STUDY OF SKILLS OF TECHNICAL AND NON-TECHNICAL STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

Tina Verma

Research Scholar (Education), School of Education, SRT Campus, H.N.B. Garhwal University, Uttarakhand

Abstract

Skills are the key in stimulating a sustainable development process. Development of the skills depends on many factors but in this study, the researcher has attempted to study the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to their family environment. The researcher used descriptive survey method in this study. 300 technical students from poly-Technic colleges and it is and 300 non-technical students from secondary schools of the Kumaun region were selected randomly. Two-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the collected data. The findings revealed a significant difference in the kills of technical and non-technical students as Non-technical students had higher skills as compare to technical students. Cohesive, expressive, conflicting, acceptance and caring, active recreational oriented and independent family environment had no significant effect on the skills of the students while organization and control dimension of the family environment had affected their skills significantly.

Keywords: Skills, Family Environment, Technical Students and Non-Technical Students.

INTRODUCTION

India is a fast developing economy, where rapid growth is taking place in all the sectors. Skills are the most important factor for the development of any country. Skills are the key in stimulating a sustainable development process and make a contribution to facilitate the transition from the informal to formal economy. Skills are also essential to address the opportunities and challenges to meet new demands of changing economies and new technologies in the context of globalization. Skills are driving force of economic growth and social development for any country. Countries with higher and better levels of skilled workers adjust more effectively to the challenges and opportunities of the world of work.

Skills are directly influencing the growth of individuals in terms of employment. Skills are showing great impact on getting employment.One ofthe main characteristics of knowledge-based industry isthe growing demand for generic skills attributes that mustbe owned by the workers. In addition totechnical skills in the field, workers must also have skillsthat are generic. **Cairney (2000)** states that the industry inthe era of knowledge-based

economy requires workerswho are able to work independently, able to managethemselves, to work in teams, to adapt to change, tosolve complex problems, and to think in a creative andinnovative way.Technical skills and employability skills are needed to sustain the development of acknowledge-based economy **(Esposto and Meagher, 2007)**.

The skills enable the individuals to comprehend people and the social systems within which they work, play, and have a social life **(Zaccaro, Mumford, Connelly, Marks, &Gilbert, 2000)**. Skills facilitate working with others to lead change, solve problems, and make sense of issues. **Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, et al. (2000)** outlined four elements important to skills: perspective taking, social perceptiveness, behavioral flexibility, and social performance.As skills are important for people for the success at their work place equally students' skills can contribute to their success. That is why there is a need to train them in these skills. In Indian economy the demand for skilled employees is at boom. With special reference to service sector; communication skills, self-management, creativity, teamwork, leadership and customer services skills are highly required.

Family plays an important role in the life of a person. In fact the whole life of a person revolves round his family. Family shapes the complete personality of an individual. Family is the first and primary institution where an individual learns to communicate, behave and becomes a useful part of the society. Family follows some customs and traditions through which the family members develop the personality of the child. Such customs, traditions and code of conduct when taken together are termed as family environment. Family environment may contribute in the development of the skills also because family is the first school of a child. Keeping it in mind, the researcher tried to study the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to their family environment.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to cohesion dimension of family environment.

2. To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to expressiveness dimension of family environment.

3. To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to conflict dimension of family environment.

4. To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to acceptance and caring dimension of family environment.

5.   To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to independence dimension of family environment.

6.   To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to active recreational orientation dimension of family environment.

7.   To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to organization dimension of family environment.

8.   To comparethe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to control dimension of family environment.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

1.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to cohesion dimension of family environment.

2.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to expressiveness dimension of family environment.

3.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to conflict dimension of family environment.

4.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to acceptance and caring dimension of family environment.

5.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to independence dimension of family environment.

6.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to active recreational orientation dimension of family environment.

7.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to organization dimension of family environment.

8.   There is no significant difference inthe skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to control dimension of family environment.

METHODOLOGY

❖   **Method Used**

Descriptivesurvey method was used in the present study.

❖   **Sample of the Study**

The investigator has employed multistage stratified random sampling technique in the present study. The researcher obtained the list of Poly-Technic colleges and ITIs from Uttarakhand Board of Technical Education Roorkee. Then a list of Poly-Technic colleges and

ITIs of Kumaun region was made and then 10 poly-Technic colleges and 10 ITIs were selected randomly. On the other hand, the researcher obtained the list of secondary schools from Uttarakhand Board of Secondary Education and selected 20 secondary schools from the Kumaun region randomly. After this the sample of 300 technical and 300 non-technical students randomly.

❖ **Statistical Analysis**

Mean, S.D. and two-way analysis of variancehave been used for the statistical analysis.

RESULTS

Table 4.1(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Cohesion Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Cohesion	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Cohesion Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	10	324.70	19.57
		Average	61	323.63	24.08
		Low	229	324.22	31.37
	Non-Technical	High	12	337.16	23.93
		Average	26	332.84	20.71
		Low	262	334.93	49.89

The table no 4.1(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low cohesive environment in the family are 324.70, 323.63 and 324.22 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low cohesive environment have high level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low cohesive environment in the family are 337.16, 332.84 and 334.93 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low cohesive environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having high cohesive environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average cohesive environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.1(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Cohesion Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	16338.53	16338.53	10.442**
Cohesion	2	134.90	67.45	0.043
Interaction	2	55.67	27.83	0.018
Between Group	6	65152318.82	10858719.80	
Within Group	594	929390.17	1564.63	

*** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.1(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 10.442, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.043, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of cohesive environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.018, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and cohesive dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that*"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to cohesion dimension of family environment"* is partly rejected and mostlyaccepted.

Table 4.2(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Expressiveness Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Expressiveness	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Expressiveness Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	22	334.09	11.75
		Average	122	322.61	26.08
		Low	156	323.89	33.59
	Non-Technical	High	21	335.71	17.54
		Average	121	331.81	34.40
		Low	158	337.03	57.37

The table no 4.2(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low expressive environment in the family are 334.09, 322.61 and 323.89 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low expressive environment have high level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low expressive environment in the family are 335.71, 331.81 and 337.03 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low expressive environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having low expressive environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average expressive environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.2(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Expressiveness Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	17239.57	17239.57	11.068**
Expressiveness	2	2866.92	1433.46	0.920
Interaction	2	1488.70	744.35	0.478
Between Group	6	65156483.87	10859413.97	
Within Group	594	925225.12	1557.61	

*** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.2(b) shows that at df 1, 594 the first obtained F-value is 11.068, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value, at df2, 594, is 0.920, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of expressive environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value, at df2, 594, is 0.478, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and expressiveness dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that*"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to expressiveness dimension of family environment"* is partly rejected and mostlyaccepted.

Table 4.3(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Conflict Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Conflict	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Conflict Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	18	330.94	12.01
		Average	87	321.81	23.79
		Low	195	324.52	32.91
	Non-Technical	High	16	340.31	23.95
		Average	63	331.00	25.84
		Low	221	335.53	52.88

The table no 4.3(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low conflicting environment are 330.94, 321.81 and 324.52 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low conflicting environment have high level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average

and low conflicting environment in the family are 340.31, 331.00 and 335.53 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low conflicting environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having high conflicting environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average conflicting environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.3(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Conflict Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	16293.71	16293.71	10.444**
Conflict	2	2746.21	1373.10	0.880
Interaction	2	101.53	50.76	0.033
Between Group	6	65154975.99	10859162.66	
Within Group	594	926733.00	1560.15	

** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.

The table no 4.3(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 10.444, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.880, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of conflicting environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.033, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and conflict dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that***"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to conflict dimension of family environment"*** is partly rejected and mostly accepted.

Table 4.4(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Acceptance and Caring Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Acceptance and Caring	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Acceptance and Caring Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	17	326.94	12.28
		Average	53	321.58	24.85
		Low	230	324.50	31.52
	Non-Technical	High	12	342.08	17.13
		Average	60	332.76	29.13
		Low	228	335.00	51.95

The table no 4.4(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low acceptance and caring environment are 326.94, 321.58 and 324.50 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low acceptance and caring environment have high level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low acceptance and caring environment in the family are 342.08, 332.76 and 335.00 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low acceptance and caring environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having high acceptance and caring environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average acceptance and caring environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.4(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Acceptance and Caring Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	17619.05	17619.05	11.276**
Acceptance and Caring	2	1256.43	628.21	0.402
Interaction	2	146.36	73.18	0.047
Between Group	6	65153531.04	10858921.84	
Within Group	594	928177.95	1562.58	

*** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.4(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 11.276, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value, at df2, 594, is 0.402, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in

the skills of students having high, average and low level of acceptance and caring environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value, at df2,594, is 0.047, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect of stream and acceptance and caring dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that *"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to acceptance and caring dimension of family environment"* is partly rejected and mostly accepted.

Table 4.5(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Active Recreational Orientation Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Active Recreational Orientation	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Active Recreational Orientation Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	44	333.11	18.50
		Average	71	321.16	24.92
		Low	185	323.11	32.97
	Non-Technical	High	28	330.57	26.63
		Average	75	328.62	34.02
		Low	197	337.81	53.30

The table no 4.5(a) shows that the mean values of skills of technical students having high, average and low active recreational oriented environment are 333.11, 321.16 and 323.11 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low active recreational oriented environment have high level of skills. The mean values of skills of non-technical students having high, average and low active recreational oriented environment in the family are 330.57, 328.62 and 337.81 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low active recreational oriented environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having low active recreational oriented environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average active recreational oriented environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.5(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Active Recreational Orientation Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	17839.85	17839.85	11.517**
Active Recreational Orientation	2	4611.95	2305.97	1.489
Interaction	2	4896.55	2448.27	1.581
Between Group	6	65161636.7	10860272.7	
Within Group	594	920072.24	1548.94	

= Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.

The table no 4.5(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 11.517, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value, at df2, 594, is 1.489, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of active recreational oriented environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value, at df2, 594, is 1.581, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and active recreational orientation dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that*"**There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to active recreational orientation dimension of family environment**"* is partly rejected and mostly accepted.

Table 4.6(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Independence Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Independence	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Independence Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	33	325.72	15.40
		Average	58	328.27	20.22
		Low	209	322.71	33.26
	Non-Technical	High	15	336.73	35.66
		Average	60	332.06	30.90
		Low	225	335.45	51.41

The table no 4.13.6(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low independent environment are 325.72, 328.27 and 322.71 respectively. It shows that technical students having high, average and low independent environment have high level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low independent environment in the family are 336.73, 332.06 and 335.45 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low independent environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having high independent environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having low independent environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.6(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Independence Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	17392.26	17392.26	11.139**
Independence	2	242.75	121.37	0.078
Interaction	2	1855.10	927.55	0.594
Between Group	6	65154226.0	10859037.6	
Within Group	594	927482.90	1561.41	

*** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.6(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 11.139, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.078, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of independent environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.594, which has also not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and independence dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that only first F-value is found significant while second and third F-values are found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that***"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to independence dimension of family environment"*** is partly rejected and mostlyaccepted.

Table 4.7(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Organization Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Organization	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Organization Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	31	327.29	16.24
		Average	131	315.74	24.35
		Low	138	331.36	34.26
	Non-Technical	High	18	333.55	22.36
		Average	106	328.83	28.42
		Low	176	338.59	56.93

The table no 4.7(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low organized environment are 327.29, 315.74 and 331.36 respectively. It shows that technical students having high and low organized environment have high level of skills while the technical students having average organized environment have average level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low organized environment in the family are 333.55, 328.83 and 338.59 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low organized environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having low organized environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average organized environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.7(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Organization Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	13243.91	13243.91	5.678*
Organization	2	21821.36	10910.68	7.150**
Interaction	2	1275.74	637.87	0.418
Between Group	6	65175225.35	10862537.55	
Within Group	594	906483.64	1526.06	

** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance. ** = Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.7(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 5.678, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 7.150, which has also been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that there is a statistical significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of organized environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.418, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and organization dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that first and second F-values are found significant while third F-value is found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that*"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to organization dimension of family environment"* is mostly rejected and partlyaccepted.

Table 4.8(a) Comparison of the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Control Dimension of Family Environment

Variable	Stream	Levels of Control	N	Mean	S.D.
Skills in relation to Control Dimension of Family Environment	Technical	High	21	337.28	25.19
		Average	93	315.56	25.69
		Low	186	326.91	30.96
	Non-Technical	High	26	341.23	19.52
		Average	73	324.71	30.26
		Low	201	337.69	53.91

The table no 4.8(a) shows that the mean values ofskills of technical students having high, average and low controlled environment are 337.28, 315.56 and 326.91 respectively. It shows that technical students having high and low controlled environment have high level of skills while the technical students having average controlled environment have average level of skills. The mean values ofskills of non-technical students having high, average and low controlled environment in the family are 341.23, 324.71 and 337.69 respectively. It shows that non-technical students having high, average and low controlled environment have high level of skills. Non-technical students having high controlled environment have shown the highest level of skills while technical students having average controlled environment have exhibited the least level of skills.

Table 4.8(b) Analysis of Variance to Compare the Skills of Technical and Non-Technical Students in relation to Control Dimension of Family Environment

Source	df	SS	MS	F-value
Stream	1	14312.53	14312.53	9.368**
Control	2	21566.36	10783.18	7.058**
Interaction	2	508.23	254.11	0.166
Between Group	6	65174202.84	10862367.14	
Within Group	594	907506.15	1527.78	

*** = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance.*

The table no 4.8(b) shows that at df 1,594 the first obtained F-value is 9.368, which has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means thatthere is a statistical significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students.

The second obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 7.058, which hasbeen found significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that there is a statistical significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of controlled environment of the family.

The third obtained F-value,at df2,594, is 0.166, which has not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that combined effect ofstream and control dimension of family environment has not created a significant effect on the skills of students.

It may be concluded that first and second F-values are found significant while third F-value is found insignificant. Thus, the null hypothesis that***"There is no significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students in relation to control dimension of family environment"*** is mostly rejected and partlyaccepted.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the interpretation of the data, following conclusions can be presented as below:

1.   There has been found significant difference in the skills of technical and non-technical students. Non-technical students have been found to have higher skills as compare to technical students.

2.   No significant difference has been found in the skills of students having high, average and low level of cohesive, expressive, conflicting, acceptance and caring, active recreational oriented and independent family environment.

3.   There has been found a significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low level of organized family environment. Students who get low organized family environment have been found to have higher skills.

4.   There has been found a significant difference in the skills of students having high, average and low controlled family environment. Students who get high controlled family environment have been found to have higher skills.

5.   Interaction of stream and family environment has not affected the skills of students significantly.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Families have the first and most important influence on a child's social-emotional development. For the most part families naturally fulfil this responsibility by simply being responsive to their child's needs and providing a safe environment to grow and learn. It becomes the responsibility of the parents to develop the necessary skills for the overall

development of their children. Parents should act as good role models. Children learn by imitation, and parents who display these virtues or soft skills in their day-to-day behavior provide an environment where children automatically learn. They grow up to be caring, committed, efficient and effective human beings. When parents are unable to impart soft-skills to their children, the least they can do is not to underrate its importance. They can send the child to either a pure-play soft-skills trainer or somebody who imparts both life skills and soft skills. Besides, awareness should be created among parents for the skill development and tosupport their children and provide path to develop their skills.

REFERENCES

Cairney, T. (2000). *The Knowledge based Economy: Implications for Vocational Education and Training, Centre for Regional Research & Innovation University of Western Sydney. Accessed from http://trevorcairney.com/file/uploads/cgilib.22733.1.VETLit Rview.pdf*

Esposto, A. and Meagher, G.A. (2007). *The Future Demand for Employability Skills and the Implications for the VET System. Accessed from http://www.avetra.org.au/publications/12-Esposto.pdf*

Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). *Leadership Skills for a Changing World: Solving Complex Problems. The Leadership Quarterly, 11(1), Pp. 11–35.*

Zaccaro, S. J., Mumford, M. D., Connelly, M. S., Marks, M. A., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). *Assessment of Leader Problem-Solving Capabilities. The Leadership Quarterly, 11(1), Pp. 37–64.*

Cassidy, S. (2006). *Developing Employability Skill: Peer Assessment in Higher Education. Educ. Train. 48(7): Pp. 508-517.*

CBI & NUS (Confederation of British Industry and National Union of Students) (2011). *Working towards Your Future: Making the Most of Your Time in Higher Education. Diakses 24 Oktober 2015 dari http://www.cbi.org.uk/pdf/ cbi-nus-employability-report.pdf.*

Tome, E. (2007). *Employability, Skills and Training in Portugal (1988- 2000): Evidence from Official Data. J. Eur. Ind. Train. 31(5): Pp. 336-357.*