Jurnal Guru Dikmen dan Diksus
Volume 8 Number 2, 2025. Page 143-152
p-ISSN: 2655-481x, e-ISSN: 2723-6404

Webinar-Based MICE Management Practice as a Pedagogical Strategy to Mitigate Learning Loss During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Risnawaty Suleman
SMK Negeri 1 Gorontalo, Indonesia

Email: risnawatysuleman@gmail.com

(Received: June 10, 2022; Accepted: October 25, 2022; Published: December 30, 2025)

ABSTRACT

The disruption of face-to-face vocational education during the COVID-19 pandemic created particular difficulties for practice-oriented courses. This practice-based article describes a webinar-production approach to teaching Meetings, Incentives, Conferences, and Exhibitions (MICE) management in an Indonesian vocational school. Drawing on the author's documented instructional procedure, it presents a three-phase implementation framework: pre-webinar planning, live-event delivery, and post-webinar administration and evaluation. Preparatory tasks encompass student team formation, topic selection, speaker coordination, technical arrangements, event documentation, registration, promotion, and electronic certification. Delivery emphasizes operational rehearsal, hosting and moderation, audiovisual readiness, and contingency connectivity. Follow-up involves speaker administration, certificate distribution, documentation, participant feedback, and reporting. The framework provides authentic opportunities to practice event planning, teamwork, communication, and digital production. However, the original account does not report a sample size, pre–post assessments, or quantitative learning outcomes; therefore, the approach should be interpreted as a promising instructional practice rather than demonstrated causal evidence of reduced learning loss. Implications for competency-based vocational teaching and evaluation are discussed.

Keywords: vocational education; MICE management; webinar; authentic learning; learning loss; COVID-19

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted schooling worldwide, placing substantial pressure on teachers to replace in-person instruction with digitally mediated alternatives. Studies documented learning setbacks, unequal access to resources, and challenges to engagement during extended school closures (Donnelly & Patrinos, 2022; Engzell et al., 2021; Kaffenberger, 2021; Kuhfeld et al., 2020; Viner et al., 2020). Emergency online provision also exposed differences between distributing content and designing interactive learning experiences (Bao, 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Ferri et al., 2020; König et al., 2020; Rapanta et al., 2020).

Vocational education faces a distinctive challenge because practical competence cannot be reduced to theoretical recall. Online delivery requires opportunities for authentic production, coordination, and reflection (Roslin et al., 2022; Siddiq et al., 2021). In the MICE field, learners are expected to plan events, communicate with speakers and participants, manage logistics, and respond to operational contingencies. Pandemic restrictions curtailed opportunities to stage conventional face-to-face events. A student-produced webinar offers an alternative practice environment in which a real event can be designed and delivered online.

At SMK Negeri 1 Gorontalo, the instructional account describes a webinar-based MICE management practice intended to maintain student participation and opportunities to develop professional skills. The purpose of this article is to articulate the implementation process, explain its pedagogical rationale, identify implementation risks, and propose an evaluation approach. It does not claim that measured learning loss was eliminated, because the source manuscript does not provide comparative outcome data.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pandemic learning disruption and vocational education

Evidence from multiple education systems indicates that COVID-19 closures affected learning progress, although the magnitude and distribution varied by context (Donnelly & Patrinos, 2022; Engzell et al., 2021; Kaffenberger, 2021; Kuhfeld et al., 2020; Sintema, 2020). Digital readiness, equipment, connectivity, and teaching capacity shaped students' access to learning opportunities (Almaiah et al., 2020; Aguilera-Hermida, 2020; Naciri et al., 2020; Sahu, 2020; Trust & Whalen, 2020). For vocational courses, this raises a pedagogical question: how can students continue performing work-related tasks when physical facilities and in-person events are unavailable (Roslin et al., 2022; Siddiq et al., 2021)?

Authentic online tasks and student engagement

Online learning quality depends not only on platform availability but also on purposeful interaction, social presence, teaching presence, and student self-regulation (Garrison et al., 2000; Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2005; Kahu, 2013; Martin & Bolliger, 2018; Richardson et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2013). Studies of digital and blended learning highlight the importance of structured activities, instructional support, feedback, and appropriately designed synchronous and asynchronous components (Broadbent & Poon, 2015; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Kebritchi et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2020; Means et al., 2013; Müller & Mildenberger, 2021). A webinar-production assignment translates these principles into an authentic event-management deliverable.

Digital delivery, collaboration, and instructional constraints

Synchronous learning can create real-time communication opportunities, but technology-related barriers and fatigue may undermine participation (Carrillo & Flores, 2020; Moorhouse, 2020; Moorhouse & Wong, 2022; Nambiar, 2020; Paechter & Maier, 2010). Learner readiness and perceptions influence performance and satisfaction (Wei & Chou, 2020), while carefully designed instructor presence can support understanding (Caskurlu et al., 2020). The reported webinar workflow therefore combines advance planning, role allocation, rehearsals, technical backup, and reflective evaluation rather than relying on a live video meeting alone.

METHOD / DESCRIPTION OF PRACTICE

This article is a descriptive account of a vocational teaching practice, not an experimental or quasi-experimental study. Its evidence base is the author's original narrative of webinar production for MICE management instruction at SMK Negeri 1 Gorontalo during the pandemic. The original manuscript identifies a staged procedure and describes perceived benefits but does not specify participant numbers, sampling, implementation dates, validated assessment instruments, or statistical analyses. No such details are introduced here.

The unit of instructional activity is the student-organized webinar. Students are assigned organizing roles and guided through pre-event preparation, live implementation, and post-event tasks. The pedagogical emphasis is on performing event-management responsibilities, collaborating in teams, producing documents and promotional materials, communicating with speakers, and reflecting on event quality. The procedure is summarized in Table 1 and Figure 1.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Phase 1: Pre-webinar planning

The source describes twelve preparation tasks: (1) forming student groups, (2) selecting the theme or title, (3) choosing supporting devices, (4) recruiting speakers, (5) appointing event personnel, (6) scheduling, (7) drafting the proposal, agenda, and correspondence, (8) preparing registration and evaluation forms, (9) designing promotional flyers, (10) writing promotional copy, (11) disseminating information via social media, and (12) preparing electronic certificates. Clear job descriptions and timelines are important because task interdependence can otherwise create uneven contributions. The resulting documents and digital artefacts can provide observable evidence of students' event-planning competencies.

Phase 2: Live webinar delivery

The delivery stage centers on an online meeting platform, speaker and committee readiness, and reliable technical execution. Student organizers check connectivity, sound, links, host and co-host access, master-of-ceremonies and moderator roles, and lighting. The original account recommends rehearsing approximately one hour before the event, using alternative connectivity when necessary, and providing speaking scripts or practice to students assigned public-facing roles. These are operational recommendations from the practitioner's account, not experimentally evaluated interventions.

Phase 3: Post-webinar administration and evaluation

Post-event activities include handling speaker-related administration, sending electronic certificates, archiving photographs and recordings, distributing evaluation questionnaires, and compiling reports. The teacher can review students' products and role performance, conduct reflection, and provide feedback. In this context, participant satisfaction should not be treated as equivalent to learning gain; competency assessment requires a separate rubric or performance-based measure.

Table 1. Three-phase webinar-based MICE management workflow

Phase	Student tasks	Potential assessable evidence
Pre-webinar	Group formation; theme; devices; speakers; personnel; schedule; proposal; agenda; correspondence; forms; flyer; promotional copy; publicity; certificates	Role matrix; event proposal; run sheet; promotional artefacts
Live webinar	Host/co-host coordination; speaker liaison; moderation; audio/video checks; rehearsal; connectivity contingency	Observation checklist; event recording; incident log
Post-webinar	Speaker administration; certificates; documentation; questionnaires; final report	Report; feedback summary; reflective journal

Pedagogical implications and evidence boundaries

The instructional framework can plausibly support event planning, collaboration, public speaking, graphic design, digital communication, and professional accountability. These are learning opportunities inferred from the specified tasks and are consistent with research emphasizing interaction, engagement, and self-regulated learning (Bond et al., 2020; Gonzalez et al., 2020; Martin & Bolliger, 2018; Rapanta et al., 2020; Rasheed et al., 2020). Nevertheless, the source provides no quantified baseline, follow-up assessment, comparison group, or verified attendance and performance records. Accordingly, the claim

that webinars prevent learning loss should be framed as a proposed instructional response rather than an established outcome.

A future evaluation could assess competency before and after the event using an analytic rubric covering planning accuracy, teamwork, communication, technical execution, problem-solving, and post-event reporting. Attendance logs, individual role portfolios, and structured student reflections would help distinguish participation from demonstrated mastery. The design should also document access constraints and the contributions of each student, as digital inequality may influence outcomes (Almaiah et al., 2020; Ferri et al., 2020; Roslin et al., 2022; Wei & Chou, 2020).

Table 2. Suggested evaluation matrix for future implementation (not results from the present article)

Competency	Evidence source	Assessment approach
Planning	Proposal, run sheet, task allocation	Analytic rubric and deadline tracking
Communication	Speaker correspondence, MC/moderator performance	Observation rubric and recorded event
Technical operations	Connectivity checks, host functions, incident responses	Performance checklist
Teamwork	Peer feedback, individual portfolio	Peer/self-assessment triangulation
Reflection	Post-event report and improvement plan	Rubric-based review

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A student-organized webinar provides a feasible practice format for MICE management teaching when face-to-face events cannot be conducted. The original practitioner account specifies a coherent three-phase sequence encompassing preparation, delivery, and follow-up. Its principal contribution is a transferable instructional workflow that can preserve opportunities for authentic vocational practice under restricted conditions. The available account does not establish a measured reduction in learning loss or quantified improvements in student attitudes, knowledge, or skills. Teachers adopting the approach should use explicit roles, accessible technology, rehearsals, backup arrangements, and competency-based assessment; subsequent research should collect systematic learner-level evidence.

REFERENCES

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2023). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: The challenges and opportunities. Interactive Learning Environments, 31(2), 863–875.

Aguilera-Hermida, A. P. (2020). College students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 1, 100011.

Almaiah, M. A., Al-Khasawneh, A., & Althunibat, A. (2020). Exploring the critical challenges and factors influencing the E-learning system usage during COVID-19 pandemic. Education and Information Technologies, 25, 5261–5280.

Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2(2), 113–115.

Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17, 2.

Bond, M., Marín, V. I., Dolch, C., Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). Digital transformation in German higher education: Student and teacher perceptions and usage of digital media. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15, 48.

Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15(1), i–vi.

Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in online higher education learning environments: A systematic review. The Internet and Higher Education, 27, 1–13.

Carrillo, C., & Flores, M. A. (2020). COVID-19 and teacher education: A literature review of online teaching and learning practices. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 466–487.

Caskurlu, S., Maeda, Y., Richardson, J. C., & Lv, J. (2020). A meta-analysis addressing the relationship between teaching presence and students' satisfaction and learning. Computers & Education, 157, 103966.

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5–22.

Donnelly, R., & Patrinos, H. A. (2022). Learning loss during Covid-19: An early systematic review. Prospects, 51, 601–609.

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, 118(17), e2022376118.

Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and challenges in emergency situations. Societies, 10(4), 86.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 2(2–3), 87–105.

Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2005). Facilitating cognitive presence in online learning: Interaction is not enough. The American Journal of Distance Education, 19(3), 133–148.

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95–105.

Gonzalez, T., de la Rubia, M. A., Hincz, K. P., Comas-Lopez, M., Subirats, L., Fort, S., & Sacha, G. M. (2020). Influence of COVID-19 confinement on students' performance in higher education. PLOS ONE, 15(10), e0239490.

Kaffenberger, M. (2021). Modelling the long-run learning impact of the Covid-19 learning shock: Actions to (more than) mitigate loss. International Journal of Educational Development, 81, 102326.

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 38(5), 758–773.

Kebritchi, M., Lipschuetz, A., & Santiague, L. (2017). Issues and challenges for teaching successful online courses in higher education: A literature review. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 46(1), 4–29.

König, J., Jäger-Biela, D. J., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: Teacher education and teacher competence effects among early career teachers in Germany. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 608–622.

Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2020). Projecting the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. Educational Researcher, 49(8), 549–565.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. Online Learning, 22(1), 205–222.

Martin, F., Sun, T., & Westine, C. D. (2020). A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018. Computers & Education, 159, 104009.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47.

Moorhouse, B. L. (2020). Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced' online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Education for Teaching, 46(4), 609–611.

Moorhouse, B. L., & Wong, K. M. (2022). Blending asynchronous and synchronous digital technologies and instructional approaches to facilitate remote learning. Journal of Computers in Education, 9, 51–70.

Müller, C., & Mildenberger, T. (2021). Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education. Educational Research Review, 34, 100394.

Naciri, A., Baba, M. A., Achbani, A., & Kharbach, A. (2020). Mobile learning in higher education: Unavoidable alternative during COVID-19. Aquademia, 4(1), ep20016.

Nambiar, D. (2020). The impact of online learning during COVID-19: Students' and teachers' perspective. The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 8(2), 783–793.

Paechter, M., & Maier, B. (2010). Online or face-to-face? Students' experiences and preferences in e-learning. The Internet and Higher Education, 13(4), 292–297.

Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L., & Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the Covid-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. Postdigital Science and Education, 2, 923–945.

Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. Computers & Education, 144, 103701.

Richardson, J. C., Maeda, Y., Lv, J., & Caskurlu, S. (2017). Social presence in relation to students' satisfaction and learning in the online environment: A meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior, 71, 402–417.

Roslin, A. R., Rahmatullah, B., Zain, N. Z. M., Purnama, S., & Yas, Q. M. (2022). Online learning for vocational education: Uncovering emerging themes on perceptions and experiences. Journal of Vocational Education Studies, 5(1).

Sahu, P. (2020). Closure of universities due to coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Impact on education and mental health of students and academic staff. Cureus, 12(4), e7541.

Siddiq, M. B., Arifin, Z., Sudira, P., & Mutohhari, F. (2021). Evaluation of online practical learning for light automotive engineering during the Covid-19 pandemic. Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi dan Kejuruan, 27(2).

Sintema, E. J. (2020). Effect of COVID-19 on the performance of grade 12 students: Implications for STEM education. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 16(7), em1851.

Szpunar, K. K., Moulton, S. T., & Schacter, D. L. (2013). Mind wandering and education: From the classroom to online learning. Frontiers in Psychology, 4, 495.

Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28(2), 189–199.

van der Velde, M., Sense, F., Spijkers, R., Meeter, M., & van Rijn, H. (2021). Lockdown learning: Changes in online foreign-language study activity and performance of Dutch secondary school students during the COVID-19 pandemic. Frontiers in Education, 6, 712987.

Viner, R. M., Russell, S. J., Croker, H., Packer, J., Ward, J., Stansfield, C., Mytton, O., Bonell, C., & Booy, R. (2020). School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: A rapid systematic review. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 4(5), 397–404.

Wang, C., Shannon, D. M., & Ross, M. E. (2013). Students' characteristics, self-regulated learning, technology self-efficacy, and course outcomes in online learning. Distance Education, 34(3), 302–323.

Wei, H. C., & Chou, C. (2020). Online learning performance and satisfaction: Do perceptions and readiness matter? Distance Education, 41(1), 48–69.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, 39.