

Original Article

Effectiveness of Implementation of Workforce Training at the Mataram City Vocational Training Center, West Nusa Tenggara

Widdatun Widdatun *, Masrun Masrun, Satarudin Satarudin

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Mataram, Mataram, Indonesia.

*Correspondence Author: Widdatun Widdatun

Majapahit Street No. 62, Gomong, Selaparang District, Mataram City, West Nusa Tenggara 83115.

✉ widdatunnisa@gmail.com

This article contributes to:



Abstract. Public vocational training requires evaluation that distinguishes the quality of delivery from demonstrated skills and employment outcomes. This study examines participants' perceptions of the Frontliner and Japanese Language Training Programs at Balai Latihan Kerja Dalam dan Luar Negeri (BLKDLN) in Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. A descriptive qualitative approach was used, involving 32 purposively selected trainees and two instructors as supplementary informants. Data collection comprised open-ended online questionnaires, observation, and documentation. Responses were coded and categorized under five domains: program understanding, targeting, timeliness, perceived objective attainment, and self-reported change. Descriptive percentages supplemented the qualitative account. Favorable assessments were reported for instructional methods and instructor support (87.5%), perceived curriculum relevance (87.5%), and understanding of training objectives and content (71.9%). In contrast, favorable assessments of training duration and time allocation were each 37.5%. Reported outcomes included basic competency improvement (43.8%), discipline and work ethics (56.3%), and future work orientation (62.5%), whereas psychological readiness for work and advanced skill development were reported at 28.1% and 21.9%, respectively. These figures describe the reported response pattern; incomplete coding documentation and unresolved denominators limit numerical interpretation. The findings suggest favorable delivery experiences alongside perceived constraints in training time and the consolidation of work readiness. They do not establish causal effects on competence or employment. Priorities include clearer program communication, more transparent access procedures, better-structured practice time, and follow-up assessment of skill application and employment transitions.

Keywords: Vocational Training, Program Evaluation, Training Transfer, Perceived Work Readiness, Public Employment Services.

1. Introduction

Public vocational training is expected to help participants develop occupational skills and prepare for employment. However, the completion of a course does not itself demonstrate that learning has occurred, that skills have been retained, or that graduates have secured suitable work. Training research therefore treats effectiveness as a question involving program design, learner characteristics, instructional processes, and conditions for applying acquired skills [1], [2]. This distinction is particularly important when evaluations rely on favorable participant perceptions as their principal evidence.

Evidence from active labor market programs also cautions against assuming uniform benefits. Meta-analyses show that outcomes vary across interventions and evaluation horizons [3], [4]. A critical review of developing-country evidence similarly finds that conventional training and employment-support interventions often produce more modest labor market gains than policy expectations suggest [5]. These findings establish a rationale for examining how programs operate, while keeping implementation assessment separate from causal impact evaluation.

Indonesian studies provide a relevant institutional context. Research on community vocational training centers identifies management, governance, evaluation, and social capital as important dimensions, while noting that graduate numbers can exceed available employment opportunities [6]. A qualitative study in Sambas reports that effectiveness is uneven across training activities [7]. More recent research in Blitar

Article info

Revised:

2025-6-21

Accepted:

2025-8-30

Publish:

2025-9-8



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

identifies favorable instructor and facility conditions alongside funding, coordination, and evaluation constraints [8]. Research on community training centers' role in supplying labor to business and industry further places employer connections within the evaluation agenda [9]. These studies concern different institutions and populations; their findings cannot be transferred directly to Mataram, but they identify questions that local evaluations should address.

The present study focuses on the Frontliner and Japanese Language Training Programs at BLKDLN in Mataram. In the source study, these programs were described as preparing trainees for service-related work and language-related employment opportunities, including potential work abroad. They provide a setting for examining whether favorable perceptions of teaching coexist with concerns about access, scheduling, and readiness to apply skills. Because the reported findings combine the two programs, this article evaluates the pooled participant experience rather than comparing their relative performance.

The study asks two questions: How do trainees describe program understanding, targeting, timeliness, objective attainment, and changes in work readiness? What implementation priorities follow from these perceptions when the limits of self-reported evidence are made explicit? Its contribution is a bounded account of public training delivery in Mataram and an interpretation that distinguishes perceived instructional strengths from unverified learning and employment outcomes. It does not claim a nationally representative evaluation, a validated effectiveness scale, or a causal estimate of training impact.

2. Analytical Framework

2.1 Distinguishing Delivery, Learning, and Outcomes

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick distinguish reaction, learning, behavior, and results as different targets of training evaluation [10]. The distinction helps clarify the evidence needed for each claim: a favorable appraisal of instruction is a reaction measure, a performance assessment can demonstrate learning, and subsequent observation can provide evidence of skill application. Employment outcomes require additional follow-up and a design appropriate to the question being asked. These categories should not be treated as a proven causal sequence. Alliger et al. examine relationships among training criteria [11], while Holton argues that an outcome taxonomy alone does not specify a sufficient evaluation model [12].

The five domains in this study are retained as an organizing framework for the original investigation. Program understanding concerns participants' comprehension of objectives, content, and procedures. Targeting concerns perceived participant suitability, curriculum relevance, and access. Timeliness concerns scheduling, duration, and time allocation. Objective attainment concerns perceived competency development. Self-reported change concerns discipline, work orientation, psychological readiness, and advanced skills. The domains are not presented as a psychometrically validated scale or as a direct reproduction of Kirkpatrick's model. In particular, reported changes in attitudes cannot be equated with independently observed workplace behavior.

2.2 Training Transfer as an Interpretive Lens

Transfer research explains why a positive classroom experience may be insufficient for subsequent performance. Baldwin and Ford identify trainee characteristics, training design, and the work environment as relevant to learning, retention, and transfer [13]. Blume et al. synthesize evidence on transfer predictors and highlight the importance of measurement choices [14]. Ford et al. further emphasize precise transfer criteria and

trajectories over time [15]. Together, these perspectives support examining opportunities for practice and continued skill use, while avoiding the assumption that course satisfaction establishes effective transfer.

Applied to Mataram, this lens suggests an interpretive proposition: favorable instruction can coexist with perceived constraints on consolidating and applying skills. The present study cannot test the mechanisms linking those conditions. It can identify participants' concerns and use them to define questions for a subsequent evaluation. Suggestions about practice design, mentoring, or employer engagement are therefore recommendations, not interventions whose effectiveness was demonstrated in this study.

3. Method

3.1 Design and Setting

The study used a descriptive qualitative design to examine experiences of the two training programs at BLKDLN in Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara. Qualitative description is appropriate when the aim is a practice-oriented account that remains close to participants' reported experiences [16]. Percentages were used as descriptive aids within this design; their inclusion does not by itself establish a mixed-methods study. The available report does not specify the training cohort dates, fieldwork period, course contact hours, or timing of questionnaire completion relative to training.

3.2 Participants and Recruitment

The reported sample comprised 32 trainees and two instructors as supplementary informants. Participants were selected purposively because they had direct involvement in the programs. The trainee total and the instructor total are kept separate throughout this article. The original report does not provide the number of eligible or invited trainees, a response rate, the distribution of respondents between programs, or demographic and prior-employment characteristics. Accordingly, representativeness and differences between the two programs cannot be assessed. The sample size is reported descriptively rather than justified through an unsupported claim of saturation. Information power offers a way to consider the adequacy of qualitative samples in relation to the study aim, sample specificity, theoretical grounding, dialogue quality, and analysis strategy [17]. Because that framework was developed for interview studies, it cannot be mechanically applied to these online questionnaire responses. Response depth and coverage must be examined before making any stronger claim about sample adequacy.

3.3 Data Collection

Open-ended questionnaires administered through Google Forms were the principal source of participant perceptions. Observation and program documentation were also reported as data sources, and two instructors provided supplementary information. Online qualitative surveys can elicit accounts from multiple participants, although the absence of real-time probing can restrict clarification and depth [18]. The source manuscript does not reproduce the questionnaire, identify the observational sessions or documents examined, or describe how instructor information was elicited. These omissions restrict assessment of the richness and consistency of the evidence.

3.4 Analysis and Numerical Reporting

The reported analysis involved data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Questionnaire responses were coded and categorized according to the five evaluation domains. This description is compatible with a domain-guided content-analysis approach, in which prior concepts guide initial categorization [19]; it does not

establish that a particular published coding protocol was followed. The number of coders, coding unit, category definitions, treatment of multiple mentions, and process for resolving disagreements were not specified. No inter-coder reliability statistic, new thematic analysis, or reanalysis of individual responses is claimed here.

Numerical summaries can support qualitative interpretation when their origin and meaning are transparent [20]. For a percentage describing respondents who express a category, the required calculation is $p = 100 \times f / N$, where f is the number of respondents assigned to that category and N is the number of eligible respondents with usable data for the item. Counting coded statements instead of respondents, averaging item scores, or using program-specific denominators would produce different quantities and must be reported explicitly. The source manuscript does not make these distinctions consistently.

All original percentages are preserved in Table I. An arithmetic consistency check identifies values that can be produced by an integer count out of 32, rounded to one decimal place. This is a check on possible denominators, not reconstruction of the original response data. Three percentages—81.8%, 78.2%, and 38.8%—cannot be reproduced under that simple assumption. They remain visible but are excluded from the abstract and from precise substantive comparisons pending verification. No missing-data assumption, alternative denominator, or corrected value has been invented. The three reported objective-attainment categories sum to 100.1%, which is compatible with rounding. Nevertheless, the category labels are not clearly distinguished in the source report, and their mutual exclusivity cannot be verified. Other indicators are not assumed to be mutually exclusive or to share identical item wording. Consequently, no aggregate effectiveness score, ranking with statistical uncertainty, inferential test, or between-program comparison is calculated.

3.5 Trustworthiness, Ethics, and Reporting Boundaries

The original study reports triangulation through comparison of questionnaires, observation, and documentation. However, it does not present the comparison records or show how agreement and disagreement between sources informed specific findings. Triangulation is therefore reported as a procedure described by the authors, rather than proof that all interpretations were independently corroborated. Participant quotations and differentiated instructor accounts are not available in the supplied manuscript and have not been fabricated. The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research and broader qualitative reporting guidance emphasize transparent accounts of context, researcher roles, analysis, and the relationship between evidence and interpretation [21], [22].

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Overview of the Reported Response Pattern

Table 1 consolidates all numerical findings in the original report. The qualitative material available for this revision consists of the authors' summarized findings rather than individual responses or field notes. Accordingly, the results below are a clarified account of the reported evidence, not a new analysis of the underlying dataset. Percentages are described as reported assessments or outcomes and should not be read as validated competency scores.

4.2. Program Understanding and Targeting

Understanding of objectives and training content was reported at 71.9%, while instructional methods and instructor support received a favorable assessment of 87.5%. The source narrative describes the content as understandable and relevant to participants' needs. Clarity of program information and procedures was reported at

56.3%, indicating that favorable views of classroom delivery did not extend uniformly to administrative communication. The available evidence does not establish whether these responses concerned recruitment information, orientation, assessment requirements, or several stages together.

Table 1.
Reported
findings and
denominator
consistency

Domain	Reported indicator	Value (%)	Info.
Program understanding	Objectives and content	71.9	Compatible
Program understanding	Instructional methods and instructor support	87.5	Compatible
Program understanding	Clarity of information and procedures	56.3	Compatible
Targeting	Participant suitability	78.1	Compatible
Targeting	Selection process	81.8	Verify
Targeting	Curriculum relevance	87.5	Compatible
Targeting	Support for work readiness	78.2	Verify
Targeting	Access and reach	38.8	Verify
Timeliness	Schedule adherence	62.5	Compatible
Timeliness	Training duration	37.5	Compatible
Timeliness	Balance of time allocation	37.5	Compatible
Objective attainment	Basic competency improvement	43.8	Compatible
Objective attainment	Partial objective attainment	34.4	Compatible
Objective attainment	Outcomes not yet optimal	21.9	Compatible
Self-reported change	Discipline and work ethics	56.3	Compatible
Self-reported change	Future work orientation	62.5	Compatible
Self-reported change	Psychological readiness for work	28.1	Compatible
Self-reported change	Advanced skill development	21.9	Compatible

Perceived participant suitability was reported at 78.1%, and curriculum relevance to work needs at 87.5%. The original account also raises concerns about selection transparency and uneven information access. The percentages assigned to selection quality, work-readiness support, and access require denominator verification, so their precise magnitudes cannot support further interpretation. Moreover, reports from enrolled trainees cannot establish how many eligible nonparticipants were excluded or whether access was equitable across the wider population.

4.3. Timeliness and Training Time

Schedule adherence was reported at 62.5%, whereas favorable assessments of training duration and balance of time allocation were each 37.5%. The source narrative describes insufficient time to engage deeply with the material and fatigue associated with a dense schedule. These findings distinguish following a timetable from providing an adequate learning schedule. A course can run as scheduled while still being perceived as too compressed. The report does not provide contact hours, attendance records, practice-to-theory ratios, or program-specific accounts. It is therefore not possible to identify an optimal duration or determine whether the concerns applied equally to Frontliner and Japanese language training. Fatigue and inadequate practice time are retained as reported concerns rather than measured explanations of learning outcomes.

4.4. Perceived Objective Attainment

The source manuscript reports basic competency improvement at 43.8%, partial objective attainment at 34.4%, and outcomes described as not yet optimal at 21.9%. The distinction between the latter two categories is insufficiently defined. The overall account suggests that trainees perceived some initial benefits but did not consistently describe

the objectives as fully attained. It does not establish a measured change from a pre-training baseline.

Limited training time, fatigue, and economic constraints were identified in the source narrative as possible impediments to learning. Their occurrence, severity, and relationship to individual responses were not quantified. Motivation and prior experience were discussed in the original manuscript but were not accompanied by participant-level evidence; they are therefore not reported here as established determinants of outcomes.

4.5. Self-Reported Change

The reported figures for discipline and work ethics and for future work orientation were 56.3% and 62.5%, respectively. Psychological readiness for work was reported at 28.1%, and advanced skill development at 21.9%. The source also describes perceived improvement in basic language ability without providing a separate percentage or a language proficiency assessment. These observations suggest an uneven pattern of perceived development, but differences among indicators should not be interpreted as comparable effect sizes. No employer assessments, independent performance tests, placement records, or longitudinal follow-up are reported. The findings consequently concern participants' accounts of change rather than verified workplace behavior, sustained proficiency, or employment attainment. The pooled results cannot identify which program contributed to each reported outcome.

4.6. Discussion

The clearest pattern in the report is the coexistence of favorable instructional assessments with more limited descriptions of advanced skills and work readiness. This pattern is consistent with the conceptual separation between reactions, learning, and subsequent application [10], [11]. It supports evaluating the domains separately; it does not establish that positive teaching experiences failed to produce learning, because objective learning was not measured. Self-assessment research provides a further reason for restraint. Sitzmann et al. examine the construct validity of self-assessed knowledge and support a more limited role for it in evaluating learning [23]. In the present study, statements about understanding, competence, and readiness remain useful as participant perspectives, but they cannot substitute for task performance. A future evaluation could pair those accounts with customer-service simulations for Frontliner training and oral, listening, and task-based language assessments for Japanese training. These are proposed measures, not procedures used in the present study.

The reported concerns about duration and time allocation suggest a concrete area for program review. Extending courses is one possible response, but total hours alone may not resolve a schedule that concentrates learning into fatiguing sessions. Research on distributed practice supports examining the spacing of learning opportunities [24]; evidence on learning techniques also supports considering retrieval practice and repeated engagement with material [25]. These findings inform redesign options without establishing which option would be effective at BLKDLN. For Japanese language instruction, shorter repeated opportunities to recall vocabulary and use language in communicative tasks could be piloted. Frontliner training could incorporate repeated service scenarios followed by feedback. Before implementing either change, organizers should review actual contact hours, trainee attendance, the balance of demonstration and practice, and participants' scheduling constraints. The evaluation should then examine whether a revised timetable improves demonstrated performance and retention, rather than relying only on satisfaction with the revised schedule.

Perceived suitability among trainees and perceived curriculum relevance address different questions from equitable recruitment. The current sample includes people who obtained access to training; it does not include eligible applicants who were not admitted or people who never received program information. Selection transparency and outreach concerns therefore identify issues for investigation, not measured rates of exclusion. This distinction adds precision to the interpretation of targeting. Indonesian research on training-center governance and employer connections provides a useful institutional comparison [6], [9]. In Mataram, an appropriate response would be to clarify eligibility requirements, publish selection procedures, document outreach channels, and examine applications and admissions by program. Any assessment of inclusion should also consider nonparticipants' experiences. Such evidence could reveal whether barriers arise from information, timing, application procedures, or other conditions, without assuming their prevalence from trainee perceptions alone.

Transfer theory directs attention to whether trainees have opportunities and support to use what they have learned [13], [14], [15]. The reported pattern of basic benefits alongside limited advanced development motivates follow-up, but does not demonstrate that inadequate post-training support caused the pattern. Mentoring, structured practice, employer feedback, and referral services are plausible options to assess. Their feasibility should be examined separately for the two programs because occupational service skills and language development may require different forms of continued practice. Employment effects require a distinct evidence base. Attanasio et al. evaluated a vocational training intervention in Colombia using random assignment [26]. That design illustrates the difference between describing participant experience and estimating an intervention's labor market effects; its findings cannot be assumed to apply to this Indonesian institution. The wider evaluation literature also cautions that program impacts depend on context and the time over which outcomes are measured [3], [4], [5]. For BLKDLN, a feasible next stage would combine program-specific baseline assessments, end-of-course performance measures, and a graduate tracer study. Follow-up could record continued study, job search, employment status, occupational match, and use of trained skills. Causal claims would require an appropriate comparison strategy and explicit handling of selection and attrition. A tracer study alone would document transitions but would not establish what would have happened without training.

5. Conclusion

Participants' reported experiences of the Frontliner and Japanese Language Training Programs at BLKDLN in Mataram indicate favorable views of instruction and curriculum relevance alongside concerns about communication, training time, and the consolidation of work readiness. Perceived benefits included basic competencies, discipline, and future work orientation, while advanced skills and psychological readiness were less prominently reported. These findings concern participant perceptions and do not establish independently measured competency gains or labor market effects. Program review should prioritize clear information and selection procedures, an examination of practice time and scheduling, and follow-up assessment of skill use. Before stronger conclusions are drawn, the numerical summaries require verification against the response data and the methods require fuller documentation. Subsequent evaluation should distinguish the two programs and connect participant accounts with direct performance measures and graduate follow-up.

6. Declaration

Author contributions and responsibilities - The authors made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the study. The authors were responsible for the data analysis, interpretation, and discussion of the results. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding - This study received no external funding. Availability of data and materials - All data are available from the authors.

Conflict of interest - The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Did you use generative AI to write this manuscript? - I did not use AI assistance in my manuscript.

Generative AI and AI-assisted technology statement in the writing process - During the preparation of this work, the authors did not use AI for writing, editing, or anything else related to the manuscript.

7. How to Quote

W. Widdatun, and M. Masrun. Effectiveness of Implementation of Workforce Training at the Mataram City Vocational Training Center, West Nusa Tenggara. *Memoirs C* 2026; 2 (2): eoa-71 - <https://doi.org/10.59535/29ta1121>

8. References

- [1] E. Salas, S. I. Tannenbaum, K. Kraiger and K. A. Smith-Jentsch, "The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 74–101, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1529100612436661.
- [2] B. S. Bell, S. I. Tannenbaum, J. K. Ford, R. A. Noe and K. Kraiger, "100 years of training and development research: What we know and where we should go," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 102, no. 3, pp. 305–323, 2017, doi: 10.1037/apl0000142.
- [3] D. Card, J. Kluve and A. Weber, "What Works? A Meta Analysis of Recent Active Labor Market Program Evaluations," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 894–931, 2018, doi: 10.1093/jeea/jvx028.
- [4] J. Kluve et al., "Do youth employment programs improve labor market outcomes? A quantitative review," *World Development*, vol. 114, pp. 237–253, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.10.004.
- [5] D. McKenzie, "How Effective Are Active Labor Market Policies in Developing Countries? A Critical Review of Recent Evidence," *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 127–154, 2017, doi: 10.1093/wbro/lkx001.
- [6] I. L. Suryono, R. Parmawati, R. Y. Warsida, Maryani and R. A. A. Yani, "Efektivitas Balai Latihan Kerja Komunitas dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Tenaga Kerja," *Jurnal Ketenagakerjaan*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 88–104, 2022, doi: 10.47198/naker.v17i1.125.
- [7] M. Azhar and Januri, "Analisis Efektivitas Peran Balai Latihan Kerja (BLK) di Kabupaten Sambas," *Sosiosaintika*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 51–62, 2023, doi: 10.59996/sosiosaintika.v1i2.135.
- [8] W. Laksono, "Efektivitas Balai Latihan Kerja (BLK) Komunitas Dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Tenaga Kerja Di Kota Blitar," *Briliant: Jurnal Riset dan Konseptual*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 646–652, 2025, doi: 10.28926/briliant.v10i3.1789.
- [9] Y. Nuraeni, A. Yuliasuti, F. A. Nasution, A. S. Muharam and F. Iqbal, "Peran Balai Latihan Kerja (BLK) Komunitas Dalam Menyediakan Tenaga Kerja Pada Dunia Usaha dan Industri," *Jurnal Ketenagakerjaan*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 11–26, 2022, doi: 10.47198/naker.v17i1.124.
- [10] D. L. Kirkpatrick and J. D. Kirkpatrick, *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*, 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA, USA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2006.
- [11] G. M. Alliger, S. I. Tannenbaum, W. Bennett, Jr., H. Traver and A. Shotland, "A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 341–358, 1997, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00911.x.
- [12] E. F. Holton III, "The flawed four-level evaluation model," *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 5–21, 1996, doi: 10.1002/hrdq.3920070103.
- [13] T. T. Baldwin and J. K. Ford, "Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 63–105, 1988, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00632.x.
- [14] B. D. Blume, J. K. Ford, T. T. Baldwin and J. L. Huang, "Transfer of Training: A Meta-Analytic Review," *Journal of Management*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1065–1105, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0149206309352880.

- [15] J. K. Ford, T. T. Baldwin and J. Prasad, "Transfer of Training: The Known and the Unknown," *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 201–225, 2018, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104443.
- [16] M. Sandelowski, "Whatever happened to qualitative description?," *Research in Nursing & Health*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 334–340, 2000, doi: 10.1002/1098-240x(200008)23:4<334::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g.
- [17] K. Malterud, V. D. Siersma and A. D. Guassora, "Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power," *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 26, no. 13, pp. 1753–1760, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1049732315617444.
- [18] V. Braun, V. Clarke, E. Boulton, L. Davey and C. McEvoy, "The online survey as a qualitative research tool," *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 641–654, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13645579.2020.1805550.
- [19] H.-F. Hsieh and S. E. Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis," *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 1277–1288, 2005, doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.
- [20] M. Sandelowski, "Real qualitative researchers do not count: The use of numbers in qualitative research," *Research in Nursing & Health*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 230–240, 2001, doi: 10.1002/nur.1025.
- [21] B. C. O'Brien, I. B. Harris, T. J. Beckman, D. A. Reed and D. A. Cook, "Standards for reporting qualitative research: A synthesis of recommendations," *Academic Medicine*, vol. 89, no. 9, pp. 1245–1251, 2014, doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000388.
- [22] H. M. Levitt, M. Bamberg, J. W. Creswell, D. M. Frost, R. Josselson and C. Suárez-Orozco, "Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report," *American Psychologist*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 26–46, 2018, doi: 10.1037/amp0000151.
- [23] T. Sitzmann, K. Ely, K. G. Brown and K. N. Bauer, "Self-Assessment of Knowledge: A Cognitive Learning or Affective Measure?," *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 169–191, 2010, doi: 10.5465/amle.9.2.zqr169.
- [24] N. J. Cepeda, H. Pashler, E. Vul, J. T. Wixted and D. Rohrer, "Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 132, no. 3, pp. 354–380, 2006, doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.132.3.354.
- [25] J. Dunlosky, K. A. Rawson, E. J. Marsh, M. J. Nathan and D. T. Willingham, "Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques: Promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 4–58, 2013, doi: 10.1177/1529100612453266.
- [26] O. Attanasio, A. Kugler and C. Meghir, "Subsidizing Vocational Training for Disadvantaged Youth in Colombia: Evidence from a Randomized Trial," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 188–220, 2011, doi: 10.1257/app.3.3.188.

Publisher's Note – Future Tecno-Science Publisher stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.