Learning Loss in English Speaking Class: A Case Study on Language Acquisition in Online Learning at Higher Education

M. Zaim
Department of English Language and Literature, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, *mzaim@fbs.unp.ac.id*

Havid Ardi
Department of English Language and Literature, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, *havid_a@fbs.unp.ac.id*

Nur Rosita
Department of English Language and Literature, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, *nurrosita@fbs.unp.ac.id*

Muflihatuz Zakiyah
Department of English Language Education, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, *muflihatuzzakiyah@gmail.com*

This study aimed to discover the learning loss in online speaking classes in the aspect of language acquisition in higher education. This research used descriptive quantitative research. The data were collected using a questionnaire distributed to the international class students at Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia. The respondents were given 34 questions about three aspects of language acquisition: constructive learning, learning strategy, and learning environment. The results revealed that the students experienced learning loss in some aspects of constructive learning, learning strategy, and learning environment to acquire English as a foreign language, especially for speaking skills. The learning loss happened due to their restricted interactions with peers, difficulty learning collaboratively, and difficulty understanding learning materials. In addition, their metacognitive and social strategy for learning speaking was quite difficult to apply, even though the online learning process was undertaken synchronously and asynchronously. Finally, the unnatural learning environment made it difficult for them to interact to practice the language they were learning. By this finding, it can be concluded that the students did not acquire language acquisition comprehensively.

Keywords: virtual simulation, web-based application, multimedia, teaching, learning, learning loss

INTRODUCTION

Conventionally, digital materials were used as supplement to teaching and learning. The covid-19 pandemic has enforced Indonesian education system to use an unconventional mode of learning known as online learning intensively. Some experts call it open, distance education, blended, or hybrid learning. Although some different terms are used, the characteristics of the teaching and learning process remain the same in which technological-based instruction and learning are applied. It refers to a type of learning that takes place at a distance, requires a high portion of Internet use and technology help, and emphasizes the student's role in acquiring knowledge and skills (Almahasees et al., 2021). It facilitates screen-mode learning, which is different from conventional learning in a physical classroom. It also differentiates face-to-face learning mode conducted in the class where the interaction occurs naturally. Almost 20 years ago, Curran (2001) called this phenomenon a multi-faceted and relatively recent innovation. It would be claimed as a genuinely exceptional phenomenon in higher education. It is a very complex cultural phenomenon in a complex scenario for higher education context since it seems to be a borderless class (Gesu & Gonzalez, 2021). To sum up, it is digital learning because students-teacher, students-students, and students-content material interaction are mediated digitally by reconstructing technology-based pedagogical preferences.

Next, online learning can be conducted in two ways; synchronously and asynchronously. The difference between them is in terms of interactivity between students and teachers. Synchronous online learning entails teachers and students attending the online class simultaneously and interacting, usually scheduled, in numerous technological modes such as video conferences. It can be similarly associated with direct learning from teacher to students in which the term instructor dependency is available (Fabriz, Mendzheritskaya, & Stehle, 2021). On the one hand, it helps the participant be more actively engaged in real-time (Hrastinski, 2008). On the other hand, it is sometimes stressful due to increased screen time (Fernandez, Ramesh, and Manivannan, 2022)

Meanwhile, asynchronous learning could be defined as the way wherein they can do the teaching and learning process by following their own pace, such as accessing a learning management system application or discussion board to study materials and do an assignment independently, even when the participants are not online at the same time (Coogle & Floyd, 2015). It can be taken place anytime and anywhere, and it is very flexible, making the students self-explore learning in terms of student-centered learning. In some cases, the blended synchronous and asynchronous is also possible to conduct. This blended mode allows one to participate in a flexible learning environment (Yamagata, 2014). In the end, these two learning modes in the online learning environment have kept the learning process going during unprecedented circumstances. However, online learning quality requires more attention to ensure the continuity of learning. The fact that the existence of learners' needs must be accommodated by these two to create a high-quality learning environment makes online learning evaluation needed.

Furthermore, the switchover from face-to-face learning to face-to-screen learning brings out various pros and cons. It has one coin with two unlike sides for some educators, especially in Indonesia. For some reasons, this mode of learning can improve learning outcomes with the use of appropriate media (Indrawati, 2021), cheaper in the term of cost-effectiveness (Renner, Laumer & Weitzel, 2014), unlimited accessibility and affordability (Roberts & Hernandez, 2019), it optimizes the quality and quantity of digital structured task (Rosita, 2020). It is advantageous to level up the quality of learning (Dung, 2020). Even though teachers and students initially use the internet and technology for teaching-learning purposes by perforce, at second hand they experience digital academy. In addition, it allows students to practice digital skills naturally. As digital natives, today's students should have acquired digital abilities. Thanks to the pandemic, it is possible for them to use such abilities in everyday life for meaningful learning. Besides, it enables them to have self-regulated learning since it is student-centered and the content materials are well organized and free accessed (Dung, 2020; Firmansyah et al., 2021).

Contrastingly, it may also reduce the quality of education due to unreadiness (Makruf, Rifa'i, & Triana, 2022). This mode typically provides limited teaching and learning care in education as a social process and raises academic rigor among learners (Standerford et al., 2020). It also recognizes many weaknesses, such as non-interactive and complicated activities, complicated instruction, unavailability of instructors, and unorganized materials (Zaim, 2019). It is a lack of interactivity, limited learning facilities, many assignments, the instability of Internet connection, and the electricity breakouts (Aqdas et al., 2023; Dung, 2020; Firmansyah et al., 2021; Sit et al., 2004). In psychology, students tended to get demotivated and anxious, and their moods changed quickly due to online learning during the pandemic (Irawan et al., 2020; Yuzulia, 2021). Online learning also causes economic losses (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2020). Despite these two sides, it is highlighted that online learning is still crucial to be implemented at higher education levels today. It might be continued up to unpredictable times in the future.

Then, by seeing the negative side of online learning, it is hardly significant to see which matters of all these circumstances bring about losses in learning. However, it cannot be denied that the dismissive aspects of online learning become a nightmare for educators and learners since it affects how learning achievement gained to be decreased. Learning loss is a notable drawback of online learning that needs to be anticipated. It is defined as a state of declining knowledge and skill academically (Betebenner & Wenning, 2021; Munawaroh & Nurmalasari, 2021; Patrinos et al., 2022). It is reflected in the diminishment of the learning process and difficulties faced by the students so that the knowledge and skills to be achieved cannot be fulfilled (Kaffenberger, 2021; Li et al., 2020; Munawaroh & Nurmalasari, 2021), activities and learning experience get restricted because of the lack of opportunity to practice the ability (Aprilia, 2021; Assiddiqi & Soeryanto, 2021). It indicates the inadequacy of learning outcomes and does not correlate with students' self-awareness (Simal et al.: 2022). Then, loss in learning can be experienced by the students due to some factors such as internet access difficulties, unorganized program quality, family support, educators, and peer

engagement (Susanto, 2022). In addition, UNESCO (2021) addresses some factors affecting learning loss, such as an abnormal balance of stress in the brain, which leads to poor time management, inability to focus, struggle to connect new information with prior knowledge, difficulty remembering what they read or hear, inability to plan and prioritize tasks, and inability to ignore distractions.

In more detail, learning loss attracts the attention of educational stakeholders worldwide. It brings about various challenges that need to be solved sooner when applying online learning to students on many levels since it leads to the imperfectness of learning achievement. The more prolonged closed schools or partial conduct learning in two modes, a learning loss might be experienced seriously (Engzell et al., 2021). It can be stated that longer time out of school may impact the higher rate of learning loss (Chen, Dorn, Sarakatsannis, & Wiesinger, 2021). Further, it may increase educational inequality. That is why upgrading and adapting eLearning is needed to maintain school existence (Sahlan, Mursalim, Umam & Subakri, (2022). Introducing blended learning, training for educators, implementing a competency-based curriculum, multimodal resources of learning materials, and gradual assessment are also included to minimize learning loss (TeamLeases Edtech, 2021).

Furthermore, educators need to transparently identify learning losses, investigate the cause, and find ways to eliminate the losses (Kasradze & Zarnadze, 2021).), review how the language experience of learners is mediated by technology to emerge their language development in obviating learning loss (Chapelle, 2007), and analyse the consequence or counterevidence of informal linguistic environment setting in acquiring language will be affected distinctively compared to formal linguistic environment setting (Krashen, 2002). Last but not least, monitoring the student's progress extensively and considering further steps based on monitoring results (Blasko, Costa, and Schnepf, 2022) are essential. All these ways out from learning loss must be considered to ensure that anticipating losses in learning is noted.

In case of English learning, for instance, speaking is getting a great attention to be assessed in the sense of its losses of learning during online or hybrid learning, since it requires direct interactions in a learning environment more than other skills do. When people speak, they construct meaningful utterances autonomously through different strategies in micro and macro environments (Taylor: 1993, Oxford: 1990, Dulay: 1982). Speaking as one of the language skills requires direct and active language production in the form of speech. In order to use speaking skills, a speaker needs to socialize with interlocutors and make interactions. Unfortunately, during the covid-19 pandemic era, both physical and social activities are distanced. Online learning exposes limited students' experience in speaking practice (Charney et al., 2020). Moreover, speaking ability is acquired in order for students can communicate in English in real-life. In the process of expressing thoughts or ideas, there are many sub-skills involved. It is not simply about making utterances, but also involving synchrony of verbal and nonverbal messages, turn-taking, and sociocultural functions. However, technology-mediated communication is deficient in nonverbal cues and frequently leads to miscommunication. Therefore, an investigation into the declines in knowledge and skills

that university students in speaking classes may experience was on demand to be conducted, so that the learning objectives can be accomplished more effectively.

There are some studies have been conducted on this issue. Amplify's (2022) research shows that elementary students experienced learning loss in reading due to covid-19. Engzell et al. (2021) found that Dutch primary school students hardly progressed during their online learning in three subjects: math, spelling, and reading. Similarly, Ardington et al. (2021) described that the decline of reading knowledge and skills also happens to seven graders in South Africa. Skar et al. (2021) found some indications of learning loss in first-grade students' writing, affecting their writing quality, handwriting fluency, and attitude toward writing. From the review above, the studies focused on learning loss experienced by school-agers in the areas of math, reading, basic speaking, and writing. Therefore, Scott (2021) has surveyed the nature of English language learning loss in four skills: listening, reading, writing, and speaking. They found that teachers also experienced language loss and lacked the confidence to speak with peers. Home learning factors are also crucial factors. Based on the review of related studies, there are few studies on losses in learning speaking.

In Indonesia, some researchers found that interaction, learning concentration, and material completeness at the university level were low (Andriani et al., 2021). Besides, the results revealed that demotivation and the gap in learning outcomes due to economic factors were detected (Pratiwi, 2021; Oktaria, Fionasari, Ramdha, 2022) as well as the loss of students' engagement with learning getting the learning itself meaningless (Assiddiqi & Soeryanto, 2021). It decreases cognitive and character development as well (Wahyudi, 2021). It causes the failure of online learning regarding students' cognitive, social, and emotional development (Arzaqi & Romadona, 2021). It reduces cognitive, affective, and psychomotor (Mahdum et al., 2021). However, none of the studies analyze learning loss in language acquisition for English as TEFL. Learning loss in foreign language acquisition in Indonesia is one of the blank spot points. Thus, this study initially fills the gap of learning loss in language acquisition in speaking classes in higher education.

It is well known that acquiring a foreign language is long and complex. Therefore, teachers' instruction as input and learners' internal and external factors such as input, aptitude, strategies, and anxiety are also keys in a succession of foreign language acquisition. In addition, a conducive environment and motivation are also crucial. In this paper, the learning loss experiences in speaking classes in terms of second language acquisition will be discussed in several aspects based on the theory of language acquisition: constructive learning, learning strategy, and learning environment.

Constructive learning

Constructivism is one of the effectively used learning theories in learning speaking. This idea highlights how creative students develop autonomous language learning (Mvududu & Thiel-Burgess, 2012; Shi, 2012; Song, 2016). They learn through experience. Therefore, it is essential to make them engage with authentic, pragmatic, and functional use of language to achieve meaningful learning (Arzu Gul, 2022). Constructivism

collects other learning theories, namely collaborative learning, self-regulated learning, and authentic learning. Philips 1997 noted that constructive learning could be plotted into three processes: individual cognitive process (i.e., cognitive constructivism), in terms of social processes (i.e., social constructivism), or terms of sociocultural processes (i.e., constructionism). Taylor (1993) classified four scale indicators for measuring constructive learning. They are autonomy, prior knowledge, negotiation, and student-centredness. Later, it was revised into five scale indicators: Personal Relevance, Uncertainty, Critical Voice, Shared Control, and Student Negotiation (Taylor et al. 1997). Moreover, there are four vital constructivist elements in the online learning environment: knowledge construction, collaborative learning, authentic learning, and self-regulation.

Learning strategy

In addition to linguistic knowledge, learning speaking also requires strategic knowledge (Macaro, 2009). The students need to know what to do with linguistic knowledge; how to put it to its best use. Although strategies are conscious activities that must be operationalized in working memory, they might eventually become subconscious with repeated use. This indicates that the learner is no longer conscious of their use. Therefore, a crucial "feature" of a strategy is its ability to be brought back into working memory and given the attention required to be assessed, considering the current circumstance.

The appropriateness of the strategies used when carrying out a task in an online learning mode is more important than how frequently they are used or the type of strategy used. Oxford (1990) classified language learning strategies into six. First, memory strategy aids students in learning and recalling knowledge using various methods, including rhyme, acronym, rhymes, gestures, and combinations. Second, cognitive strategy enables the learner to directly develop new language resources by thinking, analyzing, taking notes, summarizing, and formally practicing structures and sounds. Third, they can use a compensation strategy to learn through message interpretation based on their background when listening. Fourth, the metacognitive strategy allows them to learn by planning, organizing, and assessing the contents. Fifth, they can use effective strategies to know how they feel toward their learning. Finally, using social strategy reveals how well students connect with others.

Learning environment

Because language is a tool for communication that must be used in daily life, the learning environment that promotes extensive conversation between language learners has a significant role in language acquisition (Rosiyana, 2020; Setiyadi & Salim, 2013; Yuliana, 2020), especially in online learning. Language learning happens when the language being learned is utilized (Fatonah & Permata, 2016; Ramadhani et al., 2019). Physical gatherings often allow for conversing, talking, introducing one another, and openly exchanging ideas. However, due to the constraints of the current system for online learning, this environment cannot be created when moving to online media. Dulay et al. (1982) categorized two kinds of language environments in the acquisition

process. They are macro-environment and micro-environment. Four broad overall features of the environment (macro-environmental features) exist (1) the Naturalness of the environment in which the focus is on its content rather than on its linguistic form; (2) in communication meaning the manner the learner participates in communicative exchanges, (one way, restricted two-way, full two-way) (3) Availability of concrete referents depicting subjects and events that can be seen, heard, or felt while they are being talked about; (4) Target language models of which the (Peer vs. teacher, peer vs. parent, own social group vs. another social group). Conversely, micro-environmental features comprise characteristics of specific structures of the language the learner hears and are regarded not to have the expected significant effects on learning. They are salience, frequency, and correction or feedback (Dulay et al., 1982: 13- 43).

METHOD

Based on the background of the problem and on the review of the literature above, some research questions were formulated, namely 1) what losses did students of Universitas Negeri Padang experience in learning speaking online in term of constructive learning?, 2) what losses did the students experience in learning speaking online in term of learning strategy?, and 3) what losses did the students experience in learning online speaking in term of learning environment? To answer these questions, an online questionnaire was administered in Google Form to the students and delivered through WhatsApp group. Accordingly, this research used a descriptive quantitative approach to describe the factors of learning loss experienced by students of Universitas Negeri Padang in online speaking classes during the covid-19 pandemic era. The learning process was held by blending synchronous and asynchronous learning. The population of this study was students majoring English education who experienced learning speaking by using the blended learning on their first year of higher education. Twenty-two international class students were taken purposively because they learned speaking by using English as the only language of instruction in the learning process that required them to develop autonomous learning more than the students of other classes were.

The questionnaire consisted of 34 items (see Table 1) about their learning loss experience in terms of second language acquisition. The items were divided into three sections, namely 15 items, which are related to constructive learning (adapted from Taylor: 1993), 12 items related to learning strategy (adapted from Oxford: 2003), and seven items related to the learning environment (adapted from Dulay: 1982), followed by five responses: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

Table 1
Indicators of questionnaire

No.	Aspects	Indicators	Statement Numbers
1.	Constructive Learning	Knowledge Construction	1, 2, 3, 4
		Collaborative Learning	5, 6, 7, 8
		Self-regulated Learning	9, 10, 11, 12
		Authentic Learning	13, 14, 15
2.	Learning Strategy	Memory Strategy	16, 17
		Cognitive Strategy	18, 19
		Compensation Strategy	20, 21
		Metacognitive Strategy	22, 23
		Affective Strategy	24, 25
		Social Strategy	26, 27
3.	Learning Environment	Micro Environment	28, 29, 30, 31
		Macro Environment	32, 33, 34

The items were built in the form of both positive and negative statements (see Table 2).

Table 2
Positive and negative items in the questionnaire

Item	Statement Numbers
Positive Statements	1, 2, 3, 8, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24
Negative Statements	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34

The collected responses were analyzed by finding each item's frequency and mean scores. First, the mean scores were calculated by scoring five for each SA, four for each A, three for each N, two for each D, and one for each SD. Next, the scores of each item were summed to be divided by the number of respondents. Finally, the main scores were converted to the category of learning loss (see Table 3).

Table 3
Learning loss category

Mean Score Interval	Category for Positive Statements	Category for Negative Statements
1,00 – 1,50	Very High	Very Low
1,51 – 2,50	High	Low
2,51 – 3,50	Middle	Middle
3,51 – 4,50	Low	High
4,51 – 5,00	Very Low	Very High

FINDINGS

After the mean scores were found and converted to the learning loss category, the results unfolded that learning loss in speaking class was unavoidable. The student's knowledge and skills declined in constructive learning, learning strategy, and learning environment to acquire English as a foreign language, especially for speaking skills.

In the aspect of constructive learning, the findings are presented in the table below.

Table 4
Students' learning loss in the aspect of constructive learning

No	Item	Response					Score	Mean score	Category
		SA	A	N	D	SD			
1	I use my prior knowledge to build new knowledge to make effective learning	3	19	0	0	0	91	4,14	Low
2	I learn course content better when I put it in my own words	1	17	4	0	0	85	3,86	Low
3	I am interested to learn new knowledge for better learning	1	11	8	1	1	76	3,45	Middle
4	I get difficulty understanding high-order thinking materials	2	15	3	2	0	83	3,77	High
5	I have trouble interacting with my peers	4	10	2	6	0	78	3,55	High
6	I have difficulty collaborating with peers in understanding learning materials	4	10	3	5	0	79	3,59	High
7	I have difficulty doing a collaborative project	1	10	7	4	0	74	3,36	Middle
8	I use adequate time in doing collaborative work	2	11	5	3	1	76	3,45	Middle
9	I find it difficult to prepare for a test	1	10	4	7	0	71	3,23	Middle
10	I find it difficult to find additional reading materials for a test	0	8	6	8	0	66	3,00	Middle
11	It has trouble asking for the lecturer's guidance	1	9	7	5	0	72	3,27	Middle
12	I have trouble planning to learn and finding additional material on my own	2	7	8	5	0	72	3,27	Middle
13	I do not see much value in learning theoretical content for speaking	2	11	5	4	0	77	3,50	Middle
14	I do not find study topics useful for daily speaking practice	1	4	5	11	1	59	2,68	Middle
15	I have limited space to practice speaking skill	3	8	3	6	2	70	3,18	Middle

Table 3 shows that the students experienced a high category of learning loss when dealing with difficult learning materials, learning interactions, and collaborative learning. This indicates that online learning in the pandemic era has made difficult materials even harder for learning. The students also experienced other serious setbacks. They found it difficult to learn and collaborate with classmates in comprehending the learning materials since their interactions in the learning process were also limited. In other words, the access to construct knowledge of high-level learning materials was not only missing, but the interaction between students was also obstructed. As a result, they rarely learned and teamed up effectively to acquire speaking knowledge and skills.

In addition, Table 3 informs that the students also faced other obstacles, such as self-regulated and authentic learning. In those terms, the learning loss category was middle. It points out that they partially lost their ability to plan for a task, monitor their performance, and then reflect on the outcome; and they missed half of the chance to deal with real-world issues. Hence, no wonder that they were demotivated to learn better. Even so, they were confident about their effective learning when they could connect the

materials being learned to the previous ones and their English-speaking ability because the category for these two was low.

In the aspect of learning strategy, the findings are presented in the table below.

Table 5
Students' learning loss in the aspect of learning strategy

No	Item	Response					Score	Mean score	Category
		SA	A	N	D	SD			
16	I say new English words I have learned several times to memorize it	1	19	2	0	0	87	3,95	Low
17	I try to talk like native English speakers	5	13	4	0	0	89	4,05	Low
18	I use new English words based on contexts	4	14	2	2	0	86	3,91	Low
19	think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English during speaking practice	3	15	4	0	0	87	3,95	Low
20	I do not use gestures for words I do not know	1	7	5	9	0	66	3,00	Middle
21	I use other similar words when I do not know the exact word for my English speaking	2	18	2	0	0	88	4,00	Low
22	I find it difficult to pay attention when someone is speaking English	2	11	4	5	0	76	3,45	Middle
23	I do not find somebody to talk with in speaking English	5	12	1	4	0	84	3,82	High
24	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake	4	11	7	0	0	85	3,86	Low
25	I cannot expose what I feel and think in speaking	0	7	6	8	1	63	2,86	Middle
26	I cannot ask for feedback on my English speaking from my peers	1	11	7	3	0	76	3,45	Middle
27	I don't get feedback for my English speaking from my lecture	0	8	9	4	1	68	3,09	Middle

The data in the table above reveal that there was little chance of their using strategies for learning speaking. Among the six strategies for learning speaking, the most difficult one was the metacognitive strategy. To them, it was troublesome to pay attention to the interlocutors as they were speaking English in online learning. Beyond the classroom, finding someone to talk to in English was even more difficult. Additionally, they struggled to correct their language errors, and getting feedback from the lecturers was also hard to accomplish. Besides, some of them could not use their body language to help them to convey meaning and to compensate for speech difficulties. In sum, they had partially lost their chance to use three types of learning speaking strategies: compensation, metacognitive and social.

In the aspect of the learning environment, the findings were presented in the table below.

Table 6
Students' learning loss in the aspect of learning environment

No	Item	Response					Score	Mean score	Category
		SA	A	N	D	SD			
28	I get difficulty finding authentic English-speaking materials for daily practice	4	9	5	4	0	79	3,59	High
29	I do not have a chance to speak English in a natural English situational setting	3	8	6	5	0	75	3,41	Middle
30	I have no friends to clarify what I say whether it is correct or not	1	9	4	7	1	68	3,09	Middle
31	I have no friends to be a target model in speaking	2	4	6	9	1	63	2,86	Middle
32	I have no friends to correct y grammar mistakes	1	9	2	9	1	66	3,00	Middle
33	I have no friend to give me feedback	2	7	3	9	1	66	3,00	Middle
34	I do not find an appropriate number for practicing my English	2	11	3	4	2	73	3,32	Middle

Table 6 illustrates some indications of learning loss in the learning environment. The difficulty of authentic examples of English language use was so prominent that few students obtained the examples easily. Further, many of them learned speaking in an unsupported circumference, which did not enable them to strengthen their speaking skills. The lack of interlocutors, authentic materials, models, and direct feedback are some of the causes of the problem.

DISCUSSION

The results revealed that the three aspects of language acquisition theory are accommodated differently in online mode learning. In constructive learning, the students found difficulties in knowledge construction. Williamson (2010) mentioned that it is strongly supported to facilitate the value of working in teams for knowledge construction since there is a positive association between knowledge construction and collaborative activities. The students believe that collaborative activities will develop their knowledge construction. Therefore, authentic learning is also associated with authentic assessment (Zaim, Refnaldi & Arsyad, 2020). In the theory of constructivism, learning is seen as a social activity, showing that a learner needs other people to learn. In addition, in distance learning theory, interaction (the foundation of any social activity) matters. It is believed that individuals can create and construct meaning of the world around them in learning. The achievement of online learning objectives depends partly on interaction (Moore, 1993, as cited in Kumar et al., 2021). The interaction is classified into three: interaction between student and content material, student and teacher, and between fellow students (Moore, 1989), interacting with classmates and learning and working collaboratively with them. It indicates that student-content materials interaction and student-student interaction were not well facilitated yet. It was connected to the finding of Saricoban (2014) that there is a positive correlation between learning how to learn and foreign language achievement. How students perform in speaking class in blended synchronous and asynchronous learning will affect their language acquisition. The learning loss in speaking classes happened in terms of sharing ideas with peers and teachers, which is crucial.

Moreover, they could not easily deal with memory and cognitive strategy in learning strategy. Language acquisition occurs when language learners communicate and continue to communicate naturally, not focusing on linguistic rules (Setiyadi & Salim, 2013). The restricted student-content and student-student interactions degenerated them from achieving online learning outcomes to be naturally acquired. When the formal environment exposure is much more, a form of language will be focused on. Conversely, when the natural environment exposure is much more, communication contact will be pointed. These findings align with Moore et al. (2016, p. 5-6) and Munawaroh & Nurmalasari (2021, p. 2) that the students need to work in pairs or groups, but they lost it in online learning. Although they were set to learn collaboratively, it is hard to notice whether it ran and resulted effectively or not.

In response to the problems above, applying learning strategies could be a solution. The students can put cognitive strategies to deal with difficult materials and social strategies for figuring out the matters of interaction between fellow students in online classroom applications. Unfortunately, the metacognitive strategy was also tough to take due to the environment where the students' learning discourages them from finding someone to talk to in English in online learning mode. Making feedback or correction is quite difficult to exist. Benson (2021) mentions that language learning depends on teachers' instruction and learners' interaction inside and outside the classroom. When they do not have the opportunity to have an online talk, they cannot pay well attention to the interlocutors.

Lastly, in the learning environment, the challenge in the macro environment deals with the Naturalness of learning. It is emphasized that the quality of the language environment is essential to success in acquiring a new language (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982). This study in a formal setting did not locate the such thing. On the contrary, it does not entail with informal linguistics environment. Candilas (2018) observed a self-regulated informal linguistics environment, such as interacting in the English language using technological-based applications, reading fiction and non-fiction English materials, watching English tv programs, and listening to English podcasts, could improve students' oral skills. Then, it could be noted that exposure to the English language used outside the formal classroom instruction is also needed to be authentic learning. Meanwhile, online learning does not provide this point. These obstacles illustrate learning loss experiences in terms of learning strategy use and learning environment both in macro and microenvironment for language acquisition.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was achieved. It was found that learning loss in terms of second language acquisition did happen to students in online speaking classes during the covid-19 pandemic era. The decline of learning was felt when it came to collaborative learning. Besides, they could not use any strategy to accomplish speaking tasks freely, for example, metacognitive strategy, because they had trouble finding English interlocutors. This indicates that the learning environment was not supported in acquiring knowledge and skills of speaking during the covid-19 pandemic era. In conclusion, indications of learning loss in speaking classes in constructive learning,

learning strategy, and learning environment cannot be ignored and should be anticipated immediately. To sum up, foreign language education policymakers must avoid the losses in learning by developing supported curriculum in online environment in speaking classes and teachers need to consider relevant approaches in online learning to maintain language acquisition, especially in speaking skills. Also, the students are required to improve their self-regulated learning. The last, for the further researchers can conduct more studies on assessing which approach is appropriate to be used in online class environment that minimalizes the losses detected in this research.

REFERENCES

Almahasees, Z., Mohsen, K., & Amin, M. O. (2021). Faculty's and Students' Perceptions of Online Learning During COVID-19. *Frontiers in Education*, *6*, 119. https://doi.org/10.3389/FEDUC.2021.638470/XML/NLM

Alvarez, A. Jr. (2020). The phenomenon of learning at a distance through emergency remote teaching amidst the pandemic crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15*(1), 144-153. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3881529

Amplify. (2022, February 16). New report: because of the pandemic, more of the nation's youngest students are still struggling to learn to read. *Amplify Education, Inc.* https://amplify.com/news/new-report-because-of-the-pandemic-more-of-the-nations-youngest-students-are-still-struggling-to-learn-to-read/

Andriani, W., Subandowo, M., Karyono, H., & Gunawan, W. (2021). Learning Loss dalam pembelajaran daring di masa Pandemi Corona. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Teknologi Pembelajaran*, 484–501. http://snastep.com/proceeding/index.php/snastep/index

Aprilia, T. (2021). *Risiko Learning Loss Menghantui Peserta Didik di Masa Pandemi*. Majalah Suara Pendidikan. https://www.majalahsuarapendidikan.com/2021/02/risiko-learning-loss-menghantui-peserta.html

Aqdas, S., Ahmed, A., & Soomro, M. A. (2023). Exploring the Impact of Online Classes on Students' Performance during Covid-19: Voices from Pakistan. *International Journal of Instruction*, *16*(1), 753–766. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16142a

Ardington, C., Wills, G., & Kotze, J. (2021). COVID-19 learning losses: Early grade reading in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *86*. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJEDUDEV.2021.102480

Arzaqi, R. N., & Romadona, N., F. (2021). The Kindergarten's Headmaster View of the Potential for Learning Loss in Early Childhood Education during Pandemic COVID-19. Indonesian Journal of Early Childhood Education Studies, 10(2), 143-148.

Arzu Gul. (2022, June 14). *Constructivist Methods in Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL)*. Modern Diplomacy. https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2022/06/14/constructivist-methods-in-teaching-english-as-a-second-language-esl/

Assiddiqi, D. R., & Soeryanto. (2021). Peluang menurunnya capaian hasil belajar

(learning loss) dan alternatif solusinya: Kajian kasus pembelajaran online di era Pandemi Covid-19 di Jurusan Teknik Mesin Unesa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknik Mesin*, *10*(3), 47–54.

Benson, Phil. (2021). *Language Learning Environment: Spatial Perspective on SLA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters

Betebenner, D. W., & Wenning, R. J. (2021). *Understanding Pandemic Learning Loss and Learning Recovery: The Role of Student Growth & Statewide Testing*. Center for Assessment.

Blaskó, Z., Costa, P. da, & Schnepf, S. V. (2022). Learning losses and educational inequalities in Europe: Mapping the potential consequences of the COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *32*(4), 361–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/09589287221091687

Cameron-Standerford A, Menard K, Edge C, Bergh B, Shayter A, Smith K and Vanden Avond L (2020) The Phenomenon of Moving to Online/Distance Delivery as a Result of COVID-19: Exploring Initial Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty at a Rural Midwestern University. Front. Educ. 5:583881. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2020.583881

Candilas, K.S. (2018). Informal Linguistics Environments: Implications to Oral English Skills. Asian *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (2018)

Chapelle, C. A. (2007). Technology and second language acquisition. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 27(2007), 98–114. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190508070050

Charney, Sara A.; Camarata, Stephen M.; Chern, Alexander (2020). Potential Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Communication and Language Skills in Children. Otolaryngologyâ "Head and Neck Surgery, (), 019459982097824–. doi:10.1177/0194599820978247

Chen, K.L, Dorn, E, Sarakatsannis, J, & Wiesinger,A. (2021). Teacher survey: Learning loss is global and significant. McKinsey & Company in Public and Social Sector Practice.

Coogle, C. & Floyd, K. (2015). Synchronous and Asynchronous Learning Environments of Rural Graduate Early Childhood Special Educators Utilizing Wimba© and Ecampus. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*. Vol. 11, No. 2, June 2015 https://jolt.merlot.org/Vol11no2/Coogle_0615.pdf

Curran, C. (2001). The Phenomenon of Online Learning. European Journal of Education, Vol. 36, No. 2, On-Line Learning (Jun. 2001), pp. 113-132. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1503647

Di Gesú, M.G., González, M.F. (2020). Online Learning as a Cultural Phenomenon in a Complex Scenario a Critical View of Online Learning and Teaching Process in Higher Education. In: Di Gesú, M.G., González, M.F. (eds) Cultural Views on Online Learning in Higher Education. Cultural Psychology of Education, vol 13. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63157-4_12

Dulay, H, Burt, M, & Krashen, S. (1982). Language Two. New York: Oxford University Press

Dung, D. T. H. (2020). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Virtual Learning. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, *10*(3), 45–48. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-1003054548

Engzell, P., Frey, A., & Verhagen, M. D. (2021). Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *118*(17). https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.2022376118

Fabriz S, Mendzheritskaya J, Stehle S. Impact of Synchronous and Asynchronous Settings of Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education on Students' Learning Experience During COVID-19. Front Psychol. 2021 Oct 11;12:733554. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.733554. PMID: 34707542; PMCID: PMC8542673.

Fatonah, & Permata, N. N. (2016). Fenomena pemerolehan Bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing: Studi kasus pada mahasiswa Perancis dan Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Rekayasa Dan Teknologi Manufaktur*. http://repository.polman-bandung.ac.id/publikasi-view-PBL-201809-0046

Hrastinski, Stefan. (2008). Asynchronous and Synchronous E-Learning. EDUCAUSE Quarterly, vol. 31, no. 4 (October–December 2008)

Firmansyah, R., Putri, D. M., Wicaksono, M. G. S., Putri, S. F., & Ahmad Arif Widianto. (2021). The University Students' Perspectives on the Advantages and Disadvantages of Online Learning Due to COVID-19. *Proceeding of 2nd Annual Management, Business and Economic Conference (AMBEC 2020)*, 120–124.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2020). *The economic impacts of learning losses*. https://doi.org/10.1787/21908d74-en

Indrawati, C. D. S. (2021). The Effectiveness of Archiving Videos and Online Learning on Student's Learning and Innovation Skills. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(4), 135-154. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1449a

Fernandez, C.J., Ramesh, R. and Manivannan, A.S.R. (2022), "Synchronous learning and asynchronous learning during COVID-19 pandemic: a case study in India", *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*, *17*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAOUJ-02-2021-0027

Irawan, A. W., Dwisona, D., & Lestari, M. (2020). Psychological Impacts of Students on Online Learning During the Pandemic COVID-19. *KONSELI : Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling (E-Journal)*, *7*(1), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.24042/KONS.V7I1.6389

Kaffenberger, M. (2021). Modeling the long-run learning impact of the Covid-19 learning shock: Actions to (more than) mitigate loss. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *81*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102326

Kasradze, T. & Zarnadze, N. (2021). Learning Losses Caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic - A Significant Threat to Economic Development. *European Journal of*

Education, 4(1), January – June 2021

Krashen, S. D. (2002). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Pergamon Press Inc. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003054368-4

Kumar, P., Saxena, C., & Baber, H. (2021). Learner-content interaction in e-learning-the moderating role of perceived harm of COVID-19 in assessing the satisfaction of learners. *Smart Learning Environment*, *8*(5), 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-021-00149-8

Li, A., Harries, M., & Ross, L. F. (2020). Reopening K-12 Schools in the Era of Coronavirus Disease 2019: Review of State-Level Guidance Addressing Equity Concerns. *Journal of Pediatrics*, *227*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.08.069

Macaro, E. (2009). Developments of Language Learning Strategy. In *Contemporary applied linguistics: Language for the Real World* (pp. 10–36). Continuum International Publishing Group.

Mahdum, et al. (2021). Potential Learning Loss during the Covid-19 Pandemic; Preliminary Case in Student of English Education Study Program, University Riau. International Conference on Education Technology (URICET-2021)

Makruf, I., Rifa'i, A. A., & Triana, Y. (2022). Moodle-based online learning management in higher education. *International Journal of Instruction, 15*(1), 135-152. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.1518a

Moore, M. G. (1989). Editorial: Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *3*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526659

Moore, M. G., Warner, W. J., & Jones, D. W. W. (2016). Student-to-Student Interaction in Distance Education Classes: What Do Graduate Students Want? *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *57*(2), 1–13. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1122974.pdf

Munawaroh, E., & Nurmalasari, Y. (2021). Students Resilience After Pandemic: Learning Loss Recovery. *Psikoeduko: Jurnal Psikologi, Edukasi Dan Konseling*, *1*(1–10). https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/Psikoeduko/index

Mvududu, N. H., & Thiel-Burgess, J. (2012). Constructivism in Practice: The Case for English Language Learners. *International Journal of Education*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.5296/IJE.V4I3.2223

Oktariani, F., Fionasari, R., & Ramdha, T. (2022). The Impact of Learning Loss due to Family Income Factors on Students' Achievement during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Edunesia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 3*(1), 12-20.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview.* Retrieved from https://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/workshop/read2.pdf

Patrinos, H. A., Vegas, E., & Carter-Rau, R. (2022). *An Analysis of COVID-19 Student Learning Loss*. http://www.worldbank.org/prwp.

Pratiwi, W. D. (2021). Dinamika learning loss: Guru dan orang tua. *Jurnal Edukasi*

Nonformal, *2*(1), 147–153.

Ramadhani, A. A., Muliyono, N., & Setyowati, E. (2019). Kajian psikolinguistik sebagai representasi pemerolehan bahasa kedua mahasiswa program darmasiswa di IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. *Briliant: Jurnal Riset Dan Konseptual*, *4*(4), 473–481.

Renner, D., Laumer, S., & Weitzel, T. (2014). Effectiveness and efficiency of blended learning: A literature review. In 20th Americas conference on information systems proceedings 7–9 August 2014. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7362/4516b3ea78b0477 f0639a87e3429cc8f3255.pdf?_ga=2.164162875.50848195.1588235235-1386605532. 1551621031

Roberts, T., & Hernandez, K. (2019). Digital access is not binary: The 5'A's of technology access in the Philippines. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *85*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12084

Rosita, N., Saun, İ. & Mairi, S. (2020). Google Classroom for Hybrid Learning in Senior High School. Journal of Learning and Teaching in Digital Age, 5 (1), 35-41. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/joltida/issue/55477/760132

Rosiyana. (2020). Pengajaran bahasa dan pemerolehan bahasa kedua dalam pembelajaran BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia Penutur Asing). *Jurnal Ilmiah Korpus*, *4*(3), 374–382.

Shahabadi, M. M. & Uplane, M. (2015). Synchronous and asynchronous e-learning styles and academic performance of e-learners. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 176 (2015) 129 – 138

Scott, Rachel. 2021. Language and Learning Loss: the evidence on children who use English as an additional language. Cambridge: The Bell Foundation

Setiyadi, A. C., & Salim, M. S. (2013). Pemeroleh bahasa kedua menurut Stephen Krashen. *Jurnal At-Ta'dib*, *8*(2), 265–280.

Shi, J. (2012). The application of constructivism: Activities for enlivening comprehensive English class. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 63–70. https://doi.org/10.5539/ELT.V6N2P63

Sit, J. W. H., Chung, J. W. Y., Chow, M. C. M., & Wong, T. K. S. (2004). Experiences of online learning: students' perspective. *Nurse Education Today*, *25*, 140–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2004.11.004

Simal, F. ., Mahulauw, D. ., Leasa, M., & Batlolona, J. R. . (2022). Self-Awareness and Mitigation of Learning Loss on Students' Science Learning Outcomes During the Covid-19 Pandemic. Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA, 8(1), 239–246. https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v8i1.1172

Skar, G. B., Lei, P., Graham, S., Aasen, A. J., Johansen, M. B., & Kvistad, A. H. (2021). Handwriting fluency and the quality of primary grade students' writing. *Reading and Writing*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10185-y

Song, G. (2016). Constructivism in Audiovisual and Speaking Teaching of University.

Higher Education of Social Science, *10*(2), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.3968/8182

Susanto, S. (2022). The Challenges of Learning Loss in English Language Learning at Islamic Higher Education in the Post-Pandemic. Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching, 7(1), 140-156. https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v7i1.1076

Taylor, P. C., Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1997). Monitoring constructivist classroom learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, 27(4), 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(97)90011-2

TeamLease Edtech. 2021. Covid 19 Learning Loss in Higher Education. A report.

UNESCO. 2021. Recovering lost learning: What can be done quickly and at scale? UNESCO Covid-19 Education Response, Education Sector Issue Notes. Issue note n 7.4 – June 2021

Wahyudi, Agus. (2021). Learning Loss during Covid-19 Pandemic in Indonesia and the Strategies to Minimize It. Journal of English Education and Linguistics. Vol. 2 No. 2 (2021)

Williamson, W. D. (2010). *Assessing Constructivist Element in the Online Learning Element*. A dissertation.

Yamagata-Lynch, L. C. (2014). Blending online asynchronous and synchronous learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i2.1778

Yarrow, Noah; Masood, Eema; Afkar, Rythia. 2020. Estimates of COVID-19 Impacts on Learning and Earning in Indonesia: How to Turn the Tide. *World Bank, Washington, DC. © World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/34378 License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.*

Yuliana, R. (2020). Pemerolehan bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa kedua pada siswa Thaimand di MA Nurul Islam Jember. *Belajar Bahasa: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *5*(1), 111–122.

Yuzulia, I. (2021). The Challenges of Online Learning during Pandemic: Students' Voice. *Wanastra : Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *13*(1), 08–12. https://doi.org/10.31294/W.V13I1.9759

Zaim, M., Refnaldi, & Arsyad, S. (2020). Authentic Assessment for Speaking Skills:

Problem and Solution for English Secondary School Teachers in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(3), 587-604. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13340a

Zaim, M. & Heri Mudra (2019). Blended English Language Learning as a Course in an Indonesian Context: An Exploration toward EFL Learners' Perceptions. *In Proceedings of the 2019 8th International Conference on Educational and Information Technology (ICEIT 2019). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 209–216. https://doi.org/10.1145/3318396.3318435*