



Evaluation Of Social Compliance Training Program Using The Kirkpatrick Model In The Medical Device Company (A Case Study At Pt Xyz)

Andrie Mallisa ¹⁾

¹⁾ Business Administration, School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia

Email: ¹⁾ andrie.mallisa@sbm-itb.ac.id

How to Cite :

Mallisa, A. (2026). Evaluation of Social Compliance Training Program Using the Kirkpatrick Model in the Medical Device Company (A Case Study at PT XYZ). EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 14(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v14i1>

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received [02 June 2025]

Revised [26 January 2026]

Accepted [29 January 2026]

KEYWORDS

Evaluation, Kirkpatrick, Medical Device Company, Social Compliance, Training.

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license



ABSTRACT

In the medical device industry, compliance with social standards has become increasingly critical. To address these challenges, PT XYZ Indonesia has initiated a Social Compliance Training. This study evaluates the effectiveness of Social Compliance Training conducted at PT XYZ Indonesia using the first three levels of the Kirkpatrick Model: Reaction, Learning, and Behavior. The study used a mixed-method approach involving questionnaires (Level 1), pre- and post-training assessments (Level 2), and interviews and behavioral observations (Level 3). For the level 1 (reaction), findings show that participants react positively to the social compliance training with an average rating of more than 4,5 out of 5. To evaluate the effectiveness of a training program at Level 2 (learning), statistical analysis was conducted using a paired sample t-test. Based on the results of the paired sample t-test, the training program was effective in improving knowledge or skills related to the training content. For level 3 (behavior), the researcher conducted an interview and observation with the head of the department or division. All of the department heads and division heads consider that employees who have attended the training have a better understanding of social compliance and implement it compared to people who have not attended the training.

INTRODUCTION

The changing dynamics of global business have required companies to not only focus on achieving financial gains and product quality, but also to pay attention to aspects of sustainability and social responsibility (Amponsah-Tawiah & Dartey-Baah, 2011). One of the key elements of corporate social responsibility is adherence to principles of social compliance. In the context of the medical device industry, compliance with social standards has become increasingly critical

(WHO, 2017). The products manufactured must not only meet quality and safety standards but also be produced through ethical and responsible processes.

PT XYZ Indonesia was established in April 2004 in Sentul, Bogor, West Java. It is a leading Indonesian medical device manufacturer specializing in Auto Disable (AD) Syringes and Smart Syringes. As a pioneer in promoting safe injection practices, the company has significantly reduced the circulation of standard syringes in Indonesia, capturing a 90% market share in the AD syringe segment.

The export performance of PT XYZ Indonesia has made a significant contribution to the growth of the national medical device industry. In 2021 alone, the company successfully exported more than 150 million units of Auto Disable Syringes (ADS), valued at over US\$10.5 million, to key international partners such as UNICEF and the Ministry of Health of Ukraine. This momentum continued during the 2022–2024 period, with the company expanding its export reach to over 30 countries. This achievement was supported by export financing of IDR 524 billion from the Indonesian Eximbank (LPEI), which was allocated for increasing production capacity and global market penetration.

However, as international market expectations grow, this business success also comes with increased demands for social compliance. Failure to consistently and comprehensively implement social compliance standards poses substantial risks to the sustainability of the company's export business. Non-compliance with key principles—such as decent working conditions, non-discrimination, and freedom of association—can erode international customer trust, lead to contract cancellations, and result in the company being excluded from global supply chains.

To address these challenges and strengthen its position in the global market, PT XYZ Indonesia has initiated a Social Compliance Training Program, which has been implemented over the past year across various functions and departments. Social compliance training is a crucial strategy in fostering a strong culture of compliance and work ethics within an organization. This program serves not only as an educational tool but also as a vital pillar in mitigating business risks arising from non-conformity with internationally recognized social standards.

Through this training, employees are introduced to and equipped with a comprehensive understanding of fundamental principles such as:

- Fundamental workers' rights
- Anti-discrimination
- Freedom of association
- Fair working hours and wages
- Occupational health and safety
- Prevention of forced labor and child labor
- Prohibition of gratuities and corruption

The urgency of this training continues to rise, especially considering that failure to consistently and comprehensively implement social compliance standards can pose significant risks to the sustainability of a company's business operations. Non-compliance with principles such as decent work practices, non-discrimination, and freedom of association can lead to the loss of trust from international customers, termination of trade contracts, and even exclusion from global supply chains.

The training program has been running for one year, yet a comprehensive evaluation of its effectiveness has not been conducted. Has the training successfully improved participants' knowledge? Do the participants find the training relevant and beneficial? And most importantly, has the training been effective in driving behavior change aligned with social compliance principles in the workplace?

To answer these questions, the Kirkpatrick Training Evaluation Model was utilized. This model is widely recognized as the standard for evaluating training programs across various sectors (Sari et al., 2020). It consists of four evaluation levels:

- Level 1: Reaction – measures participants' satisfaction with the training
- Level 2: Learning – measures the increase in knowledge and skills
- Level 3: Behavior – measures behavior changes in the workplace
- Level 4: Results – measures the impact on business outcomes

In this study, the evaluation is limited to the first three levels due to time constraints and the complexity of quantitatively measuring business outcomes. These three levels are considered sufficiently representative in assessing the effectiveness of the training from the perspective of both participants and departmental leadership (Falletta, 1998).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Kirkpatrick Model, developed by Donald Kirkpatrick in 1959, is one of the most widely used frameworks for evaluating training programs. According to the website kirkpatrickpartners.com, the Kirkpatrick Model is the standard for leveraging and validating talent investments. For more than seven decades, learning and performance professionals around the world have witnessed its effectiveness firsthand. It is structured into four hierarchical levels: Reaction, Learning, Behavior, and Results.

The first level of the Kirkpatrick Model, Reaction, evaluates how participants respond to a training program. This level focuses on understanding their perceptions, satisfaction, and engagement with the training experience. Measuring reaction is critical because it provides immediate feedback on how well the training was received, helping the company gauge whether participants found it relevant, engaging, and valuable. A positive reaction is often seen as a prerequisite for deeper learning and eventual behavior change. If participants are dissatisfied or disengaged, it could hinder their willingness to absorb and apply the training content effectively.

Reaction evaluation involves tools such as surveys, questionnaires, or interviews conducted after the training session. These tools assess aspects such as the quality of content, the trainer's effectiveness, the relevance of the material to participants' roles, and logistical factors like the venue or technology used. For example, participants may be asked to rate their overall satisfaction or provide feedback on specific elements of the training. This data not only helps identify areas for improvement but also serves as a baseline for evaluating the training program's effectiveness at subsequent levels.

Level 2 of the Kirkpatrick Model, Learning, focuses on evaluating the knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired by participants during a training program. This level surpasses participant satisfaction (Level 1) to assess whether the training effectively achieved its educational objectives. Learning evaluation ensures that participants gain the intended competencies, which serve as the foundation for subsequent behavior change and organizational improvement. Measuring learning outcomes is critical for determining the training's direct impact on participants' intellectual and skill development.

To evaluate learning, the company often uses tools such as pre-tests and post-tests, practical demonstrations, case studies, and role-playing activities. These methods assess cognitive gains (e.g., understanding concepts or theories), skill proficiency (e.g., applying techniques or methods), and attitudinal shifts (e.g., fostering a positive mindset toward tasks or changes). For example, in a leadership development program, participants might complete a knowledge-based assessment on management principles and demonstrate their ability to apply conflict resolution strategies through simulations. Comparing baseline results with post-training outcomes helps identify the degree of learning achieved.

Level 3 of the Kirkpatrick Model, Behavior, evaluates whether participants apply the knowledge, skills, or attitudes learned during training to their workplace or daily activities. This

level examines the transfer of learning, emphasizing real-world application rather than theoretical understanding. It bridges the gap between learning (Level 2) and organizational results (Level 4), focusing on the extent to which participants integrate their training into their roles and perform differently as a result. Behavior evaluation is critical because, without application, even the most effective learning outcomes may fail to deliver meaningful organizational improvements.

Assessing behavior change often involves tools such as workplace observations, self-assessments, feedback from supervisors or colleagues, and performance metrics. For example, in a customer service training program, behavior evaluation might include monitoring whether employees consistently use newly taught communication techniques during client interactions. A well-designed evaluation at this level also considers the frequency, consistency, and quality of behavior changes, providing a detailed understanding of the training's impact.

Level 4 of the Kirkpatrick Model, Results, evaluates the ultimate impact of a training program on organizational performance and strategic goals. This level focuses on measurable outcomes, such as increased productivity, improved customer satisfaction, higher revenue, reduced costs, or enhanced employee retention. Results evaluation reflects the broader return on investment (ROI) of training and is often considered the most critical and challenging level of the model. It directly addresses whether the training contributes to the success of the organization, linking individual learning and behavior changes to tangible business outcomes.

Measuring results involves analyzing key performance indicators (KPIs) that align with the training's objectives. For instance, a sales training program might assess metrics such as revenue growth, lead conversion rates, or customer retention post-training. Similarly, leadership development initiatives could evaluate organizational climate surveys or employee engagement scores. To attribute changes in results to the training, the company may use techniques like control groups, trend analysis, or comparative studies conducted before and after the training period.

The Kirkpatrick Model offers a structured and comprehensive framework for evaluating training programs, making it a widely adopted tool across industries. One of its primary advantages is its clarity and simplicity, which allows the company to systematically assess training effectiveness at multiple levels. By dividing the evaluation into four distinct stages—Reaction, Learning, Behavior, and Results—the model provides a logical progression that aligns with the natural flow of training implementation and its impact.

The Kirkpatrick Model also promotes a results-oriented mindset, encouraging the company to link training outcomes to tangible business metrics. This feature helps justify investments in learning and development by demonstrating the return on investment (ROI) of training initiatives. By focusing on Levels 3 and 4 (Behavior and Results), the company can identify the long-term impact of training on employee performance and organizational success.

Although the Kirkpatrick Model is widely used and respected, it still has its limitations. One of the primary critiques is its linear and hierarchical structure, which assumes a direct progression from Reaction to Results. The relationship between these levels is not always sequential or straightforward. For example, positive participant reactions (Level 1) do not guarantee effective learning (Level 2), nor does learning automatically translate into behavior change (Level 3) or improved organizational outcomes (Level 4). This oversimplification can lead to incomplete or misleading conclusions about a training program's effectiveness.

METHODS

To collect the information needed from participants who participated in the social compliance policy training program, the researcher collects the primary data for the first-level evaluation. The primary data collection consists of the data gathered by the questionnaire, which includes ratings and open-ended questions regarding the training program that is distributed to

participants immediately after the training. These instruments measure participants' satisfaction with the training content, delivery methods, and effectiveness. Using the information gathered from the questionnaires, the researcher will apply a quantitative approach to measure the rating score for each aspect that was questioned. For the qualitative approach, open-ended questions can also capture qualitative insights into their perceptions and suggestions for improvement, providing a richer understanding of their experience.

The researcher also used pre-test and post-test scores as primary data for the second level to measure how much the participants have learned through the training program. These assessments are multiple-choice tests related to the social compliance policy training program. Comparing the results before and after the training helps determine the extent to which participants have achieved the intended learning outcomes.

Primary data for the third level: behavior is also gathered through workplace observations by asking the supervisor for evaluations to identify changes in participant behavior and the difference with untrained employees. Structured observation checklists and interviews with supervisors can provide evidence of how participants are applying their learning on the job.

The participants of the social compliance policy training program consisted of staff and managerial levels. The training program is conducted from January to October 2024. It is focused on the core training program, which is delivered by the Legal & HR Department team in Cikarang Office. A total of 89 employees from different departments, including staff and managers, have enrolled in this program.

The data analysis process for evaluating social compliance policy training programs using the Kirkpatrick Model involves both quantitative and qualitative techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of the program's effectiveness. Each level of the Kirkpatrick Model requires tailored analysis methods to assess the data collected from various sources.

For Level 1: Reaction, the analysis primarily involves descriptive statistics to summarize participants' feedback on the training. Measures such as mean, median, and standard deviation are used to evaluate satisfaction levels, relevance of the training content, and delivery effectiveness. Open-ended responses from forms are analysed qualitatively to identify recurring themes and specific suggestions for improvement.

For Level 2: Learning, quantitative methods such as paired sample t-tests are employed to compare pre- and post-training assessment scores. The t-test is a statistical method used to determine whether there is a significant difference between two sets of related data. In the context of training evaluation, it is applied to compare participants' scores before and after attending a training program. This analysis determines the statistical significance of changes in participants' knowledge and skills after the training. If the t-test result has a low p-value (typically < 0.05), it indicates the training had a significant positive effect on learning outcomes.

For Level 3: Behavior, a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques is used. Behavioral changes observed in the workplace are analyzed using thematic analysis of interview and observation data. Responses from interviews with supervisors are coded to identify patterns in how training is applied on the job. Additionally, scoring or rating systems will be used to quantify changes in specific behaviors. This mixed-methods approach ensures a nuanced understanding of the application of training in real-world contexts.

By integrating these data analysis methods, the research can draw conclusions about the evaluation of the social compliance policy training program's effectiveness. This approach ensures that both individual and organizational outcomes are thoroughly examined, leading to actionable insights and recommendations for improving future training programs.

RESULTS

The researcher calculates the average rating and places them each into Table 1. From table 1 on participants' rates to these aspects, the lowest rate aspect is time allocation of training, with a rate of 4.43 out of 5. The second lowest aspect is acceptance of the entire material and case studies by participants, with a rate of 4.52 out of 5. The third lowest aspect is the effectiveness rate, with a rate of 4.61 out of 5. From those results, we may have to focus on these lowest aspects for improvement in the future.

On the other hand, participants gave the highest rate for examples and illustrations provided by the instructor, with a rate of 4.76 out of 5. The second highest aspect is satisfaction rate, with a rate of 4.74 out of 5. The third highest aspect is the delivery method of the instructor, with a rate of 4.72 out of 5.

Based on the feedback from the training in Table 1, we can synchronize each aspect with the answer given by the participants in the open-ended question in the questionnaire. We can set the feedback in Table 2 for the priority list of improvement from the lowest rate to the highest rate.

To evaluate the effectiveness of a training program at Level 2 of the Kirkpatrick Model, statistical analysis was conducted using a paired sample t-test. This test compares participants' pre-test and post-test scores to determine whether the training led to significant learning gains.

Based on the results of the paired sample t-test, the average score before the training (pre-test) was 62.92, while the average score after the training (post-test) increased to 77.98. This shows an average improvement of 15.06 points. The t-test produced a t-statistic value of 8.17 with a p-value of 0.0000000000212, which is significantly lower than the standard significance level of 0.05.

This means there is a statistically significant difference between participants' scores before and after the training. In other words, the training had a meaningful and measurable impact on participants' learning. The increase in scores demonstrates that the training program was effective in improving knowledge or skills related to the training content.

For observation questionnaire, we have 12 participants, who were the heads of departments or divisions. In an observation questionnaire using a 1 to 5 rating scale, 1 represents the lowest or most negative response, while 5 indicates the highest or most positive response.

As we had collected the answers, we were able to calculate the overall rating for every item. The researcher calculates the average rating between the employees who have attended training and the employees who have not attended training. It can be seen in the table 3.

Based on table 3 below, we can conclude that employees who have attended social compliance training show better behavior in implementing social compliance. The highest rates in employees who have attended social compliance training are demonstrating ethical attitudes and care about social compliance issues, such as not engaging in discrimination, violence, intimidation, or harassment in the work environment, with a rate of 4,67 out of 5. It indicated that the employees who have attended social compliance training exhibit ethical attitudes and concern about social compliance issues in the workplace.

For the interview, we have 11 participants, who were the heads of departments or divisions. In an interview, we asked 5 questions related to social compliance training and the behavior of employees who have attended the social compliance training.

For the first question, we asked about the most obvious behavioral differences between employees who have attended social compliance training and those who have not attended the training. Mostly, the superiors said that the employees who have attended the social compliance training have a better understanding of the regulations and comply with them better than those who have not attended the training. In addition, they also show awareness of personal and

company integrity, confidentiality of information, and a greater concern for social issues, such as discrimination, harassment, and work safety.

For the second question, we asked about how social compliance training impacts the work culture in the department. Most of the superiors said social compliance training has major impacts on more positive changes in work culture, including: encouraging greater personal responsibility and accountability in carrying out tasks and targets; strengthening ethical behavior in acting, communicating with fellow employees, and achieving work targets; and fostering openness, discipline, and a sense of ownership of company values. Especially in the HR Department, which they are providing punishment if there is a violation of social norms in the company, so this gives them more responsibility to be able to give a good example to all employees in the company.

For the third question, we asked about what the biggest challenges are in implementing compliance behavior in the workplace. Mostly, the superiors said that the challenges in implementing compliance behavior are a lack of in-depth understanding of the importance of compliance, changing the old behavior (before training) and getting used to applying social compliance in daily activities, minimal supervision, and examples or roles from superiors to also comply with the rules. In addition, the biggest challenge in implementing compliance behavior is consistently implementing this social compliance not only in the company environment but also outside the company environment. Because if a violation occurs, the company's reputation will be affected to some extent.

For the fourth question, we asked about what employees need so that training results can be implemented optimally. Most of the superiors said that the employees need full support and commitment from top management by giving the example of the superiors, clear communication and escalation of reporting, continuous training, clear reward and punishment, a safe and confidential reporting mechanism (whistleblowing system), and support from colleagues. In addition, they also need protection for employees who are willing to provide information about violations.

For the fifth question, we asked about suggestions for improving the effectiveness of social compliance training in the future. Mostly, the superiors said the training needs improvement, such as: interactive methods; adapting materials to real conditions by giving real examples in daily activities; providing case studies and reviewing periodically; continuous training; superior involvement; and evaluating results and providing feedback.

Table 1. Summary of Respondents' Rates

No	Aspects	Rates					TR	Final Rates
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	Serving method	0	0	0	29	60	89	4,67
2	Case studies presented	0	0	3	26	60	89	4,64
3	Examples and Illustrations provided	0	0	1	19	69	89	4,76
4	Material mastery	0	0	0	28	61	89	4,69
5	Delivery method	0	0	1	23	65	89	4,72
6	Ability to respond to questions	0	0	1	28	60	89	4,66
7	Time allocation of training	0	0	4	43	42	89	4,43
8	Acceptance of the entire material & case studies by participants	0	0	4	35	50	89	4,52
9	Satisfaction rate	0	0	2	19	68	89	4,74
10	Effectiveness rate	0	0	3	29	57	89	4,61

Source: Data Processed, 2025

Table 2. Priority List of Improvement

No	Aspects	Rates	Feedback
1	Time allocation of training	4,43	- No break time - Longer time - More punctual
2	Acceptance of the entire material & case studies by participants	4,52	- Pretty good and informative - It is better that the material in Bahasa - The material is not boring and very useful - The material is easy to understand - The material is easy to understand, due to related with daily life - The material is very update
3	Effectiveness rate	4,61	It's better before work than after work
4	Case studies presented	4,64	There is no specified comment about this aspect
5	Ability to respond to questions	4,66	- Everything is fine and all my questions are answered - Respond to questions very well
6	Serving method	4,67	- Please provide training support facilities such as mineral water, snacks, etc - Get certificate after training
7	Material mastery	4,69	- Please improve in material mastery - Good in material mastery
8	Delivery method	4,72	- Easy to understand - It is hoped that the explanation will be a little slower - Please improve in delivery method - More interactive - The delivery is very good and friendly
9	Satisfaction rate	4,74	- Good training - The training was carried out very well and the material was delivered well - The training was very interesting and the trainer's language was easy to understand and his mastery of the material was very good
10	Examples and Illustrations provided	4,76	- The delivery is easy to understand and the illustrations provided are very simple - The material is broadened with illustrations related to the training material

Source: Data Processed, 2025

Table 3. Observation Result

No	Observation List	Average Rates	
		Employees who have attended training	Employees who have not attended training
1	Employees have a good understanding of social compliance policies and procedures, such as non-discrimination, anti-forced labour, fair wages, reasonable working hours, etc.	4,33	3,08
2	Employees apply the principles of social compliance in their daily tasks.	4,25	3,50
3	Employees demonstrate ethical behaviour and concern for social compliance issues, such as not engaging in discrimination, violence, intimidation or harassment in the workplace	4,67	3,58
4	Employees actively report or handle cases of violations occurring in the workplace related to social compliance by using the company's whistleblower system or reporting directly to their supervisor or the legal and compliance department	3,33	2,67
5	Employees set a positive example in terms of social compliance for their colleagues	4,00	3,25
6	Employees encourage their colleagues to comply with social compliance policies	4,08	2,92
7	Employees are able to distinguish work situations that pose a risk of social compliance violations, such as not accepting gifts, money, or facilities that could affect their work integrity	4,25	3,17
8	Employees understand current issues and adjust their behaviour accordingly, for example, human rights violations in the workplace/company	4,08	3,17
9	Employees provide input to management regarding improvements to regulations and the implementation of social compliance in the field	3,08	2,42
10	Employees are actively involved in activities or discussions related to social compliance within the company	2,83	2,25

Source: Data Processed, 2025

DISCUSSION

The objective of this research is to evaluate the social compliance policy training program, whose goals are to ensure ethical, legal, and socially responsible practices throughout the organization's operations and supply chain. Due to the high regulatory scrutiny and critical nature of the medical device industry, this training is necessary to keep the company compliant, establish trust, and secure its reputation.

In addition, the objective of this research is also to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of social compliance training between individuals who have received the training and those who have not. By applying the three levels of the Kirkpatrick Model—Reaction, Learning, and Behavior—the study aims to assess not only how participants respond to the training but also the extent to which it enhances their knowledge, influences their workplace behavior, and contributes to organizational outcomes related to compliance.

Based on the evaluation of level 1 (reaction), level 2 (learning), and level 3 (behavior) in the social compliance training, it shows that the training has a positive impact on the participants. In the level 1 (reaction), the social compliance training was considered good and effective, although several things needed to be improved.

In the level 2 (learning), the social compliance training was effective in improving knowledge and skills related to the social compliance policy. In the level 3 (behavior), the social compliance training has a good impact on employees who have attended the training. The employees who have attended the training have a better understanding of social compliance and implement compliance behavior in their daily activities than the employees who have not attended social compliance training.

CONCLUSION

Level 1: Reaction

In the social compliance training, participants did an evaluation of the training through a questionnaire at the end of the training. Participants react positively to the social compliance training as they rate most aspects with an average rating of more than 4,5 out of 5. Even though there are several aspects that need to be improved.

For example, the time allocation of training as the aspect that is rated the least, with an average rating of 4,43 out of 5, needs to be improved by being more punctual, giving break time, and giving longer time. But even though there are things that need to be improved, the social compliance training was considered to have been successfully carried out, the material was delivered well, and the trainer's delivery method was easy to understand.

Level 2: Learning

In the social compliance training, the participants did the pre-test before the training and the post-test after the training was conducted. To evaluate the effectiveness of a training program at Level 2 of the Kirkpatrick Model, statistical analysis was conducted using a paired sample t-test. Based on the results of the paired sample t-test, the average score before the training (pre-test) was 62.92, while the average score after the training (post-test) increased to 77.98. This shows an average improvement of 15.06 points.

The t-test produced a t-statistic value of 8.17 with a p-value of 0.0000000000212, which is significantly lower than the standard significance level of 0.05. This means that the training program was effective in improving knowledge or skills related to the training content.

Level 3: Behavior

For level 3, the researcher conducted an interview and disseminated the observation questionnaire to the head of the department or division to assess the behavior of the employees

who have attended the social compliance training. In addition, they also compare it with the employees who have not attended the social compliance training. All of the department heads and division heads assess that employees who have attended the training have a better understanding of social compliance and implement it compared to people who have not attended the training.

LIMITATION

There are some limitations of this research based on the research objective, the researcher's capability, and the internal policy at the company, as described below:

- This research will only be conducted by the Kirkpatrick Model until level 3 to evaluate the social compliance policy training. The last level of this model (Level 4: Results) needs more time and in-depth observation.
- The limitation of this research is the time and the number of employees that can be observed.
- The scope of research does not include the financial aspect as a detail to analyze data and provide business solutions.
- The data in this research is considered confidential internally and has not been made public yet.

REFERENCES

- Amponsah-Tawiah, K., & Dartey-Baah, K. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility in Ghana. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235909824>
- Barrientos, S., & Smith, S. (2007). Do workers benefit from ethical trade? Assessing codes of labour practice in global production systems. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4), 713–729. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701336580>
- Chakalova, I. (2022). The Benefits of Implementing Social Audit in Social Enterprises. *Economic and Social Alternatives*, 28(2), 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.37075/isa.2022.2.06>
- Chiu, I. H.-Y. (2022). The EU Sustainable Finance Agenda: Developing Governance for Double Materiality in Sustainability Metrics. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 23(1), 87–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40804-021-00229-9>
- Falletta, S. (1998). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels* Donald L. Kirkpatrick, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1996, 229 pp. *The American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(2), 259–261. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1098-2140\(99\)80206-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1098-2140(99)80206-9)
- Islam, M. A., Deegan, C., & Gray, R. (2018). Social compliance audits and multinational corporation supply chain: evidence from a study of the rituals of social audits. *Accounting and Business Research*, 48(2), 190–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2017.1362330>
- OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct. (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1787/81f92357-en>
- Sari, D. N., Ambiyar, & Rizal, F. (2020). Evaluation of 3 in 1 training program (Training, certification, work placement) at Padang industrial training center. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(4), 1067–1069.

Sedex Members Ethical Trade Audit (SMETA) Measurement Criteria. (n.d.).

WHO global model regulatory framework for medical devices including in vitro diagnostic medical devices. (2017). World Health Organizations.