International Business Management 10 (4): 534-539, 2016
ISSN: 1993-5250

Training Quality: Partisipatory Training Versus Non-Partisipatory Training on Micro Small Medium Enterprises (MSMES)

Suliyanto, Weni Novandari and Sri Murni Setyawati
Faculty of Economics and Business, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Indonesia

Abstract: The aims of research to analyze the differences perceive quality of participatory training versus perceive quality of non-participatory training. This study uses an experimental approach. Number of participants were 20 painting batik artisans in Purbalingga District, Indonesia. Data collected by using Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and questionnaires, analysis tools used were non-parametric compare mean two paired samples test (Wilcoxon). Based on the analysis can be concluded that the perceive quality of participatory training is better than perceive quality of non-participatory training.

Key words: Training quality, participatory training, Micro Small Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), FGD, experiment

INTRODUCTION

Recently, training has become as an investment in human being since, it is considered the main pathway to form adequate human resources in term of quality and quantity (Khanfar, 2011). Previous research concluded that training has positive effects on organization performance such as productivity and staff turnover decrease (Arthur, 1994; Ichniowski *et al*., 1997), gross profit per employee and market-to-book ratios (Bassi and McMurrer, 1998), savings and productivity (Frayne and Geringer, 2000) and perceptual measures of performance (Harel and Tzafrir, 1999). On SMEs training also has positive effect on performance SMEs (Aragon-Sanchez *et al*., 2003). Base on previous research can be concluded that training has important contribution on organization performance.

To get successes in the training process, the concept of training should be obvious for all joined parties (trainers, trainees and training officials) due to its strong effect on well-preparation and implementation of training programs as well as on modern techniques that satisfy the needs of personnel and enhance their knowledge and skills as well (Khanfar, 2011). Effectiveness of training depend on training input. Scaduto *et al*. (2008), Velada *et al*. (2007) and Chiaburu and Marinova (2005) said that training input consist three main element there are individual characteristic, training design and job environment. Training quality is important thing to pursue the effectiveness of training because quantity and quality of training provided within an organisation is positively associated with measures of overall effectiveness (Campbell, 1970). Organizations are constantly reminded of the importance of quality training (Waddell and Stewart, 2004).

Diversity training programs are increasing in number each year (Liberman *et al*., 2011) but research which examined design training to maximize effectiveness still limited (Kulik and Roberson, 2008; Roberson *et al*., 2003), usually research to evaluated effectiveness training conducted on big company, the research to evaluate the quality training on Micro Small Medium and Enterprises (MSEMs) still limited.

One of the MSMEs that have a problem with training is painting batik MSMEs. Painting batik is textile artwork that in the making of motive using the hand by draw at the fabric, therefore to produce the quality painting batik required artistry and special skills. There are various types of batik in Indonesia one of it is Purbalingga batik in Central Java. Painting batik industry in Indonesia face many problem, one of problem is human resource such as weak business management, lack of regeneration, low of productivity and low of creativity.

Support from local government and university on development painting batik industry were very great. One of the efforts was providing various types of training. But, training has been given has not effective yet. Lack of effective training has been done because design of the training is top down approach. So, the expectation of trainee can not be fulfill by training program. To make training more effective, it is necessary bottom up training design. One of the bottom up training design is participatory training.

However, the perceive quality of participatory training in painting batik industry need to be tested. This is important because training quality has positive effect on effectiveness of training. Organizations that are serious about achieving better results from training must not only work to improve their quality and convenience and reduce the costs of ineffective training but must work on the entire training to performance process (Chang and

Corresponding Author: Suliyanto, Faculty of Economics and Business, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Indonesia

Chen, 2013). Research of quality training was generally conducted in large companies while conducted on the MSMEs which have the characteristics, need persistence and need artistry such as painting batik industry was very limited.

Literatur review and hypothesis development

Training quality: Mathis define the training is a process by which people attain a certain ability to help achieve the goals of the organization whereas while Dessler is stated that the training is process to teach for new or existing employees, basic skills they need to carry out their work. Training has been defined as "The systematic development of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required by an individual to perform adequately a given task or job."

Raghuram (1994) and MacDuffie and Kochan (1995) stated that training is the main activity in order to have quailed, flexible and well-prepared employees and whereas (Alavi and Leidner, 2001; Bollinger and Smith, 2001) the training activity in order to achieve the correct running of each stage of the process of knowledge management.

Most academics and practitioners, agree on the importance of training evaluation as well as its under-utilization in practice. Evaluation enables top management to understand the results of their huge financial investments in training while assisting instructors and course designers to know how their programs are impacting the organization one of evaluation of training is evaluation of training quality.

Quality is perceived differently by different people, service quality can be explained by adapted disconfirmation theory, perceive quality is outcome of an evaluation process where consumers compare their expectations with service they perceive they got (Gronroos, 1982). Training program can be viewed as service, so perceive training quality can be defined as outcome of an evaluation process where trainees' compare their expectations with training program they perceive they got. The quality of training may be rated based on the degree of satisfaction by the trainee receiving the training programme.

Trainees as can be viewed as customers, even though they may be non-paying, satisfied trainees have positive reactions for the continuance of a training program but unsatisfied trainees have negative reaction almost certainly reduces the possibility of its occurring (Kirkpatrick, 1959).

Comparison participatory training versus non-participatory training: Designing training programme is an important thing to pursue the effectiveness of training. According to Lynton and Pareek to be effective, the training is the responsibility of the organization, participants and training institutions as well as based on the principle of learning, well-planned and designed to respond to the needs of the organization. Based on the description of the literature review and the results of previous research hypothesis can be formulated as follows.

Hicks and Klimoski (1987) conducted a study that examined trainees' expectations and perceptions before participation in a training programme. They found that trainees who received a realistic training preview and those who had a high degree of choice regarding attendance reported higher satisfaction with the course and greater motivation to learn. Their conclusions trainers over-estimated the value of programmed instruction and underestimated the lecture method.

Participatory training is training model which involving all stakeholders including candidate of trainees in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the the training activities. By involving trainees in the planning of training programme, the performance of participatory training would be more suitable with expectations trainees, if performance of training programme same as or more than expectations of trainee the customer or trainees will be satisfied (Parasuraman *et al*., 1985; Lewis and Mitchell, 1990), contrary in the non-participatory training using top down approach, so there is a gap between management perception with the trainees perception, hence the implementation of the non-participatory training often does not fit with the trainees expectations, then perceived quality is less than satisfactory and trainees dissatisfaction occurs.

To measure the quality of the training can be measured by assessing the quality of training elements. Training element including trainer, material, method, tools and material, place and location, timing and trainee, so quality of training measure quality of element in the training. Based on the description of the literature review and the results of previous research hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

- H_1: trainer quality on participatory training is better than trainer quality on non-participatory training
- H_2: training method on participatory training more suitable than training method on non-participatory training
- H_3: material on participatory training more suitable than material on non-participatory training

- H_4: availability of tools and materials on participatory training more available than training availability of tools and materials on non-participatory training
- H_5: timing on participatory training more suitable than timing on non-participatory training
- H_6: location suitability on participatory training more suitable than location on non-participatory training
- H_7: number and qualification of trainee on participatory training more suitable than number and qualification of trainee on non-participatory training
- H_8: overall training quality of participatory training is better than overall training quality on non-participatory training

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The type of this research is experimental. Subjects of study were 20 participants. The participants was selected by criteria artisan painting batik purbalingga who relatively the same in knowledge and skills in painting batik. Data collection was using Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and questionnaires. FGD conducted to determine the trainers, training materials, timing of training, training location, materials and tools required and methods of training desired by candidate of trainees while questionnaire used to measure perceive quality of participatory training and it non-participatory training. To analyze the differences perceive quality of participatory training and it non-participatory training used is the non-parametric compare mean two sample paired test (Wilcoxon test).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on observations of 20 participants, the result of a general overview participants as shown in Table 1. Based on the illustration can be seen in the distribution of batik based on gender, age, education, experience, frequency of jin btik training and the type of training that have been followed.

Based on gender, dominance of batik artisans in purbalingga are female. Because its perceived as an occupation that requires perseverance does not require great energy and can be done as a side job, so it is more suitable to be done by women.

Furthermore, when seen from the average age of artisans age is 46.55 years which indicates that it is including old age. This condition indicates that the problem of regeneration is important thing for the sustainability of the painting batik Purbalingga.

By level of education, there is no domination of the artisans education level. It is due to be painting batik artisans do not require a certain minimum education qualification. Based on the data it appears that a college education (PT) number is the least while the high school education were the most numerous. That is because the characteristics of batik work is still at the level of SMEs that are not required to graduate college education qualifications, quite to the level of high school education after they complete 12 years of basic education.

Table 1: General overview of participant

Variables	Values
Gender	
Male	2 (10%)
Female	18 (90%)
Age	
Average	46.55
Minimum	28
Maximum	63
Standard deviation	9.467
Education level	
Elementary	5 (25%)
Junior High School	4 (20%)
Senior High School	9 (45%)
University	2 (10%)
Experience as artisan	
1-3 years	8 (40%)
4-6 years	10 (5%)
7-10 years	1 (5%)
>10 years	1 (5%)
Frequency joint the batik training	
Average	4.15
Minimum	2
Maximum	8
Standard deviation	1.424
Type of the batik training	
Design of batik	8
Coloring	16
Stamp batik	18
Business management	4
Others	2

Next, by looking at the experience of artisans is known that most of the artisan has become batik for 4-6 years. This shows that they have not been long as artisans it relevant if they encountered some untapped potential optimally and still needs development efforts in order to further increase the length of them in batik will further improve productivity as well, either in quality or quantity.

Based on the frequency of join on training is known that the average artisans has been join training as much as 4.15 times. It shows that they have often join the batik training, both training organized by the university, provincial government and local government. In tune with the problems in this study, despite often join batik training but have not seen from the results output, its indicates that optimal results need to be studied how to overcome them, especially in terms of its training approach.

Table 2: Result of analysis compare mean two sample pairs test perceive quality of participatory training elements and perceive quality of non-participatory training elements

Elements of training	Average of perceive quality participatory training	Average of perceive quality non-participatory training	p-values	Conclusions
Trainer quality (H_1)	8.214	7.857	0.062	Rejected
Method suitability (H_2)	8.150	6.500	0.002	Accepted
Material suitability (H_3)	8.225	6.850	0.001	Accepted
The availability of tools and materials (H_4)	8.400	6.625	0.000	Accepted
Timing suitability (H_5)	8.175	7.000	0.003	Accepted
Location suitability (H_6)	8.175	7.800	0.222	Rejected
Number and qualification of trainees (H_7)	7.850	7.050	0.004	Rejected

Finally, based on the type of training which have been followed by artisans, stamp batik training. Is the most often followed and then batik training with media non-fabric and waste handling training (Table 2).

Based on the analysis using compare mean two sample pairs test-Wilcoxon, p-value of method suitability, material suitability, e availability of tools and materials, timing suitability less than apha (0.05), so the hypothesis 2, 3, 4 and 5 were accepted while p-value of trainer quality, location suitability and number and qualification of trainees higher than alpha (0.05) hence, hypothesis 1, 6 and 7 were rejected. Base on the statistical analysis can be explained as follow:

- Quality of trainers on participatory training not better than quality trainers on non-participatory training, it caused trainers who appointed by local governments and universities on non-participatory training has been satisfied trainees, so trainees candidates of participatory training choose same trainers as trainers for participatory training
- Training method on participatory training is more suitable than the method on non-participatory training, it was due to the proportion of theory on the non-participatory was too large while the proportion of theory and practice on participatory training have already adjusted to the needs of trainees
- The material on participatory training more suitable than the material on non-participatory training, this was due to materials on non-participatory training often not appropriate to the problems which faced by each trainees whereas the materials on participatory training have adjusted before to needs of trainee candidates problems
- Availability of materials and equipments on participatory training is better than its on a non-participatory training, it was due to materials and equipment on non-participatory training often lack or excess due to adjust the training budget while on the participatory training trainee candidates involved in calculating the material requirements and training equipment needs
- The timing of the participatory training is more suitable than it on non-participatory training, this was due to on non-participatory training timing is determined by the organizers, so it often do not match with the time of trainees while on the participatory training it determine by organizer, trainers and trainees
- Location on participatory training is not more suitable than it on non-participatory training, it was due to the location which has been used to carry out non-participatory training that held by local governments and universities already considered strategic and comfortable by trainees, so that when the training is done with a participatory approach they still choose the same location which has been used for training before
- The number and qualifications of trainees in participatory training is more suitable than it on the non-participatory training, this was due to on non-participatory training in determine number of trainees organizers more oriented on training budget while on participatory training the number of trainees adjusted to control range trainers and trainees chosen who have the same level on skill and knowledge

Base on Table 3, it is known that the average perceive quality of participatory training was 8.181 while perceive quality of non-participatory training was 7.126. Base on Wilcoxon test, p-value of the differences training quality participatory training versus non-participatory training was 0.001 less than alpha (0.05), so the hypothesis the overall perceive quality of participatory training is better than the overall perceive quality of non-participatory training was accepted. This is due to non-participatory training using top down approach, so that the training program does not fulfill the expectations of trainees, contrary participatory training using bottom up approach, trainees were involved in each training process from planning, implementation and evaluation, so that training programme appropriate with the expectations of trainees.

Table 3: Result of analysis compare mean two sample pairs test overall of perceive quality participatory training and overall of perceive quality non-participatory training

Training approach	Average of perceive training quality on participatory training	Average of perceive training quality on non-participatory training	p-value	Conclusion
Participatory training versus non-participatory training	8.181	7.126	0.001	Accepted

CONCLUTION

Based on the analysis we concluded that method suitability, material suitability, availability of materials and equipment, timing suitability, number and qualification of trainees suitability in participatory training is better than it in the non-participatory training and overall perceive quality participatory training is higher than overall perceive quality in the non-participatory training.

For training providers both university and also local government need to change the training approach using participatory training because the quality of participatory training is better than non-participatory training and satisfied trainees will increase the effectiveness of training programme.

LIMITATIONS

This study has some limitations in controlling the level of skills and knowledge of trainees in painting batik whereas the level of skills and knowledge of trainees has affect the assessment of the training elements, this study was limited to measuring the quality of training, so that further research need to measure the effectiveness of participatory training in enhancing the knowledge and skills of participants in other kinds of MSMEs.

REFERENCES

Alavi, M. and D.E. Leidner, 2001. Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Q., 25: 107-136.

Aragon-Sanchez, A., I. Barba-Aragon and R. Sanz-Valle, 2003. Effects of training on business results. Int. J. Human Resour. Manage., 14: 956-980.

Arthur, J.B., 1994. Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. Acad. Manage. J., 37: 670-687.

Bassi, L.J. and D.P. McMurrer, 1998. Training investment can mean financial performance. Training Dev., 52: 40-42.

Bollinger, A.S. and R.D. Smith, 2001. Managing organizational knowledge as a strategic asset. J. Knowledge Manage., 5: 8-18.

Campbell, J.P., 1970. Personnel training and development. Annu. Rev. Psychol., 22: 565-602.

Chang, W.L. and S.T. Chen, 2013. The performance of Taiwan's training quality excellence system. Total Qual. Manage. Bus. Excellence, 24: 561-576.

Chiaburu, D.S. and S.V. Marinova, 2005. What predicts skill transfer? An exploratory study of goal orientation, training self-efficacy and organizational supports. Int. J. Training Dev., 9: 110-123.

Frayne, C.A. and J.M. Geringer, 2000. Self-management training for improving job performance: A field experiment involving salespeople. J. Applied Psychol., 85: 361-372.

Gronroos, C., 1982. Strategic Management and Marketing in the Service Sector. Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsingfors.

Harel, G.H. and S.S. Tzafrir, 1999. The effect of human resource management practices on the perceptions of organizational and market performance of the firm. Hum. Resour. Manage., 38: 185-199.

Hicks, W.D. and R.J. Klimoski, 1987. Entry into training programs and its effects on training outcomes: A field experiment. Acad. Manage. J., 30: 542-552.

Ichniowski, C., K. Shaw and G. Prennushi, 1997. The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: A study of steel finishing lines. Am. Econ. Rev., 87: 291-313.

Khanfar, S.M., 2011. Impact of training on improving hotelling service quality. J. Bus. Stud. Q., 2: 84-93.

Kirkpatrick, C.L., 1959. Technique for evaluating training programs. Train. Develop. J., 13: 3-9.

Kulik, C.T. and L. Roberson, 2008. Common goals and missed opportunities: A research agenda for diversity education in academic and organizational settings. Acad. Manage. Learn. Educ., 7: 309-331.

Lewis, B.R. and V.W. Mitchell, 1990. Defining and measuring the quality of customer service. Market. Intell. Plann., 8: 11-17.

Liberman, B.E., C.J. Block and S.M. Koch, 2011. Diversity trainer preconceptions: The effects of trainer race and gender on perceptions of diversity trainer effectiveness. Basic Appl. Social Psychol., 33: 279-293.

MacDuffie, J.P. and T.A. Kochan, 1995. Do US firms invest less in human resources?: Training in the world auto industry. Industrial Relations. A J. Econ. Soc., 34: 147-168.

Parasuraman, A., V.A. Zeithaml and L.L. Berry, 1985. A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. J. Market., 49: 41-50.

Raghuram, S., 1994. Linking staffing and training practices with business strategy: A theoretical perspective. Hum. Resour. Dev. Q., 5: 237-251.

Roberson, L., C.T. Kulik and M.B. Pepper, 2003. Using needs assessment to resolve controversies in diversity training design. Group Organiz. Manage., 28: 148-174.

Scaduto, A., D. Lindsay and D.S. Chiaburu, 2008. Leader influences on training effectiveness: Motivation and outcome expectation processes. Int. J. Training Dev., 12: 158-170.

Velada, R., A. Caetano, J.W. Michel, B.D. Lyons and M.J. Kavanagh, 2007. The effects of training design, individual characteristics and work environment on transfer of training. Int. J. Training Dev., 11: 282-294.

Waddell, D. and D. Stewart, 2004. Training quality managers-do they practice what they Preach?. Total Qual. Manage. Bus. Excellence, 15: 1119-1129.