



Journal Homepage: - [www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/11015

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/11015>



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### SOCIAL AWARENESS IN COMMUNICATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN VIETNAM

Phan Trong Ngo and Le Minh Nguyet

Education Ha Noi National University of Education, Vietnam.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 18 March 2020

Final Accepted: 20 April 2020

Published: May 2020

##### Key words:-

Social Intelligence, Social Awareness in Communication, Communication Style, Communication Trends and Temperament in Communication, Secondary School Students

#### Abstract

The article describes the research results of students' social awareness in communication - An important component of personal social intelligence. The study has identified the social awareness levels of 1128 students from 6 grade to 9 grade of 10 secondary schools in 5 provinces/cities in Vietnam. It also identifies models that predict the impact of communication style factors, communication trends, and students' temperament as well as communication learning from others on social awareness of students. Predictive models discovered in the study are useful suggestions for parents and teachers and students in improving the quality of establishing positive social relationships in the communication of students, through improving their social understanding.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2020,. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction:-

##### Data analysis and statistical methods:

The level of social awareness in students' communication and related factors is determined by two parameters: (i) Average score, the average deviation of the score, lowest score, highest score and average score (on a 5-point scale); (ii) The percentage of awareness level, communication style, communication trends, temperament, and communication learning of the sample groups are determined by the average of the points and the average deviation of the points of each sample group. Results are processed using SPSS 20.0 software.

The difference in the level of social awareness as well as the level of expression of the factors tested by independent T-test (binary) and Anova test (multivariate); The used regression model is linear regression because the output variable (student's social awareness level) has a normal distribution.

#### Research Results (Results):-

##### Describe the results of social awareness in student communication:

1.1.1. Social awareness in communication and students' styles, trends, temperament, and communication learning

Table 1 describes the level of social awareness in communication; communication style and trend; temperament and communication learning of students and factors that affect students' social awareness.

The average of common score of social awareness of the whole group of surveyed students was 3.47 / 5 points, standard deviation 0.53; Median score: 3.48 points. Thus, the social awareness in the communication of students is above average and the median deviates to the right of the rating scale (5 levels).

Corresponding Author:- Phan Trong Ngo

Address:- Education Ha Noi National University of Education, Vietnam.

Consider each cognitive field: The highest is the average of the awareness of circumstances, situations where communication, behavior, and regulations of the community and society are involved in communication and behavior (Mean = 3.68 points); Next is the average of awareness about the self in communication and behavior (Mean = 3.45 points); the third is the average of the perceptions of the role of establishing social relationships in the lives of individuals (Mean = 3.44); The fourth is the average of the perceptions of other people (Mean = 3.43). Finally, awareness of how and skills to communicate, behave effectively in communication (Mean = 3.37).

About the communication style of students. The style shown the most clearly in the surveyed student group is the democratic style (Mean = 3.54 points; Median = 3.60); followed by the freestyle (Mean = 3.18 points; Median = 3.20). The domineering style has the lowest average score (2.09 < 2.5 points / 5). On the other hand, the student-oriented style of the surveyed students has a higher average score than the style towards the content of the communication, towards work in communication (Mean = 3.35 points and Mean = 3.22 points).

In terms of temperament, the two types of temperament with high average scores are calm (Mean = 3.34; Median = 3.40) and flexible (Mean = 3.25; Median = 3.20); next is the preferred temperament (Mean = 3.13; Median = 3.20), while the tempered temperament has the lowest average score, below the average (Mean = 2.43; Median = 2.40).

There is a considerable distance between the average score of the trend towards others and the trend towards self-interest in communication among secondary high school students (Mean = 3.29; Median = 3.20 and Mean = 2.89; Median = 3.0); the introvert tendency is higher than outward direction (Mean = 3.11; Median = 3.20 and Mean = 2.36; Median = 2.40). The average score for assessing the learning communication from others of junior high school students and the influence of external factors on social awareness is also quite high (Mean = 3.29; Median = 3.29 and Mean = 3.17; Median = 3.17).

**Table 1:-** Social awareness in communication; communication style and trend; student's learning temperation in communication, and impact factors.

Factors		Mean	SD	min	Max	Median
<b>The common point of perception</b>		3.47	0.53	1.68	5.00	3.48
Cognitive components	Awareness of others in communication	3.43	0.68	1.00	5.00	3.40
	Awareness of yourself in communication	3.45	0.63	1.40	5.00	3.40
	Awareness of communication situations and regulations in communication	3.68	0.67	1.20	5.00	3.80
	Understanding how and about effective communication skills	3.37	0.64	1.20	5.00	3.40
	Awareness of the role of social relations in personal life	3.44	0.63	1.40	5.00	3.40
Communication style	Unique style	2.09	0.51	1.00	3.80	2.20
	Democratic style	3.54	0.67	1.20	5.00	3.60
	Freestyle	3.18	0.55	1.40	5.00	3.20
	Style oriented work	3.22	0.57	1.40	5.00	3.20
	Style towards people	3.35	0.63	1.00	5.00	3.40
Temperament	Impatientness	2.43	0.45	1.00	4.40	2.40
	Flexibility	3.25	0.67	1.00	5.00	3.20
	Consideration	3.13	0.80	1.00	5.00	3.20
	Ease	3.34	0.63	1.00	5.00	3.40
Trends in communication	Towards other people in relationships	3.29	0.49	1.40	4.80	3.20
	Towards self-interest	2.89	0.66	1.00	4.80	3.00
	The outward	2.36	0.46	1.00	4.00	2.40
	The inward	3.11	0.67	1.00	5.00	3.20
Study, influence		3.29	0.61	1.43	5.00	3.29
Impact factor		3.17	0.61	1.17	5.00	3.17

1.1.2. Social awareness of target groups according to the parameters of gender, residence, level of participation in activities in class, grade level, learning results and training

Table 3 describes the level of social awareness in the communication of groups of surveyed students by comparison parameters: gender, locality, birth order in the family; participation/non-participation in collective activities; grade level, and academic achievement.

About social awareness in communication. The number of students with the lowest level of awareness (level 1) is very small: 2.30%. At level 2, there are more: (155 children, 13.74 %). If you combine both level 1 and level 2 into a low cognitive group, the rate is about 16.04%. The rate of students with an average awareness level is 771 students, accounting for 68.35%, the relatively high awareness level (Level 4) is 154 children, 13.65% Very high level (level 5) has 22 children, 1.95%. If you combine both Level 4 and Level 5 with a high level of 15.60%.

By gender, the proportion of male students with social awareness at levels 1 and 2 was 13.32%, while the proportion of female students was 19.07%; but at levels 4 and 5, the percentage of male students was 13.66%, while the percentage of female students was higher 17.76%. The percentage of students in rural areas with social awareness at levels 1 and 2 is 16.87%, at levels 4 and 5 is 16.86%. The corresponding rates for urban students are 15.17% and 14.44%. Considering the level of participation / non-participation in classwork, the number of participating students with the awareness rate at 1 and 2 is 14.05% and at 4 and 5 is 16.53%. Meanwhile, in non-participating students, the proportion was: 16.59% and 15.35%.

By grade level, students in grades 6 at level 1 and level 2 have 10.30%, at level 4 and level 5 have 18.46%. Students in grades 7, at level 1 and level 2 have 17.85%, grades 4 and 5 have 15.0%. Students in grades 8, level 1 and level 2 have 19.30%, at level 4 and level 5 have 13.69%, and grades 9 at level 1 have 15.76%, grades 4 and 5 have 15.77%. By order of birth, students who are a first child or only child, at levels 1 and 2 have 15.67%, at level 4 and level 5 have 16.69%, and the group of students is the second children, at level 1 and level 2 have. Students with excellent learning scores with social awareness at levels 1 and 2 have 14.33%. Students learning and practicing with good grades, social awareness at levels 1 and 2 with 19.68%, at levels 4 and 5 with 11.93%. The average/weak students with cognitive level 1 and level 2 have 16.81%, at level 4 and level 5 have 14.16%.

**Table 3:-** Social awareness level of students by target groups.

		Min-2SD		-2SD- (-1SD)		(-1SD- (1SD)		(1SD (2SD)		2SD-Max		Total
		1-2.41		2.411 - 2.94		2.941 - 4.00		4.001 - 4.53		4.531 -5		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Awareness level		26	2.30 %	155	13.74 %	771	68.35 %	154	13.65 %	22	1.95 %	1128
Gender	Male	6	1.01 %	73	12.31 %	433	73.02 %	72	12.14 %	9	1.52 %	593
	Female	20	3.74 %	82	15.33 %	338	63.18 %	82	15.33 %	13	2.43 %	535
Living	Rural	12	2.09 %	85	14.78 %	381	66.26 %	83	14.43 %	14	2.43 %	575
	Urban	14	2.53 %	70	12.64 %	390	70.4% %	72	13.0% %	8	1.44 %	554
Work participation	Yes	6	2.48 %	28	11.57 %	168	69.42 %	34	14.05 %	6	2.48 %	242
	No	20	2.26 %	127	14.33 %	603	68.06 %	120	13.54 %	16	1.81 %	886
Class	6	4	1.72 %	20	8.58% %	166	71.24 %	37	15.88 %	6	2.58 %	233
	7	9	3.21 %	41	14.64 %	188	67.14 %	38	13.57 %	4	1.43 %	280
	8	7	2.46 %	48	16.84 %	191	67.02 %	32	11.23 %	7	2.46 %	285
	9	6	1.82 %	46	13.94 %	226	68.48 %	47	14.24 %	5	1.52 %	330

Birth order	First child	10	1.70 %	82	13.97 %	397	67.63 %	88	14.99 %	10	1.70 %	587
	Younger child/ youngest child	16	2.96 %	73	13.49 %	374	69.13 %	66	12.20 %	12	2.22 %	504
Learning	Excellent	11	1.56 %	90	12.77 %	481	68.23 %	108	15.32 %	15	2.13 %	705
	Good	10	3.23 %	51	16.45 %	212	68.39 %	32	10.32 %	5	1.61 %	310
	Fair/Weak	5	4.42 %	14	12.39 %	78	69.03 %	14	12.39 %	2	1.77 %	113

## 12. The difference in student's average social awareness score according to comparative factors

Table 4 Describes the test results of differences in social awareness in the communication of secondary school students by gender groups, locality, class, work participation, birth order, and learning outcomes.

**Table 4:-** Description of test results for the difference in the scoring average of social awareness of surveyed students.

No	Factors		N	Mean	SD	Difference				
						Mean	SE	95%CI		P
1	Gender*	Male	593	3.39	0.53	-0.17	0.03	-0.23	-0.10	0.51
		Female	535	3.56	0.52					
2	Living*	Rural	575	3.48	0.54	0.006	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.84
		Urban	554	3.47	0.52					
3	Work participation*	Yes	242	3.53	0.55	0.07	0.04	-0.002	0.14	0.19
		No	886	3.46	0.52					
4	Class**	6	267	3.39	0.57	-	-	-	-	-
		7	301	3.42	0.53	0.04	0.04	-0.08	0.15	0.84
		8	292	3.52	0.53	0.14*	0.04	0.02	0.25	0.01
		9	288	3.55	0.48	0.16*	0.04	0.05	0.28	0.001
5	Birth order*	First child	233	3.49	0.51	0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.11	0.011
		Younger child/ Youngest child	280	3.45	0.55					
6	Learning**	Excellent	285	3.52	0.54	-	-	-	-	-
		Good	330	3.43	0.47	-0.09*	0.03	-0.17	-0.004	0.04
		Fair/Weak	587	3.22	0.59	-0.30	0.06	-0.45	-0.15	0.000
*□Verification independent T-test: ** Verification Anova										

\*□ Verification independent T-test; \*\* Verification Anova

The scoring average of social awareness of surveyed male students is lower than the scoring average of social awareness of female students (0.17 points), but this difference is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.51$ ), ie, social awareness in communication and behavior of male and female students are nearly equal. The social perceptions of students living in rural areas and social awareness of students living in urban areas were similar ( $p = 0.84$ ). Social awareness of students participating in collective activities is higher than social awareness of students not participating, but the difference is not statistically significant (Mean = 0.07,  $p = 0.19$ ). By grade level, the social awareness of grade 7 students is slightly higher than that of grade 6 students, but it is not statistically significant (Mean = 0.04,  $p = 0.84$ ). The scoring average of social awareness of grade 8 and grade 9 students was significantly higher than the scoring average of social awareness of grade 6 students (Mean = 0.14,  $p = 0.01$ ) and (Mean = 0.16),  $p = 0.001$ ). The scoring average of social awareness of the first child or only child is significantly higher than the scoring average of social awareness of the student who is the second child in the family (Mean = 0.05,  $p = 0.011$ ). From the perspective of learning, the scoring average of social awareness of students with good learning scores and the average/weak level is statistically lower than the students with excellent academic grades.

### Correlation between social awareness in student communication and student's style, communication, temperament, and communication learning factors

Table 5 shows the correlation between the scoring average of social awareness of students and the scoring average of the factors: style, communication trends, temperament, and communication learning of students.

There is a positive correlation that has a statistically significant, at moderate level (near-tight) between the score average of social awareness and the score average of the democracy style ( $R = 0.67$ ;  $B = 0.528$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) and styles towardshuman-being ( $R = 0.627$ ;  $B = 0.524$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ). Work-oriented style ( $R = 0.505$ ;  $B = 0.469$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) and freestyle ( $R = 0.439$ ;  $B = 0.42$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) are positively correlated with social awareness in communication at moderate and weak levels. The authoritarian style is a negative correlation with social awareness, but there is not have statistically significant ( $R = 0.053$ ;  $B = -0.05$ ;  $P = 0.07$ ).

The score average of style towards others has a positive correlation with social awareness at moderate level ( $R = 0.559$ ;  $B = 0.600$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ); The score average of introvert style ( $R = 0.478$ ;  $B = 0.376$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) and towards self-interest ( $R = 0.293$ ;  $B = 0.237$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) has a positive correlation at moderate and weak levels with awareness. The score average of the extroverted style is a positive correlation with the score average of social awareness, but it is very weak ( $R = 0.108$ ;  $B = 0.125$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ).

In term of temperament, the score average of flexible temperament, ( $R = 0.486$ ;  $B = 0.384$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ), calm ( $R = 0.485$ ;  $B = 0.407$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) and concern ( $R = 0.249$ ;  $B = 0.164$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) all have a positive correlation that has a statistically significant at the weak level with the score average of social awareness in students' communication meanwhile, the score average of temper was a positive correlation with the social cognitive score, but it is not have statistically significant ( $p = 0.171$ ).

There is a positive correlation between the score average of learning communicating from others with the score average of social awareness of students ( $R = 0.510$ ;  $B = 0.445$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ). External factors affecting social awareness are also positively correlated, but at a weak level ( $R = 0.398$ ;  $B = 0.158$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ).

**Table 5:-** Correlation between awareness level with factors of style, temperament, learning motivation, school pressure.

Factors		R	R <sup>2</sup>	B	SE of B	p
Communication style	Unique style	0.053	0.002	-0.05	0.03	0.07
	Democratic style	0.67	0.445	0.528	0.017	0.00
	Free style	0.439	0.193	0.42	0.025	0.00
	Style oriented work	0.505	0.255	0.469	0.024	0.00
	Style towards people	0.627	0.393	0.524	0.019	0.00
Trends in communication	Towards other people in relationships	0.559	0.312	0.600	0.026	0.00
	Towards self-interest	0.293	0.086	0.237	0.023	0.00
	The outward	0.108	0.012	0.125	0.034	0.00
	The inward	0.478	0.228	0.376	0.020	0.00
Temperament	Impatientness	0.040	0.002	0.047	0.034	0.171
	Flexibility	0.486	0.236	0.384	0.02	0.00
	Consideration	0.249	0.062	0.164	0.019	0.00
	Ease	0.485	0.235	0.407	0.022	0.00
Study, influence			0.261	0.445	0.022	0.00
Impact factor			0.158	0.346	0.024	0.00

### Multivariate regression correlation of factors related to student's social awareness:

The results of the multivariate linear regression models are presented in Table 6. The factors that are included in the model are Class, Student participation, Learning outcomes and training; Style; Communication trend; Temperament, and learning communication of students. The model explained 67.8% of the variation in social cognitive scores about factors. There is a positive correlation, statistically significant regression between grade 6 students and grades 7, 8, 9, according to the trend that the students in higher classes are the more social awareness in communication

than students in lower classes. Meanwhile, the factors of participation in collective work or correlated learning results are not statistically significant.

Among communication styles, democratic style has the highest regression correlation: 0.219 [95% CI 0.1181 - 0.256]; next is the style towards people 0.128 [95% CI 0.106 - 0.183]; work-oriented style 0.111 [95% CI 0.076 - 0.152] and free communication style 0.069 [95% CI 0.031- 0.107]. Autocratic communication style has a contrast but weak - 0.049 [95% CI -0.090 - (- 0.009)].

The trend of communication towards other people has higher regression correlation among the considered trends 0.131 [95% CI 0.084-0.179]; next is the correlation between introverted tendency with social awareness 0.084 [95% CI 0.046-1.114]; Finally, the correlation between the trend towards self-interest and social awareness 0.074 [95% CI 0.041-0.106]. The extroverted trend is backward correlated, but not statistically significant ( $p = 0.281$ ), which is very low predictability.

The two types of temperament are calm and flexible, which have regression correlation with social awareness equivalent to 0.073 [95% CI 0.039- 0.107] and 0.072 [95% CI 0.039- 0.105]; Concerned temperament is positively correlated and hot temperament is inversely related to social awareness, but both correlations are not statistically significant. Learning to communicate from others is also positively correlated with the student's social awareness of 0.085 [95% CI 0.048- 0.122].

**Table 6:-** Multivariate linear regression model of factors related to students' social awareness.

No	Factors		B	SE	95%CI of B		p
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	Class	6					
		7	0.014	0.005	0.006	0.018	0.000
		8	0.017	0.006	0.008	0.025	0.025
		9	0.030	0.009	0.013	0.048	0.001
2	Participation		0.009	0.022	-0.034	0.052	0.686
3	Learning	Excellent					
		Good	-0.009	0.012	-0.025	0.013	0.234
		Fair/Weakness	-0.013	0.015	-0.043	0.017	0.385
4	Unique style		-0.049	0.021	-0.090	-0.009	0.018
5	Democratic style		0.219	0.019	0.181	0.256	0.000
6	Free style		0.069	0.019	0.031	0.107	0.000
7	Style oriented work		0.111	0.019	0.076	0.152	0.000
8	Style towards people		0.128	0.020	0.106	0.183	0.000
9	Towards other people in relationships		0.131	0.024	0.084	0.179	0.000
10	Towards self-interest		0.074	0.016	0.041	0.106	0.041
11	The outward		-0.023	0.022	-0.066	0.019	0.281
12	The inward		0.080	0.017	0.046	0.114	0.000
13	Impatientness		-0.038	0.022	-0.080	0.004	0.079
14	Flexibility		0.072	0.017	0.039	0.105	0.000
15	Consideration		0.009	0.013	-0.017	0.036	0.483
16	Ease		0.073	0.017	0.039	0.107	0.000
17	Learning to communicate from others		0.085	0.019	0.048	0.122	0.048
R=0.826; R <sup>2</sup> =0.683; R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adjust</sub> = 0.678; F = 135.286; P <sub>anova</sub> <0.001; B <sub>0</sub> = 0.439							

## Discussion:-

The survey of social awareness in communication on 1128 students from grades 6 to 9 of 10 secondary schools in 5 provinces/cities in Vietnam, giving average scores on social awareness of surveyed students achieved an above-average level of a 5-step scale. Of these, 16.04% have a low awareness (levels 1 and 2), 68.35% on average, and 15.60% on high (levels 4 and 5). Outstanding points in the social awareness of surveyed students are aware of social situations and regulations in communication; awareness of yourself in communication, about the role of

relationships, communication in life. At the same time, knowledge of communication methods and skills is at its lowest.

Social awareness of secondary school students has statistical differences with an increasing tendency by grade 6 to grade 9. Social awareness of students, who are the first child or only child higher than social awareness of students who are the second child in the family. Students with good academic scores have higher social awareness in communication than other student groups.

There is a linear regression correlation, forming predictive models that enhance the social awareness of the curriculum in communication. Including models affecting perceptions of democratic style, towards people, oriented work, and freestyle of students in communication; tendency towards others; introversion and self-interest. Besides, calm and flexible temperament are predictive models that impact students' social awareness.

Besides, low academic achievement, authoritarian style of communication, outward tendencies, or impulsive temperament are also expected to have an adverse impact on social awareness in student communication, but the forecast is not high.

### Conclusion:-

Social awareness of students in communication is expressed through awareness of others in communication, awareness of oneself, about others, about situations and social regulations in communication, role awareness of relationships, communication in life and understanding of way, and communication skills are the basis of students' social intelligence.

The results of the study have determined the level of social awareness of the student as well as its manifestations. It also identifies models that predict the impact of communication style, communication trends, and temperament of the student as well as communication learning from others on social awareness of students. The predictive correlation models discovered in the study are useful suggestions for parents, teachers, and students in improving the quality of establishing positive social relationships in the communication of students through improving their social understanding. The study also recommends to a certain extent the reduction of students' authoritarian style, temper, or consideration temperament, which negatively affects their social awareness.

This research was completed under the auspices of the Viet Nam Ministry of Education and Training, through a scientific project: "Studying the social intelligence of secondary school students to meet the requirements of the new high school education program. ". Code: B 2019-SPH-07".

The author thanks the sponsorship of the Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training. Thank you for the voluntary and enthusiastic cooperation of the secondary school students that the science project was implemented.

### References:-

1. Marlowe, H.A.,(1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Education Psychology*,78,52-58
2. Sternberg, R.J., (2000), *Handbook of intelligence*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
3. Albrecht, K., (2006), *Social intelligence: the new science of success*, Jossey- Bass, Wiley Imprint.
4. Goleman D., (2006), *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*. Bantam.
5. Thorndike, E.L., (1920). *Intelligence and it's use*. Harpe's Magazine,140, 227-235.
6. O'Sullivan, M., Guilford, J.P., &DeMille,R. (1965); *Measurement of Social intelligence*. Report from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California, No. 34.
7. Tony Buzan (2016). *Sức mạnh của trí tuệ xã hội*. NXB Tổng hợp Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh.
8. Thomas Armstrong (2010). *Bảy loại trí thông minh*. NXB Lao động- xã hội
9. O' Sullivan, M., Guilford, J.P., (1965). *Six Factors of Behavioral Cognition: Understanding Other People*. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Dept of Psychology.
10. Guilford, J.P, (1967), *Nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw - Hill
11. Nguyễn Công Khanh (2011). "Nghiên cứu thực trạng trí tuệ xã hội của (SQ) của sinh viên trường ĐHSP Hà Nội". Đề tài khoa học cấp Bộ, mã số B 2009-17-176.

12. Nguyễn văn Lược- Trương Quang Lâm (2017), Kỹ năng xã hội của trẻ vị thành niên nông thôn. Tạp chí Tâm lý học. Số 10, 10- 2017, tr 24-35.
13. Lê Văn Hào (2015), Hành vi ủng hộ xã hội: sức mạnh của tình huống. Tạp chí Tâm lý học, Số 2, 2-2015, tr
14. Nguyễn Tuấn Anh (2017), Mối quan hệ giữa đồng cảm và hành vi ủng hộ xã hội ở sinh viên. Tạp chí Tâm lý học. Số 8, 8- 2017
15. Đỗ Ngọc Khanh (2017), Thái độ và hành vi ủng hộ xã hội ở thanh niên. Tạp chí Tâm lý học, Số 6, 6-2017, tr 36 - 48
16. Đỗ Lệ Hằng (2018). Sự vô cảm ở trẻ vị thành niên trong gia đình. Tạp chí Tâm lý học. Số 1, 1-2018, tr 45-60.