

# Developing Soft skills Measure in an Indonesian University: Procedure, Validity, and Reliability

Henndy Ginting

The Faculty of psychology, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, Indonesia

Email: henndyg@yahoo.com

**Abstract**—Soft skills development have been included in most Indonesian universities curriculum, but there is no standard in developing soft skills measurement. This paper reports development, validity, and reliability of a soft skills questionnaire in a university in Indonesia. Fifteen dimensions of soft skills, which were set in four factors, were operationalized into 150 items of a questionnaire. Nine hundred and four students of the university were recruited randomly and filled in the questionnaire. Exploratory factor analysis indicated the four factors model. Significant item and total items correlations in all dimensions demonstrated construct validity of the questionnaire. Furthermore, highly significant difference in almost all dimension scores of the questionnaire between activist and non-activist in student activities showed discriminative power of the questionnaire. Internal consistency and re-test reliability of the questionnaire were acceptable. We conclude that the questionnaire is a valid measure of soft skills for the university students.

**Index Terms**—university, soft skills, students, validity, reliability

## I. INTRODUCTION

The ratio of the workforce with higher education in Indonesia is still low, but the number of graduate unemployment is high. The difficulty of Indonesian university graduates to find a job has been highlighted from year to year. Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (2015) reports 7.4 million unemployed persons (15 years old and above) in Indonesia, and 5.34% (395,160 persons) are university graduates. Moreover, at least 17% of the graduates failed to secure employment within six months after graduation. Failure to find a first job for university graduates may be due to the mismatch between employers' criterion and graduates skills. Employers did not consider only the academic grade scores and experiences to be an important factor when hiring a new employee, but they also desire most some attributes related with soft skills, such as communication, teamwork, integrity, self-confidence, problem solving and other employability skills [1].

Soft skills are important component of Indonesian Qualifications Framework (IQF) which has been introduced by Indonesian government recently. All Indonesian education and training institutions should apply IQF in their learning processes. The IQF holds

legal endorsements in the form of Presidential Decree No. 8/2012, and the Ministry of Education and Culture has produced a key strategic document on the IQF (Minister of Education and Culture Regulation 73/2013). According to that regulation, the IQF is a national standard in the education sector, including university. Universities in Indonesia should produce skilled and knowledgeable graduates who are able to work more than just complying with minimal guidance but also to compete effectively in international job market. The IQF is classified in 9 levels, and university graduates are expected to achieve the 6<sup>th</sup> level which represents the ability of the graduates to take strategic decision based on the information and data analysis and provide guidelines in choosing several alternative solutions. These abilities are not only related with academic ability but also employability or soft skills.

Complying with the IQF, most Indonesian universities have improved their learning process and included soft skills development and measurement in their curriculum. As an outcomes-based Curriculum, the 6<sup>th</sup> level of the IQF's parameters are the working ability in the field (e.g., able to do), the scope of work based on the essential knowledge (e.g., acquisition of knowledge), and managerial capabilities (e.g., attitude). Learning processes and materials should be prepared to facilitate university students to achieve those parameters. Consequently, learning processes and materials do not only consist of hard skills such as scientific knowledge and expertise (know-how) but also soft skills such as character, personality, work attitude, ethics, and moral. Since it has just been new implemented, there are various ways of measuring soft skills and there is no standard in developing soft skills measurement in Indonesian Universities. Moreover, it is common that soft skills development and measurement are not adjusted with the university identity (i.e., vision, mission, strategy, and values).

There are various definitions and numbers list of soft skills due to the perception of what a soft skill is. The way people utilize soft skills also differs from context to context. A person may consider a particular attribute as a soft skill is one particular area, and may be considered the attribute as a hard skill in another area. Moreover, one institution may have a list of soft skills which is different with a list in another institution. The difference is due to the vision, mission, and values of the institutions. Hence, the understanding of what should be recognized as a soft

skill varies widely. Skill in cultural awareness might not be so useful for an electrical engineering, but it is an absolute necessity for psychologist in societies of diverse cultures.

Soft skill is not easy to find in any dictionary, but it is in our daily professional conversations. Kechagias [2] defines soft skills as intra- and inter-personal (socio-emotional) skills, essential for personal development, social participation, and workplace success. Furthermore, Kechagias [2] suggests that soft skills should be distinguished from technical skill. Saarni [3] recommends eight types of socio-emotional skills (e.g., awareness of one's own emotions and the ability to discern and understand others' emotions). In addition, Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee [4] suggest four general blocks of 20 soft skills. Those four blocks are emotional self-awareness, self-management or self-government, social awareness, management of social relations and skills. In sum, a large part of soft skills relates to a set of personal attributes and interpersonal skills that will prepare individuals for both employment and further learning. Thus, soft skills could be developed and measured.

The importance of possessing soft skills has been underlined by one of the largest private university in Surabaya. This Christian university states their vision as "to be a caring and global university that is committed to Christian values". As stated in their mission, the university develops and empowers the society as the implementation of the Christian values through: Internal and external caring; Global perspective as actualized in teaching-learning process of an international quality, both in terms of its educational system and process, research activities and scientific publications, and community outreach programs; IT-based campus as an infrastructure of communication and information system in the university; Quality and excellence in expertise, research, services, and facilities; Effectiveness and efficiency in the program making and its implementation that is based on needs. The university expresses their values as LIGHT which is an abbreviation of Love, Integrity, Growth, Humility, and Truth. Love is referred to the spirit of caring, Integrity means character in action, Growth is the fruit of holistic learning, Humility is defined as the beginning of wisdom, and Truth is the basis of true life.

Based on those values a long with the vision and mission, the university developed a list of soft skills which has been integrated to their curriculum. The university also designed a questionnaire to measure those soft skills among their students. This study used multiple sources of evidence (Sireci, 2009) to validate the questionnaire among students of the university. We evaluated factorial structure, construct validity, and discriminative power of the questionnaire. Moreover, we calculated test-retest reliability and internal consistency of the questionnaire.

## II. METHOD

### A. Participant and Sampling Technique

A total of 904 participants were recruited randomly from 15.500 students in all academic programs in the

university. We obtained informed consent from all participants before their participation. The university has 21 academic programs which were categorized into two main fields as stipulated the university namely technical, 10 academic programs (e.g., electrical engineering, civil engineering), and arts, 11 academic programs (e.g., language, finance). Sample selection followed cluster random sampling by field of study (i.e., technical or arts). A 150 item soft skills questionnaire was administered to all participants. They also completed a demographic questionnaire. Table I displays the all sample characteristics. Ninety-one participants filled in the questionnaire a second time after 3 - 5 weeks.

TABLE I. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Quantity
Gender (% Women)	54.6
Mean Age ( <i>SD</i> )	19.22 (1.32)
Mean CGPA ( <i>SD</i> )	3.03 (0.53)
Religion (% Christian)	84.9
Ethnicity (% Chinese)	47.9
Hometown (% Outside Surabaya)	49.7
Extra-Curricular (% Activist)	36.1
Program Category (% Art)	54.9
Academic Years (%):	
First	32.6
Second	25.3
Third	25.8
Forth	15.7

Note: *SD* = Standard Deviation;  
CGPA = Cumulative Grade Point Average

### B. Measure

The soft skills questionnaire is a new scale which was constructed in Bahasa to measure 15 dimensions of soft skills specifically for the university students. The construction of the scale was initiated by specifying dimensions of soft skills following an intensive examination of the university's vision, mission, and values. Based on the intensive examination, we proposed 15 dimensions of soft skills which were grouped in four clusters. Each dimension was operationalized with specific description and several indicators.

Fifteen dimensions of soft skills and the operationalization were evaluated and confirmed by significant persons in the university. These significant persons were vice rector of student and academic affairs, the head of student activities and development, and the head of student career center. After made some revisions and got reconfirmation from those significant persons, we prepared 150 items questionnaire to measure those 15 dimensions of soft skills. Each item in the questionnaire regard to one of the dimensions of soft skills and was rated on a 4-point scale. Participants response each item as a representation of their action, thought, and feeling in daily life.

The dimensions of soft skills in the first cluster (i.e., Christian Spirituality) were Christianity and Truth. The second cluster was Emotional Expressions which covered

Love, Humility, Managing Emotions, and Interpersonal Relations. The third was Personal Strengths which included Integrity, Character, and Growth. The last but not least cluster was Managerial skills which comprised Self Evaluation, Tim Work, Communication, Administration, Creativity and Innovation, and Leadership. Various related publications [2]-[5] and guidelines from International Test Commission [6] were also consulted in order to construct the scale. Table II depicts descriptions and an example of item for each dimension.

TABLE II. DESCRIPTION OF SOFT SKILLS DIMENSIONS AND ITEM EXAMPLE

Dimension	Description	Item Example
Love	Help other without ulterior motives, defend the weak, and give effect to the development of others, as well as care for the environment.	Voluntarily help others who are in trouble.
Humility	Willingness to appreciate the contribution of others and to understand other perspectives.	Proportionally praised the work of others.
Managing Emotions	Regulate anger, sadness, anxiety, disappointment, and other emotions effectively so as not to interfere with the appearance of self and relationships with others.	Expressing a disappointment to others in a friendly way.
Inter-personal Relations	Build relationships with others through openness, sensitivity, empathy, tolerance, and manage conflict effectively.	Have many friends from various ethnics and nationalities.
Tim work	Contribute significantly in the group and help other members to achieve a common goal despite having different background and personal objectives.	Actively provide suggestions and ideas during a group discussion to complete the task.
Integrity	Completely doing the truth morally though it cannot be seen by others.	Avoiding plagiarism.
Growth	Learn continuously to be able to develop self, physically, intellectually, socially, and spiritually.	Reading more literature for every course.
Character	Responsible, respectful, independent, and have a fighting spirit in the work.	Take ownership of the problem.
Self-Evaluation	Knowing the strengths and weaknesses of the self both socially and academically.	Asking others about the strengths and weaknesses of the self.
Communi-cations	Receive and impart information effectively both in individual and group settings, verbally and in writing, to conduct negotiations, transactions social networking, delegations, presentations, public speaking, and customer service.	Become a spokesman for a group.
Adminis-trations	Plan and allocate the available resources by setting goals, time management, setting priorities, and consciously maintain relationships between activities.	Manage personal finances efficiently.
Creativity and Innovation	Apply a particular method of using the information and data available to develop new and original solutions.	Found something that was not anticipated by others
Leader-ships	Using strong interpersonal styles and methods and tough in making decisions, solving problems, as well as directing individuals and groups	Leading a meeting to discuss a problem.

Dimension	Description	Item Example
	to compete goals (vision).	
Truth	Connecting seriously with God that transforms relationships with others and the environments.	Feeling strong proximity with the beauty of God's creation.
Chris-tianity	Firmly believes in the existence of God the Trinity (God the Father, His Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit) and attempts to establish / maintain a close relationship with God despite the ups and downs of life.	Believe that God created the heavens, the earth and everything in it.

### C. Statistical Analysis

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted using Maximum Likelihood (ML) with varimax rotation to validate factorial structure of the questionnaire. In general, ML will give the best results as long as the data are normally-distributed and produce more generalizable and reproducible results, as it does not inflate the variance estimates [7]. We expected that the test showed four factors model representing dimensions of soft skills in four clusters: Christian Spirituality, Emotional Expressions, Personal Strengths, and Managerial skills. We evaluated the construct validity of the questionnaire by inspecting item and total items correlations in each dimension. The ability of the questionnaire to discriminate between activist and non-activist students in extra-curricular activities was tested using an independent sample *t*-test by comparing the mean scores of each dimension between activist and non-activist. To estimate the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was computed. Furthermore, test-retest reliability was determined by calculating the correlation coefficient between test and retest scores of the questionnaire. We used SPSS 20.0 (IBM) to conduct all analyses.

## III. RESULT

There was 0.66% missing values and Little's MCAR test indicated completely missing at random in our data,  $\chi^2(6312) = 1705.43, p = 1.00$ . Expectation maximization was conducted to get more accurate data in the analyses.

### A. Demographic Profile

From a total of 904 students who participated in this study, 494 (54.6%) were women and 410 (46.4%) were men. There were more Christians 767 (84.9%) and Chinese 433 (47.9) compared with other religions (i.e., Islam, Buddha) and other ethnics such as ethnicities from Javanese, North Sumatra, and East Side of Indonesia. The distributions of demographic characteristics portrayed in Table I.

### B. Construct Validity and Factorial Structure

Pearson correlation analyses resulted most of item and total items correlations in each dimension were significant ( $r > 0.30$ ). These significant correlations demonstrated construct validity of the questionnaire. From 150 items of the first version of the questionnaire, 17 items were deleted due to the low item and total items

correlation coefficients ( $r < 0.30$ ). Table III shows final total item in each dimension.

The data was screened for suitability of a factor analysis. Significant correlations between items and total items ( $r > 0.30$ ) in each dimension of the 133 item of the final version of the questionnaire showed factorability of correlation matrix. The final sample size of this study was 904 (more than 300) and according to rule of thumb suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell [8], it was a suitable sample size. However, the final sample size of 904, providing a ratio of 7 cases per variable, suggested Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The KMO was .63, above the commonly recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant  $\chi^2(1153) = 840.26, p < .05$ . Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was deemed to be suitable with all 133 items [9].

EFA in the first order factors (15 dimensions model) produced an average variance accounted for of 23.9%, -- an over-estimation of 16.4% [10]. Based on this first order factors analysis and the moderate correlations between the 15 factors ( $r$  between 0.3 and 0.5), we conducted the EFA in the second order factors (4 factors model). This EFA produced a cumulative variance accounted for of 70% (factors loading  $\geq 0.3$ , see Table III), explaining four factors model (Eigenvalues  $> 1$ ) from of 15 dimensions of soft skills.

TABLE III. FINAL TOTAL ITEM, INTERNAL CONSISTENCY, AND FACTOR LOADINGS OF FOUR FACTORS MODEL OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dimension	Final total Item and ( $\alpha$ )	Four Factors (loadings)			
		Christi-an Lives	Emotional Expressions	Personal Strengths	Mana-gerial
Love	10 (0.83)		0.69		
Humility	7 (0.73)		0.56		
ME	7 (0.72)		0.53		
IR	8 (0.77)		0.69		
Tim work	10 (0.88)		0.71		
Integrity	8 (0.70)			0.77	
Growth	11 (0.79)			0.64	
Character	7 (0.70)			0.53	
SE	10 (0.84)				0.57
Comm.	10 (0.84)				0.62
Adm.	10 (0.86)				0.86
C&I	8 (0.84)				0.72
Lead	9 (0.86)				0.82
Truth	8 (0.86)	0.61			
Christ.	10 (0.94)	0.96			

Note: ME=Managing Emotions; IR=Interpersonal Relations; Self-Evaluation; Comm.=Communications; Adm.=Administrations; C&I=Creativity and Innovations; Lead=Leadership; Christ.=Christianity; ( $\alpha$ )=Coefficient of Internal Consistency.

### B. Discriminative Power

Independent sample  $t$ -tests resulted highly significant differences in almost all of the dimensions of soft skills,  $t(902)$  range from 3.09 to 7.01,  $p < 0.05$ , between activist and non-activist in extra-curricular (e.g., student activities). These significant differences demonstrated discriminative power of the questionnaire. Table IV

depicts overall values of differential analyses between activist and non-activist in extra-curricular activities. Creativity and Innovations dimension showed marginally significant difference between activist and non-activist in extra-curricular. There were no differences in the dimensions score between other demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, religions, ethnics, and high and low CGPA).

### C. Reliability

Internal consistency and re-test reliability of the questionnaire were acceptable ( $\alpha > 0.70$  and  $r > 0.55$ , respectively, see Table IV).

TABLE IV. DIFFERENCES OF THE DIMENSIONS BETWEEN ACTIVIST AND NON-ACTIVIST IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR AND TEST RE-TEST RELIABILITIES

Dimension	Mean (SD)		$t(902)$	Test re-test, $r$ and ( $\alpha$ ), $N = 91$
	Activist ( $N = 362$ )	Non-activist ( $N = 542$ )		
Love	26.04 (4.88)	24.68 (5.15)	3.95**	0.72 (0.85)
Humility	20.70 (3.07)	19.93 (3.28)	3.55**	0.77 (0.79)
ME	19.45 (3.61)	18.63 (3.83)	3.20*	0.55 (0.71)
IR	23.87 (3.72)	22.93 (4.16)	3.57**	0.68 (0.87)
Tim work	28.56 (5.05)	26.44 (5.70)	5.86**	0.61 (0.78)
Integrity	22.59 (3.98)	20.89 (4.08)	6.21**	0.78 (0.87)
Growth	29.62 (4.70)	27.24 (5.43)	7.01**	0.71 (0.78)
Character	20.94 (3.27)	19.85 (3.60)	4.61**	0.57 (0.71)
SE	26.77 (4.88)	25.66 (5.82)	3.09*	0.81 (0.85)
Comm.	27.12 (4.96)	25.49 (5.39)	4.59**	0.76 (0.82)
Adm	26.53 (5.77)	24.88 (6.36)	3.98**	0.83 (0.89)
C&I	20.12 (4.29)	19.57 (4.72)	1.81#	0.68 (0.79)
Lead.	25.68 (4.57)	24.38 (5.33)	3.93**	0.69 (0.78)
Truth	25.99 (4.19)	24.74 (4.57)	0.59**	0.79 (0.85)
Christianity	35.31 (6.21)	33.77 (6.62)	3.56**	0.89 (0.93)

Note: ME=Managing Emotions; IR=Interpersonal Relations; Self-Evaluation; Comm.=Communications; Adm.=Administrations; C&I=Creativity and Innovations; Lead=Leadership; Christ.=Christianity; ( $\alpha$ )=Coefficient of Internal Consistency; (\*)  $p < 0.05$ ; (\*\*)  $p < 0.001$ ; (#)  $p = 0.71$ ; SD = Standard Deviation;  $r$  = Correlation Coefficient.

## IV. DISCUSSION

This paper reports psychometric works in developing soft skills questionnaire in one of the largest private universities in Surabaya, Indonesia. Fifteen dimensions of soft skills, which were set in four factors, were developed subsequent to examining the university vision, missions, strategies, and values. Each dimension was operationalized and confirmed by significant persons in the university before we made 150 items questionnaire to measure those dimensions of soft skills. Nine hundred and four students of the university were chosen randomly and filled in the questionnaire. After screened for the data, the final version of the questionnaire contains 133 items.

The overall pattern of results shows evidences of validity required for the questionnaire to be used as a screening instrument for soft skills in the university. Construct validity of the questionnaire was acceptable. As expected, almost all items correlate significantly with total item in each dimension. There were 17 items deleted due to the low correlation between those of each item with total item in the dimension where the item belongs to. It may be that the items were too general or unclear

for the participants. There were also ceiling and floor effects in most of the deleted items and it might due to social desirability which is common in eastern culture [11]. For example, one of the deleted items, “Use drugs, marijuana, or consume alcoholic beverages”, has floor effect. Most of the participants answered this item with 1 (i.e., does not describe myself).

Discriminative power of the questionnaire is indicated by its ability to differentiate between activist and non-activist students in extra-curricular. Participated in extra-curricular activities are a great way for students to develop soft skills [12] that can help them from all backgrounds to succeed later on in life. Recent research by World Challenge has shown that non-academic experience is becoming increasingly important for university graduates to compete in internationally job market. Surprisingly, the score of the questionnaire in each dimension were not different between low and high CGPA. But, actually, achievement tests as representation of CGPA do not really capture soft skills [13].

In this study maximum likelihood EFA with varimax rotation was used to extract the 15 dimensions of the questionnaire to four factors model among the university students. The results suggested four factors model as predicted in the preparation of the construct of the soft skills questionnaire in this study. Since this study was the first in developing soft skills questionnaire, evaluations might be needed to confirm the four factors models using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in larger sample. Before conducting the CFA, some items might need revisions (rewriting) with lower primary loadings and possibly adding new items to strengthen the factors model.

The reliability of the questionnaire was good ( $\alpha > 0.70$  of the dimensions). The Cronbach’s alpha values of the questionnaire for each dimension both in the first test and re-test were above 0.70 indicating satisfactory internal consistency of the scale [14]. The test-retest correlation ( $r$  range between 0.55 and 0.89,  $p < .01$ ) demonstrated highly stability of the questionnaire.

Several limitations of this study deserve mention. First, this study used only demographics characteristics but not gold standard measures related to soft skills to check construct validity and discriminative power. Heckman and Kautz [13] suggest validated personality measures and psychological tests for convergent construct validity of soft skills questionnaire. Furthermore, lower order scales (e.g., *empathy*, *directing*, and *personality*) should be used to test construct validity of the soft skills questionnaire since these scales displayed clear specificity and have been shown to be strong predictors of soft skills. Finally, we have a sample of 904 students which for many analyses is sufficient, but this sample size might be too small for our factor analysis. More students should be recruited since they hold an important role in this kind of study. More accurate and larger studies are needed to generate stronger support for validity and reliability of the questionnaire in Indonesia. Furthermore, larger studies among students and other related variables (e.g., work performance) should be

conducted to standardize a measure that is culturally-sensitive for a better understanding of soft skills among students.

Despite these limitations, the results found in this study indicate the questionnaire is a reliable and valid instrument to assess soft skills among the university students. Specifically, using validated inexpensive screening instruments, like the questionnaire in this study, among students in Indonesia is important since soft skills are significant components in Indonesian Qualifications Framework (IQF). As far as we know, this is the first study which establishes the validity and reliability of the soft skills questionnaire in Indonesia among students. The findings, especially the valid 133 items to measure 15 dimensions of soft skills, can minimize the likelihood of poor intervention decisions or erroneous research conclusions concerning soft skills development and measurement in Indonesia.

APPENDIX A SOFT SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE (TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH FROM BAHASA)

**Instruction**

The following sentences represent action, thinking, and feeling you may experience in campus environment. Please read the sentence and respond it by choosing one of the numbers that best describes you. In each item, please circle the number that is most applicable to you:

- 1 = Does not describe me**
- 2 = Somewhat describe me**
- 3 = Strongly enough describes me**
- 4 = Very strongly describes me**

Example:

1.	Visiting library	1	2	3	4
----	------------------	---	---	---	---

In the example above, you are asked to answer whether “visiting library” as your daily activity or not. If you never or rarely visit the library means the activity does not describe you and you should circle number 1 in that sentence, like the following example:

1.	Visiting library	1	2	3	4
----	------------------	---	---	---	---

Please answer each sentence as honestly as possible. Note that there are no wrong or right answers. It is only your personal answer that counts. Use your time efficiently and responds all sentences. Good luck.

	Pernyataan	1	2	3	4
001.	Giving charity to the needy.	1	2	3	4
002.	Accompanying a friend to doctor.	1	2	3	4
003.	Organizing others to collect aids for people in a disaster area.	1	2	3	4
004.	Supporting environmental organizations.	1	2	3	4
005.	Together with others to find alternative solutions for their problems.	1	2	3	4
006.	Giving voluntary helps to others who are in troubles.	1	2	3	4
007.	Offering helps to a lower level employee who will lose his/her job.	1	2	3	4
008.	Supporting all effort to eradicate poverty.	1	2	3	4
009.	Giving concrete suggestions to a friend who is having academic problem.	1	2	3	4
010.	Lending references to friends who need course materials.	1	2	3	4
011.	Does not cheat in exam.	1	2	3	4
012.	Does not agree with plagiarism.	1	2	3	4
013.	Asking clarification questions to the lecturers.	1	2	3	4
014.	Using money (from parents) prudently.	1	2	3	4
015.	Attending courses on time.	1	2	3	4
016.	Refusing a friend’s favor to sign his/her	1	2	3	4

	name in the list of attendees.				
017.	Reading holy book and praying regularly.	1	2	3	4
018.	Giving feedback (correction) for unacceptable behaviours of friends even though there will be unpleasant consequences from them.	1	2	3	4
019.	Maintaining wellness through exercise and other physical activities.	1	2	3	4
020.	Balancing diet and managing eating pattern.	1	2	3	4
021.	Reading references about a topic that will be studied in the class.	1	2	3	4
022.	Asking question in a course meeting.	1	2	3	4
023.	Discussing previous lessons with friends.	1	2	3	4
024.	Being active in student organizations.	1	2	3	4
025.	Attending seminar, training, or workshop regarding self-development.	1	2	3	4
026.	Knowing a new person (stranger).	1	2	3	4
027.	Regularly praying and attending religious meeting.	1	2	3	4
028.	Talking with others about how good is God in this life.	1	2	3	4
029.	The way I respond the problem is different than before.	1	2	3	4
030.	Listening others without interruption.	1	2	3	4
031.	Sincerely acknowledge the strengths of others.	1	2	3	4
032.	Doing what people suggested and advised.	1	2	3	4
033.	Proportionally acknowledge achievement of others.	1	2	3	4
034.	Does not easy to be upset with other's criticism.	1	2	3	4
035.	Asking advices and guidances from others.	1	2	3	4
036.	Working together with youngers.	1	2	3	4
037.	Passing exams with excellent results to praise God.	1	2	3	4
038.	Understanding failure as something temporary.	1	2	3	4
039.	Inquire of the Lord before taking a decision.	1	2	3	4
040.	Doing God's will even though contrary to the will of man.	1	2	3	4
041.	Invoke God's help in distress.	1	2	3	4
042.	God always provides a way for all the problems.	1	2	3	4
043.	Realizing that life was not free of problems	1	2	3	4
044.	Feel a strong closeness with the beauty of God's creation.	1	2	3	4
045.	Analysing my strengths and weaknesses.	1	2	3	4
046.	Asked close friends about my strengths and weaknesses.	1	2	3	4
047.	Regularly, evaluate my works (i.e. academic achievement).	1	2	3	4
048.	Ask for feedback to academic advisor about my performance.	1	2	3	4
049.	Ask the opinion of parents about my strengths and weaknesses.	1	2	3	4
050.	Sensibly evaluate the reactions of others for my actions.	1	2	3	4
051.	Clearly looked future career to be run.	1	2	3	4
052.	Setting a realistic achievement targets but also challenging.	1	2	3	4
053.	Systematically plan for self-development.	1	2	3	4
054.	Ask advice from professionals (psychologists, counsellors, and career consultants) on my self-potential.	1	2	3	4
055.	Admitting my mistakes to others.	1	2	3	4
056.	Protect weaker persons (i.e. little brother/sister, youngers and senior citizens).	1	2	3	4
057.	Do not depend on others when doing my tasks.	1	2	3	4
058.	Choosing courses without adjusting to another friends.	1	2	3	4
059.	Strive to achieve the best performance.	1	2	3	4
060.	Set a target to be acceptable as worker in a	1	2	3	4

	favorite institution.				
061.	Firmly rejects friends enticement to skip the class.	1	2	3	4
062.	Not easy to cry when faced with the sad situations.	1	2	3	4
063.	Always enthusiastic though facing problems.	1	2	3	4
064.	Express disappointment to others in a friendly way.	1	2	3	4
065.	Control emotions so it is not easily angered.	1	2	3	4
066.	Refrain from replying to the anger of others.	1	2	3	4
067.	Stay confident when facing exams.	1	2	3	4
068.	Apply effective communication in front a group of persons.	1	2	3	4
069.	Having a lot of friends from various ethnicities and regions.	1	2	3	4
070.	Start a conversation actively with new person.	1	2	3	4
071.	Can feel the grief experienced by a friend.	1	2	3	4
072.	Be polite when speaking with people who are much older.	1	2	3	4
073.	Understand the feelings of friends who are in trouble.	1	2	3	4
074.	Become a mediator in conflict situations between friends.	1	2	3	4
075.	Looking for the right time to resolve a conflict with another person.	1	2	3	4
076.	The existence of a girlfriend is actually improving my academic achievement.	1	2	3	4
077.	Actively provide suggestions and ideas during group discussions to complete the task.	1	2	3	4
078.	Has an important role when working with others.	1	2	3	4
079.	Find common ground between various interests in the group	1	2	3	4
080.	Encourage less-active members to contribute more in the task group.	1	2	3	4
081.	Together with others to formulate common goals to be achieved by the group.	1	2	3	4
082.	Bring a cheerful and friendly atmosphere in the group.	1	2	3	4
083.	Friends feel lost if I was not present at the meeting.	1	2	3	4
084.	Being a resource person (to whom people ask questions) in problem solving in groups.	1	2	3	4
085.	Work effectively with people of different ages, gender, and ethnicities.	1	2	3	4
086.	Being part in a work team (i.e. stewardship, committee, or task force).	1	2	3	4
087.	Mutual email correspondence with various kinds of persons (i.e. ethnicity, profession, age).	1	2	3	4
088.	Negotiate with others to find a mutually beneficial solution.	1	2	3	4
089.	Share critical information with others.	1	2	3	4
090.	Provide a clear assignment to another person.	1	2	3	4
091.	Become a spokesman for the group.	1	2	3	4
092.	Giving a speech in front of a group of people.	1	2	3	4
093.	Listen and find solutions to other people's dissatisfaction.	1	2	3	4
094.	Write proposal or research plan in a paper that is easy to understand.	1	2	3	4
095.	Use an analogy or illustration (symbols, pictures, or formula) to help others to understand my ideas.	1	2	3	4
096.	Asked further questions to understand the message of others.	1	2	3	4
097.	Make up a plan and budget in a proposal.	1	2	3	4
098.	Managing personal finances efficiently.	1	2	3	4
099.	Make schedule for personal activities.	1	2	3	4

100.	Classifying documents and other references so they are easily to find if needed.	1	2	3	4
101.	Establish priority for each activity.	1	2	3	4
102.	Write down every activity in a book so it does not overlap.	1	2	3	4
103.	Setting short term and long term goals	1	2	3	4
104.	Make a meeting appointment and attend the meeting on time.	1	2	3	4
105.	Identify available resources before making plans.	1	2	3	4
106.	Documenting activities (e.g. in a diary) to be used as feedback for future improvement.	1	2	3	4
107.	Using certain methods (i.e. mind mapping, SWOT analysis) to find a solution that is not thought by others.	1	2	3	4
108.	Find the problem behind an agreement among the various parties.	1	2	3	4
109.	Thinking an idea that was not anticipated by others.	1	2	3	4
110.	Processing quantitative data into findings that surprised others.	1	2	3	4
111.	Linking various data and information to identify the findings of a new problem.	1	2	3	4
112.	Implementing a business idea that is completely new.	1	2	3	4
113.	Found a new way that is more efficient in solving a problem.	1	2	3	4
114.	Using the latest technology to find information or solve a problem.	1	2	3	4
115.	Convincing others through ideas (opinions).	1	2	3	4
116.	Chaired a meeting to discuss a problem.	1	2	3	4
117.	Getting commitments from others to work better.	1	2	3	4
118.	Helping a group of people to work more effectively.	1	2	3	4
119.	Designing the process in order to improve the effectiveness of group work.	1	2	3	4
120.	Applying the discipline of self and others.	1	2	3	4
121.	Motivate self and others to stay energized to win the competition.	1	2	3	4
122.	Took the decision quickly despite considering the risk.	1	2	3	4
123.	Anticipating objections from others so that they remain on the commitment to achieve the objectives of the group.	1	2	3	4
124.	Believe that God created the heavens, the earth and everything in it.	1	2	3	4
125.	Feel the love of God in my life.	1	2	3	4
126.	Believes that sooner or later God would answer my prayers.	1	2	3	4
127.	Believe that Jesus is the son of the Holy God.	1	2	3	4
128.	Admit my sins before God.	1	2	3	4
129.	Doing the subject about love of Christ in the ups and downs of life.	1	2	3	4
130.	Feel communion with the Holy Spirit.	1	2	3	4
131.	Ask for the Holy Spirit counsel in living the life.	1	2	3	4
132.	Wait for the coming of Jesus to life together in heaven.	1	2	3	4
133.	Believe that Jesus has redeemed my sins.	1	2	3	4

Notes:

1. Love = 1 – 10
2. Integrity = 11 – 18
3. Growth = 19 -29
4. Humility = 30 – 36
5. Truth = 37 – 44
6. Self-Evaluation = 45 – 54

7. Character = 55 – 61
8. Managing Emotions = 62 – 67
9. Interpersonal relations = 68 – 76
10. Tim work = 77 – 86
11. Communication = 87 – 96
12. Administration = 97 – 106
13. Creativity and Innovation = 107 – 114
14. Leadership = 115 – 123
15. Christianity = 124 – 133

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank vice rector of student and academic affairs, the head of student activities and development, and the head of student career center of the university where this study conducted in 2014. This work was supported in part by a grant from the university.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. S. Nugroho, Nizam, R. M. Samik-Ibrahim, and P. W. Handayani, "Graduate employability in Indonesia," in *Graduate Employability in Asia*, UNESCO Bangkok, 2012, pp. 5-23.
- [2] K. Kechagias, *Teaching and Assessing Soft Skills*, Neapolis (Thessaloniki), 1<sup>st</sup> Second Chance School of Thessaloniki, 2011.
- [3] C. Saami, "A skill-based model of emotional competence: A developmental perspective," presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM, April 15-18, 1999.
- [4] R. E. Boyatzis, D. Goleman, and K. Rhee, "Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights for the emotional competence inventory," in *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, R. Bar-on and J. D. A. Parker, Ed. San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 2000, ch. 2, pp. 343-362.
- [5] J. D. Mayer and P. Salovey, "Social intelligence [emotional intelligence, personal intelligence]," in *Character Strengths and Virtues*, C. Peterson and M. E. P. Seligman, Eds., Washington, DC, pp. 337-353.
- [6] International Test Commission. (June 17, 2015). International test commission guidelines for translating and adapting tests. [Online]. Available: <http://www.intestcom.org>
- [7] A. B. Costello and J. W. Osborne, "Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis," *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, vol. 10, no. 7. pp. 1-9, July 2005.
- [8] B. G. Tabachnick and L. S. Fidell, *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Boston: Pearson Education Inc, 2007.
- [9] B. Williams, T. Brown, and A. Onsmann, "Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices," *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 1-13, 2010.
- [10] W. A. Arrindell and J. van der Ende, "An empirical-test of the utility of the observations to variables ratio in factor and components-analysis," *Applied Psychological Measurement*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 165-178, 1985.
- [11] L. Middleton and J. L. Jones, "Socially desirable response sets: The impact of country culture," *Psychology and Marketing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 149-163, February 2000.
- [12] A. F. da Silva and J. Tribonet, "Developing soft skills in engineering studies – the experience of students personal portfolio," in *Proc. International Conference on Engineering Education*, Coimbra, Portugal, 2007.
- [13] J. J. Heckman and T. Kautz, "Hard evidence on soft skills," *Labour Economics*, vol. 19, pp. 451-464, May 2012.
- [14] R. K. Henson, "Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha," *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 177-189, October 2001.



**Dr. Henndy Ginting** was born in Kabanjahe, North Sumatera, Indonesia, on the 14<sup>th</sup> of November 1971. Dr. Ginting is a psychologist who graduated in 1997 from the faculty of psychology, Padjadjaran University (Unpad), Bandung, Indonesia. He earned his master degree in 2008 in developmental psychology also from Unpad. He finished his doctorate degree in 2014 in clinical psychology from Radboud University, Nijmegen, the

Netherlands.

He has developed an interest in personality theories and psychological measures since he was assigned as a lecturer in the faculty of psychology, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung. He has experienced for 17 years using and teaching various psycho-diagnostic methods, such as projective techniques (i.e., drawing, graphology), objective techniques (i.e., MBTI, EAS), and behavioural techniques (i.e., assessment center, DiSC). He is certified on DiSC from IML, and has been using it to help people and organizations improving their own

effectiveness. Some of psychological measures that he has developed and adapted are Test Inteligensi Multidimensional, Generic Competencies Profiler, Identifikasi Faktor Kepribadian, the Indonesian version of the Beck Depression Inventory-II, Multidimensional Anger Inventory, Beck Anxiety Inventory, Spiritual Attitude and Involvement List, DS14, Identifikasi Prilaku Hidup Sehat, and various assessment center exercises. He was an associate consultant in Assessment Center PT. Telkom (1995-2004), a psychological expert in PT. Pharos Indonesia (2005-2008), and psychometric consultant in Pusdiklat PT. PLN (2006-2010). He has published research articles in prestigious international journals, such as *Psychology & Health*, *Journal of Health Psychology*, *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, and *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*.

Dr. Ginting is currently member of International Association for the Psychology of religion (IAPR), Indonesian Association of Clinical Psychology, and Association for Researchers in Psychology and Health. Dr. Ginting enjoys travelling and chatting around with family members and friends.