

Soft Skills Development Through Live In Program in UPH Surabaya Campus in 2020

Erwin Kristianto Julistiono

Abstract:

The industry world nowadays requires its workforce to embrace soft skills. This condition demands universities to conduct soft skills development programs. One implementation of the soft skills development program in UPH Surabaya Campus is Live In. Live In combines education and community service aspects, by bringing the participants to live in an underdeveloped village and putting them some programs to organize for three days. The expected result is the enhancement of the following skills: integrity, communication, polite manner, responsibility, social skills, positive attitudes, professionalism, flexibility, cooperation, and work ethics. The research is conducted with a descriptive quantitative method, using a questionnaire instrument and convenience sampling technique. The result analyzed from 44 respondents reveals that the average value of the soft skills enhancement reached 3.12 of 4. This means that participants acknowledged the importance of the program in enhancing their soft skills. Furthermore, there are 3 soft skills which are improved more than others, which are flexibility, responsibility, and social skills.



IJSB
Accepted 27 January 2021
Published 2 February 2021
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4490927

Keywords: *development, live in, soft skills, community service, industrial world, education.*

About Author (s)

Erwin Kristianto Julistiono, S.Kom., MAC., M.H., Lecturer, Universitas Pelita Harapan Surabaya Campus, Taman Kutisari Indah Selatan 5, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia.
Email: erwin.julistiono@uph.edu

1. Introduction

Current human resource development and trends demand the workforce nowadays to master a variety of soft skills. Soft skills have been shifted as the priority compared to other qualifications in many recruitment decisions (Hodges & Burchell, 2003). In many cases, soft skills provide a great impact on career successes or failures. For example, an empirical study toward 105 of 142 employees of PT. Krakatau Tirta Industri in 2017 revealed that mastering soft skills have positive and significant effects on employee job performance (Rokhayati, Kambara, & Ibrahim, 2017). Even a more technical job like software architect, still requires soft skills, such as communication, teamwork, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills (Ahmed, Campbell, Beg, & Capretz, 2011). Moreover, many organizations have realized the importance of social responsibility and ethics, thus leading them to demand University graduates to not only possess job skills, but also awareness toward the environment, ethics, and community (Jackson, 2009). The importance of soft skills is also shown in a survey conducted by the National Association of Colleges (NACE) in 2002 toward 457 employers in the US, which revealed 19 of the top 20 expected qualities in the workplace are indeed soft skills (Putra & Pratiwi, 2005). Therefore, soft skills development is considered by current business leaders as a very important determinant toward productive work performance in the workplace (Nealy, 2005).

2. Literature Review

By definition, soft skills are the opposite of hard skills or technical skills. Soft skills are the weave of personality attributes, both internally and externally, that differentiate one from others in the community, and people within their levels of job or career (Utama, Suprapti, Wartini, & Widyatmika, 2009). Soft skills are also defined as skills in constructive analytical thinking, logical thinking, critical thinking, communication, teamwork, and independence in work (Listyani, 2011). Additionally, soft skills are called social skills, which mean skills in building effective social relationships with other people, maintaining those relationships, and overcoming potential interpersonal conflicts that might happen (Dermawan, 2008). Social skills also talk about competencies to search, select, and manage information, to solve daily problems, to communicate well, to understand, appreciate and work with others, as well as to apply their academic education in the adaptation of social development (Maryani & Syamsudin, 2009). Soft skills cause the functioning of hard skills, thus without soft skills, possessed knowledge and other skills have the potential to harm self and others (Elfindri, et al., 2011).

There are so many variables in soft skills. In 2011, a research was conducted in America by distributing 90 questionnaires to business executives to find out which soft skills are most needed in the workplace, and the result revealed 10 soft skills, namely integrity, communication, polite manner, responsibility, social skills, positive attitude, professionalism, flexibility, cooperation, and work ethics (Robles, 2012). Another research in 2013 toward 181 managers and HR representatives from various companies in Indonesia revealed at least 16 competence aspects of soft skills needed in the workplace, among which are leadership, effective communication, problem-solving, empathy and positive behavior, commitment, and so on (Rilman & Djamaris, 2013). The latest research using the Gioia method was conducted in Australia in 2020, revealing 9 important soft skills in the digital transformation project, which are communication, emotional intelligence, empathy, leadership, motivation, resistance, conflict resolution, professionalism, and negotiation (Gulati & Reaiche, 2020).

To limit the soft skill variables within this research, 10 soft skill aspects are selected based on Robles's (2012) research mention before. **Integrity** is an attitude in living life far from

pretense and falsehood, where someone lives according to his/her values regardless of whatever conditions suppress him/her (Gea, 2006). **Communication** refers to the ability to effectively exchange information, both in delivery and reception. **Polite manner** refers to orderly attitudes and behavior, which helps someone to obey the customs, norms, or ethics in a society (Zuriah, 2007). **Responsibility** can be defined as the ability and willingness to complete a given task or work (Poerwopoespito & Utomo, 2000). **Social skills** or interpersonal skills are a person's abilities to build relationships effectively with other people, to maintain these social relationships, and to be able to handle interpersonal conflicts effectively (Dermawan, 2008). A **positive attitude** is an evaluative statement or a positive choice of action towards a particular object, person, or event (Suharyat, 2009). **Professionalism** is a person's attitude in completing their work according to their profession, including in terms of maintaining appearance. **Flexibility** is the ability to adapt, a willingness to change, and a willingness to continue to learn and accept new things (Robles, 2012). **Cooperation** is commonly translated as the ability to work well with other people in a group. Lastly, **work ethics** is the adherence toward a positive work culture and supports others in completing their work.

The importance of mastering the soft skills above requires Universities to design self-development programs for their students. One of them is Community Service Program, which in Indonesia is commonly named *Kuliah Kerja Nyata* (KKN). KKN is a part of the curriculum program carried out by interdisciplinary students that integrate community service, education, and research, under the guidance of lecturers (Fida', et al., 1997). While participating in KKN, students are conditioned to live with residents in rural villages classified as underdeveloped villages. The development of soft skills for KKN participants is expected to take place through social interactions, such as interactions among individuals, interactions between individuals and groups, and interactions among groups (Gunawan, 2000). Groups here can mean students or participant groups, as well as local groups in the village such as youth communities, female associations which is quite common in Indonesia, village officials, and so on. Previous research on the implementation of KKN in Lampung in 2013 has been shown to have a significant effect on the improvement of social skills for the participants (Perdana, Holilulloh, & Nurmalisa, 2013). The models and approaches in implementing KKN in various universities vary widely depending on the dynamics of each campus and the selected village or society.

The implementation of KKN at UPH Surabaya Campus is called Live In. Live In is one of the Student Executive Board (BEM) programs that invite participants to live in an underdeveloped village, then live together in the daily lives of its residents. Live In runs for 3 days, while some similar programs in the other universities normally run for more than 1 (one) month. Live In is designed accordingly so it will not cut much time for lectures, because Live In occurs during active weeks of lectures. Another unique aspect of Live In, compared to other KKNs in general, is the fact that Live In is an extra-curricular program, meaning that it is not included in the educational curriculum. Therefore, student participation is voluntary. Even so, Live In participants are still accompanied by assigned lecturers. For 3 (three) days in the village, Live In participants also carry out various activities, such as counseling, environmental hygiene, education, health services, cheap markets, and so on. Each activity is carefully planned since 2-3 months before the departure through communication and coordination with the village officials via telephone or social media.

Live In in UPH Surabaya Campus has been conducted once every year since 2018. In 2020, Live In was held in Tawangrejo Village, Mojokerto, Indonesia for 3 (days) and 60 UPH and

high-school students signed up to join. On the first day, all participants attended the opening and introductory session with the civil servants and the villagers. The first session was then followed by a seminar “Hoaxes on Social Media” presented by a lecturer from the Faculty of Law. Later, they got a counseling session on the cultivation of Porang plants, as one of the natural products in the local village, from an alumnus who has expertise in that field. On the second day, the activity began with an environmental cleanliness initiative, in which participants along with villagers cleaned the village environment, such as village hall, sewer, main road, etc. After that, the participants delivered educational activities for local kindergarten and elementary school students, using lessons previously discussed with their respective class teachers. In the afternoon, they had a thrift shop that put on the sale of secondhand clothes, collected from all UPH members beforehand and it was followed by a small gathering with the villagers. The third day was started with morning exercise in the schoolyard and continued by closing and farewell events with the residents and village officials. Each activity was carried out by a group of participants. Participants who were not on duty would spend time with their landlady and her family to help to do their daily chores such as cooking, washing, or their daily routines in the fields and the farms.

Live In is a self-development program. A development program is oriented towards future needs (Simamora, 2003). Development is a long-term educational process applying systematic and organized procedures in which participants are educated to use conceptual and theoretical knowledge to answer common problems (Mangkunegara, 2008). Therefore, Live In, which is only held for 3 (three) days, acts more as a trigger for the participants in applying the knowledge learned from their entire lecture process in their study. By doing so, participants are expected to be able to pick up various soft skills along the way. This study aims to address how participation in Live In can improve participants’ soft skills. Furthermore, the second purpose is to identify which soft skills the participants considered had the most potential to be developed through this program.

3. Research Method

This research is conducted using a Descriptive Quantitative Method. It was implemented using a questionnaire instrument that was filled out by Live In participants after the completion of the activity. The questionnaires were distributed through Google form to ease and quicken the process, thus the primary data was directly obtained from the respondents. The questions covered 3 things, which were to evaluate the participants’ preparation before the program, the smoothness of the program implementation, and the participants’ perceived benefits upon the completion of the program. The last part of the evaluation aimed to review the level of soft skills learned by the participants after running all the activities in this program. That part will be the focus of this research. However, the first two parts will also be discussed in the finding section as an evaluation for the Live In itself.

In the section on learning soft skills, the questionnaire used 10 variables of soft skills introduced in Roble’s (2021) research discussed above as the indicators. They are integrity, communication, polite manner, responsibility, social skills, positive attitude, professionalism, flexibility, cooperation, and work ethics. Each variable is asked in separate question using a scale of 4, where value 1 means “no increase”, value 2 means “a minimum increase”, value 3 means “an increase”, and value 4 means “a very significant increase”. An even scale is used in this questionnaire to avoid the central tendency of the respondents. Each variable is processed using the mean value, to obtain the average value of soft skills improvement for each studied skill separately. After the mean value of each variable is obtained, the total mean value is more sought, which is the average of the mean values from all variables. The total

mean value is expected to be the main indicator to determine whether Live In activities are generally useful in improving the soft skills of the participants. Furthermore, the mean value of each variable will be compared with each other to find out which soft skills are most affected or improved through this program.

The population of the study was all 60 Live In participants. It consisted of UPH students and some high school students who took part in the program. Their ages ranged from 17-21 years old. High school student participation was a form of good collaboration between UPH and partner schools to equip the students with various soft skills from an early age. The sampling technique used in this study was Convenience Sampling or Haphazard Sampling, where the sample was selected based on participants who were easy to contact and provide fast and complete responses in filling out the questionnaire (Given, 2008). By using the Slovin formula with 10% tolerance, then the minimum sample size required was 38. The total sample collected in this study was 44 respondents. Therefore, the sample was qualified to represent the existing population. The initial plan of the study was to use Total Population Sampling, but some participants could not be contacted and some did not give a complete response. The research was carried out at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, therefore communication with the entire population was limited.

4. Result and Discussion

The 44 respondents who have filled out the questionnaire include 25 males and 19 females, among which are 29 UPH students and 15 high school students. The initial questions in the questionnaire are related to understanding the objectives of the activity and the role of each participant. Of the 44 respondents, 100% stated that they understood the purpose of Live In and 100% stated that they understood their respective duties in the activity implementation before they depart to the village. One of the interesting experiences for the participants was living together in the homes of residents, known as the landlady. 100% of the respondents answered that the landlady gave a warm welcome and acceptance for their presence. 95.5% of respondents also stated that the house they lived in was classified as comfortable or very comfortable. In each house, participants shared in the daily activities of villagers. Some worked in the fields to plant corn or avocado, some worked in the farms, and some helped to do their daily household chores. Besides, Live In 2020 participants held at least 5 activities, namely seminar, environmental cleanliness, education for kindergarten and elementary students, thrift store, and morning exercise with residents. The evaluation of the perceived benefits of each activity was very good with answers ranging from 70.5%-97.8%. Meanwhile, the evaluation of the smoothness of each activity ranged from 29.6% - 65.9%. Overall, 84.1% of respondents considered this program a success and 13.6% considered it very successful. In other words, 97.7% of participants represented by the respondents thought that this program was going well and achieved the expected goals. Respondent data for each activity in the program are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Benefit and Smoothness of Programs

Program	Benefit	Smoothness
Seminar/counseling	84,1 %	50,0 %
Environmental cleanliness	81,8 %	65,9 %
Education (KG, Elementary)	75,0 %	65,9 %
Cheap market	97,8 %	52,3 %
Morning Exercise	70,5 %	29,6 %
Average	81,8 %	52,7 %

Source: Questionnaire Result of Live In 2020

Table 2: Soft Skill Improvements Perceived by Respondents

Soft Skills	No Improvement	Minimum Improvement	Improvement	Significant Improvement	Average
Integrity		13,64%	68,18%	18,18%	3,05
Communication		6,82%	81,82%	11,36%	3,05
Polite Manner		4,55%	79,55%	15,91%	3,11
Responsibility		4,55%	68,18%	27,27%	3,23
Social Skills		6,82%	70,45%	22,73%	3,16
Positive Attitude		13,64%	68,18%	18,18%	3,05
Professionalism	2,27%	9,09%	77,27%	11,36%	2,98
Flexibility		4,55%	63,64%	31,82%	3,27
Cooperation		4,55%	77,27%	18,18%	3,14
Work Ethics		13,64%	61,36%	25,00%	3,11
AVERAGE					3,12

Source: Questionnaire Result of Live In 2020

The scores of program benefits are quite high with an average of 81.8% because every program implemented has been communicated with village officials during the planning period before departure. Based on good coordination with the village officials, the program has been planned and adjusted to the needs of the residents. By doing so, hopefully, all of the village residents can enjoy the benefits. Meanwhile, the scores for the smoothness of activities were not too high with an average of only 52.7%. This is due to various obstacles, including rain during the running of the activities that couldn't be anticipated. Also, the participation level of the villagers is rather low in several activities, especially the morning exercise activity. Many residents felt embarrassed to participate together with the Live In participants in that particular activity. The respondents' evaluation result on the perceived improvement of every soft skill variable reveals positive responses for all 10 variables. On average, participants feel an increase in their mastery level in each soft skill discussed. The complete data are presented in Table 2. From that table, the total average answer is 3.12, with the smallest score in 2.98 and the largest score in 3.27. The mean 3.12 out of 4 falls into the category of improvement. Even the smallest score of 2.98 is still in the category of improvement. This means that all participants feel the benefits of joining Live In in improving all of their 10 soft skills.

Among the 10 soft skills in the questionnaire, 3 soft skills scored higher than the others, namely flexibility, responsibility, and social skills. The mean score for flexibility was 3.27 with no respondents answering "no improvement". 63.64% stating an increase, and 31.82% even stating a significant increase. The second-highest increase among soft skills variables was responsibility, with an average score of 3.23. There were no respondents who stated that there was no increase, 68.18% stated that there was an increase, and 27.27% stated that there was a significant increase. The next highest soft skill that has a significant impact is social skills, with an average value of 3.16. There were no respondents who stated that there was no increase, 70.45% stated that there was an increase, and 22.73% stated that there was a significant increase.

Before Live In departure, an initial briefing was conducted for the participants. The results of the questionnaire in regards to the participants' understanding of the objectives of the activity and their respective roles were in line with the objectives of the initial briefing. One way that training can provide maximum results is by making the learning process provides deep meaning to the training participants (Dessler & Tan, 2009). Therefore, during the initial briefing, participants were given a big picture of the meaning and purpose of holding the

activity and the expected benefits, so that participants could be motivated to go through the whole process. Through this initial briefing, participants were also expected to be able to project their contribution and participation toward the entire program. Thus, it would enable them to absorb certain skills or competencies that were expected to be obtained by participants through this program. A good response toward the conditions of the landlady and its house was the result of good communication with the village officials. The village official had communicated intensively with participant representatives and has been very helpful in guiding and selecting villagers to willingly accommodate the participants in their houses. Besides, the Tawangrejo village was selected for this program because it had previously been visited by another KKN group. Thus, the villagers were better prepared to accept and adapt to the activity participants.

The most important finding from the study was the positive responses from participants that Live In was proven to be useful as a trigger to improve their soft skills. The theoretical implication of the results obtained is that the program, which was a form of KKN activity, is proven to have a significant impact on the soft skills development of its participants. Therefore, Live In or other similar programs are needed by education institutions to complement the academic education process that students get from their daily lectures. Another implication is that soft skills are proven to be improved through extra-curricular student activities in the field such as Live In. This means that students must be encouraged to take part in various extra-curricular activities to improve their soft skills. One of the biggest challenges in soft skills training educators mostly deal with is that there is no definite way to teach soft skills and there is no way to assess the level of soft skills (Zehr, 1998). Live In can be the right solution to answer these challenges. Furthermore, the practical implications of these findings are as an input for the Live In organizer and committee. Student Executive Board and Student Life Bureau would be able to improve the implementation of Live In at a later date so that the benefit of the future programs can be better enhanced. Additionally, hopefully, the results of this research can motivate other universities or institutions which have never held similar activities before, to develop and organize similar programs so that they may get similar benefits.

Another important finding was related to the 3 soft skills that participants perceived as the most impacted by the program. The high response to flexibility reflected what the participants experienced during the program. They inevitably had to learn to adapt and adjust to their new environment in the village. For most participants, it was a completely new and perhaps surprising experience to see a different environment, lifestyle, and standard of living than what they had at their homes. The most visible examples of lifestyle changes are their daily meals, drinking water quality, very limited telecommunication networks, and so on. The second highest soft skill, responsibility, was learned a lot through various activities within the program, that had been planned, managed, and executed by the groups of participants on their own. The number of members in each group was very limited so that each person had a unique and different role. Each participant had to rely on each other to complete their collective tasks. Without any responsibility, there would be conflicts between participants, even potential problems for the smoothness of the program. Participants were also required to be responsible for themselves. They could no longer rely on their parents or household assistants as in their daily life at home. The third soft skills, social skills were needed by the participants to build relationships, both with other participants who previously might not know each other, as well as with village officials, the landlady and her families, and other villagers.

5. Conclusion

The research has answered the main problem, that Live In 2020 in UPH Surabaya Campus can enhance the soft skills of its participants. Live In is a human resource development program that combines community service and training aspects. Live In can develop at least 10 soft skills that are selected as variable indicators in this study. Moreover, the research underlines 3 particular soft skills that are most suitable to be improved through Live In activities. These important soft skills needed in the industrial world are flexibility, responsibility, and social skills. The result on the other 7 soft skills also reveals perceived improvements from the participants, although they are not as high as the former 3 soft skills. These later soft skills include integrity, communication, polite manner, positive attitude, professionalism, cooperation, and work ethics. With the positive results obtained in this study, it is highly recommended that Live In can be a recurring program at a later date and expand its reach. For example, the program can be implemented as a compulsory program for all students. Besides, the duration of the program can also influence the results of improving soft skills. Future similar activities are proposed to be extended to 4 or 5 days long. Hopefully, the longer social interactions during the activities can improve the soft skills learning even more. Another suggestion from this study, taking into account the existing benefits, is the duplication of similar activities at the study program level or at other universities and institutions that have not had similar programs yet.

This research has various limitations, one of which is the absence of a more comprehensive analysis of the initial conditions of the participants. Therefore, further research can be done by comparing the result of a pre-test before the program and a post-test afterward. This comparison may result in more accurate results on the improvement of participants' soft skills. Besides, future research can also be complemented with qualitative data analysis through direct interviews with the participants to obtain more accurate results and descriptions.

6. Reference

- Ahmed, F., Campbell, P., Beg, A., & Capretz, L. F. (2011). What Soft Skills Software Architect Should Have? A Reflection from Software Industry. *2011 International Conference on Computer Communication and Management* (hal. 565-569). Singapore: IACSIT Press.
- Dermawan, I. (2008). *Kiat Jitu Taklukan Psikotes*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Widyatama.
- Dessler, G., & Tan, C. H. (2009). *Human Resource Management - An Asian Perspective, Second Edition*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.
- Elfindri, H., Rasmita, F., Engel, R. B., Rumengan, J., Wello, M. B., Tobing, P., . . . Indra, R. (2011). *Soft Skills untuk Pendidik*. Jakarta: Baduouse Media.
- Fida', H. A., Dalyono, M., Sumartono, Suyono, M., Purnomo, H., & Ihsanuddin. (1997). *Pedoman Pelaksanaan Kuliah Kerja Nyata (KKN)*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Gea, A. A. (2006). Integritas Diri: Keunggulan Pribadi Tangguh. *Character Building Journal*, 3(1), July 2006, 16-26.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Los Angeles, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Gulati, R., & Reaiche, C. H. (2020). Soft Skills: A Key Driver for Digital Transformation. *The Fourteenth International Conference on Digital Society* (hal. 40-43). Adelaide: IARIA.
- Gunawan, A. H. (2000). *Sosiologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Hodges, D., & Burchell, N. (2003). Business Graduate Competences: Employers' Views on Importance and Performance. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 4(2).
- Jackson, D. (2009). An International Profile of Industry-Relevant Competencies and Skills Gaps in Modern Graduates. *International Journal of Management Education*, 8 (1).

- Listyani, E. (2011). Pengembangan Softskill Mahasiswa Calon Guru Melalui Perkuliahan di Jurusan Pendidikan Matematika. *Seminar Nasional Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Penerapan MIPA* (hal. 133-138). Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. (2008). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Maryani, E., & Syamsudin, H. (2009). Pengembangan Program Pembelajaran IPS untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi Keterampilan Sosial. *Jurnal Penelitian* 9 (1).
- Nealy, C. (2005). Integrating Soft Skills Through Active Learning in the Management Classroom. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 2(4).
- Perdana, A., Holilulloh, & Nuralisa, Y. (2013). Pengaruh Pelaksanaan Kuliah Kerja Nyata Terhadap Keterampilan Sosial Mahasiswa Program Studi PPKN Universitas Lampung. *Jurnal Kultur Demokrasi Vol. 1* (7).
- Poerwopoespito, F. X., & Utomo, T. A. (2000). *Mengatasi Krisis Manusia di Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Putra, S. I., & Pratiwi, A. (2005). *Sukses dengan Soft Skill*. Bandung: Direktorat Pendidikan Institut Teknologi Bandung.
- Rilman, A., & Djamaris, A. (2013). Analisis Faktor Kompetensi Soft Skills Mahasiswa yang Dibutuhkan Dunia Kerja Berdasarkan Persepsi Manajer dan HRD Perusahaan. *Jurnal Manajemen, XVII* (02), 160-174.
- Robles, M. M. (2012). Executive Perceptions of the Top 10 Soft Skills Needed in Today's Workplace. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 75(4).
- Rokhayati, A., Kambara, R., & Ibrahim, M. (2017). Pengaruh Soft Skill dan Perencanaan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Kualitas Pelatihan sebagai Variabel Modertor. *Jurnal Riset Bisnis dan Manajemen Tirtayasa*, 1 (2), 107-124.
- Simamora, H. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, edisi kedua*. Yogyakarta: STIE YKPN.
- Suharyat, Y. (2009). Hubungan Antara Sikap, Minat Dan Perilaku Manusia. *REGION, I*(3), September 2009 .
- Utama, M. S., Suprapti, W. S., Wartini, M., & Widyatmika, P. (2009). *Evaluasi Pengembangan Soft Skills Mahasiswa Melalui Proses Pembelajaran*. Bali: Universitas Udayana.
- Zehr, M. A. (1998). New Office Economy Putting Greater Demands of Schools. *Education Week*, 17(23).
- Zuriah, N. (2007). *Pendidikan Moral dan Budi Pekerti Dalam Perspektif Perubahan*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.

Cite this article:

Erwin Kristianto Julistiono (2021). Soft Skills Development Through Live In Program in UPH Surabaya Campus in 2020. *International Journal of Science and Business*, 5(4), 11-19. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4490927>

Retrieved from <http://ijsab.com/wp-content/uploads/702.pdf>

Published by

