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Abstract

This study aimed to empirically examine the work readiness model developed in this study by using a variable approach to training, apprenticeship, self efficacy and locus of control. Data on training variables, apprenticeship, self efficacy, locus of control, and work readiness were obtained through interviews using a questionnaire conducted to the final semester students of the Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business of Walisongo State Islamic University (UIN Walisongo Semarang). The sample selection was conducted using a purposive random sampling approach in order to obtain a total of 112 respondents. Testing the research model was done by using SEM as an approach to the analysis technique. The test results showed that training and apprenticeship were proven to be able to explain self-efficacy and locus of control. The results of this study also showed that training, apprenticeship, self efficacy and locus of control were appropriate variables to explain variations in work readiness. Square Multiple Correlation value on work readiness variable was 33.5%. Based on the findings of this study, the suggestion for future research is to develop a research model by testing the self-concept variables and fear of failure to work readiness.
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INTRODUCTION

Chaplin (2006) conceptualized work readiness as a condition that reflects the development of maturity or the level of maturity that enables a person to practice something. At present, hard skills are not enough to express themselves as having work readiness to enter the workforce. The knowledge gained from formal education especially vocational education has not been able to provide sufficient guarantees for graduates to be ready to enter the world of work and get a job (Sulistyarini, 2012). Sulistiyarini further stated that the difficulty of vocational education graduates to penetrate job vacancies was more due to the low readiness of vocational education graduates or the lack of compatibility between graduates’ skills and the needs of the world of work / industry. Readiness is a pretty good ability physically and mentally. Physical readiness means sufficient energy and good health, while mental readiness, has sufficient interest and motivation to carry out an activity (Dalyono, 2005). Work is defined as the activity of doing something to earn a living or livelihood (Powerswardarminta, 2003). Based on this opinion, it can be concluded that work readiness is the overall condition of the individual which includes physical, mental and experience maturity as well as the willingness and ability to carry out a job or activity in accordance with their area of expertise.

According to The Ministry of National Development Planning or National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) statistics that the percentage of unemployment in 2015 increased by 6.18%. This shows that around 7.56 million productive population have not found employment and placement in accordance with their competencies. Based on sources from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) 2015, it states that the productive population who have worked with elementary school education were 50.83 million, junior high school 20.70 million, high school (SMA) 19.81 million, Vocational High School (SMK) 10.84 million, Diploma 3.08 million and University 9.56 million. This illustrates that the productive population with elementary school education is increasing compared to tertiary education. This proves that the low productive population with higher education in Indonesia is still low.

Research on work readiness is not a new thing. Studies related to variables that explain work readiness have been carried out. Some previous studies found that high or low job readiness can be explained by several factors. Stevani & Yulhendri (2014), Noviana (2014), and Sijabat (2018) in their study showed that problems related to work readiness could be explained by self-efficacy factors. But different in studies conducted by Widyowati & Hadjam (2014) where self-efficacy was not able to explain the rise or fall of self-efficacy. Another study conducted by Muyasaroh (2013) and Sijabat (2018) showed that locus of control was also a factor that could explain work readiness. However, Widyowati & Hadjam (2014) study stated that locus of control was not an explanation of the work readiness variable. The findings of empirical phenomena regarding the lack of work readiness and the results of previous studies related to explanatory factors for work readiness that have not been conclusive are the main attractions that encourage re-study of work readiness. Meanwhile, according to Ndraha (in Anggraeni, 2013) work readiness is an assessment of behavior carried out by students who are simulated in school to prepare themselves at work. According to Ndraha (in Anggraeni, 2013) work readiness will be formed if a combination of maturity levels, experiences needed and matching mental and emotional conditions have been achieved. This article develops several hypotheses including.

First, effect of training on self efficacy. A low level of formal education can be an indication of the low quality of workers in Indonesia. One of these gaps can be overcome by providing training to prospective workers, namely prospective graduates. The training provided is still very theoretical. The material given during the training is not much different
from that given during lectures. The material is still far from the practical side or the implementation of the material in the world of work. For example investment training. In the training 80% of the material presented was theoretical. Students have not been invited to be able to practice directly how to invest. In fact, training can be a program that bridges prospective workers with the real world of work or careers (Newman & Newman, in Hanifan & Tarmidi, 2012). This picture of the actual world of work will increase the confidence of prospective workers. The training obtained by prospective workers will further strengthen the self-efficacy of the prospective workforce itself. This is so because through the training capabilities / skills are increasingly strengthened so that prospective workers will be more confident that the prospective workforce will have confidence in their own abilities (Pratama & Suharnan, 2014). A study conducted by Lavasani et al (2011) on training and self-efficacy variables showed that statistically providing training could affect self-efficacy.

Second, effect of training on locus of control. Internal locus of control is one of the internal factors that supports the career maturity of prospective workers. Locus of control shows the depth of thinking of prospective workers about the actions they do with the results they will get (Pratama & Suharnan, 2014). Training allows prospective workers to obtain the ability or skills that can strengthen the desires / expectations of their careers so that the training of locus of control owned by prospective workers will be stronger. Through training, abilities / skills that are not yet owned or even possessed by prospective workers will be increasingly strengthened so that in the end the prospective workforce can empower the potential possessed by him in order to obtain the best results. The effect of training on locus of control has been investigated by Smith, Ronald E (1989) whose results indicated that mastery of training skills (coping skill training) proved to have a significant positive effect on locus of control.

Third, effect of apprenticeship on self-efficacy. Problems regarding the imbalance between supply and demand of labor often lead to labor force buildup. This next problem regarding prospective workers occurs when faced with the fact that they still have to compete closely with prospective workers who have not been absorbed or other workers have experience in the workforce, causing anxiety in prospective workers (Trisnawati, 2013). Industrial work practices become a program of activities that bridges prospective workers with a description of the need for skills in the world of work. Industrial work practices that have been undertaken by prospective workers will be able to provide confidence to prospective workers that their abilities / skills can be used as capital to be able to work. Industrial work practices obtained by prospective workers will increase self-confidence, eliminate anxiety, fear and failure of prospective workers in doing work (Conroy, 2002). Apprenticeship is often referred to industrial work practices. Industrial work practices are knowledge or skills that are known and mastered by prospective workers after implementing work practices in the business world or in the industrial world for a certain period of time. The results of studies conducted by Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) on the variables of industrial work practices and self efficacy showed that industrial work practices proved to have a significant positive effect on self-efficacy.

Fourth, effect of apprenticeship on locus of control. Locus of control refers to the degree to which an individual sees events in his life as a consequence of his actions that can be controlled or as something that is not related to his behavior so that it cannot be controlled. Industrial work practices are expected to be a means of matching and linking (Link and Match) between the world of education and the world of industry in terms of workforce training and competent human resource improvement (Mashudi & Widjaja, 2016). Apprenticeship or industrial work practices carried out by prospective workers provide a real picture of the world of work. Real picture obtained by prospective workers allows pros-
pective workers to measure their abilities / skills with the real abilities / skills needed by the world of work. Thus, prospective workers will be able to find out whether their abilities / skills will be able to solve work problems. This of course will strengthen the locus of control of prospective workers (Pratama & Suharnan, 2014).

Fifth, effect of training on work readiness. Herminanto (in Widodo, 2009) explained that work readiness can be interpreted as an effort to have skills that are in accordance with the needs of the community so that prospective workers can be absorbed by the business / work world. Programmed work training makes prospective workers have: a high work ethic, discipline, responsibility, independence, self-confidence, the ability to communicate and cooperate, and competencies in accordance with their fields. Job training is a means to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes, as well as the ability to communicate and cooperate. The accumulation of knowledge, skills, independence, and the ability to communicate and work together is a modality for the ability to solve problems (Hidayanto, 2002). The ability to solve problems is very much needed in entering the workforce.

Sixth, effect of apprenticeship on work readiness. Studies on the effect of industrial work practices on work readiness have been conducted by several previous researchers. In a study conducted by Santi, Maureen Evita (2013) showed that industrial work practices proved not to have a significant positive effect on work readiness. However, this is not the case with the results of other studies. Studies conducted by Noviana (2014) and Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) actually showed that industrial work practices programs proved to have a significant positive effect on work readiness.

Seventh, effect of self-efficacy on work readiness. Entering the world of work requires both physical and mental readiness. In addition to the knowledge and skills and experience that prospective workers have, the mental readiness of prospective workers is needed. Bandura (1997) in social cognitive theory suggested that self efficacy is one’s belief about the ability he has in achieving the goals to be achieved. Self-efficacy affects one’s internal conditions in work readiness, so having high self-efficacy can increase the confidence of prospective workers to face intense competition in the business and industrial world. Self efficacy can be seen from three dimensions, namely level / magnitude, strength, and generality. Stevani & Yulhendri’s study (2014) on these two variables showed that self efficacy had a significant positive effect on work readiness. Likewise, the studies of Trisnawati, Dhita Ayu (2013), Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) and Noviana (2014) also showed that self efficacy proved to have a significant positive effect on fears of job seekers’ failure. However, studies conducted by Widyowati & Hadjam (2014) showed different results where self efficacy had a significant positive effect on pension preparation. Eighth, effect of locus of control on work readiness. This locus of control explains that to what extent a person believes that he is the controller of his own destiny or external factors that exist outside of him that can determine his destiny. Differences in locus of control in a person can actually cause other aspects of personality. Adolescents who have internal locus of control have a belief that they can manage and direct their lives and are responsible for the achievement of whatever reinforcement they receive (Aji, 2010). The effect of these two variables has been studied by several previous researchers. In the Muyasaroh study, Ngadiman & Hamidi (2013) showed that the Locus of control had a significant positive effect on work readiness. Likewise, the study of Pratama, Beny Dwi & Suharnan (2014) which also showed that Internal locus of control had a significant positive effect on work readiness. Likewise, the study of Pratama, Beny Dwi & Suharnan (2014) which also showed that Internal locus of control had a significant positive effect on career maturity. However, the study of Widyowati & Hadjam (2014) showed different results where the locus of control had no significant positive effect on pension preparation.
METHODS

This study developed indicators of research variables, variables studied in this study included training, apprenticeship, self-efficacy, locus of control and work readiness variables. The indicators developed for the measurement of research variables are as follows: First, the measurement of training variables was carried out by using three indicators, developed from Gomes, Faustino Cardoso (2000) consisting of participant reactions (X1), learning (X2), and results (X3). Second, apprenticeship variable was measured by using four indicators developed from Rizali et al (2009) which included compatibility (X4), suitability (X5), harmony (X6), and equivalence (X7).

Third, the self-efficacy variable was measured by using indicators using five indicators adopted from studies conducted by Hamahack in Grace (2004) and Pratama & Suharnan (2014) consisting of confidence in his ability to overcome problems (X8), confidence in equality with people others (X9), acceptance of shameless praise (X10), awareness of feelings of desire and behavior that are not entirely agreed upon by the community (X11), belief in the ability to improve themselves because he feels able to express aspects of personality he does not like and tries to change them (X12). Fourth, the locus of control variable was measured using seven indicators adopted from studies conducted by Rotter in Wiriani (2011), and Pratama & Suharnan (2014) which includes everything that an individual achieves as a result of his own efforts (X13), confident of his own abilities (X14), individual success due to hard work (X15), everything that is obtained by individuals is not due to luck (X16), the ability of individuals to determine events in life (X17), individual life is determined by their actions (X18), and failures experienced by individuals due to actions itself (X19). Fifth, the measurement of work readiness variables was measured by using five indicators adopted from the study of Anggraeni (2013) and Dinata (2013) which include having logical considerations (X20), having the ability to work together (X21), having a critical attitude (X22), being responsible (X23), and ambitious to go forward (X24).

The population used in this study was the final semester students of the Faculty of Economics and Islamic Business of UIN Walisongo Semarang. Sampling done by using a purposive random sampling approach with the criteria of the respondents was the final semester students of the Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business of UIN Walisongo Semarang so that a sample of 112 respondents was obtained. Research data covering training variables, industrial work practices, competence, self efficacy, locus of control, and work readiness were obtained through interviews using a questionnaire with alternative answers provided by researchers in the range of 1 to 10. The analysis technique used in this study was Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) which was operated through the AMOS program.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation of Reliability and Variance Extract

Reliability test shows the extent to which a measuring instrument can provide relatively the same results if it is measured again on the same object. Minimum reliability value and dimension / indicator forming latent variable that can be accepted is equal to 0.70. While the measurement of Variance Extract shows the amount of variance of the indicator extracted by the construct / latent variable developed. The acceptable Variance Extract value is at least 0.50. The results of the Reliability and Variance Extract calculations can be seen in Table 1.

Based on the calculation results shown in Table 1. it is known that all latent variables can meet the reliability and Variance Extract criteria. So it can be concluded that the indicators observed can reflect the analyzed factors and are able to reflect the existence of a unidimensionality.
Table 1. Reliability and Variance Extract

| Variable         | Std. Load | Std.Load2 | 1-Std.Load2 | Reliability | Variance |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| Training         |           |           |             |              |          |
| X1               | 0.825     | 0.681     | 0.031       | 0.986        | 0.958    |
| X2               | 0.830     | 0.689     | 0.029       |              |          |
| X3               | 0.826     | 0.682     | 0.030       |              |          |
|                  | 2.481     | 2.052     | 0.090       |              |          |
| X4               | 0.797     | 0.635     | 0.041       | 0.912        | 0.912    |
| X5               | 0.742     | 0.551     | 0.067       |              |          |
| Apprenticeship  |           |           |             |              |          |
| X6               | 0.733     | 0.537     | 0.071       |              |          |
| X7               | 0.763     | 0.582     | 0.056       |              |          |
|                  | 3.035     | 2.305     | 0.235       |              |          |
| X9               | 0.804     | 0.646     | 0.038       | 0.982        | 0.933    |
| X10              | 0.748     | 0.560     | 0.064       |              |          |
| Self Efficacy    |           |           |             |              |          |
| X11              | 0.818     | 0.669     | 0.033       |              |          |
| X12              | 0.789     | 0.623     | 0.045       |              |          |
|                  | 3.159     | 2.498     | 0.180       |              |          |
| X13              | 0.704     | 0.496     | 0.088       | 0.969        | 0.816    |
| X14              | 0.648     | 0.420     | 0.124       |              |          |
| X15              | 0.677     | 0.458     | 0.104       |              |          |
| Locus of Control |           |           |             |              |          |
| X16              | 0.724     | 0.524     | 0.076       |              |          |
| X17              | 0.641     | 0.411     | 0.129       |              |          |
| X18              | 0.632     | 0.399     | 0.135       |              |          |
| X19              | 0.728     | 0.530     | 0.074       |              |          |
|                  | 4.754     | 3.238     | 0.730       |              |          |
| X20              | 0.775     | 0.601     | 0.051       | 0.983        | 0.921    |
| X21              | 0.758     | 0.575     | 0.059       |              |          |
| Work Readiness   |           |           |             |              |          |
| X22              | 0.800     | 0.640     | 0.040       |              |          |
| X23              | 0.714     | 0.510     | 0.082       |              |          |
| X24              | 0.831     | 0.691     | 0.029       |              |          |
|                  | 3.878     | 3.016     | 0.260       |              |          |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2019)
Full Model Analysis
In the full model testing, two stages of testing was carried out, namely the suitability of the model and the test for the significance of causality through the regression coefficient test (Ferdinand, 2006). The results of testing in the two stages are described in Figure 1.

Based on the results presented in Table 2, it can be seen that the value of Chi Square = 222,947 with probability = 0.451 and index values which include CMIN / DF, TLI, CFI, and RMSEA are included in the good category while the GFI and AGFI indexes are included in the marginal category then it

Figure 1. The Research Model Test
Source: Processed Primary Data (2019)

Model Conformity Test – Goodness of Fit Test
Table 2. The Feasibility Test of the Research Model

| Goodness of Fit Indeks   | Cut off Value | Result      | Model Evaluation |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| Chi-Square (df = 221)   | $\leq 256.680$ | 222.947     | Good             |
| Probability             | $\geq 0.05$   | 0.451       | Good             |
| CMIN/DF                 | $\leq 2.00$   | 1.009       | Good             |
| GFI                     | $0.90 \leq \text{GFI} < 1.00$ | 0.854 | Marginal         |
| AGFI                    | $0.90 \leq \text{AGFI} < 1.00$ | 0.817 | Marginal         |
| TLI                     | $0.95 \leq \text{TLI} < 1.00$ | 0.998 | Good             |
| CFI                     | $0.95 \leq \text{CFI} < 1.00$ | 0.998 | Good             |
| RMSEA                   | $\leq 0.08$   | 0.009       | Good             |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2019)
can be concluded that there is no difference between the sample covariance matrix and the estimated population covariance matrix or in other words the model is fit.

**Causality Test**

After evaluating the assumptions that must be met in using the analysis with SEM, then hypothesis testing was conducted. Testing of the four hypotheses proposed in this study was carried out by analyzing the value of the Critical Ratio (CR).

**Effect of Training on Self Efficacy**

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of training on self efficacy showed a CR value of 2.245 with a probability of 0.025. Because of the CR value (2.245) > 2.00 and the probability value (0.025) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the training variable had a significant positive effect on self efficacy. This finding showed that if respondents are given training it will increase self efficacy. The results are in line with the results of a study conducted by Lavasani et al (2011) where the provision of training statistically proved to increase self efficacy. The quality of workers in Indonesia can be an indication of the low quality of formal education in Indonesia. These conditions can be overcome through providing training to prospective workers or prospective graduates. According to Newman & Newman, in Hani-fan & Tarmidi (2012) training provided to prospective workers is expected to be a bridge between prospective workers with actual work conditions. A good understanding of the world of work will increase the confidence of prospective workers. Prospective workers will get self-concept reinforcement through the training they get. This is so because through the training, capabilities / skills are increasingly strengthened so that prospective workers will be more confident in their own abilities (Pratama & Suharnan, 2014).

**Effect of Training on Locus of Control**

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of training on the locus of control showed a CR value of 3.123 with a probability of 0.002. Because of the CR value (3.123) > 2.00 and the probability value (0.000) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the training variable proved to have a significant positive effect on the locus of control. This finding shows that if respondents are given training it will increase the locus of control. This effect has also been proven in Smith’s study (1989) whose results indicated that mastery of training skills (coping skill training) has proven to have a significant positive effect on locus of control. Locus of control is a concept related to the ability to think deeply about what is done and the results obtained (Pratama & Suharnan, 2014). Provision of abilities and skills can be ob-

**Table 3. Hypothesis test**

| Variable       | Parameter | Estimate | S.E.  | C.R. | P       |
|----------------|-----------|----------|-------|------|---------|
| Self_Efficacy  | Training  | 0.202    | 0.074 | 2.245| 0.025   |
| Self_Efficacy  | Apprenticeship | 0.685 | 0.118 | 6.212| ***     |
| LOC            | Apprenticeship | 0.819 | 0.129 | 6.565| ***     |
| LOC            | Training    | 0.258    | 0.065 | 3.123| 0.002   |
| Work_Readiness | Self_Efficacy | 0.396 | 0.125 | 2.272| 0.023   |
| Work_Readiness | LOC       | 0.734    | 0.245 | 2.224| 0.026   |
| Work_Readiness | Training    | 0.621    | 0.092 | 3.967| ***     |
| Work_Readiness | Apprenticeship | 0.938 | 0.262 | 2.756| 0.006   |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2019)
tained from training so that it will strengthen the belief that wishes / expectations will be fulfilled.

Effect of Apprenticeship on Self Efficacy

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of apprenticeship on self efficacy showed a CR value of 6.212 with a probability of 0.000. Because of the CR value (6.212) > 2.00 and the probability value (0.000) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the apprenticeship variable had a significant positive effect on self efficacy. This finding shows that if respondents are given apprenticeship activities it will increase self efficacy. The results of this study are in line with the results of studies conducted by Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) on the apprenticeship variable and self efficacy which showed that apprenticeship proved to have a significant positive effect on self-efficacy.

Effect of Apprenticeship on Locus of Control

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of apprenticeship on the locus of control showed a CR value of 6,565 with a probability of 0,000. Because of the CR value (6,565) > 2.00 and the probability value (0,000) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the apprenticeship variable proved to have a significant positive effect on the locus of control. This finding shows that if respondents are given apprenticeship activities, it will increase locus of control. Pratama & Suharnan Study (2014) stated that through apprenticeship, prospective workers will be able to find out whether their abilities / skills will be able to solve work problems. This of course will strengthen the locus of control of prospective workers.

Effect of Training on Work Readiness

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of training on work readiness showed a CR value of 3,967 with a probability of 0,000. Because of the CR value (3,967) > 2.00 and the probability value (0,000) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the training variables proved to have a significant positive effect on work readiness. This finding shows that if the respondent is given training activities, it will increase the work readiness of the respondent. The results of this study provide an empirical justification for Hidayanto’s (2002) statement that work training is a means of developing knowledge, skills and attitudes, as well as the ability to communicate and cooperate. The accumulation of knowledge, skills, independence, and the ability to communicate and cooperate is a modality for the ability to solve problems.

Effect of Apprenticeship on Work Readiness

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of apprenticeship on work readiness showed a CR value of 2.756 with a probability of 0.006. Because of the CR value (2.756) > 2.00 and the probability value (0.006) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the apprenticeship variable had a significant positive effect on work readiness. This finding shows that if the respondent is given apprenticeship activities, it will increase the work readiness of the respondent. Studies on the effect of apprenticeship on work readiness have been carried out by several previous researchers. In a study conducted by Noviana (2014) and Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) which also showed that the apprenticeship program proved to have a significant positive effect on work readiness.

Effect of Self-efficacy on Work Readiness

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of self efficacy on work readiness showed a CR value of 2,272 with a probability of 0.023. Because of the CR value (2,272) > 2.00 and the probability value (0.023) < 0.05, it can be concluded that the self efficacy variable proved to have a significant positive effect on work readiness. This finding shows that if the respondent has strong self efficacy, it will increase the work readiness of the respondent. Studies of Stevani & Yulhendri (2014), Trisnawati (2013), Eliyani, Yanto & Sunarto (2016) and Noviana (2014), (Sijabat, 2018) on these two variables indicated that self efficacy had a significant positive effect on work readiness.
ness.

Effect of Locus of Control on Work Readiness

The estimated parameter for testing the effect of the locus of control on work readiness showed a CR value of 2.224 with a probability of 0.026. Because of the CR value (2.224)> 2.00 and the probability value (0.026) <0.05, it can be concluded that the locus of control variable had a significant positive effect on work readiness. This finding shows that if the respondent has a strong locus of control, it will increase the work readiness of the respondent. In the Muyasaroh study, Hana Binti., Ngadiman & Nurhasan Hamidi (2013), (Sijabat, 2018) showed that the Locus of control had a significant positive effect on work readiness. Likewise, the Primary study, Beny Dwi & Suharnan (2014) also showed the same results.

CONCLUSION

This study develops a research model that tests changes that explain work readiness. The test results showed that work readiness was built from self-efficacy and locus of control. The results of this study also showed that self-efficacy and locus of control were formed from training and apprenticeship factors. Based on the results of the test of interdependence between variables it can be seen that apprenticeship was the variable that had the greatest contribution in explaining self-efficacy, locus of control and work readiness. That is, to improve self-efficacy, locus of control and work readiness, it needs to be focused on the apprenticeship factor. The study on "The Pathway of Strengthening Work Readiness (Study of Graduates of the Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business of University of UIN Walisongo Semarang)" departed from research problems regarding the low absorption of graduates in the world of work as well as the differences in the results of previous studies regarding the factors which can explain work readiness. These problems encouraged this study to develop a work readiness model using four variables, namely training, apprenticeship, self-efficacy and locus of control. Therefore, the managerial implications proposed in this study to improve work readiness will be related to the variables of self-efficacy and locus of control through training and apprenticeship.

The managerial implications proposed were, first, the findings obtained related to apprenticeship were the accepted industrial work practices that are often incompatible with the competencies possessed, the industrial workplace was appropriate but the placement in the division did not match my competencies, the industrial work practices was not in accordance with the competencies that I already had, material with industrial work practices that were not harmonious, and material with industrial work practices that were not commensurate. In addition, there were cases of students searching for companies to be able to do apprenticeship so that the workplace or company used for practice often was not in accordance with competencies. Therefore, in the future the institution needs to facilitate the participants to get a company as an internship that is in accordance with their competencies.

Secondly, the findings obtained by this study related to the training included the training material was not too special, I had received training materials in other places, the material submitted was not in line with current developments or conditions, the abilities that I had gained did not improve, my abilities were still like when I entered. I still did not feel expert, my expertise was still not very improved, I could not follow because it was made into one class with experts, the material presented was too little, and the material delivered was less detailed. Therefore, before the training begins, it would be better if the trainees were given a replacement test so that the abilities of the participants for each class were homogeneous. In addition, the training provided at BBPLK Semarang has not separated hard skills and soft skills and more or even all the training provided is often hard skill. From these findings, institutions need to categorize
trainings that are hard skills and soft skills and balance their availability according to the demands of the world of work.
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