

The Effectiveness of Cased Method And Team Based Project Based Education and Training Management Learning Models

- Sahat Siagian^{1*}, Ali Fikri Hasibuan², Tri Andri Hutapea³, Desman Jonto Sinaga⁴
1. Postgraduate Program Faculty, Universitas Negeri Medan
 2. Economic Faculty, Universitas Negeri Medan
 3. Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Negeri Medan
 4. Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Medan

* E-mail of the corresponding author: sahat.sgn61@gmail.com

Financed by Medan State University PNPB Funds for Fiscal Year 2024 In accordance with the Decree of the Chancellor of Medan State University Number: 0029/UN33/KPT/2024, 20 March 2024

Abstract

The Aim of research to develop an Educational Management and Training Instructional Model of Case Method and Project-Based and to determine the effectiveness of model. The research was conducted at Educational Technology Program (S2) Postgraduate Studies Program of Universitas Negeri Medan (Unimed). The target population consisted of students in the S2 Educational Technology Program at Unimed, with the sample being all S2 students enrolled in the Educational Management and Training course. The research method employed was model dissemination based on the Borg and Gall model. Additionally, the Dick and Carey model was used to plan course materials. The results showed that the instructional model of case method and project-based feasible and practical for use in teaching, and they are effective in enhancing learning outcomes.

Keywords: Effectiveness Model, Case Method, Project-Based Learning, Educational Management and Training Learning

DOI: 10.7176/JEP/15-13-09

Publication date: December 30th 2024

1. Introduction

The case method-based learning model provides opportunities for students to develop their potential, self-actualization, innovation, and find solutions to cases that will be discussed. This poses a unique challenge for lecturers in determining final assessment decisions. In instructional model of Case Method, students strive to achieve maximal result. As lecturers, each class is reconstructed based on the results of previous learning sessions. As explained by Yin R.K (2013), and Fauzi, A (2023) notes that the case method is an alternative teaching-learning activity where the approach involves studying cases related to course material, which may originate from either internal organizational environments or external ones. The emergence of issues and problems in case studies provides a platform for students to position themselves as decision-makers for the issues presented in the case study, enabling them not only to understand the problem discussed but also to think critically to find solutions.

The implementation of this case method facilitates participatory learning through problem-solving discussions that stimulate and enhance critical thinking skills, active communication, collaboration, and innovation. This requires lecturers, as the forefront of education, to design strategies and learning media that support these objectives. The proper application of learning activities is a crucial point in case method and project-based learning. The steps involved in the Case Method include: a) Deepening of material, b) Presentation of cases, c) Formation of groups, d) Case solving (searching for data, information, theories, resources, submitting ideas, discussions and validations, formulation of solutions, writing results), e) Presentation of work results, f) Class/Group discussion, g) Assessment and feedback. Instructional Model Team-based project involves: a) Dividing student more than one group to work together assignments within specified timeframe, b) Groups are given real-world problems from society or complex questions and are provided create collaborative, c) Prepares a final presentation to be displayed before the audiences, d) The lecturer guides each group Widiastuti, F, et al. (2022) and Farikah, et al. (2022). The steps of a team-based project include: a) fundamental problem, b) Planning, c) Scheduling, d) Observation of participants e) Evaluation, f) Explained the experience, Pengyue G, et al. (2020), Aay Susilawati, et al. (2017) and Mohammed A A. (2020). The development instructional model

uses Borg and Gall (2083) product development model, while the learning plan development uses Dick & Carey development model (1990). The syntax model is as follows:




Figure 1. Syntax of the Instructional Design Learning Model Based on the Cased Method and Team Based Project

2. Methods

This research is also referred as "research-based development," aimed at improving the learning outcomes of Unimed students. Propose a series of steps to be followed in this approach, namely: "research and information collecting, planning, develop preliminary form of product, preliminary field testing, main product revision, main field testing, operational product revision, operational field testing, final product revision, and dissemination and implementation.

Data collection in this research uses questionnaires, attitude assessments, observation guidelines, and interviews. The initial activity conducted is the validation of all research instruments descriptively and qualitatively in the form of general assessments, which include: questionnaires, attitude assessments, observation guidelines, and interview guidelines with categories such as very good, good, fair, poor, very poor, used without revision, used with minor revisions, used with major revisions, and cannot be used. The data analysis process in this research includes data descriptive and percentage.

3. Results and Discussion

- a. Feasibility of the model will be evaluated based on: model rationality, system, the implementation.

- b. The practicality of the model will be assessed based on: the implementation of syntax, the implementation of implementation of management principles.
- c. Effectiveness of the model will be measured by: student learning outcomes, lecturers, and responses and lecturers to the learning components and activities.

3.1. Feasibility of the Learning Model

The results of the feasibility assessment of the Educational Management and Training Learning Model are as follows:

Table 1. Expert Validation on the Feasibility of the Learning Model

Aspects being assessed	Validator			Average
	1	2	3	
Model Rasonality	4,00	3,50	4,00	3,83
Model Supporting Theory	3,33	4,00	3,67	3,67
Syntax	3,75	3,75	3,75	3,75
Social System	3,67	3,67	4,00	3,78
Reaction Principle	3,67	4,00	3,67	3,78
Supporting System	4,00	3,50	4,00	3,83
Application Impact	4,00	3,75	4,00	3,92
Average				3,79

Based on the average scores across all aspects, the feasibility of the Educational Management and Training is 3.79. Referring to feasibility previously established, concluded feasibility Educational Management and Training is "feasible" category.

3.2. Practicality of the Learning Model

Practicality assessment for model are as follows:

Table 2. Validation of the Practicality of the Model

No	Aspect Evaluated	Validator			Average Score
		1	2	3	
Syntax					
1	The level of implementation of all model stages	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
2	Coverage of important aspects in learning	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3	Implementation of activity sequence and collaboration in the learning process	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67
Total Syntax					3.89
Social System					
1	Involvement of active student participation in the learning process	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
2	Level of implementation of situations (discussions, asking questions, and debating)	3.000	3.00	4.00	3.33
3	Level of implementation of cooperation, mutual respect, and assistance among students	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67
Total Social System					3.67
Reaction Principles					
1	Level of implementation of the Lecturer facilitating a conducive learning environment	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
2	Level of implementation of the Lecturer providing opportunities for students to ask questions, express opinions, and give feedback	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3	Level of implementation of the Lecturer providing scaffolding, guiding work, and offering motivation	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Total Reaction Principles					4.00
Overall total					3.85

The overall average score is 3.85. Referring to the previously established practicality level, Management Training falls into the "practical" level category.

3.3. Effectiveness of the Learning Model

3.3.1. Student Learning Outcomes

The students' learning outcomes are reflected in the high level of mastery. This means that 80% of students mastered 80% of the course material presented. Out of 25 students, 2 scored between 80-82, 9 scored between

83-85, 10 scored between 86-88, 4 scored between 89-91. From this data, it can be concluded that all students achieved a minimum score of 80. Among the data, only 9 students scored below 85, while 16 students scored 85 or above. According to the evaluation criteria at Unimed, a score of 85 and above is considered an A. This data indicates that almost all students understood the material presented by the lecturer.

Table 3. Distribution score of Student Learning Outcomes

Class Interval	Frequency
80 -82	2
83-85	9
86-88	10
89-91	4




Figure 2. Distribution Score and Frequency of Student Learning Outcome

3.3.2. Results of data analysis on lecturers' ability to manage learning

The data from observations regarding below:

Table 4. Data from Observations on Lecturers' Ability to Manage Learning

No	Aspects Observed	Observer/Score		Average
		I	II	
Starting Learning				
1	Communicating learning objectives	4	4	4
2	Presenting introductory materials/apperception	3	3	3
3	Motivating students to engage in learning activities	3	3	3
		Mean		3,33
Managing Learning Activities				
4	Delivering lesson content	3	3	3
5	Implementing the Case Method and Team-Based Project model	3	3	3
6	Using media/learning resources	4	4	4
7	Providing reinforcement	3	3	3
8	Giving examples	4	4	4
9	Providing opportunities for student activity	4	4	4
		Mean		3,5
Organizing Time, Students and Learning Facilities				
10	Managing time usage	3	3	3
11	Organizing Students	3	3	3
12	Managing and utilizing learning facilities	3	3	3
		Mean		3,00
Implementing Assessments				
13	Implementing assessment during learning	4	4	4
14	Implementing assessment at the end of learning	3	3	3
		Average		3,5
Ending Learning				
15	Summarizing learning	3	3	3
16	Providing follow-up	3	3	3
		Mean		3,00
		Total Mean		3,27

Overall score for lecturers' ability to manage learning models is 3.27. The average value is 3.27 if referred to the criteria for determining the level of which have been determined previously, it can be concluded that the level of in category value for each learning stage can be represented by the following diagram:




Figure 3. Category Values for Lecturer Ability to Manage Learning

Information:

- 1 = started learning
- 2 = managing learning activities
- 3 = organizing time, students and study facilities
- 4 = implementing assessment
- 5 = ending learning

Based on Diagram 2, the observations of show that for the aspects observed: (1) Starting Learning has an average score of 3.33, (2) Managing Learning Activities has an average score of 3.50, (3) Organizing Time, Students, and Learning Facilities has an average score of 3.00, (4) Implementing Assessment has an average score of 3.50, and (5) Ending Learning has an average score of 3.00.

3.3.3. Analysis of Student and Lecturer Responses

a. Analysis of Student Responses

Responses to the process applying Management Training model can be seen in Table 5 below:

No	Aspect	Frequency		Percentage	
		Happy	Not Happy	Happy	Not Happy
Student Feelings Towards Learning Components					
I	Lecture material	23	2	92	8,00
	Module	25	0	100	0
	Classroom atmosphere	24	1	96	4,00
	Lecturer's Teaching Method	22	3	88,00	12,00
				94,00	6,00
				Mean	
Student Opinions on Learning Components					
II	Lecture Material	25	0	100	0
	Module	25	0	100	0
	Classroom atmosphere	25	0	100	0
	Lecturer's Teaching Method	23	2	92	8,00
				Mean	98,00
				2,00	
Interest in Continuing Learning					
III	Continuing with the Case Method and Team-Based Project model	23	2	92	8,00
				Mean	92
				8,00	
Student Opinions on Module					
IV	Understanding Language in Module	23	2	92	8
	Interest in Module Design	25	0	100	0
				Average	96,00
				8,00	
				Average Score	95,00
				6,00	

Table 5, Students, or 95%, expressed satisfaction with the components and activities of the learning process Management Training model. This indicates that students are interested and enthusiastic about learning with the model implemented by the lecturer. The percentage of 95% meets the criterion for a positive response, which is at least 80% of the subjects providing components and activities. Therefore, it can be concluded that the level of student is categorized as positive.

b. Analysis of Lecturer Responses

Data on lecturer responses to the components and activities Management Training model were obtained through a questionnaire administered to lecturers. The lecturer are presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6. Data on Lecturer Responses to Components and Learning Activities

No	Aspect	Percentage			
		Very Helpful	Helpful	Lesshelpfull	Not Helpful
Lecturers' Opinions on Learning Tool Components					
I	Topic Analysis/Task Analysis	80	20	0	0
	Concept Map	80	20	0	0
	Lesson Plan	90	10	0	0
	Module	90	10	0	0
	Test Blueprint	80	20	0	0
	Learning Activities	80	20	0	0
	Mean		83,33	16,67	0
Lecturer Evaluation of Teaching Materials					
II	Topic Analysis/Task Analysis	80	20	0	0
	Concept Map	80	20	0	0
	Lesson Plan	80	20	0	0
	Module	90	10	0	0
	Test Blueprint	100	0	0	0
	Learning Activities	100	0	0	0
	Mean		88,33	11,67	0

Based on the data in Table 6, it is observed that overall, lecturer responses regarding the components and activities of the Case Method and Team-Based Project Management Training model show an average of 83.33% indicating that the components are "Very Helpful" and 16.67% indicating that they are "Helpful" in the classroom learning process. Furthermore, lecturers' evaluations of the components and activities show an average of 88.33% rating them as "Very Good" and 11.67% as "Good".

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The results showed that the case method and project-based learning model are feasible and practical for use in teaching, and they are effective in enhancing learning outcomes. the majority of students, or 95%, expressed satisfaction with the components and activities of the learning process using the Case Method and Team-Based Project Management Training model. This indicates that students are interested and enthusiastic about learning with the model implemented by the lecturer. The percentage of 95% meets the criterion for a positive response, which is at least 80% of the subjects providing a positive response to the components and activities. Therefore, it can be concluded that the level of student response to the components and activities is categorized as positive. lecturer responses regarding the components and activities of the Case Method and Team-Based Project Management Training model show an average of 83.33% indicating that the components are "Very Helpful" and 16.67% indicating that they are "Helpful" in the classroom learning process. Furthermore, lecturers' evaluations

of the components and activities show an average of 88.33% rating them as "Very Good" and 11.67% as "Good."

Acknowledgment

This research has been made possible with the support of various parties committed to enhancing the quality of education at Medan State University, specifically within the Postgraduate Program of Educational Technology. The research was funded by the Medan State University fund, and special thanks are extended to the Rector and Vice Rector for providing the financial assistance that enabled this research. Additional thanks are due to the Director of the Postgraduate Program for providing the necessary facilities. Appreciation is also given to all individuals who contributed to the successful completion of this study. Finally, it is hoped that the results of this research will be beneficial to university in general and to the Postgraduate Program in particular.

References

Asri Fauzi, dkk. (2023), The Effectiveness of Case Method Learning in View of Students' Critical Thinking Ability. Universitas Mataram Indonesia RESEARCH ARTICLE published: 10 February 2023 doi: 10.21070/pedagogia11i1.1544. Universitas Mataram Indonesia.

Aay Susilawati, dkk. (2017), THE APPLICATION OF PROJECT-BASED LEARNING USING MIND MAPS TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ENVIRONMENTAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS WASTE MANAGEMENT IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS'. International Journal of Education Vol. 9 No. 2, Februari 2017, pp. 120-125 ©2017 Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia doi: dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijev9i2.5466.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. 1983, Educational Research: An Introduction. (Fourth ed.). New York & London: Longman Inc.

Dick, W. and Carey, L. (1990), The Systematic Design of Instruction. (Third ed.). United States of America : HarperCollins Publishers

Farikah, dkk. (2022), Learning Case and Project-based Model Methods: Challenges and Opportunities. Jurnal Riset Pedagogik Volume 6 Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 P-ISSN: 2581-1843 E-ISSN: 2581-1835.

Fitri Widiastuti, dkk. (2022), Efektivitas Metode Pembelajaran Case Method Dalam Upaya Peningkatan Partisipasi dan Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa pada Mata Kuliah Manajemen Perubahan. Receive: 10/01/2022 Accepted: 12/01/2022 Published: 01/03/2022. | ISSN 2548-8201 (Print) | 2580-0469 (Online) | Universitas Jambi.

Mohammed Abdullatif Almulla, (2020), The Effectiveness of the Project-Based Learning (PBL) Approach as a Way to Engage Students in Learning. SAGE Open July-September 2020: 1 –15 © The Author(s) 2020 DOI: 10.1177/2158244020938702 journals.sagepub.com/home/sgo.

Pengyue Guo, dkk. (2020), A review of project-based learning in higher education: Student outcomes and measures. International Journal of Educational Research 102 (2020) 101586, Wilfried Admiraal ICLON, Leiden Universit Graduate School of Teaching, Leiden University, Kolffpad 1, 2333 BN Leiden, The Netherland. International Journal of Educational Research journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijedures.

Robert K. Yin. (2014), Case study research design and methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 282 pages. ISBN 978-1-4522-4256-9. Reviewed by Trista Hollweck, University of Ottawa. Journal: CJPE; Volume 30; Issue: 1 DOI: 10.3138/CJPE.BR-240'.