanese national. There were more than 1,000 cases in half of the provinces by July 23. It was the most cases ever announced in a one day on July 9th, after 2,657 new occurrences were made public. In the span of 24 hours, 2,366 people were rescued and 139 were killed. Finally, on July 13, recovery overtook the number of active cases (Astini, 2020). Indonesia had the highest number of cases in Southeast Asia by July 2020, followed by the Philippines and Singapore. There are 4,975 people who have died in Indonesia, making it the fifth-highest death toll in Asia (Simamora, 2020).

Pleasingly, the government approved broad social restrictions. The Ministry of Health approves the local restrictions. Closing public places, restricting public transportation, and closing schools are all included (WHO, 2020; Simamora, 2020; Yen & Mohamad, 2020). Since the Covid-19 outbreak, all educational levels and the informal sector must use home-based learning (Engzell, et. al., 2021; Astini, 2020). You can learn at home using Whatsapp, Zoom, or online platforms. Google Classroom, Kahoot, and Edmodo are now popular (Engzell, et. al., 2021; Simamora, 2020). Teachers and students struggled for four reasons. First, teachers lack adequate online training. 2. Lack of preparation and support for teachers to design quality distance learning (Maldonado & De Witte, 2020). Third, teachers struggled to find suitable digital tools for distance learning. Fourth, teachers were overwhelmed by online learning resources (Witteveen & Velthorst, 2020).

Indonesian education adapts. To prevent the spread of COVID-19 among students and teachers, direct classroom learning and teaching have been replaced by distance learning. A variety of tools and platforms are used to maximize learning at home, including Google Classroom, Google Meeting, Zoom Meeting, WhatsApp, and YouTube (Vlachos, et. al., 2021; Judge, 2016; Adawi, 2016). These apps and platforms allow students, teachers, and parents to learn directly and indirectly how to use technology in the classroom from home (UN, 2020).

Three research questions were sought to answer in this study:

1) What Google classroom activities are identified in English teaching to SMP in the pandemic era in Indonesia?
2) How do students and teachers perceive the google classroom platform in teaching English for SMP during the pandemic era in Indonesia?
3) What is the impact of the pandemic on students' ability to learn English using Google Classroom in Indonesia?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Education via the Internet

Students and educators can access educational materials via the Internet through a process known as online learning (also known as e-learning) (Tareen & Haand, 2020). The Internet,

email, chat, SMS, and audio and video conferencing are just some of the technologies used in online learning (Ez-zaouia et al., 2020). The global pandemic of the Covid-19 virus makes schools and colleges around the world quickly implement online learning as a substitute for traditional instruction (Salleh et al., 2020; Bailey & Lee, 2020). Many colleges and universities now offer online classes for their students (King & Boyatt, 2015).

Online learning has four connotations. First, e-learning is E-learning is a type of technology-based learning (Tareen & Haand, 2020). Second, E-learning is learning aided by technology. Third, e-learning uses online interactions between lecturers and students (Salleh et al., 2020). Fourth, e-learning is a form of educational technology (Tareen & Haand, 2020; Cole, 2000). Valverde-Berrocoso et al. (2020) state e-learning is a student-centered learning environment that is open, fun, and interactive. E-learning is simply blended learning that meets educational needs and goals (Garrison, 2017; Adarkwah, 2020; Sayekti, 2015). Many world-renowned universities now use Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) (Caldwell, 2020; Breslow et al., 2013; McAuley et al, 2010; Pappano, 2012; Sulistyo et al, 2019).

Indeed, universities continue to dominate online education in Indonesia (Sumarno, 2019). Due to infrastructure constraints, cultural concerns (Borotis & Poulymenakou, 2004), and technology stuttering, only a few secondary schools use online learning (Zulham, 2013). Huang et al. (2020) and Caldwell, (2020) identified four challenges associated with using online teaching in schools: (1) a lack of time for preparing or adapting offline to online materials; (2) a shortage of direct and free interaction between instructors and learners disrupts the learning process; (3) effective pedagogy requires additional effort to motivate and engage students in online learning; and (4) a lack of school facilities and a national curriculum that supports online learning (Byun & Slavin, 2020).

To use e-learning in the instructions process calls for difficulties and challenges labeled as the "barriers" (Schoepp, 2005; Pelgrum, 2001). Learners, teachers, curriculum, and schools are the four categories that receive the barriers (Assareh & Bidokht, 2011). Learner barriers include financial issues, lack of motivation, experience with online learning, and social interaction. Teacher e-learning challenges include a lack of knowledge and assessment (Bailey & Lee, 2020). Obstacles to the E-learning curriculum include ambiguity and quality. Finally, school barriers are organizational and structural challenges, including infrastructure, technology, and e-learning implementation (Pelgrum, 2001).

Barriers have been summarized by experts. Ertmer (1999) mentions hardware (accessibility, and technical support), software (pedagogy, beliefs, and personal preferences, material or non-material) (Pelgrum, 2001), teacher, school, and system (Balanskat, et al., 2006), teachers, schools, curriculum, and students (Assareh & Bidokht, 2011). The instructor obstacles are (1) a lack of confidence (Bingimlas, 2009), (2) resistance to change (Hew & Brush, 2007), (3) an ignorance of the benefits of E-Learning (Scrimshaw, 2004), (4) a lack of belief in ICT (Hew & Brush, 2007; Ertmer, 1999). Accordingly, school-level barriers typically include equipment and program accessibility, web links, and overall school strategy (Bingimlas, 2009). Students' lack of e-learning skills, access to innovation frameworks, and motivation to use E-Learning are defined by Hew & Brush (2007) as three levels of barriers.

2.2 Google Class

The classroom is a free web-based platform that provides access to all of your G Suite services, including Google Docs, Gmail, and Google Calendar. The classroom is a time and

paper saver to set assignments (Azhar & Iqbal, 2018), helping students learn online or through e-learning. Computers and smartphones can serve virtual classrooms, distribute assignments, submit assignments, and grade the assignments (Hammi, 2017). A video-conferencing tool delivered through Zoom is also applicable to google classroom (Pelgrum, 2001).

As an online tool for teachers, Google Classroom is designed to facilitate teacher-student file sharing (Breslow et al., 2013). It lets teachers create an online classroom for students, Google Docs, Sheets, and Slides editable (McAuley et al, 2010; Pappano, 2012). Teachers can create and assign assignments online, monitor students' progress; discuss assignments; and communicate online (Pappano, 2012). With Google Classroom, educators can engage their students in hands-on exploration of scientific concepts. Online chat rooms for students can be set up by teachers to help them communicate with each other (Pappano, 2012). The Google Classroom app is designed to help students achieve meaningful learning objectives, manage student learning, and deliver accurate and timely information (Hakim, 2016).

External factors such as school closures (planned or unplanned) can cause academic performance to decline or knowledge and skills to be lost (Neisbit, 2021; Azhar & Iqbal, 2018; Adams-Prassl, et. al., 2020). A learning loss occurs due to a break in education (e.g. semester holiday) or the closure of an institution because of a disarter or pandemic (Neisbit, 2021; UN, 2020). Neisbit (2021) identifies four types of learning disabilities: (1) seasonal learning loss, (2) educational interruptions, such as global pandemic-related school closures, (3) absences from school for a long time, and (4) low-quality teaching.

The COVID-19 pandemic has also changed society, often exacerbating social and economic disparities (Zhang, et. al., 2020). Governments around the world have suspended classroom instruction to slow its spread, affecting roughly 95 percent of the learners in the world are bothered their education process (UN, 2020). All kids should get free primary education (UN, 1989). To assess the costs of school closures, we need to recognize if learners are comfortable to learn during restriction and they get advantages (Brooks, et. al., 2020; Downey, et. al., 2014). Parents are less able to provide support due to economic uncertainty or work-from-home demands (Adams-Prassl, et. al., 2020; Maldonado et al.).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Design

Phenomenological design is used in this study, aimed at uncovering and investigating human life experiences (Caelli, 2001; Groenewald, 2004). Fouche (1993) states that phenomenology captures detailed descriptions of experiences, their context, understands the subjects from a perspective that is based on the subject's point of view and describes the human experience in its own terms (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998; Cameron, 2001). Because the Covid-19 pandemic is centered around online learning, this study used cyber ethnography as a method of investigation (Greene, 1989; Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Using a qualitative content analysis approach, this study analyzed the data following Zhang & Wildemuth (2009; 2016).

3.2 Participants

This study included 12 English teachers and 15 students. They were chosen from three SMPs in three different areas: city, district, and village. The distribution of English teachers was from city school 4, district school 4, and village school 4 (2 males and 2 females). The students

were identified as having unequal conditions when learning English using Google Classroom in the pandemic era. The school zones were as follows: Students in SMP 3 (city, district, village). Teacher assignments and student knowledge were used to select teachers. Students were chosen based on their financial situation, lack of a smartphone for online study, and teacher recommendations (Groenewald, 2004). But not all students who couldn't access online education had the same issues. As per etiquette, the teachers were coded as follows: City SMP (C-1-C-4), District SMP (D-1-D-3-D-4), Village SMP (V-1-3-V-3) On the other hand, students were assigned to SMPs (City, District, and State) (Village SMP).

3.3 Instruments

To collect data for this study, two basic research instruments written in Indonesian were used: an interview guide and a checklist. The researchers created both instruments. The interview guide was made up of seven questions to guide the interview about Google Classroom. Interview questions seek the following topics: (1) difficulties in preparing teaching materials; (2) difficulties in presenting Google Classroom; (3) obstacles of online instruction; (4) digital competence and parents' drive; (5) involvement in online instruction and accessibility on the internet; (6) benefits and drawbacks related to online instruction; and (7) a solution to overcome the difficulties (Caelli, 2001; Groenewald, 2004; Bentz & Shapiro 1998). The interview guide was divided into two sections: a tour question and open-ended questions. The second guide was a request for teachers and students to list problems and solutions they had encountered while using Google Classroom. Prior to the data collection, the guide was evaluated by an expert to judge the validity of the items. The language was changed to accommodate the interviewees' perceptions and to make it easier to understand. The correction made by the expert was incorporated into the final version of the seven-item interview guide. Finally, the researchers prepared the guides for email and WA distribution.

3.4 Data Collection

An attempt was made in this study (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998) to learn more about the thoughts and feelings of the participants' minds. Participants were asked to share their impressions of the Google Classroom format during the teaching process. A number of interviews were served using WhatsApp messaging apps or in-person meetings. We used field notes and records to keep track of things during the interview. We did the interviews with teachers via WhatsApp; however, we were able to call each student at school as their teachers permitted. It was hoped that the interviews with students would help us better understand how they felt about online education. In advance of the interview, instruments were developed for both students and teachers to use.

All sessions were videotaped with the consent of the interviewees, who were all present (Bazimaziki, 2020). There was a different alphabet character assigned to each interview code, which was unique to that particular interview. Every conversation was recorded verbatim and we put the code corresponding themes We listened to the audio recordings of each interview and took notes immediately afterward. The researchers who recorded significant words, phrases, and utterances were able to hear the voices of the participants/informants because they were using a microphone to record their voices. We also used field notes, artifacts, and related information to store data. Because the human brain forgets information quickly, we recorded data as thoroughly as possible after each interview, without making judgments.

Field notes included luck, feelings, timing, playfulness, and art (Lofland & Lofland, 1999; Bailey, 1996).

3.5 Data analysis

In the words of Coffey & Atkinson (1996), "an analysis" is the methodical process of identifying fundamental features and interactions between these features and their environs. It is a technique for analyzing and modifying numerical data. Caelli (2001) and Groenewald (2004) used phenomenology analysis, and Zhang & Wildemuth (2009; 2016) used content analysis. Bracketing and reduction, unit delineation, clustering, and summarization are all steps in the analysis.

Bracketing and phenomenological reduction

In order to find themes from the entire data set, we listened to each interview several times, so that the researchers could get a better grasp of the situation, and the interviewee's words were familiarized. In this study, we listened to the interview tapes regularly to identify themes that related to the research questions.

Describing units of meaning

The second step is to define the meaning units we listed from the record. Results of interviews that are redundant are removed (Moustakas, 1994). We took into account all of these elements, as well as any nonverbal cues.

Grouping meaning to form themes

The third step is creating themes obtained from the list of non-redundant meaning units. We tried to understand individual units within a larger whole. Topics are defined by mixing the meaning of the units and identifying major subjects (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994).

Summary, validity, and modification

Informants confirmed the findings, validated and adjusted them. We checked with the informant to make sure the transcript accurately captured the essence of the interview (Hycner, 1999). We used brackets to emphasize the insider perspective. Each participant received a finding summary to match their understanding of the phenomenon.

Exploring unique themes and a composite summary

After the interview, we looked for common themes and variations that appeared in the interviews (Hycner, 1999). When we first came across the themes, we created a summary that conformed with the context we discovered (Hycner, 1999; Moustakas, 1994). We reworded the participants' everyday speech into scientific jargon. We generate ideas more than just accurate data. We broke data down into narrative and numerical data, identifying themes and units of analysis, applying the coding system to all themes and units of analysis, and revising them if they are incorrectly coded. The process ends by selecting the final data (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009; 2016).

4. Findings and Discussion

Theme 1: Learning Barriers of Google Classroom Teaching

Learning barriers using google classroom are explored to answer RQ 1. Results are obtained from the lists made by teachers and students when they were asked to identify g-meet

activities and their barriers. The results of the interview are added to support the list. The findings are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. Online teaching is categorized into:

- Teaching materials
- Platform
- Teaching techniques

The teaching materials cover four variations namely: video recording, YouTube with links, exercises, and recorded group assignments. The materials are not specified with learning outcomes specifically so that English language skills are identified properly. For any reason, the implementation of teaching the materials is constrained by the use of platforms. Of the four platforms, g-meet, zoom, laptop, WA group, and Google exam, usually selected by teachers, g-meet is the easiest to do.

Table 1. Characteristics of Online Teaching

No	Teaching materials	Platforms	Teaching techniques
1	Video recording	Google meet	Once meeting only
2	YouTobe with link	Zoom	Google search
3	Exercises	Laptop	Recorded activities
4	Recorded group assignment	WA Group	You tube
5		Google exam	

A teacher reports:

1) "I already prepare well my teaching materials, however, I cannot fully teach students in my own purpose because the platform 80% is not proper".

Because of the limited platform to operate, teachers select their own teaching strategies, and the content of the English materials is devised from their own perspectives.

2) "I prefer to use Youtube and assign students in their own groups. I deliver the materials online but asked students to submit them at school face to face," another teacher added.

Regarding the teaching frequency, all teachers admit that they lost time teaching and they taught not properly as the schedule set. Some teachers admit that they just teach once time only in the entire semester.

3) "I just teach once in the whole semester. I assigned students with home assignments then they submitted them at school."

Obstacles in online teaching are the basic problems for teachers. As Table 2 indicates, obstacles to implementing online teaching for the students can be divided from the students' side and teaching materials, affecting the contents of teaching English materials are lost. From the students' side constraints appear due to technical drawbacks, such as a lack of quota for students, and network problems. Teaching materials are colored with improper teaching delivery that makes teaching contents not specified well. More technical problems caused by the software appear so that learning is not well defined.

Table 2. Obstacles in teaching using the Google platform

Students' side	Teaching materials and methods
30 students only 20 active	Learning is missing a lot of material because the scope is not covered
Lack of quota	Teachers can't monitor interactions per student
Network down	Learning objectives cannot be determined according to the syllabus
Government aid is for special software	English skills cannot be done fully
Wifi is not stable	The linguistic content is delivered by sample
Network problems such as legging	The teacher does not convey the platform that will be used to teach
	Teaching materials are not proper to the syllabus
	Midterm test and final exam formats are based on daily assignments only
	There are teachers who teach only once by submitting assignments
	The next meeting the teacher only asks students to submit assignments

To change from face-to-face to online instructions needs specific training. The characteristics of how teaching materials are taught vary from the scope, delivery, syllabus content, assignment, midterm test, and final test. Students feel the materials are not satisfied and the test and assessment are not properly assigned. On the other sides, teachers consider that their teaching preparation to serve the properness of teaching contents and evaluation is not so good. Specifically, the target to teach English either orally or written is not achieved.

Simanjuntak et al. (2020) confirm that learners and instructors face difficulties, challenges, and problems. Bazimaziki, (2020) and Carrillo & Flores (2020) identify ethical values, critical thinking, analytical thinking, and communication skills as the challenge. Bazimaziki (2020) emphasizes proficiency in ICT, learning needs, online teaching, and the need to combine classroom and online teaching methods as teaching problems.

Barriers of the Google application consist of 11 kinds as in Table 3. Basically, problems are caused by the readiness of the support system in all areas of teaching: city, district, and sub-district. Using Zoom platform is better than G-meet using Android, however, zoom is too expensive for students. Consequently, the teaching platform is changed into g-meet. Problems appear in that internet access for g-meet is limited, and as more students reside in the villages, the teaching process is not properly done.

Table 3. Constraints in the support system

Constraints
1. Infrastructure constraints occur in cities, sub-districts, and villages
2. Constraints on the availability of quotas occur throughout every student
3. Network problems are all over the place
4. There is a platform innovation in the city school but it doesn't support android
5. Software innovation in sub-districts and villages does not occur because of infrastructure
6. Inequality occurs due to economic factors, natural factors, and technical factors
7. Learning loss occurs because the adequacy of the material is not met

8. Students who don't have cellphones can't take lessons, don't do assignments
9. Schools lend cell phones but only when students come to school
10. Students who don't have cellphones can't do assignments, don't take lessons, and can't do midtest and final test
11. There are teachers who care and help students who don't have cell phones, but there are also those who don't care

Ertmer (1999) confirms that accessibility and technical support appear as the first barriers. Second-order barriers include teacher, school, system (Balanskat et al., 2006), curriculum, and students (Pelgrum, 2001; Assareh & Bidokht, 2011). The second barriers include a lack of confidence (Bingimlas, 2009); resistance to move their training (Hew & Brush, 2007); lack of understanding of the benefits of E-Learning (Scrimshaw, 2004); and mentality and expectation in ICT (Hew & Brush, 2007; Ertmer, 1999). The school-level barriers are typically based on the accessibility of equipment and programs, web associations, and the school's overall strategy. This study confirms that both teachers and administrators consider the ideal opportunity to create lessons or textbooks and the absence of special assistance (Bingimlas, 2009). Three levels of barriers to using E-Learning are students' lack of e-learning skills, innovation frameworks, and low motivation to use E-Learning (Hew & Brush, 2007).

Theme 2: Perception on Google Classrooms

The second research question pertains to perceptions of the application of google classroom perceived by the teacher (table 4) and students (table 5). As indicated in Table 4, this study finds 12 perceptions that can be sorted into 3 categories based on the rate of percentage the teacher responses namely: (1) the internet support system and teaching method, (2) the application of google classroom. Problems on the internet support system and teaching methods are perceived as not proper by 100% of respondents, and the application of google classroom is perceived to provide inequality for students' involvement by 83.3%.

Table 4. Teachers' perception

Perception	F, N=12	%
1. Teachers know more about the use of ICT by using google classroom	12	100
2. The teaching time used is shorter by using google classroom;	12	100
3. The learning process can be done anywhere and anytime when there is free time and when connected to the internet;	12	100
4. Easy to use learning media such as smartphones, tablets, and laptops;	12	100
5. Additional costs incurred to purchase internet packages when carrying out the learning process using google classroom;	12	100
6. Unfavorable classroom atmosphere during the learning process by using google classroom;	12	100
7. Minimizing the use of paper during the learning process by using google classroom.	12	100
8. Learning materials are only in the form of documents sent by the teacher through google classroom;	10	83.3
9. The learning process does not run effectively and efficiently during learning using google classroom;	10	83.3
10. Network damage that causes the learning process to stop when learning using Google Classroom;	10	83.3
11. Teachers have difficulty in making learning media with google classroom;	10	83.3
12. Difficult of applying learning methods in google classroom;	10	83.3

When asked about teaching content, a teacher explained:

(4) "I am confused to prepare teaching materials to upload in google classroom. So, I just prepare reading text or grammar for discussion in every meeting," a teacher explained.

Another teacher in a city school confirmed:

(5) "I am bothered much in the infrastructure of support system and quota. The system is frequently down. The quota is limited and not every area the students live can give access when teaching. So, I just give students assignments. Selecting a topic in youtube for teaching materials or for the exercises"

The problem in the evaluation in the midterm test and the final exam appears in terms of the availability of cell phones for low-income family students who have no Android. To solve this teachers asked students to work on paper-based assignments or tests. They did double work. Some students can submit their exams online, and those who have an android to work submit a paper-based assignment at school.

Students' perception of google classroom applications is almost the same with teachers' perception. Students' answer is classified into 4 categories according to the rate percentage of the perception. They are: (1) inadequate infrastructure (100%), (2) low internet access (80%), (3) student inequality (47.3%), and (4) low teaching materials and problems on evaluation (33.3%).

Table 5. Students' Perception on the Application of Google Form

Perception	F, n=15	%
1. The learning process can be done anywhere and anytime but access is limited in different areas	15	100
2. Students must have learning media such as smartphones, tablets and laptops	15	100
3. Youtobe as teaching materials and methods is difficult to understand	15	100
4. Internet access is low making only students whose area is accessible can join the class actively; only 50% can access in every meeting	12	80
5. Students know more about the use of ICT by using google classroom;	12	80
6. The learning process does not run effectively and efficiently in google classroom	12	80
7. Students become confused because they do not understand the material given by the teacher through google classroom;	7	46.7
8. Students who do not have media cannot follow the learning process	7	46.7
9. The study time used is shorter by using google classroom	7	46.7
10. Materials and exercises are focused on youtube that are difficult to follow	5	33.3
11. Contents of the teaching material sent by the teacher through google classroom are difficult to understand	5	33.3
12. The evaluation process using Google form is not well designed	5	33.3

Previous studies have confirmed teachers' and students' perceptions of Google Classroom implementation. This shows that countries without a strong online learning infrastructure do not use Google Classroom (Adarkwah, 2020). Many rural areas are still not able to implement online learning because the pedagogical aspects of online learning do not support it (Carrillo

& Flores, 2020). There are three main challenges facing educators today: (1) ensuring that teachers are utilizing appropriate teaching methods and integrating online resources; (2) ensuring that learning designs cater to students' unique needs while taking into account their social contexts, contexts, and learning processes; and (3) ensuring that educators are using appropriate tools and technologies while ensuring that students are held accountable for their progress. Even in developed countries, electronic devices are still a barrier to online learning, according to recent studies (Adarkwah, 2020; Carrillo & Flores, 2020).

Theme 3: Learning Loss

Despite the benefits to claim that e-learning is probably provided, learning loss appears more prominent in this study. Analysis of the learning loss is elaborated from criteria suggested by Neisbit (2021). The criteria include (1) seasonal break, e.g. semester break, (2) absence from school, (3) educational interruption, e.g. covid-19 pandemic, school closure, and (4) low quality of teaching, e.g. low materials, low professional services.

Results of the interview and checklist indicate that learning loss that varies from 4 categories are elaborated by teachers and students and the analysis of the checklist showing the response frequency appears in Table 6. The following are the variations:

1. **Seasonal breaks**

- National and religious holiday
- School break, e.g. teachers meeting
- Midterm break
- Final test break

2. **Absence from school**

- National and religious holiday
- Facultative break, e.g. teachers meeting
- Midterm break
- Final test break

3. Educational interruption due to Covid-19

- Transition from early covid-19
- Peak season of Covid-19
- Transition to new normal
- Limitation for social distance
- Second pandemic of Delta Covid
- Vaccination

4. Low quality of teaching and professional services

- Low online infrastructure and online support system
- Low internet access and inequality
- Low online teaching materials
- Low online teaching methods
- Low online learning assessment
- Low online technical education services at school

Kinds of activities to indicate the learning loss above are identified from the testimony of English teachers and students.

Teachers in city schools, district schools, and village schools clarify:

(6) "I am fully aware that internet access is the main problem in my school teaching service. It is a village school and most students come from a low economy. To buy quota for the g-meet is hard, even 60% of students in one class do not have Android" said an English teacher at a village school.

If the (6) testimony describes more students do not have an android to learn, this teacher emphasizes the frequency of absence at school because of various constraints.

(7) "More student-parents are farmers, if harvest season comes, students help their parents to harvest in the field. The student was absence. Sometimes, the parents come to school to ask their children to leave the class. Officially, our tradition also has the breaks for religious commemoration, a national holiday that we call as a read-calendar. Almost every month we have the read calendar."

The needs of Work From Home during covid-19 spread in 2020-2021 are obvious in all levels of school. Online teaching becomes the most technique to apply in a lamented condition. Teachers do not think of the quality of teaching methods and teaching materials, rather, they present teaching services for regular needs as civil servant.

Table 6. Learning loss in English teaching

Learning loss and its activities	Teacher		Students	
	F=12	%	F=15	%
A. Seasonal breaks				
1. National and religious holiday	12	100	15	100
2. Facultative break, e.g. teachers meeting	12	100	15	100
3. Midterm break	12	100	15	100
4. Final test break	12	100	15	100
Average		**100**		**100**
B. Absence from school				
1. Because of sickness	12	100	12	80
2. Parents' request	10	83.3	12	80
3. Ditching	7	58.3	12	80
4. Emergency needs	12	100	15	100
Average		**85.4**		**85**
C. Educational interruption due to Covid-19				
1. Transition from early covid-19	12	100	15	100
2. Peak season of Covid-19	12	100	15	100
3. Transition to the new normal	12	100	15	100
4. Limitation for social distance	10	83.3	12	80
5. Second pandemic of Delta Covid	12	100	15	100
6. Vaccination	10	83.3	8	53.3
Average		**94.4**		**88.9**
D. Low quality of teaching and professional services				
1. Low online infrastructure and online support system	10	83.3	15	100
2. Low Internet access and inequality	12	100	15	100

3. Low online teaching materials	8	66.7	15	100
4. Low online teaching methods	8	66.7	15	100
5. Low online learning assessment	12	100	15	100
6. Low online technical education services at school	10	83.3	15	100
Average		**97.2**		**100**

Table 6 shows that the average proportion of learning loss is (1) seasonal breaks (teacher=100%, students=100%), (2) absence from school (teachers=85.4%; students=85%), (3) educational interruption because of Covid-19 (teacher=94.4%; student=88.9%, and (4) low quality of teaching and professional services (teacher=97.2%; students=100%).

Recently discovered evidence confirms that learning loss has occurred and threatens education attainment around the world (UN, 2020; WHO, 2020). There's no doubt that aspiring English teachers in Cilli are under threat (Sepulveda-Escobar & Morrison, 2020). The most significant influences on online learning in the United States were the absence of face-to-face interaction with students and the frequent alteration of the learning environment. Problems arise in the classroom when teachers and students interact when information is shared when plans are made when feedback is given, when time is managed when students are evaluated, and when they work in groups (Sepulveda-Escobar & Morrison, 2020; Krishan et al., 2020; Yen & Mohamad, 2020).

Basically, online teaching gives benefits for several purposes: easy and fast access, an easy application using Android, and easy to improve and modify teaching materials. However, the problems on practices still indicate that learning loss occurs in four sectors mainly because of the Covid-19 outbreak that makes school closures for all over the school level throughout Indonesia.

This study evidently shows that learning loss during the pandemic outbreak does appear in the English teaching process at secondary-level schools in Indonesia. Teaching materials are short, teaching methods are eliminated, and learning assessment is reduced its use. The school practices can not compensate for four kinds of learning loss as defined by Neisbitt (2021). This finding is a new contribution in the analysis of teaching online. Substantially, learning loss is also required for the ELT curriculum and teaching material evaluation. Therefore, this study has its novelty in two areas: learning loss theory is required to analyze ELT and curriculum evaluation, and online teaching platforms should consider learning loss factors.

5. Conclusion and Suggestions

To sum up, we reemphasize that this study has its novelty in three areas: it applies learning loss theory to evaluate ELT curriculum, online teaching practices, and implementation of cyber technology approach in the research method. Teaching activities using google classroom are characterized by the limitation of online teaching drawbacks and internet access. The practices of google classroom teaching are perceived unsatisfactorily by teachers and students because of the limitation of the support system of the online learning-teaching process. Finally, the restrictions of the overall system have contributed to four sources of learning loss that occur in ELT for secondary school students in Indonesia seriously.

This study however has limitations in two areas: a short number of the study sample and not details ELT curriculum analysis that involves various sources. Future research is suggested to

enlarge the study sample by using an in-depth case study or survey research involving more schools and a wider area, thus more teachers and students are involved. In addition, the sources of analysis can involve the ELT curriculum, English teaching materials mapping used by teachers, and assessment aspects to assure students' attainment.

References

Adams-Prassl, A., Boneva, T., Golin, M., and Rauh, C. (2020). Inequality in the impact of the coronavirus shock: Evidence from real-time surveys. Journal of Public Economics 189, 104245.

Adarkwah, MA (2020). "I'm not against online teaching, but what about us?": ICT in Ghana post Covid19. Education and Information Technologies, 2.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10331-z

Adawi, R. (2016). E-Learning Based Learning. eprint. Retrieved from http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/541/

Assareh, A., & Bidokht, MH (2011). Barriers to E-teaching and e-learning. Procedia Computer Science, 3, 791-795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010. 12,129

Astini, SNK (2020). Challenges and Opportunities for Utilizing Information Technology in Online Learning during the Covid-19 Period Cetta: Journal of Educational Sciences, 3(2), 241–255.https://doi.org/10.37329/cetta.v3i2.452

Azhar, KA, & Iqbal, N. (2018). Effectiveness of Google Classroom: Teachers' Perceptions. Prizren Social Science Journal, 2(2), 52–66.

Bailey R. D & Lee, R. A. (2020). Learning from Experience in the Midst of COVID-19: Benefits, Challenges, and Strategies. Computer-Assisted Language Electronic Journal, 21(2), 176-196.

Bailey, P. H. (1995). Narrative analysis as a qualitative research method for nursing research. Unpublished manuscript. Available on https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?hl=en&publication_year=1995&author=+Bailey%2C+P.+H.&title=Narrative+analysis+as+a+qualitative+research+methodfor+nursing+research#d=gs_cit&u=%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dinfo%3A-8rrHbGuu9YJ%3Ascholar.google.com%2F%26output%3Dcite%26scirp%3D0%26hl%3Den

Balanskat, A., Blamire, R., & Kefala, S. (2006). The ICT impact report: A review of studies of ICT on schools in Europe. European Communities: Education and Culture.

Bazimaziki, G. (2020). Challenges in using ICT Gadgets to cope with effects of COVID-19 on Education: A short survey of online teaching Literature in English. Journal of Humanities and Education Development, 2(4), 299–307.https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.2.4.8

Bentz, V. M., & Shapiro, J. J. (1998). Mindful Inquiry in Social Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bingimlas, KA (2009). Barriers to the Successful Integration of ICT in Teaching and Learning Environment: A Review of the Literature. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 5(3), 235-245. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/75275

Borotis, S., & Poulymenakou, A. (2004). E-Learning Readiness Components: Key Issues to Consider Before Adopting e-Learning Interventions. 1622–1629. Retrieved from https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/11555/

Breslow, L., Pritchard, DE, DeBoer, J., Stump, GS, Ho, AD, & Seaton, DT (2013). Studying

Learning in the Worldwide Classroom Research into edX's First MOOC. Research & Practice in Assessment, 8, 13–25.

Brooks, S. K., Smith, L. E., Webster, R. K., Weston, D., Woodland, L., Hall, I., and Rubin, G. J. (2020). The impact of unplanned school closure on children's social contact: rapid evidence review. Eurosurveillance 25.

Byun, S., & Slavin, RE (2020). Educational Responses to the COVID-19 Outbreak in South Korea. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3652607

Caelli K. (2001). Engaging with Phenomenology: Is it more of a Challenge than it Needs to be? Qualitative Health Research. 11(2):273-281. doi:10.1177/104973201129118993

Caldwell, M. (2020). An Investigation into the Perception of Japanese University Educators on the Use of ICT in an EFL Tertiary Setting. Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal, 21(2), 1-16.

Cameron J. (2001). Negative Effects of Reward on Intrinsic Motivation—A Limited Phenomenon: Comment on Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (2001). Review of Educational Research. 2001;71(1):29-42. doi:10.3102/00346543071001029

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies. Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among

Five Tradition. London: Sage Publications.

Downey, D. B., Von Hippel, P. T., and Broh, B. A. (2004). Are schools the great equalizer?: Cognitive inequality during the summer months and the school year. American Sociological Review 69, 613–635.

Engzell, P, Frey, A, Verhagen, M. (2021). Learning Loss due to School Closures during COVID-19 Pandemic. PNAS, 118(17), 1-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022376118

Ertmer, P., A. (1999). Addressing First and Second Order Barriers to Change: Strategies for Technology Integration. ETR&D, 7(4), 47-61.

Ez-zaouia, M., Tabard, A., & Lavoué, E. (2020). EMODASH: A dashboard supporting retrospective awareness of emotions in online learning. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102411

Fouche, F. (1993). Phenomenological Theory of Human Science. In J. J. Snyman (ed.), Conceptions of Social Inquiry. Human Sciences Research Council. pp. 87--112. Available on https://philpapers.org/s/Fidela%20Fouche

Garrison, D. . (2017). E-learning in the 21st Century: A Community of Inquiry Framework for Research and Practice (3rd edition). Routledge.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11, 255-274.

Groenewald, T. (2004) A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3, 1-26.

Hammi, Z. (2017). Implementation of Google Classroom in Class XI IPA MAN 2 Kudus. Semarang State University Handarini, OI, & Wulandari, SS (2020). Online Learning as a Study From Home (SFH) Effort During the Covid-19 Pandemic. Journal of Office Administration Education (JPAP), 8(3), 496–503.

Hew, KF, & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating Technology Into K-12 Teaching and Learning: Current Knowledge Gaps and Recommendations for Future Research Educational Technology Research and Development, 55, 223-252.

Huang, R., Tlili, A., Chang, TW, Zhang, X., Nascimbeni, F., & Burgos, D. (2020). Disrupted classes, undisrupted learning during COVID-19 outbreak in China: application of open educational practices and resources. Smart Learning Environments, 7(1).https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-020-00125-8

Hycner, H. Richard. (1985. Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. Human Studies 8 (3):279 - 303 (1985). Doi: 10.1007/BF00142995

Judge, AB. (2016). Effectiveness of Using Elearning Moodle, Google Classroom, and Edmodo. I-statement: information systems and technology management, 2(1): 2442-8337.

King, E., & Boyatt, R. (2015). Exploring factors that influence the adoption of e-learning within higher education. British Journal of Educational Technology, 46(6), 1272–1280. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12195

Lofland, John & Lyn H. Lofland. (1984). Analyzing Social Setting: A Guide To Qualitative Observation and Analysis. Belment California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Maldonado, J. E., & De Witte, K. (2020). The effect of school closures on standardized student test outcomes, KU Leuven Department of Economics Discussion Paper DPS20. 17.

McAuley, A., Stewart, B., Siemens, G., & Cormier, D. (2010). The MOOC Model for Digital Practice. University of Prince Edward Island, 64.

Moustakas, C. E. (1994). Phenomenological research methods. Sage Publications, Inc.

Nisbet, Jordan. (2021, July). Should We Be Focusing on Learning Loss or Unfinished Learning?. Available at https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/learning-loss-unfinished-learning/. Retrieved on 12 November 2021.

Pappano, L. (2012, November 2). Massive Open Online Courses Are Multiplying at a Rapid Pace. The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massiveopen-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html

Pelgrum, W., J. (2001). Obstacle to the Integration of ICT in Education: Results from a Worldwide Educational Assessment Computer & Education, 37, 167-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1315(01) 00045-8.

Salleh, F. I. M., Ghazali, J. M., Ismail, W. N. H. W., Alias, M., & Rahim, N. S. A. (2020). The impacts of Covid-19 through online learning usage for tertiary education in Malaysia. Journal of Critical Reviews. https://doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.08.30

Sayekti, R. (2015, December 28). Implementation of E-learning in Higher Education: Answering the Challenges of Technology and Educational Development [Monograph]. Retrieved October 10, 2019, from http://repository.uinsu.ac.id/1916/

Schoepp, K. (2005). Barriers to Technology Integration in a Technology-rich Environment. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives, 2(1), 1-24.

Scrimshaw, R. (2004). How Can Innovative ICT Practice be Sustained and Extended?. Paper Presented at the Becta Research Conference.

Shereen, M. A., Khan, S., Kazmi, A., Bashir, N., & Siddique, R. (2020). COVID-19 infection: Emergence, transmission, and characteristics of human coronaviruses. Journal of advanced research, 24, 91-98.

Sepulveda-Escobar, P., & Morrison, A. (2020). Online teaching placement during the COVID-19 pandemic in Chile: challenges and opportunities. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 587–607.https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1820981

Simamora, R. M. (2020). The Challenges of Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic: An Essay Analysis of Performing Arts Education Students. Studies in Learning and

Teaching, 1(2), 86-103. https://doi.org/10.46627/silet.v1i2.38

Sulistyo, WD, Nafi'ah, U., & Idris, I. (2019). The Development of E-PAS Based on Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) on Local History Materials. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET), 14(09), 119–129.

Sumarno, A. (2019). Spada Indonesia. Retrieved October 10, 2019, from Spada Indonesia website: http://spada.ristekdikti.go.id//

Tareen, H., & Haand, M. T. (2020). A Case Study of UiTM Post-Graduate Students' Perceptions on Online Learning : Benefits & Challenges. International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications, June.

United Nations. (2020). Education during COVID-19 and beyond; UN Policy Briefs: 2020.

Valverde-Berrocoso, J., Garrido-Arroyo, M. del C., Burgos-Videla, C., & Morales-Cevallos, MB (2020). Trends in Educational Research about e-Learning: A Systematic Literature Review (2009–2018). Sustainability, 12(5153), 1–23

Vlachos, J., Hertegard, E., and Svaleryd, H. B. (2021). School closures and SARS- CoV-2: Evidence from Sweden's partial school closure. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, forthcom.

Weeden, K., & Cornwell, B. (2020). The small-world network of college classes: Implications for epidemic spread on a university campus. Sociological Science, 7(9), 222–241. http://doi.org/10.15195/v7.a9

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. 2020. https://www.who.int/

Witteveen, D., and Velthorst, E. (2020). Economic hardship and mental health complaints during COVID-19. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117, 27277–27284.

Yen, E. L. Y., & Mohamad, M. (2020). Utilizing e-learning to assist primary school ESL pupils in learning to spell during COVID-19 pandemic: A literature review. Creative Education, 11(8), 1223-1230.

Zhang, Y & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative Analysis of Content, In: B. M. Wildemuth, Ed., Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science, Libraries Unlimited, 2009. pp. 1-12.

Zhang, Yan & Wildemuth, Barbara. (2016). Qualitative Analysis of Content. Available online at:

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Qualitative-Analysis-of-Content-by-Zhang-Wildemuth/b269343ab82ba8b7a343b893815a0bae6472fcca. Retrieved on 2 August 2020.

Zulham, M. (2013). The Digital Gap Among Middle School Teachers (Descriptive Study of the Information Technology Accessibility and Capability Gap among Middle School Teachers in Krian District). Retrieved from http://lib.unair.ac.id