IJIET, e-ISSN 2548-8430, p-ISSN 2548-8422, Vol. 8, No. 1, January 2024, pp. 35-49

International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJIET
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

INVESTIGATING EFL STUDENTS' ONLINE ENGAGEMENT IN ZOOM MAIN ROOM AND BREAKOUT ROOMS

Regina Yoantika Natalie[1*] and Rina Astuti Purnamaningwulan[2]
[1,2]Sanata Dharma University, Indonesia
reginayoantika@gmail.com[1] and rina.ap@usd.ac.id[2]
*correspondence: reginayoantika@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v8i1.6152
received 27 March 2023; accepted 24 January 2024

Abstract
Zoom as one of the video conference applications facilitates synchronous online learning through its main room and breakout rooms features. This research aimed to compare students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Breakout rooms. It also explored the extent to which group discussions could facilitate students' online engagement through Zoom Breakout rooms. Ninety-one EFL students participated in this mixed-method study. Quantitative data were collected using 24-item questionnaires addressed to two different groups of students: breakout room and main room students. Qualitative data were collected by interviewing six respondents from the breakout room group to explore their opinions regarding the breakout room's effectiveness in promoting online engagement. The independent sample t-test towards the quantitative data revealed a significant difference between online engagement that occurred in the Breakout room compared to the Zoom main room ($t=-4.922$, $df=89$, $p<0.05$). Further, it was found that Zoom breakout rooms were able to facilitate online engagement in the five engagement aspects, namely social, collaborative, behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement. These findings imply that Zoom Breakout rooms can be optimized to boost online engagement.

Keywords: breakout rooms, online engagement, synchronous learning, Zoom

Introduction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, students and educators should conduct learning activities from home. This issue compelled educators to rethink how they provide their courses promptly. Online education is the most excellent solution and has ushered us into a new era of education. There are two types of online learning systems: synchronous and asynchronous. According to Wintemute (2021), asynchronous learning is not real-time learning. The synchronous method allows students to communicate with their teachers or peers (Kumar, 2021). This procedure is like the traditional one, except it is carried out using an internet platform.

In synchronous learning, students' engagement is one of the most important aspects that should be seen. Zoom meeting is a software that can be used to do synchronous meetings and can help to boost students' engagement. Mclaughlin and

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Brame (2021) show the data that Zoom Meeting was one of the most popular video conferencing software for education in 2020. According to Ngoma (2020), Zoom meetings have many features, including cloud or computer recording—which allows the educator to record the meeting so that students can learn asynchronously, screen sharing—which allows the educator to show the materials, and breakout rooms—which allows the educators to divide the students into smaller spaces. Conducting group discussions through the Breakout rooms feature in a class is suitable for applying student-centered learning (Korturska, 2019).

For English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students, Zoom meetings are beneficial as the media to practice and improve their language skills. Based on Nurieva and Garaeva's (2020) research, students feel more convenient attending online learning through Zoom meetings than the traditional one due to its flexibility to be accessed. However, there are several problems with the device and internet connection when having synchronous learning using Zoom meetings.

This study investigated the use of the Zoom meeting and the Breakout rooms. There are several studies about the use of Zoom meetings for educational purposes. Some of them are Nurieva and Garaeva's (2020) study which discusses the benefits of Zoom as a distance learning tool and Venton and Pompano's (2021) research which examines active learning methods in Zoom meetings. However, the studies that compare and investigate online engagement in Zoom meetings and Breakout rooms are scant because several studies only focus on the engagement happening in the Zoom main meeting or Breakout rooms. Furthermore, this research was conducted to fill the gap in the literature by investigating an online conference platform, Zoom's main room, compared to its feature, Breakout rooms, to stimulate students' online engagement.

This study aimed to determine students' engagement in Zoom's main room and Breakout rooms. It also explores the extent to which group discussions facilitate online engagement in Breakout rooms. In other words, this study has two research questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom's main room and Zoom Breakout rooms?
2. To what extent do group discussions in Zoom Breakout rooms facilitate students' online engagement?

To answer the first research question, particularly, hypotheses were developed.

a. H_0: There is no significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom Breakout rooms. (H_0: $\bar{x}_{mainroom}=breakout_{out}$)
b. H_A: There is a significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom Breakout rooms. (H_A: $\bar{x}_{main\ room}\neq breakout_{out}$)

Equationarning

In the era of COVID-19, education must run online learning. Online learning is education that occurs using the Internet. It is one form of "distance learning" (Vural, 2013). According to Rossett (2002), online learning offers vast potential, but it takes time, effort, and resources to get the benefits. Online learning must be authentic, interactive, and collaborative. There are two alternatives to conducting

online learning, i.e. asynchronous and synchronous learning systems (Ring & Mathieux, 2002).

Kumar (2021) claims that asynchronous learning does not imply real-time learning because educators upload the materials to a cloud where students can open them. Asynchronous has several strengths: convenience for students in having a high degree of control over when and where they engage with course materials and activities, highly structured, efficient, and secure management of assignments and grades for educators and students (Fadde & Vu, 2014).

Meanwhile, the synchronous method is a technique that allows students to have live communication with educators, similar to what they did in the traditional school system (Fadde & Vu, 2014). The most important advantage of synchronous learning is that educators can provide instant feedback to students (Chen et al., 2005). It increases levels of motivation which might boost students' engagement to get better learning experiences (Chen et al., 2005; It-analysis, 2001)

Zoom Meeting

Zoom meetings are a beneficial software for teleconferencing that can support learning needs by enabling interaction with so many individuals remotely (Pratiwi et al., 2019). Zoom meeting has many features, such as screen sharing, recording of the meeting, and Breakout rooms, which can support the meeting. It is compatible with computers, laptops, Android devices, and smartphones (Laili & Nashir, 2021).

Zoom facilitates educators and students to have synchronous learning (Laili & Nashir, 2021). Some Zoom features enable English educators to display and examine language skills via full interactions with students and deliver the essence of material in various ways (Guzacheva, 2020).

Zoom main room and breakout rooms feature

Zoom meeting accommodates online learning similar to traditional learning–face-to-face learning. Educators and students can meet synchronously in the Zoom main room. After actions are taken in the Zoom main room, it gives students positive feelings about the Zoom meeting (Nurieva & Garaeva, 2020).

One of Zoom's features is Breakout rooms that can be used in online teaching. In Zoom, the Breakout Rooms feature is a virtual room separate from the main room (Agustina & Suharya, 2021). The use of the Breakout rooms can be a game-changer in anticipating learning obstacles in digital learning (Lee, 2021). The educators can split students into small groups, so the students can interact with peers (Chandler, 2016). Venton and Pompano (2021) surveyed students' attitudes toward Breakout room activities, and the result shows that students feel more engaged in learning in smaller groups. As language learners, it helps students to practice and use the language being studied. Students who are engaged with each other in the learning process through various methods, such as group work, can improve their ability in speaking and critical thinking (Coates, 2006).

Students' online engagement

Engagement is about the activity that makes people feel a sense of belonging (Redmond et al., 2018). Good student engagement is about the time, energy, and resources students devote to activities designed to enhance learning and the quality of learning that can invite students to participate in the learning process (Krause,

2005). There are five student engagement; social, cognitive, behavioral, collaborative, and emotional engagement (Redmond et al., 2018). Social engagement refers to the social investment to have experiences in every participation (Knight, 2013). It is about building community, creating a sense of belonging, developing relationships, and establishing trust. Cognitive engagement concerns students' scholastic success (Pasaribu & Wulandari, 2021). It is about how the learning process can build students' critical thinking (Redmond et al., 2018). Behavioral engagement concerns students' attitudes toward achieving academic skills and supporting and encouraging peers (Redmond et al., 2018). Collaborative engagement is associated with forming various networks and alliances that facilitate learning, such as peer-to-peer learning and collaboration with others (Redmond et al., 2018). The last one, emotional engagement refers to students' reactions to their peers, educators, academics, and colleges (Fredricks et al., 2004).

Students' online engagement is essential in education since the educator can provide the learning strategies to engage the students using these five frameworks (Redmond et al., 2018). Each aspect has its indicators as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Online engagement framework for higher education (Redmond et al., 2018)

Online Engagement Element	Indicators
Social Engagement	Building community
	Creating a sense of belonging
	Developing relationships
	Establishing trust
Cognitive Engagement	Thinking critically
	Activating metacognition
	Integrating ideas
	Justifying decisions
	Developing deep discipline understanding
	Distributing expertise
Behavioral Engagement	Developing academic skills
	Identifying opportunities and challenges
	Developing multidisciplinary skills
	Developing agency
	Upholding online learning norms
	Supporting and encouraging peers
Collaborative Engagement	Learning with peers
	Relating to faculty members
	Connecting to institutional opportunities
	Developing professional networks
Emotional Engagement	Managing expectations
	Articulating assumptions
	Recognizing motivations
	Committing to learning

Method

A mixed-method explanatory design approach was conducted to answer the research questions because it empowers a more comprehensive and meaningful understanding of the topic (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018). The mixed-method approach focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing quantitative and qualitative

data in a single study or series of studies, providing a chance to understand research problems and questions (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 32). This approach also gives more prosperous, broader, and more profound knowledge about a situation (Creswell & Clark, 2018). In the explanatory design, the quantitative data is used to help give direction to the qualitative research and its results to help explain the initial quantitative findings (Creswell & Clark, 2018).

The research was carried out in the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) at Sanata Dharma University (SDU). This research was conducted in February 2022. The research participants were SDU ELESP batch 2019 students who have experienced online learning using Zoom meetings to have discussions in the Zoom main room or Breakout rooms during the pandemic.

To collect the quantitative data, the researchers made a closed-ended questionnaire containing two different links to answer the first research question; one focuses on ELESP students' views on the use of Zoom main room and another one is on the use of the Breakout rooms feature to stimulate students' online engagement. The respondents could click the link by themselves based on their experiences. Closed-ended questions with 4-point Likert scales ranging from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree were used in this questionnaire so that the participants have to choose their absolute side with no neutral answer (Cohen et al., 2018). The scale had been thoroughly evaluated for dependability and internal consistency. The Cronbach Alpha value was 0.932 (>0.70), indicating that the scale has excellent internal consistency validity (Pallant, 2020).

The questionnaire consisted of 24 close-ended questions based on indicators of students' online engagement aspects from Redmond et al.'s (2018) theory. There were four statements about social engagement, six statements about cognitive engagement, six statements about behavioral engagement, four statements about collaborative engagement, and four statements about emotional engagement.

Table 2. Total respondents

Form	Total of Respondents	Percentage
Zoom main room	33	36.26%
Breakout rooms	58	63.74%
Total	91	100%

There were 91 out of 159 students in the ELESP batch 2019 who participated in the questionnaire. Among those, 33 respondents gave responses about Zoom main room and 58 students gave responses about Zoom breakout rooms. Using Google Form features, all respondents were only allowed to fill out the questionnaire once. In other words, there was no possibility that a respondent gave answers to two different types of questionnaires.

After collecting sufficient quantitative data, purposive sampling was used to narrow down the respondents based on some resourceful people who have had or shared similar experiences (Etikan et al., 2016). To find the qualitative data, six resourceful interviewees were selected from the results of the use of the Breakout Rooms questionnaire. Three students with the highest and lowest scores who filled

out the Breakout Rooms questionnaire form and were willing to be interviewed were the samples in this study.

For collecting the qualitative data, a semi-structured interview was performed. In formulating questions for the interview, the researchers combined Redmond et al.'s (2018) theory with Agustina and Suharya's (2021) statement on students' perspectives of peer-to-peer in an online method, Lee's (2021) statement that group work discussion can increase students' active participation, and Krause's (2005) statement that effective discussions can improve speaking skills.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the interview was conducted through Zoom. The purpose of the online interview was to learn more about samples' views on using Breakout rooms to stimulate students' online engagement. The online interview was semi-structured because there were some planned questions and additional questions (Adams, 2015). The online interview consisted of seven open-ended questions so that interviewees could freely express their experiences and thoughts to obtain the necessary answers (Creswell & Clark, 2018).

The quantitative data were analyzed inferentially using independent samples t-test. The researchers tried to answer the first research question and reject the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected if the p-value is below or equal to the given level of significance or critical alpha ($p \leq \alpha$), whereupon the critical alpha is 0.05 (García & Puga, 2018). Before proving the null hypothesis, the researchers endeavored to demonstrate the data's variance homogeneity and normality.

To answer the second research question, numerical results were tabulated into a descriptive statistic. By spotting patterns in data, quantitative descriptive analysis characterizes the phenomenon by equipping responses to the who, what, where, when, and to what extent questions (Loeb et al., 2017). In addition, Loeb et al. (2017) also mentioned that the explanatory method is used to present the data. Therefore, data from Zoom main room and Breakout rooms are classified using the following categories:

Table 3. Standard of the mean from each engagement

Mean Range	Category
1.00-1.60	Very Low
1.60-2.20	Low
2.20-2.80	Moderate
2.80-3.40	High
3.40-4.00	Very High

Each form of Zoom main room and Breakout rooms would be looked for the mean and its mean category to compare and find out what engagement aspects are there. For the qualitative data, the audio/video of the interview was transcribed into written dialogue. As a result, to process the data, several stages were conducted, namely data managing, reading/memoing, describing, classifying, interpreting, and representing/visualizing (Creswell & Clark, 2018).

Findings and Discussion

Students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom breakout rooms

Using the quantitative data from the questionnaire, the researchers performed a hypothesis testing to find the difference in EFL students' online engagement in

different Zoom meeting rooms. Table 4 shows the descriptive summary of the quantitative data.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics

	Zoom Main Room	Breakout Rooms
Mean	70.33333	80.60345
Standard Deviation	10.56724	8.96179
Minimum	49	57
Maximum	94	96

Table 4 shows the average students' online engagement score in Zoom main room ($\bar{x}$=70.33, SD=10.57) and Breakout rooms ($\bar{x}$=80.60, SD=8.96) is different, i.e. the Breakout room group has a better average. The maximum score on Breakout rooms is a perfect score for the total score on the questionnaire (96). It indicates that some participants were highly satisfied with the Breakout rooms feature for online discussion and learning.

Before performing the hypothesis test, the data needs to be checked in terms of homogeneity and normality. The following table displays the result of the homogeneity test.

Table 5. Test of homogeneity of variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Based on Mean	0.061	1	89	0.806
Based on Median	0.053	1	89	0.818

According to Parra-Frutos (2013), in checking homogeneity, the significance value based on the mean must be greater than the critical alpha (0.05). The data above shows that the homogeneity p-value is greater than the critical alpha (0.806>0.05), so it reveals that the data were homogeneous.

Next, a test of normality was performed to check if the data distributions were normal. Table 6 displays the result of the normality test.

Table 6. Test of normality

Label	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
Zoom Main Room	0.129	33	0.180
Breakout Rooms	0.080	58	0.200

In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, the data is normal if the significance of the data is more than the critical alpha (0.05) (Das & Imon, 2016). It was deduced that the data collected is normal because the significance of the Zoom main room (0.180) and Breakout rooms (0.200) are greater than the critical alpha. Since the data are normally distributed, the researchers can proceed to the next stage of data testing. The independent sample t-test was performed to prove the hypothesis. Table 7 shows the result of the t-test.

Table 7. T-test result

	t	df	Significance	
			One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
Equal variances assumed	-4.922	89	0.000	0.000
Equal variances not assumed	-4.703	58.088	0.000	0.000

The independent t-test results (df=89, p=0.00) showed that students' online engagement in Zoom Breakout rooms ($\bar{x}$=80.60, SD=8.96) is higher than in Zoom main meeting ($\bar{x}$ =70.33, SD=10.57). It indicates that the students' online engagement in Zoom main rooms and Breakout rooms is statistically different ($\bar{x}_{main\ room} \neq breakout_{out}$, p<0.05). It gives enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis—there is no significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom Breakout rooms—and accept the alternative hypothesis—there is a significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom Breakout rooms.

Based on the results obtained from the statistical calculations above, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between students' online engagement in Zoom main room and Zoom Breakout rooms where engagement occurs in the Breakout rooms and is proven to be better than in Zoom main room. It verifies Lee's (2021) statement that small group discussions can increase students' engagement and active participation. In addition, Álvarez's (2020) statement also proves that peer-to-peer learning can bring good engagement in learning.

Therefore, this result confirms the findings of Venton and Pompano's (2021) research, which found that students felt more motivated to learn in Breakout rooms. In addition, this research is linear with Nurieva and Garaeva's (2020) findings that Zoom meetings, in particular, the breakout rooms feature can facilitate students' learning and skill development during online learning.

Students' online engagement in Zoom breakout rooms

In this part, the researchers attempted to answer the second research question; to what extent do group discussions in Zoom Breakout rooms facilitate students in online engagement?

Descriptive statistics results

The average value of each engagement aspect was measured to display further the differences in engagement in the Zoom main room and Breakout rooms. Table 8 shows the results of the categorization.

Table 8. Mean categorization for each engagement

Engagement	Zoom Main Room			Breakout Rooms		
	SD	Mean	Category	SD	Mean	Category
Social	0.69	3.01	High	0.58	3.53	Very High
Cognitive	0.70	3.10	High	0.59	3.43	Very High
Behavioural	0.94	2.92	High	0.81	3.17	High
Collaborative	0.90	2.52	Moderate	0.55	3.37	Very High
Emotional	0.81	3.04	High	0.64	3.36	High

The table above is presented using a 4-point Likert scale. Cognitive engagement is the best in the Zoom main room ($\bar{x}$=3.10, SD=0.70). Meanwhile, in Breakout rooms, social engagement ($\bar{x}$=3.53, SD=0.58) is the most pleasing engagement that students could experience. Although behavioral engagement isthe most subordinate engagement in Breakout Rooms ($\bar{x}$=3.17, SD=0.81), the average value is still higher than the moderate cognitive engagement in the Zoom main room, which is the highest average in the Zoom main room. As another proof, the data presented above show that high and very high categories dominate most of the average categories in Breakout rooms.

Table 8 shows all engagement that occurs in both the Zoom main room and Breakout rooms. However, the data showed that the students' online engagement in Breakout rooms is better than in Zoom's main rooms. So, group discussions in Breakout rooms can facilitate online engagement through all aspects of engagements.

Interview results

To strengthen the results related to the extent to which Breakout rooms can facilitate online engagement through all aspects of engagements, qualitative evidence is presented as follows:

1. Collaborative Engagement

   Collaborative engagement is about doing a target through collaboration, such as peer-to-peer learning. Some respondents said:

   [Respondent 1: *I enjoy learning with my friends. We can discuss some materials together. Peer-to-peer tutoring activity is a suitable method for me. We, me and my friends, can share our thoughts about a problem.*]

   [Respondent 2: *Learning with peers is helpful. It can release my anxiety. We can discuss some materials together. This activity helps me to broaden my knowledge and later our findings can be asked by the lecturer whether our information is accurate or not.*]

   Those show that peer tutoring is beneficial. It could give students new experiences in exploring materials. Lee (2021) stated that peer collaboration will make students feel more comfortable talking to their friends. The interview results also show linear results. It indicates that Breakout rooms provide a friendly collaboration space for students.

2. Social Engagement

   Socialization can build relationships and communities (Knight, 2013; Redmond et al., 2018). The respondent said:

   [Respondent 5: *In addition, during this pandemic, the engagement that occurs in Breakout rooms can expand our opportunities to get to know our classmates more deeply*.]

   Having online learning pushed students not to meet in person with their friends. However, Breakout rooms gave us chances to keep building good

friendships through discussion. Redmond et al. (2018) said that social engagement is about the activity that makes people feel a sense of belonging. So, this is true if direct interaction with friends in Breakout rooms makes them know their friends better.

3. Cognitive Engagement

Cognitive engagement is something related to academic knowledge which can build critical thoughts (Redmond et al., 2018). Respondent 2 gave a statement that supported this finding.

[Respondent 2: *The most important thing is that we can sharpen our critical thinking by discussing problems and solving them together. We also must be wiser in filtering information.*]

Active learning activities require students to be more selective in accepting the data or information. Pasaribu and Wulandari (2021) agreed that cognitive engagement focuses on scholastic success. Critical thinking is the first step to achieving this success. Therefore, in addition to establishing familiarity, discussions conducted by students can also be useful in preparing themselves to improve their thinking skills.

4. Emotional Engagement

Getting involved in the discussion is a fundamental aspect of engagement and this engagement relates to reactions to their peers or educators (Fredricks et al., 2004). In accordance, some said:

[Respondent 3: *I will actively participate in the forum as my responsibility to improve my skills and knowledge.]*

[Respondent 4: *I will give my ideas and share my understanding because I respect my group mates.*]

Respondent 3 shows that in group discussions, students were aware of taking a role in discussions due to the responsibility and developing their knowledge. Therewith, Respondent 4 also explained that respect could bring students to involvement in group work.

In addition to reactions to peers and educators, emotional engagement is also related to the feelings felt during online learning activities. Hasan and Pardjono (2019) mentioned that discussions in small groups make students feel not under pressure. Departing from this statement, it was found that several respondents had the same feelings with the following answers:

[Respondent 1: *I feel nervous speaking in the main room because I am terrified of making errors and will look stupid. Yet, learning in Breakout rooms gives me a chance to gain more confidence. If I don't know the materials, I can ask my friends freely. I have no doubts about showing my nescience. We can collect information together.*]

[Respondent 4: *We study with our friends so that we can be more comfortable, we can make jokes. It is not tedious. We also can discuss the tasks more casually*.]

[Respondent 5: *I am afraid to ask questions in the Zoom main room because I am frightened that my friends and lecturers will think I am making a rhetorical question. Also, I feel bad for my lecturers if I still make some grammar mistakes. Breakout rooms give us space for more expression. That is why, I am happy when I am given the authority and freedom to discuss with friends.]*

Those excerpts supported the previous statement. Respondents said that learning in smaller groups makes them more relaxed because discussing learning materials with peers created a better experience for SDU ELESP batch 2019 students. Being at the same level of acquaintance made them more pleased to explore the material. Moreover, discussing materials with friends could make the dialogue more relaxed and could even make some jokes in the forum. These experiences in Zoom Breakout rooms gave them an immersive and engaging learning experience.

5. Behavioural Engagement

This engagement is focused on supporting and encouraging peers (Redmond et al., 2018). In Breakout rooms, some students could support and encourage their peers to have good discussions. This attitude brought students to respect each other. Here are the answers of some respondents:

[Respondent 2: *I try to be the initiator in group discussions. I invite my friends to engage with each other so we can produce good results. I always open my camera, which indicates I am ready to do tasks.*]

[Respondent 5: *I always try to appreciate all my friends. As much as possible, I will respond to my friends' suggestions and deliver my view. I will open my camera because I want to be considered there or if I cannot do that, I will just open my microphone.*]

From those statements, it is concluded that the freedom to study with peers gave them space to express their feelings and responsibilities. Students could show respect and openness to help each other complete the assigned tasks.

In correlation with behavioral engagement, students could acquire other good impacts because of the application of this aspect. As language students, language proficiency must be applied in real life. One of the main things that students must do is practice speaking. Online learning conducted by the ELESP at SDU facilitates students to carry out this practice. Some lecturers in certain courses mandated students to use English when discussing in Breakout rooms and this activity showed a tremendous impact. These things could be reflected in the following answers:

[Respondent 1: *Lecturers make it mandatory to speak English in Breakout rooms, which is very helpful. I do agree that we will become more confident in honing our speaking skills with the discussion in English. Even though we don't fully*

speak with perfect grammar in that small group, at least we have learned to increase our fluency.]

That shows that using English during group discussions could also increase EFL students' confidence and even fluency in speaking. Krause (2005) believes that discussions give students a chance to learn to speak in a group and it gives a chance to improve their speaking skills. From the experience above, Krause's (2005) statement is true. Besides, those students could get partners to continue rehearsing these skills.

The above statement clearly stated that all aspects of online engagement could be satisfactorily fulfilled in the Breakout rooms. Many positive things were obtained from the discussion activities in the Breakout room. Students could hone critical thinking, socialize with friends, collaborate, learn leadership, be responsible, respect each other, work together in teams, understand others, and develop speaking skills. So, the extent to which group discussions facilitate online engagement in the Breakout room can be seen through all the engagements that occur and along with all the good advantages that can be acquired.

Conclusion

This research aimed to find out the difference in students' engagement in Zoom main room and Breakout rooms. It also explored the extent to which group discussions facilitate online engagement in Breakout rooms. In this study, it was found that there was a significant difference in students' online engagement in Zoom main rooms and Breakout rooms. Primarily, both Zoom main room and Breakout rooms can stimulate student engagement because, in the study, it was found that all aspects of online engagement can be fulfilled both in Zoom main room and Breakout rooms. However, the engagement happens in Zoom's main room and the Breakout rooms are different. The data showed that students learning in the Zoom breakout room had stronger engagement, compared to those who learned in the Zoom main room.

In addition, it was also found that all six interviewees confirmed that all online engagement aspects could be fulfilled in Breakout rooms. For collaborative engagement, several students stated that having discussions in Breakout rooms makes the learning process more enjoyable. For social engagement, some students agreed that Breakout rooms gave chances to keep building good friendships through discussion. For cognitive engagement, the students stated that having group discussions trained them to be wiser and more critical. For emotional engagement, the students could be involved in the learning process with their peers and it gave them fun activities to do together. Then, for behavioral engagement, the students could learn how to respect others and be responsible for their tasks. However, sometimes, group discussions could make students feel unsure about their discussions' findings. Even so, all respondents agreed that having group discussion activities in Breakout rooms could allow them to get to know their peers better during online learning. Moreover, students could also learn to hone critical thinking, work in teams, develop leadership, and practice speaking skills which are very useful for EFL students.

Based on these research findings, it is recommended that English educators set learning methods that can engage students to get involved in material discussions considering the many features offered in Zoom meetings to make the class more interactive. Moreover, following what Krause (2005) said practical group discussions can improve speaking skills, this platform and its feature, Breakout rooms are recommended for English educators to design English activities that can make students continue developing their basic English skills. Other than that, it is advised that English educators apply an active learning system through group discussions because group discussions with peers make the learning process happier. It also follows. Hasan and Pardjono's (2019) unified statement states that peer discussion can provide a more relaxed feeling.

For EFL students, they are advised to use the opportunity to learn in Zoom's main room and Breakout rooms properly to support their learning process. Further, EFL students are urged to take advantage of the online discussion in the Zoom main room and Breakout rooms to gain new knowledge, improve soft skills, and develop basic English skills in the learning process. Lastly, future researchers are advised to investigate other advantages of Zoom main room and Breakout rooms features and other platforms that can increase students' engagement in online classrooms.

References

Adams, W. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K.E. Newcomer, H.P. Hatry, & J.S.Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (4th ed., pp. 492–505). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386.ch19

Agustina, E., & Suharya, T. (2021). Zoom breakout rooms for students' collaborative skill enhancement in history learning during the COVID-19 outbreak. *International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education*, *5*(1), 41–46.

Álvarez, D. O. (2020). Maximizing engagement between online and on-campus students via Zoom. *The Wabash Center Journal on Teaching*, *1*(1), 113–113.

Chandler, K. (2016). Using breakout rooms in synchronous online tutorials. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, *4*(3), 16–23. https://doi.org/10.14297/jpaap.v4i3.216

Chen, N., Ko, H., Kinshuk, K., & Lin, T. (2005). A model for synchronous learning using the Internet. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *42*(2), 181–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290500062599

Coates, H. (2006). *Student engagement in campus-based and online education*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203969465

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research method in education* (8th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Das, K. R., & Imon, A. H. M. R. (2016). A brief review of tests for normality. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 5-12. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.12

Etikan, L., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Fadde, P. J., & Vu, P. (2014). Blended online learning: Benefits, challenges, and misconceptions. In P.R. Lowenthal, C.S. York, & J.C. Richardson (Eds.), *Online learning: Common misconceptions, benefits and challenges* (pp. 33–47). Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the Concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

García, A. M. R. R., & Puga, J. L. (2018). Deciding on null hypotheses using p-values or Bayesian alternatives: A simulation study. *Psicothema*, *30*(1), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2017.308

Guzacheva, N. (2020). Zoom technology as an effective tool for distance learning in teaching English to medical students. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, *6*(5), 457–460. https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/54

Hasan, A., & Pardjono, P. (2019). The correlation of higher order thinking skills and work readiness of vocational high school students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi Dan Kejuruan*, *25*(1), 52–61. https://doi.org/10.21831/jptk.v25i1.19118

It-analysis. (2001). *Synchronous vs asynchronous learning*. Retrieved from http://www.it-analysis.com/article.php?articleid=2236.

Knight, E. M. (2013). Aligning the curriculum of the human resources management undergraduate courses at an English-speaking university in the Caribbean with the university's 2012–2017 strategic plan. *Global Business and Economics Research Journal*, *2*(8), 61–68.

Korturska, T. (2019). *How to use the breakout rooms in virtual training software?* Vedamo. Retrieved from https://www.vedamo.com/knowledge/benefits-breakout-rooms-in-virtual- training-software/

Krause, K. (2005). Understanding and promoting student engagement in university learning communities. Paper presented as keynote address: Engaged, inert, or otherwise occupied?: Deconstructing the 21st century undergraduate student. *James Cook University Symposium 'Sharing Scholarship in Learning and Teaching: Engaging Students' James Cook University*. https://doi.org/10.1.1.659.6304

Kumar, R. (2021). *Do students prefer synchronous or asynchronous classes?* The Spokesman. Retrieved from https://thespokesman.net/3616/opinion/do-students-prefer-synchronous-or- asynchronous-classes/

Laili, R. N., & Nashir, M. (2021). The use of zoom meeting for distance learning in teaching English to nursing students during covid-19 pandemic. *UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL (UICELL)*, *4*, 235–244.

Lee, A. R. (2021). Breaking through digital barriers: Exploring EFL students' views of zoom breakout room experiences. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, *21*, 510–524. https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.21..202106.510

Loeb, S., Dynarski, S., McFarland, D., Morris, P., Reardon, S., & Reber, S. (2017). Descriptive analysis in education: A guide for researchers. *U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*, 1–40. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED573325

Mclaughlin, M., & Brame, D. (2021). *The best video conferencing software for 2021*. PCMag. Retrieved from https://sea.pcmag.com/videoconferencing/4839/the-best-video-conferencing-software-for-2020

Ngoma, S. (2020). Introduction to zoom for teaching. *SUNY Geneso*, 1–8. Retrieved from https://zoom.us/

Nurieva, G. R., & Garaeva, L. M. (2020). Zoom-based distance learning of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *11*, 439–448. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2020.16344

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117452

Parra-Frutos, I. (2013). Testing homogeneity of variances with unequal sample sizes. *Computational Statistics*, *28*(3), 1269–1297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-012-0353-x

Pasaribu, T. A., & Wulandari, M. (2021). EFL teacher candidates' engagement in mobile-assisted flipped classroom. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *22*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.961774

Pratiwi, A. D., Afandi, A., & Wahyuni, E. S. (2019). Potensi aplikasi Zoom cloud meetings dalam. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional FKIP 2019*, 1747–1754.

Redmond, P., Heffernan, A., Abawi, L., Brown, A., & Henderson, R. (2018). An online engagement framework for higher education. *Online Learning*, *22*(1), 183–204. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1175

Ring, G., & Mathieux, G. (2002). *The key components of quality learning.* Paper presented at the ASTD Techknowledge 2002 Conference, Las Vegas.

Rossett, A. (2002). Waking in the night and thinking about e-learning. In A. Rosset (Ed.), *The ASTD e-learning handbook* (pp. 3–18). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Venton, B. J., & Pompano, R. R. (2021). Strategies for enhancing remote student engagement through active learning. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, *413*(6), 1507–1512. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-021-03159-0

Vural, O. F. (2013). The impact of a question-embedded video-based learning tool on e-learning, educational sciences: Theory and practice, 2013. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *13*(2), 1315–1323.

Wintemute, D. (2021). *Synchronous vs. asynchronous classes: What's the difference?* The Best School. Retrieved from https://thebestschools.org/magazine/synchronous-vs-asynchronous-education/