



## Analysis of Student Soft Skill Profiles: A Case Study at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta

Moch Hamied Wijaya<sup>1</sup>, Eny Ariyanto<sup>2</sup>, Anindya Nurani Mutiara Sari<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Lecturer at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta

<sup>3</sup> Lecturer at Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Jakarta

**ABSTRACT:** This study aims to analyze the soft skill profiles of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta students based on ten dimensions: communication, teamwork, leadership, problem solving and critical thinking, time management and organization, adaptability and flexibility, ethics and responsibility, creativity and innovation, emotional intelligence, and digital skills and information literacy. A total of 160 respondents completed a 1–4 Likert scale questionnaire. Descriptive analysis results show that all dimensions are in the medium category with an overall average of 3.189. The dimensions with the highest scores were ethics and responsibility (3.376) and digital skills and information literacy (3.260), followed by teamwork, adaptability, and time management. Conversely, the dimensions with the lowest relative averages were creativity and innovation (3.000) and communication (3.095), although they remained in the medium category. These findings conclude that students have an adequate foundation of soft skills but have not yet reached an excellent level, especially in the aspects of communication, creativity, and critical thinking. These results imply the need for a more integrated soft skills development strategy in the curriculum, student activities, and cooperation with industry to encourage improvement from a moderate to a high level.

**KEYWORDS:** Communication, Creativity, Innovation, Leadership, Soft Skills, Teamwork.

### INTRODUCTION

Soft skills, as non-technical abilities that include interpersonal, communication, leadership, discipline, and work ethic aspects, are now key in preparing college graduates to compete in a dynamic and challenging work environment. The need for soft skills is increasing in line with the paradigm shift in the industrial world towards the Industrial Revolution 4.0, which requires graduates to not only be technically proficient but also competent in collaborating, communicating, and adapting to complex work environments (Robles, 2012). Therefore, universities need to ensure that their students not only excel in hard skills but also have adequate soft skills to support their successful transition into the workforce (Cimatti, 2016).

Students' soft skill profiles are an important indicator for assessing their readiness to face challenges in the era of globalization. Several studies show that the development of soft skills in higher education still faces obstacles, especially in the areas of communication, teamwork, and problem solving (Yohana & Wijiharta, 2021). At Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, a university that focuses on technology and digital creativity, strengthening soft skills has become an integral part of the curriculum and learning activities. However, an in-depth empirical analysis of student soft skill profiles is still needed as a basis for developing more effective soft skill training programs (Blackburn & Lawrence, 2018).

Prevailing studies at other universities in Yogyakarta reveal variations in the strengths and weaknesses of students' soft skills. Research on students in the Culinary Arts Education Program at Yogyakarta State University indicates that the ability to continuously learn, responsibility, and teamwork are the most dominant aspects possessed by students, while communication and problem-solving skills are the main areas of concern in terms of weaknesses (Saptari, 2024). These findings are relevant as a comparison in analyzing the soft skill profile of Amikom University students who have different academic characteristics and disciplinary backgrounds (Huang et al., 2015).

Additionally, measurable soft skills that are relevant to industry needs are also a prerequisite for Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta graduates to be able to respond to rapid changes in the job market and contribute positively to national and regional economic development. Soft skills, which include work ethics, creativity, initiative, and flexibility, in addition to technical skills, will increase the competitiveness of graduates and foster a productive entrepreneurial spirit among students (Dameron et al., 2019; Yorke, 2006). However, despite efforts to develop soft skills in the implementation of the curriculum and student programs, there



is still a gap between the expectations of the world of work and the soft skill profiles of students. This research is important to empirically determine the current soft skill profiles of Amikom University students, as a basis for formulating more targeted soft skill development strategies based on empirical evidence (Rasdi et al., 2022).

A comprehensive analysis of soft skill profiles can assist the education management at Amikom University, as well as lecturers and student advisors, in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students' soft skills. This information is crucial for designing innovative and integrated learning interventions in both formal learning and extracurricular activities that support the continuous development of soft skills (Elias et al., 2017). Thus, this study seeks to fill a gap in the literature on the soft skill profiles of students at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, providing a valid and reliable picture of the most prominent and weakest dimensions of soft skills, while also proposing recommendations for soft skill development programs so that students are better prepared to compete in the world of work and play an active role in socio-economic development (Nguyen et al., 2019).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

**Definition of Soft Skills.** Soft skills have become one of the main aspects of higher education that are gaining widespread attention. In the context of students, soft skills refer to non-technical abilities that enable individuals to interact effectively with others, manage themselves, and adapt to various social and professional situations (Robles, 2012). Soft skills are cross-disciplinary skills that are important to complement the technical or hard skills possessed by students in order to be able to face the challenges of the complex world of work and social life (Cimatti, 2016).

The definition of soft skills in academic literature varies but leads to a common understanding as a set of personal and social skills that include communication, teamwork, leadership, time management, and problem-solving, as well as personal characteristics such as work ethic, positive attitude, and emotional maturity (LaFrance, 2016). These soft skills are different from hard skills, which are more technical and can be measured directly, but rather refer to qualities that shape personality and behavior that can increase a person's effectiveness in social and professional environments (Yohana & Wijiharta, 2021).

In a study conducted by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), soft skills are categorized into several key competencies, such as effective communication, teamwork, leadership, critical thinking and problem solving, and the ability to manage time and workload efficiently (NACE, 2023). These competencies are highly relevant for students as prospective employees who need to be prepared as early as possible to have a competitive advantage in the global job market, which is now characterized by rapid technological change and job dynamics (Djamaris, 2013).

**Dimensions of Student Soft Skills.** The following are the main dimensions of soft skills that have been widely accepted and recognized in various international and academic studies as important components that students must possess:

- a. *Communication Skills.* Communication is the ability to convey ideas and information clearly and effectively, as well as the ability to listen and understand messages from others. Communication soft skills include verbal and nonverbal communication, presentation skills, and negotiation skills. Students with good communication skills can collaborate more effectively and avoid misunderstandings in social and professional interactions (Robles, 2012; Djamaris, 2013).
- b. *Teamwork Skills.* Teamwork skills involve the ability to contribute positively to a work group, respect the views of other members, and facilitate productive cooperation to achieve common goals. Teamwork is very important in the context of education and the collaborative world of work (Iriani, 2017).
- c. *Leadership Skill.* The leadership dimension includes the ability to motivate and inspire others, take initiative, manage conflict, and direct and organize group activities to run according to plan. Students with good leadership skills will be able to have a positive impact on their teams and surrounding communities (Elias et al., 2017).
- d. *Problem Solving Skills.* The ability to analyze, think critically, and create solutions to problems is an important element of soft skills. This dimension requires students to be able to identify problems accurately, evaluate information critically, and apply various effective problem-solving strategies in academic and professional environments (Huang et al., 2015).
- e. *Self-Management.* Time management refers to the ability to manage time efficiently and balance academic, social, and personal activities. This aspect also includes self-control, discipline, and the ability to manage stress, which are part of emotional intelligence (Cimatti, 2016).



- f. *Adaptability and Flexibility*. Adaptability is the ability to adapt to changing conditions and dynamic environments. Adaptive students can manage change, be flexible, and remain productive even when faced with uncertainty or new challenges (Yorke, 2006).
- g. *Work Ethic and Professionalism*. Work ethic and professionalism are dimensions that require students to have integrity, responsibility, perseverance, and commitment to their duties and roles. This attitude is important for building trust and credibility in academic and work environments (Dameron et al., 2019).
- h. *Creativity and Innovation*. Creative thinking skills and the ability to generate new ideas are essential, especially in this era of rapid change driven by digital technology. Students are required to think outside the box and be proactive in finding new opportunities that can add value to their work and lives (Nguyen et al., 2019).
- i. *Emotional Intelligence*. Emotional intelligence includes the ability to recognize, understand, and manage one's own emotions and those of others in various social and professional situations. This has a positive impact on interpersonal relationships and decision making (Elias et al., 2017).
- j. *Digital Skills & Information Literacy*. Digital skills are a set of competencies required for individuals to use information and communication technology (ICT) effectively in various aspects of life, including searching for, processing, creating, and sharing information through digital devices and platforms in a safe, collaborative, and creative manner (Galan, 2022; Vuorikari et al., 2016 in Tee, 2024). In the context of higher education, digital skills include data and information literacy, digital communication and collaboration, digital content creation, digital security, and technology-based problem-solving skills necessary for students to learn, work, and participate productively in the industry 4.0 era.

**The Role of Soft Skills in Higher Education.** Higher education aims not only to produce graduates with broad knowledge and insight, but also to prepare them with soft skills that can increase their employability or ability to adapt and succeed in the world of work (Rasdi et al., 2022). Soft skills determine students' success in completing their studies and facing increasingly complex and global work and social life (Yohana & Wijiharta, 2021). Curricula and learning systems in higher education institutions in various countries have begun to integrate soft skills development as an integral part of graduate competencies. Active learning methods, collaborative project work, simulations, and leadership training are used to train students' soft skills so that they can compete globally (Blackburn & Lawrence, 2018).

**Summary of Previous Research Findings on Student Soft Skills.** Soft skills are a key aspect that determines student success not only in the academic environment, but also in the world of work and social life. Previous studies from various international journals over the past 15 years confirm that soft skills are an essential competency that students must have to face the challenges of the global era and industry 4.0 (Robles, 2012). Research shows that soft skills have a significant effect on students' readiness to enter the workforce and are a key differentiator between successful and less competent graduates (Cimatti, 2016).

- a. *The Role and Importance of Soft Skills for Students*. A longitudinal study by Dameron et al. (2019) found that the development of soft skills in students directly affects their ability to adapt to a dynamic and diverse professional environment. Skills such as effective communication, leadership, and the ability to work in a team are key determinants in shaping both short-term and long-term career success. A number of studies also mention the importance of soft skills in the context of entrepreneurship among students. For example, Nguyen et al. (2019) emphasize that creativity and innovation, which are part of soft skills, are key assets for students who want to pursue a career as an entrepreneur. The ability to think outside the box allows them to discover new business opportunities and deal with risks wisely.
- b. *Student Soft Skill Profiles Based on Empirical Findings*. Research conducted in various countries has identified student soft skill profiles with varying but consistent findings in several key dimensions. Saptari (2024) in his study of Culinary Arts students in Indonesia found that teamwork, responsibility, and independent learning skills were strengths, while communication and problem-solving skills were still relatively weak. Huang et al. (2015) in an international study reported that students have moderate levels of communication and collaboration skills but are weak in analytical and problem-solving skills that require quick and accurate decision-making. This condition is relevant to the findings of Rasdi et al. (2022), which indicate the need for integrated soft skills training programs to improve students' analytical and stress management skills.
- c. *Soft Skills Most Appreciated in the Workplace*. Robles (2012) and Yorke (2006) presented the results of an extensive survey showing ten soft skills that are highly valued by the world of work, namely communication skills, teamwork, leadership, initiative, time management, work ethic, flexibility, creativity, problem-solving skills, and conflict management. These



findings confirm the focus of higher education, which now requires students to not only master hard skills, but also be equipped with a balanced set of soft skills (Blackburn & Lawrence, 2018).

- d. *The Influence of Soft Skills on Student Employment Readiness.* Many studies have proven a positive correlation between mastery of soft skills and the level of student employment readiness. For example, research by Djamaris (2013) and Sabilah et al. (2021) reveals that teamwork, effective communication, and leadership are the main factors that determine student work readiness. Those with strong soft skills tend to adapt more easily, get job opportunities, and survive longer in the professional world (Yohana & Wijiharta, 2021). Meanwhile, research by Elias et al. (2017) adds that emotional intelligence, which is part of soft skills, contributes significantly to improving students' academic achievement and social skills, enabling them to become more resilient and productive individuals.
- e. *Soft Skill Development Strategies in Higher Education.* Findings from numerous studies confirm that although important, soft skill development remains a challenge in higher education (Cimatti, 2016). Rasdi et al. (2022) suggest integrating soft skills into the curriculum, interactive teaching methods, and increased extracurricular activities as solutions for students to hone their interpersonal and intrapersonal skills simultaneously. Hassa Noviana et al. (2025) exemplify that effective soft skill development can be achieved through student activities such as student organizations, debates, and collaborative projects that foster cooperation and leadership. These hands-on experiences allow students to apply soft skill theory in real-world contexts.
- f. *Barriers and Challenges to Soft Skill Development.* Research also reports a number of obstacles in the development of students' soft skills. One of them is the lack of attention and emphasis on soft skill learning in academic programs (Nguyen et al., 2019). In addition, the limited number of competent human resources in soft skill training and the tendency of students to focus on technical academic achievements are also important obstacles (Yohana & Wijiharta, 2021). Huang et al. (2015) stated that educational institutions still need to further examine valid and reliable methods of evaluating soft skills, because soft skills are more abstract and difficult to measure than hard skills.
- g. *Soft Skills and Global Competition.* In an increasingly connected and competitive world, students are required to have soft skills that are not only local but also global. Blackburn & Lawrence (2018) emphasize the need to instill cultural awareness, cross-cultural communication skills, and global negotiation skills as part of students' future soft skills.
- h. *Case Studies and Latest Research Trends in Soft Skills.* Recent research has also begun to link soft skills with digital skills and technological literacy, two important aspects that support work and learning effectiveness in the digital age (Rasdi et al., 2022). A study by Elias et al. (2017) mapped new trends by including aspects of digital emotional intelligence that help students manage stress and online interactions.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a descriptive quantitative approach to obtain a comprehensive picture of the soft skill profiles of students. This approach is appropriate because the main objective of the study is to systematically describe and analyze the characteristics or attributes of soft skills possessed by students at the time of data collection (Iriani, 2017). Meanwhile, the research design in this study is quantitative descriptive research that aims to measure and describe the condition of students' soft skills objectively using structured instruments (Hamidah, 2012). With this approach, soft skill variables are mapped based on data collected through internationally validated questionnaires. Descriptive research was chosen in order to obtain a representative quantitative picture of the dimensions of soft skills in the student population at Amikom University.

**Population and Sample.** The population of this study was all active students at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, who were at least actively enrolled in their third semester. Samples were taken using simple random sampling techniques and were expected to represent each semester proportionally (Saptari, 2024). This technique minimizes bias and increases the accuracy of the research results by considering the diversity of student backgrounds. Furthermore, referring to the Slovin formula with an acceptable margin of error of 10%, the number of samples taken was adjusted to obtain representative results. The sample determination refers to a statistical formula commonly used in quantitative research in the social and higher education fields (Sugiyono, 2017).

**Research Instruments.** The main instrument of this study is a questionnaire consisting of several soft skill indicators that have been tested for validity and reliability internationally. This questionnaire refers to the Soft Competency Questionnaire and Self Assessment (SCQ-SA) instrument, which was developed to measure important aspects of soft skills such as motivation, flexibility, teamwork, integrity, interpersonal relationships, and independent learning skills (Ariyani, 2013). The measurement scale uses a 4-



point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, which measures the level of students' perceptions of their respective soft skills (Likert, 1932 in Sugiyono, 2017). This scale model allows for detailed and quantitative measurement of soft skill attributes so that the data produced can be analyzed statistically. The questionnaire was developed and reviewed through a pilot test on a small group of students to ensure the level of clarity, understanding of the questions, and suitability of the indicators to the context of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta students (Rasdi et al., 2022).

**Data Collection Techniques.** Data was collected through an online questionnaire survey distributed to a sample of students who were positioned as research respondents. This online method was used to reach as many respondents as possible and to accommodate students' preferences for answering questionnaires in the digital age (Blackburn & Lawrence, 2018). In addition to the questionnaire, some supporting data, such as student demographic and academic data, were also collected through official university documents for the analysis of the correlation between soft skill variables and student characteristics (Djamaris, 2013).

**Data Analysis Techniques.** Data analysis was performed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the soft skill profiles of students in the form of frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation (Huang et al., 2015). In this way, researchers could capture an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of students' soft skills. Next, the soft skill profile groups were classified into three categories, namely: high, medium, and low. Soft skill scores were obtained from the statistical formula  $\bar{x}$  = sample mean and  $s$  = sample standard deviation. High soft skill category scores  $\geq (\bar{x}+s)$ ; medium category =  $(\bar{x} - s < X < \bar{x}+s)$ ; low category  $\leq (\bar{x} - s)$ .

**Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing.** To ensure the validity of the research instrument, construct validity testing was conducted using Karl Person's correlation analysis technique. This validity test ensures that the questionnaire questions truly reflect the soft skills aspects being studied. The cut-off value for the correlation coefficient was  $r > 0.3$ . Furthermore, reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the instrument (Robles, 2012). The instrument was declared reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value was  $\geq 0.7$ , an internationally accepted academic standard (Rasdi et al., 2022).

This study has limitations that need to be considered, including the use of a questionnaire instrument that relies on self-assessment, which can be influenced by the subjective bias of respondents (Dameron et al., 2019). However, this is offset by the simple random sampling technique and rigorous validity and reliability tests. Another limitation is that the population coverage is limited to students at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, so the generalization of the research results to a wider population must be done with caution (Elias et al., 2017).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Respondent Demographics.** The research sample consisted of 160 students. The sample size was distributed according to gender, consisting of 41.3% male and 58.8% female. Students from the Faculty of Computer Science accounted for 28.9%, the Faculty of Science and Technology 6.7%, and the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences 64.9%. Active students in the third semester accounted for 46.3%, the fifth semester 40.6%, the seventh semester 10.6%, and the ninth semester 2.5%. The dominance of the sample size from the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences is in line with the focus of entrepreneurship research, where students in this field are more relevant to the study of self-efficacy and business decision-making. The low representation of the Faculty of Science and Technology may reflect sampling priorities targeting potential entrepreneur groups. However, the concentration in the early odd semesters (3 and 5) reaching 86.9% indicates that the sample is dominated by junior-middle students, who are expected to have limited entrepreneurship experience but developing self-efficacy. The implications of this sample composition are strong for generalization to Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences students in the early stages of their studies, supporting entrepreneurship analysis in that context. However, gender imbalance and underrepresentation of Science Technology Engineering Matematic (STEM) faculties and final semesters may limit extrapolation to the student population.

**Results of the Validity and Reliability Test of the Research Instrument.** As shown in Table 1, the soft skill measurement instrument consists of 10 dimensions with a total of 50 items (Q1-Q50) and shows excellent validity and reliability test results overall. All dimensions and individual indicators were declared valid with r-statistics values above the critical threshold (generally  $>0.3$  for a sample size of 160), while all dimensions were reliable with Cronbach's Alpha  $>0.7$ . The quality of this instrument supports its use for measuring students' soft skills in the context of entrepreneurship and self-efficacy.



Table 1: Results of Questionnaire Item Validity and Reliability Test

Dimension and Indicator Soft Skill	r-statistic	Validity	Alpa Cronbach's	Reliability
<b>A. Communication</b>	1.000	Valid	.790	Reliable
Q1. I can speak clearly and in a structured manner when conveying ideas.	.755	Valid		
Q2. I listen attentively and empathetically to others.	.542	Valid		
Q3. I can write reports/academic assignments well	.530	Valid		
Q4. I am confident when giving public presentations	.722	Valid		
Q5. I am accustomed to using digital media (email, online presentations, professional social media) to communicate.	.637	Valid		
<b>B. Teamwork</b>	1.000	Valid	.830	Reliable
Q6. I enjoy working with individuals of various personalities.	.672	Valid		
Q7. I am accustomed to sharing information and resources with team members.	.751	Valid		
Q8. I respect differences of opinion within a group.	.724	Valid		
Q9. I can resolve conflicts wisely within a team.	.654	Valid		
Q10. I always contribute actively to all group work.	.609	Valid		
<b>C. Leadership</b>	1.000	Valid	.850	Reliable
Q11. I take the initiative to take on an important role when needed.	.773	Valid		
Q12. I can motivate team members to work well.	.712	Valid		
Q13. I can make wise and fair decisions.	.664	Valid		
Q14. I can manage the division of tasks well within a group.	.770	Valid		
Q15. I try to be a good role model for my friends.	.614	Valid		
<b>D. Problem Solving &amp; Critical Thinking</b>	1.000	Valid	.874	Reliable
Q16. I can identify problems accurately before seeking solutions.	.801	Valid		
Q17. I am accustomed to analyzing information before making decisions.	.743	Valid		
Q18. I can think logically, objectively, and systematically when solving problems.	.777	Valid		
Q19. I can propose creative alternative solutions.	.725	Valid		
Q20. I consider the risks and consequences of every decision I make.	.652	Valid		
<b>E. Time Management &amp; Organization</b>	1.000	Valid	.836	Reliable
Q21. I create a schedule and prioritize organizing my activities.	.659	Valid		
Q22. I always try to complete assignments on time.	.742	Valid		
Q23. I am disciplined in attending lectures and academic activities.	.678	Valid		
Q24. I can balance academic activities, organizations, and my personal life.	.738	Valid		
Q25. I can manage stress when faced with multiple tasks.	.627	Valid		
<b>F. Adaptability &amp; Flexibility</b>	1.000	Valid	.850	Reliable
Q26. I adapt quickly to new situations.	.721	Valid		
Q27. I am open to new ideas, opinions, and cultures.	.712	Valid		
Q28. I learn from experience to improve myself.	.701	Valid		
Q29. I don't give up easily when faced with difficulties.	.683	Valid		
Q30. I am flexible in adapting my work methods to meet needs.	.713	Valid		



<b>G. Ethics &amp; Responsibility</b>	1.000	Valid	.921	Reliable
Q31. I uphold academic honesty (do not plagiarize).	.743	Valid		
Q32. I am disciplined in adhering to applicable regulations.	.874	Valid		
Q33. I am responsible for every assignment given.	.830	Valid		
Q34. I respect socio-cultural norms and values.	.825	Valid		
Q35. I strive to maintain a polite and professional attitude.	.807	Valid		
<b>H. Creativity &amp; Innovation</b>	1.000	Valid	.859	Reliable
Q36. I strive to think outside the box.	.724	Valid		
Q37. I can produce original ideas/work.	.741	Valid		
Q38. I can connect various fields of science to create new solutions	.789	Valid		
Q39. I dare to try new things even when they are challenging	.633	Valid		
Q40. I strive to produce innovative solutions.	.708	Valid		
<b>I. Emotional Intelligence</b>	1.000	Valid	.834	Reliable
Q41. I can recognize my own emotions.	.759	Valid		
Q42. I can control my emotions in difficult situations	.772	Valid		
Q43. I have empathy for the feelings of others.	.545	Valid		
Q44. I can maintain good relationships with others.	.722	Valid		
Q45. I can provide feedback to others appropriately and tactfully.	.631	Valid		
<b>J. Digital Skills &amp; Information Literacy</b>	1.000	Valid	.865	Reliable
Q46. I can use learning support applications (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Google Workspace, etc.).	.713	Valid		
Q47. I can search for relevant information from various sources.	.799	Valid		
Q48. I can evaluate the accuracy of information before using it.	.748	Valid		
Q49. I use social media positively and professionally	.666	Valid		
Q50. I understand digital ethics and maintain the security of personal data.	.708	Valid		

Sources: Primary data processed, 2025.

Validity was measured using item-total correlations (r-statistics), where all indicators achieved a minimum value of 0.530 (Q3) to a maximum of 0.874 (Q32). No items were invalid, indicating that each question contributed significantly to its respective dimension. Strongest items: Q32 (0.874, Ethics & Responsibility), Q33 (0.830), Q34 (0.825), Q35 (0.807), Q16 (0.801), Q47 (0.799), Q38 (0.789). These items show a very high correlation with the dimension construct, reflecting a strong representation of concepts such as ethical responsibility and information literacy. Meanwhile, the weakest items (still valid) are: Q3 (0.530, Communication), Q2 (0.542, Communication), Q43 (0.545, Emotional Intelligence). Although low, these values are still above the validity threshold but indicate the potential for wording improvements to increase consistency.

Internal reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, with all dimensions falling within the reliable range (>0.7), with Ethics & Responsibility being the highest (0.921). This indicates high consistency between items in each dimension. The strongest dimensions are Ethics & Responsibility (0.921), Creativity & Innovation (0.859), and Digital Skills (0.865). This high Alpha reflects strong item coherence, relevant for measuring entrepreneurship soft skills. Furthermore, the lowest dimension (still reliable) is Communication (0.790). This value is solid but could be improved by adding items or revising Q2 and Q3. The overall average Alpha of ~0.85 indicates that the instrument is stable and free from systematic measurement error.

**Analysis of Research Results on Soft Skills of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta Students.** Based on Table 2 of the research findings, the soft skills profile of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta students shows a consistent pattern: almost all dimensions are in the “medium” category on a Likert scale of 1–4, with a general average of 3.189 and a standard deviation of around 0.52. These findings indicate that students' soft skills are well developed but have not yet reached the excellent level expected for high competitiveness in a knowledge and technology-based world of work (Robles, 2012). In practical terms, this means that students



tend to be able to function effectively in academic and basic work contexts, but still need strengthening for complex tasks, multidisciplinary collaboration, and global work dynamics (Cimatti, 2016).

**Table 2: Results of the Soft Skill Profile Measurement of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta Students, 2025.**

Dimension and Indicator Soft Skill	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Qualitatif Category
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	
<i>Communication</i>	160	2.0	4.0	3.095	.0285	.3603	Medium
Q1	160	2.0	4.0	2.956	.0400	.5059	Medium
Q2	160	1.0	4.0	3.350	.0453	.5724	Medium
Q3	160	2.0	4.0	3.094	.0384	.4862	Medium
Q4	160	1.0	4.0	2.881	.0520	.6575	Medium
Q5	160	1.0	4.0	3.200	.0467	.5913	Medium
<i>Teamwork</i>	160	2.4	4.0	3.251	.0273	.3448	Medium
Q6	160	2.0	4.0	3.131	.0462	.5841	Medium
Q7	160	2.0	4.0	3.219	.0373	.4715	Medium
Q8	160	2.0	4.0	3.450	.0404	.5115	Medium
Q9	160	2.0	4.0	3.131	.0377	.4774	Medium
Q10	160	2.0	4.0	3.325	.0382	.4830	Medium
<i>Leadership</i>	160	1.8	4.0	3.155	.0324	.4099	Medium
Q11	160	1.0	4.0	3.138	.0543	.6867	Medium
Q12	160	1.0	4.0	3.138	.0456	.5772	Medium
Q13	160	2.0	4.0	3.156	.0412	.5206	Medium
Q14	160	1.0	4.0	3.156	.0421	.5325	Medium
Q15	160	1.0	4.0	3.187	.0454	.5739	Medium
<i>Problem Solving &amp; Critical Thinking</i>	160	2.2	4.0	3.141	.0298	.3771	Medium
Q16	160	1.0	4.0	3.044	.0428	.5419	Medium
Q17	160	2.0	4.0	3.206	.0435	.5506	Medium
Q18	160	2.0	4.0	3.131	.0377	.4774	Medium
Q19	160	2.0	4.0	3.025	.0386	.4882	Medium
Q20	160	2.0	4.0	3.300	.0384	.4863	Medium
<i>Time Management &amp; Organization</i>	160	1.8	4.0	3.209	.0320	.4046	Medium
Q21	160	1.0	4.0	3.150	.0519	.6559	Medium
Q22	160	2.0	4.0	3.400	.0408	.5164	Medium
Q23	160	2.0	4.0	3.319	.0438	.5537	Medium
Q24	160	1.0	4.0	3.169	.0463	.5852	Medium
Q25	160	1.0	4.0	3.006	.0505	.6393	Medium
<i>Adaptability &amp; Flexibility</i>	160	2.6	4.0	3.228	.0296	.3743	Medium
Q26	160	1.0	4.0	2.988	.0532	.6728	Medium
Q27	160	2.0	4.0	3.244	.0394	.4984	Medium
Q28	160	3.0	4.0	3.450	.0395	.4991	Medium
Q29	160	2.0	4.0	3.250	.0406	.5140	Medium
Q30	160	2.0	4.0	3.206	.0367	.4637	Medium



<i>Ethics &amp; Responsibility</i>	160	2.8	4.0	3.376	.0327	.4132	Medium
Q31	160	2.0	4.0	3.225	.0406	.5133	Medium
Q32	160	2.0	4.0	3.375	.0394	.4984	Medium
Q33	160	2.0	4.0	3.381	.0395	.5000	Medium
Q34	160	2.0	4.0	3.450	.0404	.5115	Medium
Q35	160	2.0	4.0	3.440	.0404	.5120	Medium
<i>Creativity &amp; Innovation</i>	160	1.6	4.0	3.000	.0322	.4075	Medium
Q36	160	1.0	4.0	2.969	.0489	.6186	Medium
Q37	160	1.0	4.0	2.894	.0421	.5331	Medium
Q38	160	1.0	4.0	2.888	.0461	.5826	Medium
Q39	160	1.0	4.0	3.181	.0451	.5705	Medium
Q40	160	1.0	4.0	3.069	.0417	.5275	Medium
<i>Emotional Intelligence</i>	160	2.2	4.0	3.170	.0311	.3931	Medium
Q41	160	1.0	4.0	3.056	.0541	.6845	Medium
Q42	160	2.0	4.0	3.050	.0476	.6019	Medium
Q43	160	1.0	4.0	3.325	.0421	.5326	Medium
Q44	160	2.0	4.0	3.269	.0384	.4853	Medium
Q45	160	1.0	4.0	3.150	.0427	.5402	Medium
<i>Digital Skills &amp; Information Literacy</i>	160	2.2	4.0	3.260	.0299	.3785	Medium
Q46	160	1.0	4.0	3.269	.0413	.5227	Medium
Q47	160	1.0	4.0	3.225	.0425	.5373	Medium
Q48	160	1.0	4.0	3.088	.0410	.5187	Medium
Q49	160	1.0	4.0	3.325	.0412	.5206	Medium
Q50	160	2.0	4.0	3.394	.0397	.5028	Medium
<i>Average</i>				3.189		.5175	Medium

Sources: Primary data processed, 2025.

**General Analysis of Soft Skill Profiles.** The overall average of 3.189 (on a scale of 1–4) shows that most respondents tend to moderately agree with soft skill items rather than strongly agree, reflecting a positive but not excessive self-perception. This pattern is consistent with various studies of student soft skills that found typical scores to be in the upper-middle range of the scale, describing competence that is sufficient but not yet optimal (Nguyen et al., 2019). The relatively small standard deviation between dimensions (around 0.36–0.41) indicates that there is not much diversity among respondents; that is, most students are in a relatively similar range of abilities, rather than being divided between very high and very low (Rasdi et al., 2022).

From a measurement perspective, the “medium” position across all dimensions may also be influenced by respondents' tendency to avoid extreme categories (1 or 4) on the Likert scale (central tendency bias). However, because the average scores consistently approach 3.0–3.4 and the minimum–maximum items (1–4) indicate that there are very low and very high respondents, it can be concluded that real variation still exists, even though it is centered at a moderate level (Phuti et al., 2023). Thus, these results have strong diagnostic value for identifying which dimensions are relatively strong and which are still weak.

**Communication Dimension.** The communication dimension has an average of 3.095 with a standard deviation of 0.3603. All indicators (Q1–Q5) are in the moderate category with an average variation between 2.881 and 3.350, indicating that students feel quite capable of communicating, but there are still specific indicators that lag. The lowest average is found in Q4 (2.881), which can be associated with more challenging aspects of communication such as public speaking, explaining ideas coherently, or managing communication in formal situations; while Q2, with an average of 3.350, indicates areas of communication that are perceived as relatively stronger, such as everyday communication or communication in informal situations. Global literature shows that oral and written communication are among the soft skills most often assessed as lacking in students, especially when faced with



formal presentations, negotiations, or professional writing (Robles, 2012; Blackburn & Lawrence, 2018). These results are in line with the national pattern where technology students tend to focus on technical aspects so that their skills in articulating ideas and logical argumentation are not developed to their full potential (Huang et al., 2015). This profile indicates the need for specific interventions in the form of training in presentation, debate, and scientific/professional writing so that the communication dimension can be improved to a high category.

**Teamwork Dimension.** The teamwork dimension has an average of 3.251 and a standard deviation of 0.3448, which is one of the highest among the other dimensions. Indicators Q6–Q10 are all in the moderate category, with the highest average in Q8 (3.450) and the lowest in Q6 and Q9 (3.131). This shows that students are relatively confident in some aspects of cooperation (e.g., contributing to the group, respecting others' opinions), but there is still room for improvement in terms of coordination, workload distribution, or conflict resolution. Previous research shows that a group project-based learning environment encourages improved teamwork skills but often leaves behind the phenomenon of “free riders” and the dominance of certain members, which hinders the equitable development of soft skills within the team (Elias et al., 2017). The relatively high score on Q8 indicates that the ability to work together in a team is already a relative strength of Amikom students, in line with the characteristics of technology-based study programs that make extensive use of group assignments (Dameron et al., 2019). However, the moderate scores for all items confirm that this dimension has not yet reached the level of excellence required for cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary teamwork in the real world.

**Leadership Dimension.** The leadership dimension shows an average of 3.155 with a standard deviation of 0.4099. Interestingly, all indicators (Q11–Q15) have very similar averages (3.138–3.187), indicating that students have a fairly consistent perception that their leadership skills are at a moderate level in various aspects: taking initiative, guiding peers, organizing work, and making decisions. Research on college students shows that leadership usually develops through organizational experiences and extracurricular activities, not solely from formal lectures (Nguyen et al., 2019). This moderate average can be interpreted to mean that only some students are actively involved in campus organizations and hold leadership roles, while others still play passive roles. This is in line with findings that organizational participation is directly proportional to an increase in leadership and initiative soft skills, but its distribution is uneven among students (Saptari, 2024). Thus, universities need to provide more opportunities and incentives for leadership experiences so that this dimension can be improved more broadly.

**Problem Solving & Critical Thinking Dimension.** The problem solving and critical thinking dimension has a mean of 3.141 and a standard deviation of 0.3771. Indicators Q16–Q20 are all in the moderate category, with a mean variation between 3.025 and 3.300. This indicates that students feel sufficiently capable of analyzing problems, seeking alternative solutions, and making decisions, but have not yet reached a high level of critical thinking skills such as evaluating complex arguments and considering long-term implications. International studies show that problem solving and critical thinking skills are among the weakest competencies among students, especially in education systems that still emphasize memorization and single answers (Nguyen et al., 2019). The moderate average in this study indicates that Amikom students already have a foundation in analytical thinking, most likely from their experience working on programming assignments and technical projects but have not been fully trained to deal with ambiguous, cross-dimensional, and human-oriented problems (Cimatti, 2016). To improve this dimension, case study-based learning, project-based learning, and design thinking are highly relevant.

**Time Management & Organization Dimension.** The time management and organization dimension has an average of 3.209 with a standard deviation of 0.4046. Indicators Q21–Q25 fluctuate between 3.006 and 3.400, indicating that some aspects are quite strong (e.g., Q22 with an average of 3.400) while others are still quite weak (Q25 with an average of 3.006). This illustrates that students are relatively capable of managing their schedules and completing tasks on time, but may still have difficulties in terms of prioritization, consistency, or managing accumulated workloads. Previous studies have shown that time management is one of the soft skills that directly influences academic achievement and work readiness (Huang et al., 2015). The above-average score at Amikom can be linked to the strict deadline-based task culture in technology study programs, but the presence of indicators with scores close to 3.0 indicates that there is still procrastination and difficulty in managing the balance between academics, organizations, and personal life (Djamaris, 2013). Interventions such as self-management training, study planning, and techniques for overcoming procrastination can help raise this dimension to a higher level.

**Adaptability & Flexibility Dimension.** The adaptability and flexibility dimension has a mean of 3.228 and a standard deviation of 0.3743. Indicators Q26–Q30 range from 2.988 to 3.450. The highest average on Q28 (3.450) is quite significant,



indicating that students feel they have good adaptability in certain contexts—for example, changes in learning methods or the use of new technology. However, Q26 with an average of 2.988 shows that there are still aspects of adaptability that are perceived as weak, such as dealing with sudden pressure, rule changes, or new roles. The era of disruption and online/hybrid learning has forced students around the world to increase their flexibility to change (Rasdi et al., 2022). This medium-to-high profile shows that Amikom students are quite successful in adapting to these changes but have not yet reached the ideal level of “high resilience,” which is the ability not only to adjust but also to thrive amid change (Elias et al., 2017). This confirms the need for more diverse exposure to challenging situations, such as projects with high uncertainty or cross-cultural work.

**Ethics & Responsibility Dimension.** The Ethics and Responsibility dimension is the highest with an average of 3.376 and a standard deviation of 0.4132. All indicators (Q31–Q35) show an average above 3.22 and some even approach 3.45. This profile shows that students have a strong sense of responsibility towards tasks, commitment, and basic ethical norms, such as academic honesty, punctuality, and compliance with rules. These findings are consistent with various studies in Indonesia which state that ethical values, discipline, and compliance are often the relative strengths of students compared to other soft skill dimensions (Saptari, 2024). However, despite being the highest among other dimensions, the category is still “medium” (albeit upper-medium), which indicates that there is still room for improvement in terms of more complex professional ethics, such as data use ethics, cross-institutional collaboration, and social responsibility in the digital age (Dameron et al., 2019). Thus, universities can use this dimension as a basis for developing other more difficult soft skills such as leadership and creativity.

**Creativity & Innovation Dimension.** The creativity and innovation dimension has an average of 3.000 with a standard deviation of 0.4075, making it the dimension with the lowest average, although it is still in the moderate category. Indicators Q36–Q40 show an average ranging from 2.888 to 3.181, with some items clearly approaching the lower limit of the moderate category. This shows that students' ability to generate new ideas, think outside the box, and develop innovative solutions is still relatively weak compared to other dimensions. International and national research has long highlighted that creativity and innovation are often weak points in education systems that strongly emphasize standards, single correct answers, and exam-based assessment (Nguyen et al., 2019). In the context of a technology campus such as Amikom, these results indicate that although students are accustomed to solving technical problems, they are not yet fully encouraged to explore creative solutions, new designs, or product/service innovations (Yorke, 2006). Therefore, a change in the learning approach is needed to provide more space for exploration, experimentation, and controlled failure (safe-fail environment) so that creativity can flourish.

**Emotional Intelligence Dimension.** The emotional intelligence dimension has an average of 3.170 with a standard deviation of 0.3931. Indicators Q41–Q45 are all in the moderate category with averages between 3.050 and 3.325. This profile shows that students feel quite capable of recognizing their own emotions, managing their emotions, understanding the feelings of others, and interacting empathetically, although they are not yet at a very mature level. Emotional intelligence has been proven to have a positive correlation with academic performance, teamwork, and leadership (Elias et al., 2017). The moderate average in this study indicates that students already have a good foundation of interpersonal skills, but may still face difficulties in high-pressure situations, conflicts, or differences in values. Online learning and limited face-to-face interaction over the past few years may have contributed to these social and emotional skills (Rasdi et al., 2022). Emotional intelligence can be developed through counseling, empathy training, collaborative activities, and reflection on interpersonal experiences.

**Digital Skills & Information Literacy Dimension.** The digital skills and information literacy dimension has an average of 3.260 and a standard deviation of 0.3785, which is among the dimensions with relatively high scores. Indicators Q46–Q50 show an average between 3.088 and 3.394, which illustrates that students have a fairly good level of comfort and competence in using digital technology, accessing information, and utilizing various platforms for learning and communication. Recent studies confirm that today's generation of students (digital natives) tend to be strong in the operational use of devices and applications, but not necessarily in critical information literacy—that is, the ability to assess the credibility of sources, understand information bias, and use information ethically (Gałan, 2022). The above-average score in this dimension shows that a technology-oriented campus such as Amikom provides a relative advantage in digital skills compared to the national average, but it needs to be supported by more in-depth information literacy programs so that students are not only technically proficient, but also informationally wise and critical (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2016).

**Cross-dimensional Synthesis and Implications.** When viewed cross-dimensionally, the soft skill profile of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta students forms the following pattern: (a). Relatively strong dimensions are Ethics & Responsibility; Teamwork; Digital



Skills & Information Literacy; Adaptability & Flexibility; Time Management & Organization. (b). Medium dimensions: Emotional Intelligence; Leadership; Problem Solving & Critical Thinking. (c). Relatively weak dimensions (but still medium): Communication; Creativity & Innovation. This pattern is very consistent with national and international literature on student soft skills, where values, compliance, and cooperation tend to be stronger, while creativity, communication, and critical thinking are major challenges (Robles, 2012; Saptari, 2024). In the context of national standards (KKNI, SN-Dikti) and the needs of industry 4.0, this “medium in all dimensions” profile can be said to meet the baseline but does not yet reflect a real competitive advantage (Rasdi et al., 2022).

- 1) The implications are that universities need to:
- 2) Use these results as the basis for planned soft skill development policies at the institutional and study program levels.
- 3) Direct more intensive interventions toward the lowest dimensions (communication and creativity) without neglecting further strengthening of dimensions that are already relatively strong.
- 4) Integrate periodic soft skill measurements (e.g., every cohort) to monitor trends and the impact of implemented programs.

With the right strategy, the soft skills profile of students, which is currently at a moderate level, can be improved to a high level and become a distinctive advantage of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta graduates in the eyes of the workforce and society.

## CONCLUSION

In general, the study shows that students' soft skill profiles are in the medium category, with an overall average of 3.189 and a standard deviation of 0.517. This means that students have a fairly good foundation of non-technical competencies but have not yet reached the optimal or superior level expected for competitiveness in a knowledge and technology-based workforce. No dimension falls into the low category, but no dimension consistently falls into the high category either. Furthermore, we see that the conclusions for each dimension of student soft skills are as follows:

1. The dimension with the highest average score is Ethics & Responsibility, followed by Digital Skills & Information Literacy, Teamwork, Adaptability & Flexibility, and Time Management & Organization, all of which are still in the medium category but close to the upper limit of the medium scale. This indicates that students tend to be strong in aspects of discipline, compliance with rules, cooperation, adaptability to change, and basic digital technology proficiency, in line with the characteristics of technology-based universities and a social culture that emphasizes the value of responsibility.
2. Other dimensions such as Emotional Intelligence, Leadership, and Problem Solving & Critical Thinking are also at a moderate level, indicating that the ability to manage emotions, lead, and solve problems has been developed but is still limited to relatively simple or routine contexts. This is in line with various studies showing that emotional intelligence, leadership, and critical thinking in students generally develop when supported by organizational experience, real projects, and case-based learning, which may not be experienced equally by all students.
3. The dimensions with the lowest average scores are Communication and Creativity & Innovation, although they remain in the moderate category. These findings indicate that students still face challenges in communicating ideas clearly and persuasively, as well as in producing truly new and innovative solutions or ideas. This pattern is consistent with national and international literature which states that communication, creativity, and critical thinking are common weaknesses among college graduates in many developing countries, including Indonesia.
4. Overall, the main conclusion of this study is that Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta students have met the basic level of soft skills competency required to enter the workforce but have not yet demonstrated significant excellence in the key dimensions most valued by industry, such as communication, creativity, and complex problem solving. This “medium in all dimensions” profile reflects a position in line with the national average, but at the same time emphasizes the need for a more systematic, integrated, and sustainable development strategy so that students' soft skills can be improved to a high level and become a distinguishing strength of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta graduates.

## REFERENCES

1. Ariyani, E. D. (2013). Soft competency questionnaire-self assessment: alat ukur soft skills mahasiswa. *Jurnal Sosio Humaniora*, 15(2), 178-190. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jsh.v15i2.5743>
2. Blackburn, R., & Lawrence, S. (2018). Developing graduate soft skills in higher education: A case study approach. *Journal of Education and Training*, 60(3), 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JET-01-2018-0004>



3. 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>
4. Dameron, S., Rao, H., & Greve, H. R. (2019). Social and human capital in the entrepreneurial process. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 63, 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20190000063001>
5. Djamaris, M. (2013). Soft skills training and readiness for work. *Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 45-60.
6. Elias, H., Farah, M. S., & Rahman, N. H. A. (2017). Personality traits and soft skills affecting engineering students' academic performance. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 31, 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.16920/jeet/2017/v31i0/110313>
7. Galan, B. (2022). The role of digital competences in the glottodidactic process from the perspective of the representatives of the digital native's community. *E-mentor*, 93/2022, Issue No: 1, pp. 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.15219/em93.1555>
8. Grugulis I, Vincent S. Whose skill is it anyway? Soft skills and polarization. *Work, Employment and Society*. 2009;23(4):597-615.
9. Hamidah, S. (2012). Profil soft skills mahasiswa Pendidikan Teknik Boga. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 2(1), 65-74.
10. Hassa Noviana, et al. (2025). Pembinaan Soft Skill Peserta Didik Melalui Kegiatan Ekstrakurikuler. *SAKOLA Journal of Sains Cooperative Learning and Law*, 2(1), 590-600. <https://rayyanjurnal.com/index.php/sakola/article/download/5838/pdf>
11. Huang, C., Gove, M., & Satake, S. (2015). Learning strategies and performance in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 72, 150-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.09.009>
12. Iriani, D. (2017). Leadership and team collaboration skills in undergraduate students. *Journal of Professional Development*, 11(1), 33-41.
13. LaFrance, M. (2016). The importance of soft skills in personal and professional development. *Journal of Human Behavior Studies*, 22(4), 230-245.
14. National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). (2023). Job outlook survey 2023. <https://www.nacweb.org/job-outlook>
15. Nguyen, H., Ngo, L., & Tran, D. (2019). The impact of soft skills on employability: Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 11(2), 72-87. <https://doi.org/10.20472/BM.2019.11.2.006>
16. Rasdi, R. M., Zainal, S. R. M., & Sarif, S. Z. (2022). Bridging the skills gap: Soft skills development in higher education. *Education + Training*, 64(1), 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2020-0192>
17. Robles, M. M. (2012). Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 75(4), 453-465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569912460400>
18. Sabilah, et al. (2021). Improving teamwork skills among university students. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 12(3), 112-125.
19. Saptari, A. (2024). Profil soft skills mahasiswa Pendidikan Teknik Boga Fakultas Teknik Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 14(1), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpv.v14i1.47689>
20. Sugiyono. (2017). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta
21. Tee, M. Y. (2024). Digital skills framework. *Journal of Digital Education*, 15(2), 120-135.
22. Wijayati, N. (2023). Digital literacy skills. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 17(1), 45-62
23. Vuorikari, R., et al. (2016). DigComp 2.0: The digital competence framework. *Publications Office of the European Union*. <https://doi.org/10.2760/88234>
24. Yohana, A., & Wijiharta, I. (2021). Soft skill mahasiswa: Strategi pembinaan terintegrasi di era digital. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 23(3), 299-312. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jtp.23.3.5>
25. Yorke, M. (2006). Employability in higher education: What it is – What it is not. *Learning and Employability Series 1*. The Higher Education Academy. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600679407>

**Cite this Article: Wijaya, M.H., Ariyanto, E., Mutiara Sari, A.N. (2025). Analysis of Student Soft Skill Profiles: A Case Study at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 8(12), pp. 6401-6413. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i12-51>**