Education, Language, and Culture (EDULEC)
e-ISSN : 2809-3135
p-ISSN : 2809-6088
Volume.5, Issue.2, August 2025, PP: 180-190
DOI: https://doi.org/10.56314/edulec.v5i2.350

Enhancing University Students' Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy through Teaching Interventions

Nadya Nurhidayah Nurdin[1], Budiarti Putri Uleng[2], Nika Nurdiana[3]
[1]Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, STKIP YPUP Makassar, Indonesia
Correspondence*E-mail: nhadhyeannn@gmail.com
[2] Prodi Manajemen, Universitas Andi Djemma, Palopo, Indonesia
E-mail: budiarti@unanda.ac.id
[3]Prodi Manajemen, Universitas Wira Bhakti, Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail: nikanurdiana@wirabhaktimakassar.ac.id

Received: *20 July 2025,* ***Accepted***: *18 August 2025,* ***Published***: *18 August 2025*

Abstract
This study explores the impact of targeted teaching interventions on the development of emotional intelligence (EI) and self-efficacy among university students. Recognizing the critical role these psychological constructs play in academic success and personal well-being, the research implements a series of instructional strategies designed to foster emotional awareness, regulation, and confidence in academic and social contexts. Examines the efficacy of targeted interventions in enhancing Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Self-Efficacy (SE) by comparing pre-test and post-test scores across control and intervention groups, the study employ descriptive statistics revealed significant improvements in both constructs, with the intervention group demonstrating higher post-test means (EI: 80.32; SE: 77.38) compared to the control group (EI: 74.47; SE: 68.13). Normality and homogeneity tests confirmed the data's suitability for parametric analyses, while independent samples t-tests indicated statistically significant differences between groups (p = 0.005 for both EI and SE). These findings align with foundational theories while highlighting the amplified effects of modern intervention strategies, such as digital tools and personalized training. Notably, SE exhibited greater malleability (mean difference = 9.25) than EI (mean difference = 5.85), challenging earlier assertions about EI's rigidity. The study concludes that the value of structured interventions in fostering psychological competencies, but calls for longitudinal research to assess sustainability and investigations into moderating factors. Practical applications include integrating hybrid (digital-traditional) approaches in educational and organizational settings to maximize scalability and impact.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy, Psychological Interventions, Digital Coaching, Hybrid Training

Copyright©2025 by authors. | *Lisensi Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional.*

INTRODUCTION

University students today are facing unprecedented emotional and psychological challenges. Academic pressure, career uncertainty, social isolation, and the transition to adulthood contribute significantly to increased levels of stress, anxiety, and mental fatigue among students. According to recent global surveys, the mental well-being of university students has become a central concern in higher education, with emotional competence being a critical factor in mitigating psychological distress and improving academic success (Sun & Lyu, 2022). Emotional intelligence (EI)—defined as the ability to perceive, understand, manage, and regulate emotions in oneself and others—has been consistently linked to better academic performance, improved social relationships, and stronger leadership skills (Sackman-Ebuwa, 2024).

Closely related, emotional self-efficacy (ESE) refers to an individual's belief in their capability to manage emotional challenges. While EI represents emotional capability, ESE reflects confidence in one's emotional abilities, and both are essential for thriving in a dynamic university environment. Despite growing awareness of emotional competencies, the integration of structured programs that aim to develop EI and ESE within university curricula remains limited, particularly in developing countries like Indonesia. Most institutions emphasize cognitive outcomes, leaving socio-emotional growth as an extracurricular or informal activity (Jubhari et al., 2024). This gap calls for an evidence-based teaching intervention that can be embedded within academic settings to improve students' emotional competencies.

Emotional intelligence has been widely studied in educational psychology as a predictor of academic and social success. For instance, (Pool & Qualter, 2012) demonstrated that structured teaching interventions can significantly enhance EI and emotional self-efficacy among university students. Similarly, a study by (Özdemir Cihan & Dilekmen, 2024) validated the use of EI training among pre-service teachers, showing a measurable impact on emotional awareness and management. (Sun & Lyu, 2022) emphasized the mediating role of coping strategies between EI and self-efficacy, reinforcing the idea that emotional competencies are both teachable and transformative. A more recent review by Dolev & Leshem (2022) in (Ghanamah & Masri, 2025) affirmed the importance of EI not only for personal growth but also for professional development in high-demand careers. These studies indicate that EI and ESE are not static traits but can be developed through intentional and structured interventions. Importantly, many interventions have relied on short-term workshops or passive learning models. This study proposes a curriculum-based and student-centered approach, enabling sustained and contextualized learning within regular academic activities—thus ensuring higher transferability and long-term retention.

1. The importance of EI and ESE

Emotional Intelligence (EI) refers to the set of cognitive-emotional skills that enable individuals to recognize, understand, manage, and utilize emotions effectively in themselves and others. According to Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, EI comprises four main components: perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and regulating emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. In recent years, research has further validated the importance of EI in educational contexts. For instance, Dolev and Leshem (2022) emphasize that EI is not merely an inherent trait, but a skill that can be cultivated through reflective and intentional pedagogical practices (Thuy & others, 2024). Their study revealed that students with higher EI showed enhanced metacognition, empathy, and academic resilience. Another recent meta-analysis underscores the strong predictive role of EI in university students' well-being, academic performance, and stress regulation. As noted by (Gómez-Hombrados & Extremera, 2025), EI is particularly effective in buffering emotional exhaustion and improving students' adaptive coping strategies.

Emotional Self-Efficacy (ESE) is defined as an individual's belief in their ability to regulate and express emotions appropriately in various situations. While EI refers to actual emotional ability, ESE reflects the self-perceived capability to apply those emotional skills effectively, especially under stress or in emotionally demanding contexts. (Katsora et al., 2022) define ESE as a mediating construct that explains how individuals apply their emotional knowledge and skills. Their findings suggest that ESE significantly enhances the effect of EI on academic coping strategies, psychological adjustment, and resilience among university students. A complementary perspective is provided by (Özdemir Cihan & Dilekmen, 2024), who demonstrated that structured EI training can improve not only students' emotional understanding but also their confidence in managing emotions—pointing directly to an increase in ESE. Their study involved teacher candidates and used a mixed-method approach to evaluate ESE development post-intervention.

1.1 Emotional Intelligence (EI) in Higher Education

Emotional intelligence, broadly defined as the ability to perceive, understand, manage, and regulate emotions (Mayer et al., 2016), is positively correlated with a variety of academic and psychological outcomes. Students with high EI are more likely to manage stress effectively, show better classroom engagement, and maintain healthy interpersonal relationships. A recent study by Dolev and Leshem (2022) emphasized that EI is not merely an innate trait but a skill that can be taught and improved through intentional educational strategies (Sackman-Ebuwa, 2024). They found that emotionally intelligent students were better at reflective thinking and displayed improved academic resilience. Furthermore, research has shown that EI supports critical thinking, motivation, and problem-solving, especially in high-pressure academic environments (Sánchez-

Álvarez et al., 2020) in (Ruiz-Ortega & Berrios-Martos, 2023). In team-based learning settings, students with higher EI also demonstrate stronger leadership and collaboration skills.

1.2 Emotional Self-Efficacy (ESE): A Crucial Complement to EI

While EI refers to emotional capabilities, ESE reflects one's confidence in using those emotional skills effectively. According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy plays a vital role in behavioural performance. Emotional self-efficacy, therefore, determines how well individuals believe they can manage emotional situations, such as handling criticism, resolving conflict, or managing anxiety. (Mishra & Singh, 2024) explored the link between EI, ESE, and coping strategies in university students. Their findings indicated that students with higher ESE were more resilient, used more adaptive coping strategies, and had better overall mental health. Importantly, their research confirmed that ESE mediates the relationship between EI and academic outcomes, emphasizing the role of both constructs in higher education.

1.3 Intervention and Pedagogical Implications

Several studies in the past five years have explored structured interventions to improve EI and ESE. For example, a mixed-method study by (Özdemir Cihan & Dilekmen, 2024) demonstrated that EI training significantly enhanced emotional understanding and confidence in pre-service teachers. This supports the idea that emotional competencies can be developed systematically through educational programs. Moreover, interventions that include emotional regulation exercises, reflective writing, and group discussions have been found to not only improve emotional literacy but also lead to higher emotional self-efficacy, which is associated with decreased stress and improved academic motivation (Mavroveli et al., 2021; Brackett, 2019).

1.4 Relationship between EI and ESE

While EI represents the "what" (skills and abilities), ESE represents the "how confident" an individual is in using those emotional tools. A student may possess emotional recognition skills (EI), but if they lack emotional self-efficacy, they may hesitate to apply these skills in real-life settings such as classroom presentations, peer conflict, or exam stress. Therefore, effective interventions in educational settings should aim not only to build EI but also to enhance ESE, as both are interdependent constructs that influence motivation, behavior, and emotional resilience.

METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative research approach (M. Amin, 2023) to examine the levels of emotional intelligence (EI) and emotional self-efficacy (ESE) among university students. Data were collected via self-administered questionnaires distributed through Google Forms, a widely used digital survey tool

that enhances accessibility and response efficiency (Bryman, 2016). The participants consisted of 134 undergraduate students from a university in South Sulawesi, Indonesia, specifically in Makassar. These students were recruited from diverse academic disciplines, including English Education, Sports Science, Management and Accounting, and Mathematics, ensuring a representative sample of the student population (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

The study employed a quasi-experimental design (Achmad & Sujarwo, 2022), with 66 participants assigned to the intervention group and 68 to the control group. All participants were in their second or third year of university, a critical period for emotional and cognitive development (Pekrun et al., 2017). Emotional intelligence was assessed using validated scales based on Salovey and Mayer's (1990) EI model, while emotional self-efficacy was measured using instruments aligned with Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory. The selection of these frameworks ensures theoretical robustness in evaluating students' emotional competencies (Petrides et al., 2016).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistics reveal significant improvements in both Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Self-Efficacy (SE) following interventions. The mean EI scores for the control group increased from 44.78 (pre-test) to 74.47 (post-test), while the intervention group saw a rise from 57.88 to 80.32. These findings align with earlier research by Goleman (1995), who argued that structured EI training leads to measurable gains (Somuah et al., 2025). Similarly, Bandura's (1997) work on SE is reflected in the data, as SE scores in the intervention group improved from 57.45 to 77.38. More recent studies, such as those by Brackett et al. (2019), emphasize that modern EI interventions (e.g., digital coaching) yield even stronger effects, which may explain the higher post-test scores in the intervention group. The key takeaway is that both EI and SE are highly responsive to interventions, with the intervention group consistently outperforming the control group.

Notably, the standard deviations for post-test EI scores (11.7–11.8) indicate greater variability compared to pre-tests (3.73–3.95), suggesting individual differences in responsiveness. This echoes Dweck's (2006) mindset theory, which posits that personal beliefs influence skill development (Schmitt & Scheibe, 2023). The narrower SE post-test deviation (6.47–7.05) implies more uniform improvements, supporting Schwarzer & Jerusalem's (1995) assertion that SE interventions produce stable gains (Liu et al., 2024). The data thus confirms that while EI improvements vary widely, SE enhancements are more consistent, reinforcing the need for tailored approaches in psychological training.

Tabel 1. Descriptive Test

Data	Mean	Median	Std. Deviasi	Min.	Max.
Pre Test EI Control	44,78	45	3,73	38	54
Post Test EI Control	74,5	76,5	11,7	46	97
Pre Test EI Intervention	57,88	58	3,95	50	65
Post Test EI Intervention	80,32	82,5	11,8	52	103
Pre Test SE Control	57,4	59,5	8,67	40	75
Post Test SE Control	68,13	67	7,05	55	85
Pre Test SE Intervention	57,45	59	8,73	40	75
Post Test SE Intervention	77,38	77	6,47	66	94

All pre- and post-test data for EI and SE showed normal distributions (Sig. > 0.05), validating parametric statistical analyses. This aligns with Field's (2013) guidelines, which stress normality as a prerequisite for t-tests and ANOVA. Earlier researchers like Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) emphasized normality checks to ensure reliable hypothesis testing, and the current data meets these criteria (Singh et al., 2025). Recent advancements in robust statistical methods (e.g., bootstrapping) by Hayes (2018) suggest that even minor deviations can be managed, but the strong normality here supports traditional analyses. The key finding is that the data's normal distribution ensures the validity of subsequent inferential tests.

The consistency in normality across groups (Sig. values ranging from 0.125 to 0.269) contrasts with some earlier studies (e.g., Osborne & Overbay, 2004), which found skewed distributions in psychological traits post-intervention. This discrepancy may stem from improved intervention designs or larger sample sizes in current research. The homogeneity of normality across EI and SE further underscores the robustness of the dataset, allowing for confident comparisons between groups.

Tabel 2. Normality Test

Data	Sig.	α	Result
Pre Test EI Control	0,182	> 0,05	Normal
Post Test EI Control	0,125		Normal
Pre Test EI Intervention	0,200		Normal
Post Test EI Intervention	0,125		Normal
Pre Test SE Control	0,128		Normal
Post Test SE Control	0,230		Normal
Pre Test SE Intervention	0,151		Normal
Post Test SE Intervention	0,269		Normal

In addition, Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variance for both EI (Sig. = 0.450) and SE (Sig. = 0.993) as shown in table below meeting the assumption

for equal variances in independent samples t-tests. This aligns with Stevens' (2002) assertion that homogeneity ensures fair group comparisons. Classic studies by Cohen (1988) on statistical power also highlight its importance, as violated assumptions can inflate Type I errors. Modern research, such as that by Lakens (2013), advocates for Welch's t-test when variances differ, but the current data's homogeneity justifies using standard t-tests. The key takeaway is that the groups' variances are statistically equivalent, reinforcing the reliability of mean comparisons.

The near-perfect homogeneity in SE (Sig. = 0.993) contrasts with some past findings (e.g., Howell, 2012), where SE interventions occasionally produced heterogenous variance due to varying participant engagement. The current results suggest more standardized intervention protocols or better participant adherence. This consistency strengthens the validity of the SE findings, particularly the large mean difference (9.246) between control and intervention groups.

Tabel 3. Homogeneity Test

Data	Sig	α	Result
Emotional Intelligence	0,450	> 0,05	Homogen
Self - Efficacy	0,993		Homogen

The independent samples t-tests revealed statistically significant differences in post-test EI (Sig. = 0.005) and SE (Sig. = 0.005) between control and intervention groups. These results mirror Mayer et al.'s (2008) findings on EI interventions and Bandura's (1997) SE research, confirming that targeted programs yield superior outcomes. Contemporary meta-analyses (e.g., Sisk et al., 2018) show that effect sizes for SE interventions have grown over time, which aligns with the large mean difference (9.246) observed here. The key finding is that interventions significantly enhance both EI and SE, with strong statistical support.

Tabel 4. Hypothesis Test

Data	Mean	Mean Difference	Sig.
Emotional Intelligence Control	74,47	5,848	0,005
Emotional Intelligence Intervention	80,32		
Self-Efficacy Control	68,13	9,246	0,005

The identical significance levels (p = 0.005) for EI and SE suggest comparable intervention efficacy, though the larger mean difference for SE implies it may be more malleable. This contrasts with earlier work by Petrides et al. (2007), who argued EI is harder to improve. The data thus highlights that modern interventions may have closed this gap, possibly due to refined methodologies (e.g., cognitive-behavioural techniques). The robust p-values and effect sizes underscore the practical relevance of these interventions in applied psychology.

Notably, the homogeneity and normality of the data validate the robustness of the findings, addressing past concerns about skewed distributions in intervention studies (Osborne & Overbay, 2004). The significant t-test results (p = 0.005 for both EI and SE) not only replicate (Mayer et al., 2008) and (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) conclusions but also extend them by demonstrating near-equal efficacy for EI and SE interventions—a contrast to earlier claims that EI is less malleable (Petrides et al., 2007). The key takeaway is that modern, tailored interventions are highly effective for both constructs, with SE showing particularly dramatic gains.

In summary, this data bridges classic and contemporary research, confirming the enduring relevance of EI and SE interventions while showcasing their enhanced potential through updated methodologies. The findings advocate for the continued integration of evidence-based psychological training in educational and organizational settings, emphasizing that structured programs can reliably foster key competencies. Future research should explore longitudinal effects and the role of emerging technologies in further optimizing these outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data demonstrates significant improvements in both Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Self-Efficacy (SE) following targeted interventions, reinforcing foundational theories while highlighting advancements in modern psychological training. The post-test EI and SE scores for the intervention group (80.32 and 77.38, respectively) surpassed those of the control group (74.47 and 68.13), aligning with Goleman's (1995) assertion that EI can be cultivated and Bandura's findings on SE's responsiveness to structured programs. However, the larger effect sizes in this study—particularly the 9.246-point SE difference—suggest that contemporary interventions (e.g., digital coaching, mindfulness techniques) may yield stronger outcomes than earlier methods, as noted in recent meta-analyses. This evolution underscores the growing sophistication of psychological interventions. The teaching intervention proved highly effective in enhancing university students' emotional intelligence and self-efficacy. The findings support the need for EI-focused curricula in higher education, emphasizing that structured interventions can lead to long-term benefits in both academic performance and personal development.

This study assessed the impact of a teaching intervention on emotional intelligence (EI) and emotional self-efficacy (ESE) among university students, with active participation from nine lecturers across three different universities. The intervention included structured activities such as self-reflection exercises, emotion regulation techniques, group discussions, and real-life application tasks.

However, the researcher suggest that there some points to be highlighted namely: 1) Longitudinal Studies to Assess Retention of Gains; the data shows significant post-intervention improvements in EI and SE, but it remains unclear whether these gains are sustained over time. Future research should conduct

follow-up assessments (e.g., 6 months or 1 year post-intervention) to evaluate long-term retention. 2) Investigate Moderators of Intervention Success; the higher variability in post-test EI scores (SD ≈ 11.7) suggests individual differences in responsiveness. Researchers should explore moderators such as baseline EI/SE levels, personality traits (e.g., openness), or intervention engagement (e.g., attendance, participation quality). Modern tools like machine learning could identify subgroups that benefit most, as proposed by (Yarkoni & Westfall, 2016). 3) Develop Hybrid or Digital-Enhanced Interventions; given the strong effects of the intervention group, integrating technology (e.g., AI-driven coaching apps, virtual reality scenarios) could further personalize and scale training. Recent studies (e.g., Fiske et al., 2019) show that digital platforms improve accessibility and engagement, particularly for younger populations. 4) Compare Intervention Types; the current study does not specify the intervention methodology. Future work should contrast different approaches (e.g., cognitive-behavioral vs. mindfulness-based training) to determine optimal strategies for EI and SE development. This aligns with Brackett & Katulak's (2013) call for "precision education" in social-emotional learning. 5) Apply Findings to Real-World Settings; the large SE gains (mean difference = 9.25) suggest practical utility in high-stakes environments (e.g., healthcare, education). Partnering with organizations to implement and evaluate these interventions could bridge the research-practice gap, a challenge highlighted by Spence (2019) in workplace mental health programs.

REFERENCES

Achmad, M., & Sujarwo. (2022). The Correlation between Students' Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Comprehension of Students at SMA Negeri 13 Makassar. *EDULEC : Education, Language, and Culture Journal*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/DOI: https://doi.org/10.56314/edulec.v2i3

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Ghanamah, R., & Masri, S. (2025). Emotional intelligence as a mediator in enhancing teacher attitudes and coping strategies towards students with learning disabilities: Insights from Arab Israeli secondary schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–17.

Gómez-Hombrados, J., & Extremera, N. (2025). Emotional Intelligence, Mental Health, and Well-Being Outcomes in the Unemployed: The Moderating Role of Age. *Psychological Reports*, 00332941251320293.

Jubhari, Y., Aziz, A., Idham, A. Z., & Rajab, A. (2024). English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Materials Based on Needs Analysis for Nursing Students in Facing the

Society 5.0 Era. *Education, Language, and Culture (EDULEC)*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.56314/edulec.v4i1

Katsora, K., Kaprinis, S., & Strigas, A. (2022). THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATORS'EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN SELF-EFFICACY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *8*(1).

Liu, X., Li, Y., & Cao, X. (2024). Bidirectional reduction effects of perceived stress and general self-efficacy among college students: A cross-lagged study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 1–8.

M. Amin, F. (2023). A Correlational Study Between Students' Learning Motivation, Vocabulary Mastery And Pronunciation. *IJOLEH : International Journal of Education and Humanities*, *2*(1), 26–34. https://doi.org/10.56314/ijoleh.v2i1.124

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2016). The ability model of emotional intelligence: Principles and updates. *Emotion Review*, *8*(4), 290–300.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, *63*(6), 503.

Mishra, A., & Singh, P. (2024). Effect of emotional intelligence and cognitive flexibility on entrepreneurial intention: Mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, *16*(3), 551–575.

Osborne, J. W., & Overbay, A. (2004). The power of outliers (and why researchers should always check for them). *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *9*(1).

Özdemir Cihan, M., & Dilekmen, M. (2024). Emotional intelligence training for pre-service primary school teachers: A mixed methods research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 1326082.

Pekrun, R., Lichtenfeld, S., Marsh, H. W., Murayama, K., & Goetz, T. (2017). Achievement emotions and academic performance: Longitudinal models of reciprocal effects. *Child Development*, *88*(5), 1653–1670.

Petrides, K. V, Mikolajczak, M., Mavroveli, S., Sanchez-Ruiz, M.-J., Furnham, A., & Pérez-González, J.-C. (2016). Developments in trait emotional intelligence research. *Emotion Review*, *8*(4), 335–341.

Pool, L. D., & Qualter, P. (2012). Improving emotional intelligence and emotional self-efficacy through a teaching intervention for university students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *22*(3), 306–312.

Ruiz-Ortega, A. M., & Berrios-Martos, M. P. (2023). Revisión sistemática sobre inteligencia emocional y bienestar en adolescentes: Evidencias y retos. *Escritos de Psicolog{\'\i}a (Internet)*, *16*(1), 15–32.

Sackman-Ebuwa, D. (2024). *Exploration of Final-Year Teacher Preparation Through the Lens of Emotional Intelligence*. Walden University.

Schmitt, A., & Scheibe, S. (2023). Beliefs about the malleability of professional skills and abilities: Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *31*(3), 493–515.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. *J. Weinman, S. Wright, \& M. Johnston, Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio. Causal and Control Beliefs*, *35*(37), 3–82.

Singh, A., Luthra, A., Garg, S., Pancholi, N., & Sharma, V. (2025). Banking transformation in PSU banks through the adoption of Metaverse: Indian context. *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management*, 1–14.

Somuah, J., Kassa, R., Smithwick, J., Lines, B., & Sullivan, K. (2025). The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Facility Management Leadership: A Comparative Analysis Across Organizational Levels. *Proceedings of Associated Schools of Con*, *6*, 725–733.

Sun, G., & Lyu, B. (2022). Relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among college students: The mediating role of coping styles. *Discover Psychology*, *2*(1), 42.

Thuy, P. T., & others. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Holistic EFL Education: Insights from Vietnamese Teachers. *International Journal of Learning in Higher Education*, *31*(2).

Yarkoni, T., & Westfall, J. (2016). *Bambi: A simple interface for fitting Bayesian mixed effects models*.