

Vol:2, Issue: 8 pp: 235-245

JEL Codes: I2, I21

ROSMIATI, KHAIRINAL, HUTABARAT, Z.S. (2021). **"Follow-up Analysis of Student Soft Skill Evaluation"**,
Vol: 2 Issue: 8 pp: 235-245

Keywords: student, soft skill evaluation, Jambi University

Article Type Research Article

Follow-up Analysis of Student Soft Skill Evaluation

Arrived Date
24.08.2021

Accepted Date
13.09.2021

Published Date
31.10.2021


Rosmiati¹ Khairinal², Zuhri Saputra Hutabarat³


ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the reality that education in Indonesia provides a larger portion of soft skills content. This research is included in the survey research group with a population of all students of the Economic Education study program, FKIP Jambi University, batches of 2015, 2016 and 2017. The number of respondents planned for each batch is 60 people, so the total number of respondents is 180 people. The methodology that will be used in this research emphasizes on measuring the ownership of soft skills attributes possessed by students with the degree of ownership of each of these attributes and the instrument used in this study is an instrument resulting from development research that has been carried out in 2017. The number of questions is 69 items grouped into 23 categories. ; Each category consists of 3 statement items. The results are: 1) The results of the research on the soft skills attributes that students have overall are very good with a Relative Frequency of 63.91%, 2) The results of the research on the soft skills of students per batch, 2015, 2016 and 2017 are very good with an absolute frequency of 36 and a relative frequency of 69.23% with a comparison of 2015 and 2016 Class Students. 3) The results of the ability research based on gender. Soft Skills of students based on sex that women are higher than men with very good average abilities with a count of 25 for men -male and female count 122. 4) The results of the Soft Skills study of students based on origin from villages and cities, the results of the analysis obtained a coefficient of F count of 0.218 with a rejection rate of 64.10%, thus there is no difference in the average soft skills of students who from the city and from the village.

INTRODUCTION

This research is a continuation of previous research which focuses more on preliminary studies in preparation for conducting this research. In this study, it is more focused on further researching the ownership of soft skill attributes of students of the Economic Education Study Program, FKIP UNJA, (Groh et al., 2016) and (Brungardt & Ph, 2011) especially in the aspect of interpersonal relationships. It is very important to continue this research so that the final result of this research is how the actual ownership of students' soft skills attributes can be known, the results of which can be used as a basis for formulating appropriate policies according to the existing problems (Guerra-Báez, 2019).

¹  Dr., rosmiati.fkip@unja.ac.id, Universitas Jambi, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jl. Jambi Muara Bulian, Jambi/ INDONESIA

²  Prof. Dr., khairinal.fkip@unja.ac.id, Universitas Jambi, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jl. Jambi Muara Bulian, Jambi/ INDONESIA

³  Dr., Corresponding author, zuhri2saputra1hutabarat9@gmail.com, Universitas Batanghari Jambi, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jl. Slamet Riyadi, Jambi/ INDONESIA



In previous research, a soft skills assessment instrument has been successfully compiled consisting of 69 statement items. The instrument is divided into 23 categories. The product validity of the soft skills assessment instrument model for economic education students is needed in this study before it is used in and applied by students of economics study program (Loyd & Koenig, 2008). The results of the recapitulation of the feasibility level of the soft skill assessment instrument model product reached 86.25%. The percentage shows that the soft skills assessment instrument model is in very good criteria and can be used by students of economic education (Mohamad et al., 2017) and (Meeks, 2017). The validity is seen by the suitability of the small group test results and product testing using the soft skills instrument model of economics students. Thus, the results of this field test are truly reliable. (Cimatti, 2016).

This research is expected to be able to obtain sustainable funding which in the end can be arranged a framework of soft skill attributes that will be cultivated and what lecturers need to strive for to obtain graduates with soft skill attributes that are superior for graduates of economic education study programs.

This research is a preliminary study to obtain initial information about understanding soft skills and ownership of soft skills attributes by both lecturers and students. In the next year, it is hoped that the research can be continued with a focus on obtaining what soft skill attributes need to be improved and the design of learning strategies. And in the third year, it is possible to test the implementation of the design of the soft skills learning model which is then formulated as a standard soft skill learning model that will be applied to the economic education study program.

Awareness of the need for soft skills has spread to various educational institutions, especially well-known higher education institutions in Indonesia which are role models and references for other universities (Theses et al., 2020), who wish to follow in their footsteps, including in the economic education study program at Jambi University.

The development and application of soft skills learning models must start from the awareness of the economic education study program, the direction of its development and the application of the desired soft skills whose success must be supported by the lecturers involved (Sultanova et al., 2021). Students also need to continue to learn and cultivate soft skills that are in great demand by the world of work and support future success.

In line with the above, the economic education study program of the faculty of teacher training and education at the University of Jambi, does not yet have a direction for developing soft skills learning which is standardized in a policy that must be followed by every existing study program.

Therefore, the economic education study program deems it necessary to immediately formulate a policy direction for the soft skills learning model that is expected (Azliza Muhammad et al., 2018), to become the superior characteristics of graduates who will later become capital for success in entering the world of educational work in particular and the business world. industry in general.

Research Methods

This research is included in the survey, (Arsyad, 2019) research group with a population of all students of the Economic Education study program, FKIP Jambi University, batches of 2015, 2016 and 2017. The number of respondents planned for each batch is 60 people, so the total number of respondents is 180 people. The methodology that will be used in this research is as follows.

a) Research Emphasis

The emphasis is on measuring the ownership of soft skills attributes owned by students of the Economics Education Study Program, FKIP UNJA and the degree of ownership of each of these attributes.

b) Research Instruments

The instrument used in this research is an instrument resulting from development research that has been carried out in 2017. The number of questions is 69 items which are grouped into 23 categories; Each category consists of 3 statement items.

c) Data Collection

Data were collected using a questionnaire given to students directly and collected on the same day (Jannah, 2010). This is taken because if it is collected with free time, based on previous experience many will not collect it again for various reasons. The data that has been collected will then be analyzed descriptively.

Results and Discussion

Results

The results of this study are in the form of an assessment instrument for soft skills learning models that have gone through a series of validations (Umar, 2002) and (Sukardi, 2013). The data collected is in the form of an assessment in the form of a questionnaire from instrument experts on soft skills instrument instruments developed through students by distributing questionnaires to students from the 2015 2016 and 2017 batches of students at the Economic Education Study Program, University of Jambi.

What soft skills attributes do students in the entire Economic Education Study Program, FKIP Jambi University, have

Table 1. Tabulation of Average Soft Skills Ability of Economic Education Study Program Students

Student Soft Skills Ability	Total	
	frequency absolute	frequency relatively
Not good	2	0,87%
Good	81	35,22%
Very good	147	63,91%
Amount	230	100,00%

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Table 2. Tabulation of Average Soft Skills Ability of Economic Education Study Program Students

Student Soft Skills Ability	Regular Student		Independent Student	
	frequency Absolute	frequency relatively	frequency Absolute	frequency relatively
Not good	-	-	2	2,56%
Good	54	35,53%	27	34,62%
Very good	98	64,47%	49	62,82%
Amount	152	100,00%	78	100,00%

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Based on Table 1 and Table 2, it can be explained that the Soft Skills Ability of Economic Education Study Program students is very good with a relative frequency of 63.91%.

When distinguished between Regular Students Freq. Absolute 98 and Relative Frequency 64.47% while Independent Students Freq. Absolute 49 and Freq. Relatively 62.82% .

However, there is a small percentage (1 65%) of the distribution between Regular Students and Independent Students.

The soft skills of Economic Education study program students from 2015 to 2017 are seen from 23 assessment points. The twenty-three items are as follows:

Table 3. Item Description

No	Item Description	Very Good		Not good		Good		Very good	
		Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %
1	Initiative	1	0,43	45	19,57	103	44,78	81	35,22
2	Integrity	2	0,87	47	20,43	115	50,00	66	28,70
3	Critical thinking	1	0,43	49	21,30	101	43,91	79	34,35
4	Willingness to Learn	4	1,74	21	9,13	85	36,96	120	52,17
5	Commitment	5	2,17	18	7,83	101	43,91	106	46,09
6	Excited Attitude	3	1,30	34	14,78	89	38,70	104	45,22
7	Motivational Attitude	3	1,30	31	13,48	72	31,30	124	53,91
8	Reliability	1	0,43	16	6,96	79	34,35	134	58,26
9	Verbal communication	1	0,43	18	7,83	140	60,87	71	30,87
10	Creativity	3	1,30	48	20,87	99	43,04	80	34,78
11	Analysis Ability	2	0,87	29	12,61	138	60,00	61	26,52
12	Ability to Cope with Stress	1	0,43	15	6,52	79	34,35	135	58,70
13	Self management	-		3	1,30	26	11,30	201	87,39
14	Problem Solving Ability	1	0,43	7	3,04	42	18,26	180	78,26
15	Summarizing Ability	-		43	18,70	80	34,78	107	46,52
16	Cooperation / Cooperation	1	0,43	10	4,35	50	21,74	169	73,48
17	Flexibility / Flexibility	2	0,87	17	7,39	82	35,65	129	56,09
18	Teamwork	-		18	7,83	81	35,22	131	56,96
19	Independence	2	0,87	21	9,13	67	29,13	140	60,87
20	Attitude of Listening to Others	2	0,87	27	11,74	69	30,00	132	57,39
21	Toughness	2	0,87	45	19,57	84	36,52	99	43,04
22	Arguing Ability	5	2,17	86	37,39	96	41,74	43	18,70
23	Time Management	3	1,30	48	20,87	94	40,87	85	36,96
	Average	1,96	0,85	30,26	37,28	85,74	37,28	112,04	48,71

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

From the table above, it can be seen that the soft skills of students of the Economic Education study program from 2015 to 2017 are seen from 23 assessment points.

The twenty-three items are very good, it can be seen from the average of each item 23 assessment of soft skills.

Table 4 The soft skills ability of students of the Regular Economics Education Study Program from 2015 to 2017 seen from 23 assessment points. The twenty-three items are as follows:

Table 4. The soft skills ability of students of the Regular Economics Education Study Program from 2015 to 2017 seen from 23 assessment points

No	Item Description	Very Not Good		Not good		Good		Very good	
		Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %
1	Initiative	0	0,00	36	23,68	71	46,71	45	29,61
2	Integrity	0	0,00	39	25,66	74	48,68	39	25,66
3	Critical thinking	0	0,00	35	23,03	70	46,05	47	30,92

4	Willingness to Learn	2	1,32	11	7,24	57	37,50	82	53,95
5	Commitment	3	1,97	14	9,21	67	44,08	68	44,74
6	Excited Attitude	1	0,66	27	17,76	62	40,79	62	40,79
7	Motivational Attitude	1	0,66	22	14,47	49	32,24	80	52,63
8	Reliability	0	0,00	10	6,58	55	36,18	87	57,24
9	Verbal communication	0	0,00	9	5,92	99	65,13	44	28,95
10	Creativity	2	1,32	37	24,34	59	38,82	54	35,53
11	Analysis Ability	0	0,00	23	15,13	95	62,50	34	22,37
12	Ability to Cope with Stress	1	0,66	11	7,24	54	35,53	86	56,58
13	Self management	2	1,32	7	4,61	143	94,08	152	100,00
14	Problem Solving Ability	0	0,00	0	0,00	20	13,16	132	86,84
15	Summarizing Ability	0	0,00	30	19,74	60	39,47	62	40,79
16	Cooperation / Cooperation	1	0,66	6	3,95	28	18,42	117	76,97
17	Flexibility / Flexibility	1	0,66	12	7,89	49	32,24	90	59,21
18	Teamwork	0	0,00	12	7,89	55	36,18	85	55,92
19	Independence	0	0,00	11	7,24	45	29,61	96	63,16
20	Attitude of Listening to Others	0	0,00	20	13,16	42	27,63	90	59,21
21	Toughness	0	0,00	30	19,74	60	39,47	62	40,79
22	Arguing Ability	2	1,32	53	34,87	76	50,00	21	13,82
23	Time Management	0	0,00	31	20,39	69	45,39	52	34,21
Average		0,70	0,44	21,13	13,32	63,43	39,99	73,35	46,24

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Table 5. The soft skills of the students of the 2015-2017 Independent Economics Education Study Program seen from 23 assessment points

No	Item Description	Very Good		Not Good		Good		Very good	
		Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %	Absl	Rel %
1	Initiative	1	1,28	9	11,54	32	41,03	36	46,15
2	Integrity	2	2,56	2	2,56	41	52,56	27	34,62
3	Critical thinking	1	1,28	14	17,95	31	39,74	32	41,03
4	Willingness to Learn	2	2,56	10	12,82	28	35,90	38	48,72
5	Commitment	2	2,56	4	5,13	34	43,59	38	48,72
6	Excited Attitude	2	2,56	7	8,97	27	34,62	42	53,85
7	Motivational Attitude	2	2,56	9	11,54	23	29,49	44	56,41
8	Reliability	1	1,28	6	7,69	24	30,77	47	60,26
9	Verbal communication	1	1,28	9	11,54	41	52,56	27	34,62
10	Creativity	1	1,28	11	14,10	40	51,28	26	33,33
11	Analysis Ability	2	2,56	6	7,69	43	55,13	27	34,62
12	Ability to Cope with Stress	0	0,00	4	5,13	25	32,05	49	62,82
13	Self management	0	0,00	1	1,28	19	24,36	58	74,36
14	Problem Solving Ability	0	0,00	7	8,97	22	28,21	48	61,54
15	Summarizing Ability	0	0,00	13	16,67	20	25,64	45	57,69
16	Cooperation / Cooperation	0	0,00	4	5,13	22	28,21	52	66,67
17	Flexibility / Flexibility	1	1,28	5	6,41	33	42,31	39	50,00

18	Teamwork	0	0,00	6	7,69	26	33,33	46	58,97
19	Independence	2	2,56	10	12,82	22	28,21	44	56,41
20	Attitude of Listening to Others	2	2,56	7	8,97	27	34,62	42	53,85
21	Toughness	2	2,56	15	19,23	24	30,77	37	47,44
22	Arguing Ability	3	3,85	33	42,31	20	25,64	22	28,21
23	Time Management	3	3,85	17	21,79	25	32,05	33	42,31
Average		1,30	1,68	9,09	11,70	28,22	36,32	39,09	50,31

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

If the two groups, namely Regular Students and Independent Students, are compared, is there a significant difference between the two results as follows:

Table 6. Test the Difference between the Regular and Independent Student Group

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Regular Independent	-.00500	3.37618	1.68809	-5.37725	5.36725	-.003	3	.998

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

This means that the two groups are not significantly different, this is indicated by the coefficient $t = 0.003$ with a significance of 0.998.

From these results it can be seen that the difference test between the Regular and Independent Student Groups Sig. (2-tailed) 0.998 with Std. Deviation 3.37618 that the soft skill ability between the Regular and Independent Student Groups that the Regular Student is higher.

5.2 Soft Skills Ability of Students Per batch 2015, 2016 and 2017 Economic Education Study Program FKIP Jambi University

Table 7. Tabulation of Average Soft Skills Ability of Students of Economic Education Study Program Class of 2015, 2016 and 2017

Student Soft Skills Ability	Class of 2015 Students		Class of 2016 Students		Class of 2017 Students	
	Frequency Absolute	Frequency Relatively	Frequency Absolute	Frequency Relatively	Frequency Absolute	Frequency Relatively
Not good	2	2,22%	0	-	0	-
Well	28	45,16%	37	31,90%	16	30,77%
Very good	32	51,61%	79	68,10%	36	69,23%
Amount	62	100,00%	116	100,00%	52	100,00%

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Table 8. Soft Skill Attributes of Regular and Independent Students Class of 2015, 2016 and 2017

Class of Year Students			Regular and Non-Regular		Total
			Regular	Non Regular	
2015	Student Average Ability	Not good	0	2	2
		Well	12	16	28
		Very good	20	12	32
	Total		32	30	62
2016	Student Average Ability	Well	27	10	37
		Very good	51	28	79
	Total		78	38	116
2017	Student Average Ability	Well	15	1	16
		Very good	27	9	36
	Total		42	10	52
Total	Student Average Ability	Not good	0	2	2
		Well	54	27	81
		Very good	98	49	147
	Total		152	78	230

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Based on table 8 that the Soft Skills Ability of the 2017 class of students is very good with an absolute frequency of 36 and a relative frequency of 69.23% with a comparison of 2015 and 2016 students, according to the table, it can be seen that the Soft Skills Ability of equipment students has increased from 2015. up to 2017.

5.3 Ability Based on Gender Soft Skills of students of the Economic Education Study Program, FKIP Jambi University

Table 9. General Soft Skills Abilities of Students by Gender

			Student Average Ability	Total	Student Average Ability	Total
			Very good		Very good	
Gender	Man	Count	0	20	25	45
		% within Gender	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	0.0%	24.7%	17.0%	19.6%
		% of Total	0.0%	8.7%	10.9%	19.6%
	Woman	Count	2	61	122	185
		% within Gender	1.1%	33.0%	65.9%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	100.0%	75.3%	83.0%	80.4%
		% of Total	0.9%	26.5%	53.0%	80.4%
Total		Count	2	81	147	230
		% within Gender	0.9%	35.2%	63.9%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.9%	35.2%	63.9%	100.0%

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Soft Skill Abilities of Students Based on Gender Table 9 General Soft Skills Ability of Students by Gender that women are higher than men with an average ability of very good with the results of count 25 for men and women with count 122.

Table 10. Average Ability of Students and Gender

Anova					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.314	1	.314	1.249	.265
Within Groups	57.273	228	.251		
Total	57.587	229			

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

The results of the analysis show that the value of $F = 1.249$ with a rejection rate of 26.5 means that if this study sets a rejection rate of 5%, the results of this study show that there is no difference in the ownership of students' soft skills between male and female gender.

5.4 Soft Skills of students of the Economic Education Study Program, FKIP Jambi University based on their origin from villages and cities.

Student Origin * Average Ability of Students Crosstabulation

Table 11. General Soft Skills of Students Based on Place of Origin

			Student Average Ability			Total
			Not good	Good	Very good	
Student Origin	City	Count	1	24	41	66
		% within Student Origin	1.5%	36.4%	62.1%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	50.0%	29.6%	27.9%	28.7%
		% of Total	0.4%	10.4%	17.8%	28.7%
	Village	Count	1	57	106	164
		% within Student Origin	0.6%	34.8%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	50.0%	70.4%	72.1%	71.3%
		% of Total	0.4%	24.8%	46.1%	71.3%
	Total	Count	2	81	147	230
		% within Student Origin	0.9%	35.2%	63.9%	100.0%
		% within Student Average Ability	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.9%	35.2%	63.9%	100.0%

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

Table 12. Average Ability of Students and Origin of Student Residence

Anova					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.055	1	.055	.218	.641
Within Groups	57.532	228	.252		
Total	57.587	229			

Source: SPSS 25 (Data processed by researchers 2021)

The results of the analysis obtained that the calculated F coefficient was 0.218 with a rejection rate of 64.10%, thus there was no difference in the average soft skills of students from the city and from the

village. With that it can be seen that students from the village have higher soft skills than students from the city.

Discussion

Based on the research results of the Soft Skill Ownership Analysis of the Economic Education Study Program students, FKIP Jambi University, the researchers obtained the following findings:

- a) The results of the study the soft skills attributes that students have overall in the Economic Education Study Program, FKIP Jambi University, are very good with a relative frequency of 63.91%. When distinguished between Regular Students Freq. Absolute 98 and Relative Frequency 64.47% while Independent Students Freq. Absolute 49 and Freq. Relatively 62.82%. However, there is a small percentage (1 65%) of the distribution between Regular Students and Independent Students (Whitehurst, 2016), (Achmad Muhammad et al., 2019), (Dewiyani, 2015), and (Hanover Research, 2014).
- b) The results of the study on the soft skills of students per batch, 2015, 2016 and 2017 Economic Education Study Program FKIP Jambi University were very good with an absolute frequency of 36 and a relative frequency of 69.23% with a comparison of students from the 2015 and 2016 batches, according to the table it can be seen that the Soft Skills Ability of equipment students has increased from 2015 to 2017 (Rashidi et al., 2013), (Cordova & Suryani, n.d.), (Caggiano et al., 2020), (Taylor, 2016), and (Mohammed, A. S. Abozeid, H. A. Mohammed, M. and Ahmed, 2019).
- c) The results of the ability research based on gender. Soft Skills of students of the Economic Education Study Program, FKIP Jambi University by Gender, that women are higher than men with very good average abilities with a count of 25 for men and 122 for women (Martin, 2019), (Aworanti et al., 2015)(Jones, 2003), and (Gibb, 2014).
- d) The results of the Soft Skills study of the Economic Education Study Program FKIP Jambi University based on the origin of the village and city, the results of the analysis obtained a calculated F coefficient of 0.218 with a rejection rate of 64.10%, thus there is no difference in the average soft skills ability of students who from the city and from the village. With that it can be seen that students from the village have higher soft skills than students from the city (Kanokorn et al., 2014), (Nambiar et al., 2019), (Rogers, 2020), and (Lubis, 2021).

Conclusion

Based on the research results of the Soft Skill Ownership Analysis of the Economic Education Study Program students, FKIP Jambi University, the following conclusions were obtained:

1. Analysis of Soft Skill Ownership of Economic Education Study Program FKIP Jambi University students can be used as an instrument for soft skills learning models for groups and individuals.
2. The assessment instrument for soft skills learning models regarding student interpersonal relationships can be a reference for lecturers in assessing students' soft skills objectively.
3. Before using the soft skills assessment instrument regarding student interpersonal relationships, we must first study and understand the instrument assessment instructions, assessment procedures and the essence of the assessment in each rubric. So that at the time of implementation it does not take a long time to read the assessment criteria in the rubric and focus on the direction of the soft skills that will be taught.

Acknowledgment: The authors have not received financial support from the University or any other institution/organization. The authors are grateful to the journal's anonymous reviewers for their extremely helpful suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Arsyad, A. (2019). *Hubungan Kompetensi Profesional Guru Terhadap Motivasi Mengajar*. 5(2), 66–70. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/tfnk4>.
- Aworanti, O. A., Taiwo, M. B., & Iluobe, O. I. (2015). *Validation of Modified Soft Skills Assessment Instrument (MOSSAI) for Use in Nigeria*. 3(11), 847–861. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2015.031111>.
- Brungardt, C., & Ph, D. (2011). "The Intersection Between Soft Skill Development and Leadership Education Organizational Life and Leadership Education". *Education*, 10(1), 1–22.
- Caggiano, V., Schleutker, K., & Petrone, L. (2020). Towards Identifying the Soft Skills Needed in Curricula : Finnish and Italian Students' Self-Evaluations Indicate Differences between Groups.
- Cimatti, B. (2016). "Definition, development, assessment of soft skills and their role for the quality of organizations and enterprises". *International Journal for Quality Research*, 10(1), 97–130. <https://doi.org/10.18421/IJQR10.01-05>.
- Cordova, F. F., & Suryani, E. (n.d.). Interpersonal Skills Learning in Information System Dept: Developing Soft skills and Caring Attitude in the Information Technology Education.
- Dewiyani, M. J. (2015). "Improving Students Soft Skills using Thinking Process Profile Based on Personality Types". *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 4(3), 118–129. <http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v4i3.4502>
- Gibb, S. (2014). "Soft skills assessment: theory development and the research agenda". *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(4), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2013.867546>.
- Groh, M., Krishnan, N., McKenzie, D., & Vishwanath, T. (2016). The impact of soft skills training on female youth employment: evidence from a randomized experiment in Jordan. *IZA Journal of Labor and Development*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40175-016-0055-9>.
- Guerra-Báez, S. P. (2019). "A panoramic review of soft skills training in university students". *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-35392019016464>.
- Hanover Research. (2014). *Incorporating soft skills into the K-12 curriculum*. March, 34.
- Jannah, B. P. dan L. M. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Teori dan Aplikasi*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Jones, L. P. (2003). *Skills for Successful Mentoring : Competencies of Outstanding Mentors*. 1–12.
- Kanokorn, S., Pongtorn, P., & Sujanya, S. (2014). "Soft Skills Development to Enhance Teachers' Competencies in Primary Schools". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112(Icepsy 2013), 842–846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1240>
- Lubis, R. K. (2021). "The Effect of Soft Skill On Work Readiness Facing Society 5 . 0 In Informatics Engineering Students of STMIK Pelita Nusantara Medan". *Journal of Management Science (JMAS)*, 4(1), 13–16.
- Martin, T. N. (2019). "Review of Student Soft Skills Development Using the 5Ws/H Approach Resulting in a Realistic, Experiential, Applied, Active Learning and Teaching Pedagogical Classroom". *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 19(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.21818/jbam.19.1.3>
- Meeks, G. (2017). *Critical Soft Skills to Achieve Success in the Workplace This is to certify that the doctoral study by*.
- Mohamad, S. I. S., Muhammad, F., Mohd Hussin, M. Y., & Habidin, N. F. (2017). "College Students' Perceptions of the Embedded Soft Skills Elements Program in Accounting Courses". *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 778–784. <https://doi.org/10.21276/sjhss.2017.2.1.15>.
- Mohammed, A. S. Abozeid, H. A. Mohammed, M. and Ahmed, Z. A. (2019). "Relationship between Soft Skills and Academic Achievement among 4 th Year Nursing Students". *Journal of Nursing and Health Science*, 8(4), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-0804011523>

- Muhammad, Achmad, Ariyani, E. D. W. I., & Sadikin, S. (2019). The Soft Skill Analysis of the Students and the Graduates of POLMAN Bandung. 32(1), 154–162.
- Muhammad, Azliza, Lebar, O., Mokshein, S. E., Mohamed, R., Ridzwan, S., & Khairil, L. F. (2018). "Assessing Student Teachers' Soft Skills Using Rubrics in E-portfolio". *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(10), 1245–1255. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i10/5295>.
- Nambiar, D., Karki, S., Rahardiani, D., Putri, M., & Singh, K. (2019). *Study on skills for the future in Indonesia*. July, 1–117. www.opml.co.uk.
- Rashidi, A., Fakhrul Adabi, A. K., & Ilhamie, A. G. A. (2013). "Integrating soft skills assessment through soft skills workshop program for engineering students at University of Pahang: An analysis". *International Journal of Research In Social Sciences*, 2(1), 33–46. http://ijsk.org/uploads/3/1/1/7/3117743/v2i105_human_sciences.pdf
- Rogers, J. (2020). *Issue Online : A Review & Framework*. 2020, 0–52.
- Sukardi. (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bina Aksara.
- Sultanova, L., Hordiienko, V., Romanova, G., & Tsytsiura, K. (2021). "Development of soft skills of teachers of Physics and Mathematics". *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1840(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1840/1/012038>.
- Taylor, E. (2016). "Interdisciplinary Journal of e-Skills and Lifelong Learning Investigating the Perception of Stakeholders on Soft Skills Development of Students: Evidence from South Africa". *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Skills and Lifelong Learning*, 12, 1–18. <http://www.ijello.org/Volume12/IJELLv12p001-018Taylor2494.pdf>.
- Theses, E., Hernandez, A., & Hernandez, A. (2020). Exploring the Need of Soft Skills Development in Alternative Education Settings Serving Youth at Risk by.
- Umar, H. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian Aplikasi dalam pemasaran. edisi II*. PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Whitehurst, G. J. "Russ. (2016). Hard thinking on soft-skills. *Brookings Institution*, 1, 1–10. http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2016/03/24-hard-thinking-soft-skills-whitehurst?hs_u=saraschung@wustl.edu&utm_campaign=Center+on+Children+and+Families&utm_source=hs_email&utm_medium=email&utm_content=27848577&hsenc=p2ANqtz--YZuJXArwpHMQHSvx_jn1.