

Bridging the training–practice gap in social-emotional learning of pre-service teachers

Duc-Hoi Dinh¹, Thien-Vu Giang², Van-Son Huynh³

¹Department of Early Childhood Education, Faculty of Early Childhood Education, Thai Nguyen University of Education, Thai Nguyen, Vietnam

²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Counseling, Therapeutic and Clinical Psychology, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

³Department of Psychology, Faculty of Basic Psychology, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Article Info

Article history:

Received May 21, 2025

Revised Jan 31, 2026

Accepted Feb 23, 2026

Keywords:

Pre-service teacher

Pre-service teacher practice

Pre-service teacher training

SEL-based practice

Social-emotional competence

Social-emotional learning

ABSTRACT

To successfully embed the social-emotional learning (SEL) model in the education sector, pre-service teachers must prepare for social-emotional competence (SEC). Unfortunately, studies on how pre-service teachers were trained and developed their SEC before practicing the SEL model in the teaching profession are lacking. This study focuses on discovering how to train and develop SEC for pre-service teachers within the framework of teacher undergraduate training programs in Vietnam, a developing country in Southeast Asia. We employed a convergent parallel mixed-method approach, utilizing both quantitative data (n=650) and qualitative data (n=23), which were subsequently integrated during the interpretation phase to derive comprehensive results. Our findings revealed that the current pre-service teachers had an average level of SEC, which was limited by: i) confusion in understanding SEC and SEL concepts; ii) the lack of professional supervision in undergraduate training; and iii) the unguaranteed need to foster SEC self-development and SEL-based practice training courses. These themes highlight the need to change the administrative policy in undergraduate teacher training programs to support and supervise the development of pre-service teachers' SEL-based knowledge and practice in developing countries.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Thien-Vu Giang

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Counseling, Therapeutic and Clinical Psychology

Ho Chi Minh City University of Education

No.280 An Duong Vuong St., Cho Quan Ward, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Email: vugt@hcmue.edu.vn

1. INTRODUCTION

In the global shift toward holistic education, social-emotional competence (SEC) is increasingly recognized as a core attribute that future educators must possess to navigate the demands of modern classrooms [1], [2]. Defined as the capacity to understand, regulate, and utilize emotions effectively in interpersonal contexts, SEC forms the foundation for educators' resilience, instructional efficacy, and professional well-being [3], [4]. In particular, the social-emotional learning (SEL) framework, pioneered by the collaborative for academic, social, and emotional learning (CASEL), has become a widely adopted model to cultivate these competencies across educational systems [5], [6]. In the current study, we define SEC as the capacity to understand, regulate, and utilize emotions effectively in interpersonal contexts; and SEL as a structured framework to cultivate these competencies through intentional educational approaches,

as established by CASEL. Maintaining this distinction is essential for clarity in interpreting the findings and framing implications. In this study, we consistently maintain a conceptual distinction between SEC and SEL: SEC refers to the individual's capacity to understand, regulate, and utilize emotions effectively in interpersonal contexts [7], while SEL refers to the structured educational framework designed to cultivate such competencies [8]. This distinction is critical for interpreting the findings, particularly given that one of the study's central results is the confusion between these two concepts among participants.

While developed nations have integrated SEL into teacher education and public schooling with considerable success, the situation in Southeast Asian developing countries presents a more complex landscape. Vietnam, a country undergoing rapid education reform through the implementation of the 2018-general education curriculum, exemplifies this transitional phase. In this context, there is an increasing emphasis on competency-based education and student-centered pedagogy. However, systemic constraints, including outdated teacher training models, fragmented implementation of psychological services, and a lack of policy-level coherence, continue to hinder the development of pre-service teachers' SEC [9], [10].

Research on SEC in Vietnamese teacher education remains nascent and largely anecdotal. The limited available studies suggest that while pre-service teachers are aware of SEL as an imported educational philosophy, their practical understanding of SEC is underdeveloped and rarely embedded within structured coursework [11]. Furthermore, the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic has intensified emotional burnout and social disconnection among pre-service teachers, revealing deeper vulnerabilities in their preparedness for socio-emotional demands of the profession [12]. These concerns are especially pertinent in Vietnam, where the teacher attrition rate is rising and emotional exhaustion has been linked to the lack of professional emotional support [13].

The current study is part of a broader research program investigating the development and application of SEL in the Vietnamese educational context across multiple levels. Earlier studies in this program include a national cross-sectional survey examining SEL competencies among elementary students [14], and a qualitative case study on the application of SEL models in primary school teaching by in-service teachers [15]. Building on these foundations, the present study focuses on the pre-service teacher population to examine how SEL is currently conceptualized and cultivated, or overlooked, within formal teacher education. By addressing this often-overlooked transitional group, the study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the systemic opportunities and gaps in SEL implementation in Vietnam.

Against this backdrop, this study seeks to address a critical gap in the literature: how are Vietnamese pre-service teachers trained and supported to develop SEC during their undergraduate programs? While existing studies have alluded to conceptual ambiguities and systemic challenges, there remains a lack of empirical evidence on how SEC is understood, experienced, and fostered among future teachers within the Vietnamese teacher education landscape. Accordingly, this study investigates four interrelated questions:

- i) What is the current level of SEC among Vietnamese pre-service teachers?
- ii) How do pre-service teachers perceive the concepts of SEC and SEL, and to what extent can they translate these into practice?
- iii) In what ways are undergraduate teacher education programs preparing (or failing to prepare) pre-service teachers to cultivate SEC, both for themselves and their future students?
- iv) What are the perceived needs, institutional barriers, and proposed supports for integrating SEL-based training into pre-service teacher education?

By adopting a convergent parallel mixed-method approach, this research aims not only to reveal the extent of SEC development in Vietnamese teacher training programs but also to provide policy-relevant recommendations for embedding SEL into the fabric of teacher education in Southeast Asian developing contexts.

2. METHOD

2.1. Study design

To explore the SEC of Vietnamese pre-service teachers and their readiness for SEL-based educational practice, this study employed a convergent parallel mixed-method design [16]. This approach allows for the simultaneous collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, enabling researchers to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem through triangulation and complementarity. The rationale for using a mixed-method strategy lies in the multidimensional nature of SEC, which includes both self-perceived competencies and the contextual, institutional dynamics that influence its development. Quantitative data served to describe the general status of SEC among pre-service teachers, while qualitative interviews revealed the experiential and interpretive aspects of how SEC and SEL are conceptualized and applied in real academic settings.

2.2. Procedure

The study followed a sequential protocol that integrated both quantitative and qualitative phases under a convergent parallel mixed-methods design. After obtaining ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board (Code: ECSH-2024-002), the research team coordinated with administrative offices at seven pedagogical universities to distribute participant invitations. Informed consent was obtained digitally prior to participation.

In the quantitative phase, eligible pre-service teachers received a link to an online survey platform containing the self-developed SEC scale. Data collection lasted for four weeks and was monitored to ensure balanced representation across academic years and gender. Following quantitative data collection, the qualitative phase involved the purposive selection of 23 participants who indicated willingness to be interviewed and who represented diversity in academic year, gender, and quantitative SEC score profiles. This ensured that the qualitative sample reflected a range of perspectives and experiences relevant to the study aims. Individual semi-structured interviews were scheduled at their respective campuses and conducted in quiet, private settings. Each interview was audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and anonymized for analysis. Both phases were conducted independently and concurrently by separate sub-teams to avoid bias, and data were integrated during the interpretation phase for triangulation.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

2.3.1. Quantitative strand

A self-developed SEC rating scale was utilized to assess participants' competencies based on the five core domains identified in the CASEL framework: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The initial item pool (65 items) was generated through a thorough literature review on SEC and SEL frameworks, teacher competencies, and educational psychology, particularly drawing from DeVellis and Thorpe [17] eight-step guidelines for scale development. A panel of three experts in SEL and Vietnamese teacher education evaluated the content validity, resulting in the refinement and retention of 45 culturally appropriate items (nine per domain). These items were further reviewed for semantic clarity and pedagogical relevance to the Vietnamese context.

To ensure face validity, a pilot study was conducted with 20 pre-service teachers across two institutions. Based on their feedback, ambiguous language was revised and item phrasing was adjusted to reflect authentic classroom situations. The revised instrument was then administered at scale. Internal consistency was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84 for the overall scale, with domain-specific alpha values ranging from 0.76 to 0.88, indicating good to excellent reliability. The final instrument employed a 6-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree), and total scores were categorized into five SEC levels. The five SEC levels ("very low", "low", "average", "high", "very high") were determined using the total possible score range (45–270) based on the 45 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale. Cut-off points were set according to equal-interval divisions of this range to ensure interpretability across domains. This approach allows for comparison across different samples while maintaining cultural specificity. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze trends across demographic variables such as academic year and gender. This multi-step development and validation process ensured that the scale was both theoretically grounded and contextually appropriate, increasing the robustness and interpretability of the quantitative results for an international audience.

2.3.2. Qualitative strand

To complement the survey data, qualitative data were collected through face-to-face semi-structured interviews conducted at participants' universities. The semi-structured interview protocol was developed based on existing literature on SEC and SEL in teacher education and informed by preliminary quantitative findings. To establish content validity, the protocol was reviewed by two experts in teacher education and one expert in educational psychology. Their feedback was used to refine question wording, sequence, and cultural relevance before pilot testing with two pre-service teachers. Interviews lasted between 20 and 50 minutes and were guided by an open-ended protocol focused on participants' experiences with SEC-related training, understanding of SEL theory, and perceived institutional support. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and subjected to inductive thematic analysis [18]. The coding process was iterative and conducted by a team of researchers with expertise in SEL and teacher education.

After initial line-by-line coding, emergent codes were clustered into higher-order themes. These themes were refined through multiple rounds of team discussion, where overlapping or ambiguous codes were clarified, and theme boundaries were defined based on representativeness and conceptual coherence. To enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis, several strategies were employed: peer debriefing was conducted at each coding stage to challenge assumptions and interpretations; triangulation was applied by comparing patterns across interview transcripts and linking them to quantitative findings; and inter-coder agreement was

established through independent double-coding of 30% of the transcripts, achieving a Cohen's Kappa of 0.82. These procedures contributed to the credibility and transparency of the qualitative findings.

Finally, integration of both data strands occurred during the interpretation phase, wherein convergences and divergences between the quantitative trends and qualitative narratives were synthesized to construct a cohesive understanding of Vietnamese pre-service teachers' SEC development and institutional readiness for SEL implementation. During the integration phase, we employed a joint display matrix to align quantitative trends with qualitative themes. Convergences and divergences were examined through side-by-side comparison, and discrepancies were discussed in research team meetings to identify potential explanatory factors. This process reduced interpretive bias by ensuring that both data strands informed the final conclusions.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Participant demographics

The final sample included 650 pre-service teachers from seven pedagogical universities across Vietnam who completed the SEC rating scale, and 23 participants who participated in follow-up semi-structured interviews. Among survey respondents, 67.2% were female and 32.8% were male, with an average age of 21.3 years (ranging from 20 to 24). The sample was evenly distributed across academic years, with 51% juniors and 49% seniors. Interview participants mirrored this distribution, providing a representative qualitative sub-sample.

3.2. Quantitative findings: the level of social-emotional competence

The self-developed SEC rating scale yielded an average SEC score of 76.8 (SD=12.4), indicating that most pre-service teachers demonstrated a moderate level of SEC, as shown in Table 1. The highest scoring domain was relationship skills (M=83.5), while the lowest was self-awareness (M=63.2). The breakdown by SEC domain revealed the following: i) self-awareness: only 9.5% of participants scored in the "high" or "very high" range, while over 45.1% scored "low" or "very low"; ii) self-management: approximately 89.2% fell into the "average" category, with only 10.8% reaching a "high" level and above; iii) social awareness and responsible decision-making: these two domains showed moderately stronger results, yet still clustered around the average band; and iv) relationship skills: the strongest dimension, with 20.8% scoring in the "high" or "very high" range.

Table 1. The current SEC of Vietnamese pre-service teachers

Components	Mean score	Very low (25–49)	Low (50–74)	Average (75–99)	High (100–124)	Very high (125–150)
Self-awareness	63.2	68 (10.5%)	225 (34.6%)	295 (45.4%)	45 (6.9%)	17 (2.6%)
Self-management	74.1	30 (4.6%)	195 (30.0%)	355 (54.6%)	50 (7.7%)	20 (3.1%)
Social awareness	79.8	18 (2.8%)	110 (16.9%)	435 (66.9%)	65 (10.0%)	22 (3.4%)
Relationship skills	83.5	10 (1.5%)	95 (14.6%)	410 (63.1%)	95 (14.6%)	40 (6.2%)
Responsible decision-making	77.4	25 (3.8%)	140 (21.5%)	355 (54.6%)	85 (13.1%)	45 (6.9%)
Overall SEC score	76.8	22 (3.4%)	198 (30.5%)	325 (50.0%)	70 (10.8%)	35 (5.3%)

3.3. Qualitative findings: limitations in SEC development and SEL preparation

Through thematic analysis of the 23 in-depth interviews, three prominent limitations emerged regarding pre-service teachers' readiness for SEL implementation and self-development of SEC. Each theme reveals a distinct yet interconnected structural issue in Vietnamese teacher education.

3.3.1. Conceptual confusion between SEC and SEL

Most participants expressed uncertainty or conflation between SEC as an individual capacity and SEL as an educational approach. While some were able to recite theoretical definitions of SEL from coursework, their application and reflection on SEC remained shallow or misunderstood.

"I know SEL involves managing emotions, but I thought it was just for students. Nobody ever told us to develop those skills for ourselves as future teachers." (Participant 08, male, junior student in primary education)

"SEC? I've heard of it... but I think it's the same thing as SEL, just a different name." (Participant 17, female, senior student in primary education)

This conceptual confusion may reflect a top-down and fragmented curriculum, where SEL is presented as policy rhetoric without being embedded into practical or reflective pedagogical frameworks. The absence of clear instruction on how SEC relates to teacher identity, classroom management, and mental well-being led to internal dissonance among participants.

“They kept talking about 21st-century skills and competencies, but when I felt overwhelmed during teaching practice, I didn’t know how to regulate myself. Nobody teaches us that.” (Participant 03, female, senior student in primary education)

3.3.2. Lack of professional supervision during training

Participants voiced strong concerns regarding the lack of supervision, feedback, and modeling by faculty members, especially during pedagogical practicums and coursework that mention emotional or social development.

“I was assigned to teach in a real classroom, but my mentor just told me to follow the plan and didn’t mention anything about how to emotionally support students.” (Participant 21, male, junior student in primary education)

“The SEL workshops are one-off events. There is no follow-up, no one checks how we apply them in real teaching.” (Participant 11, female, senior student in primary education)

Several interviewees noted that teaching methods remained traditional, despite the reform rhetoric in curriculum documents. The reliance on lecture-based delivery, rote memorization, and passive assignments undermined their engagement and confidence.

“I’ve never had a teacher who asked how I felt or how I managed stress. It’s like emotions are not part of learning here.” (Participant 04, female, junior student in primary education)

In the absence of emotional modeling by lecturers and mentors, pre-service teachers felt disconnected from the principles of SEL they were expected to implement.

3.3.3. Unmet needs in SEC development and SEL-based practice

All interviewees strongly expressed the need for dedicated training modules, mentoring, and supportive structures to help them build emotional resilience and classroom empathy. However, institutional responses were often unclear or scattered across departments.

“If we want to learn SEL properly, should we go to the psychology department, the pedagogy department, or somewhere else? No one knows.” (Participant 19, male, senior student in primary education)

“I really want to improve my self-regulation. I often feel overwhelmed but have no one to talk to. Counseling services at my university are more for students with serious mental issues, not for teacher training.” (Participant 02, female, junior student in primary education)

Beyond formal instruction, participants advocated for experiential learning formats, such as scenario-based workshops, guided reflections, and classroom simulations for practicing SEC-related strategies.

“I want real examples, not just definitions. Like how to calm a child who cries or manage my anger when students are too noisy.” (Participant 06, female, senior student in primary education)

Some also emphasized the need for systematic, long-term plans instead of isolated training:

“SEL training should be part of our whole 4 years here, not just a seminar in the last semester before we graduate.” (Participant 12, female, senior student in primary education)

These narratives reveal a structural vacuum where institutional intent (policy) and pedagogical reality (practice) diverge. Without structural supports, pre-service teachers are left with aspirational goals but no tools to actualize them.

4. DISCUSSION

This study sought to examine how Vietnamese pre-service teachers develop SEC within the framework of teacher education programs and how institutional structures enable, or constrain, preparation for SEL-based practice. By employing a convergent mixed-methods design, the findings offer both statistical evidence of moderate SEC levels and rich phenomenological insights into students' lived experiences during their undergraduate years. Quantitative results revealed low scores in self-awareness, a foundational domain of SEC, despite stronger performance in relationship skills. This discrepancy suggests that while pre-service teachers may manage classroom relationships, they lack reflective capacity and emotional insight critical to long-term professional well-being. The qualitative findings further illuminate this pattern: many participants conflated SEC and SEL, indicating a superficial grasp of emotional development and underscoring a fragmented training experience. A critical interpretive point in these findings is the persistent confusion between SEC and SEL among participants. Although the study clearly defined SEC as an individual capacity to understand, regulate, and utilize emotions effectively in interpersonal contexts, and SEL as a structured educational framework to cultivate such competencies, many participants conflated the two. This conceptual blurring has direct implications for how teacher candidates perceive their professional responsibilities and their own emotional development.

The quantitative patterns suggest a general lack of emphasis on self-directed emotional development during teacher training, despite relatively better interpersonal and relational skills. The results showed that most participants possessed moderate SEC, with particularly low scores in self-awareness, a domain foundational to reflective practice, emotional regulation, and the teacher's capacity to build authentic relationships with students [5], [13]. These findings raise critical questions about the developmental trajectory of SEC in Vietnamese teacher education, where surface-level curriculum reforms have not been matched by substantive transformation in teaching methods or institutional support systems. This discrepancy underscores that while pre-service teachers may exhibit interpersonal management in classroom contexts (a skill often reinforced by SEL activities for students), they may lack the deeper self-regulatory and reflective capacities that define SEC. Without an explicit understanding that SEL is a means and SEC is an end state of competence, teacher preparation risks overemphasizing student-focused interventions at the expense of teachers' own emotional growth.

The qualitative narratives deepen this diagnosis by unveiling the internal dilemmas and emotional isolation experienced by pre-service teachers. The recurring confusion between SEC and SEL, despite exposure to theory, reveals a gap in embodied learning, pre-service teachers may be cognitively aware of SEL as a framework but have not internalized its principles in a way that shapes their own emotional stance as educators. As one participant aptly shared:

"We teach about emotions, but nobody asks how we feel about being teachers." (Participant 07, female, junior student in primary education).

This comment resonates with the literature on teacher authenticity, which highlights how effective SEL must begin with teacher self-awareness and emotional integration [4], [19]. This distinction matters: SEL training devoid of self-reflective SEC development risks producing educators who can teach about emotional regulation without being able to model it authentically. In other words, SEC is not merely another professional skill; it is the teacher's emotional operating system, while SEL is the curriculum and pedagogy that activates it for students.

A key implication of these findings is the need to embed experiential SEL curricula into teacher education through sustainable and context-specific models. Rather than one-off workshops, programs should include scenario-based learning, guided emotional reflection, simulation of classroom challenges, and embedded SEL modules in practicum. These approaches would help pre-service teachers internalize emotional strategies and apply them meaningfully in future teaching. Furthermore, the lack of professional supervision reported by participants indicates the necessity for structured mentoring systems, where faculty and field mentors not only assess instructional skills but also model and coach emotional regulation, empathy, and stress management [9], [20]. Professional development for university lecturers on how to integrate SEL into pedagogy is equally critical.

Moreover, the perceived institutional ambiguity, about which department should own SEL and how it should be implemented, illustrates a critical governance gap. While universities are tasked with preparing emotionally competent teachers, no clear mechanism exists for doing so. This reflects a broader tension in developing countries: policy initiatives that valorize global models (such as CASEL) are not always contextually grounded or structurally supported [21]. As a result, pre-service teachers are caught between the aspiration for progressive pedagogies and the inertia of systemic tradition. Importantly, participants' desire for structured, long-term, and practice-based SEC development opens a path for innovation. Calls for integrated counseling services, reflective workshops, and experiential SEL curricula align with best practices

from international teacher education models [22], [23]. However, such interventions must go beyond ‘soft’ add-ons and become part of core professional formation, a strategic re-design of how teacher identity and capacity are developed in emotionally meaningful ways [24]. These findings also reveal governance-level ambiguities, participants were uncertain which department (e.g., psychology vs. pedagogy) was responsible for SEL, leading to institutional disconnection. Addressing this requires clear policy mandates within universities that define SEL responsibilities, integrate cross-departmental coordination, and establish mental health support services tailored for teacher trainees, not just crisis intervention.

Based on the findings, this study contributes to the evolving discourse on SEL in developing contexts by offering a phenomenological understanding of emotional marginalization in teacher training. Rather than treating SEC as a fixed skill set [25], we conceptualize it as a lived developmental process shaped by institutional culture, pedagogical ecology, and personal meaning-making [26]–[28]. Through this lens, the moderate SEC levels and qualitative dissatisfaction are not just indicators of program failure, but symptoms of an educational system struggling to humanize its own professionals [29], [30]. Addressing these challenges requires not only curriculum reform [31], but deep cultural shifts in how emotion, reflection, and relationality are valued within teacher education. For example, culturally relevant approaches in Vietnam could include scenario-based workshops simulating common classroom disruptions, role-playing exercises for conflict resolution, guided reflective journals on teaching practicum experiences, and small-group mentoring circles led jointly by pedagogy and psychology faculty. These practices would operationalize SEL principles in ways that resonate with the realities of Vietnamese classrooms.

Regarding limitations, several considerations must temper the interpretation of our findings. First, the SEC scale relied on self-reported responses, which may inflate or underestimate certain competencies due to social desirability bias or limited self-awareness, particularly relevant given the low scores in self-reflective domains. Second, although our sample is diverse and drawn from seven leading pedagogical universities, the institutional prestige and access to reform initiatives at these schools may not represent the realities of smaller or rural teacher education institutions. Thus, findings should be generalized cautiously. Third, the qualitative interviews capture participant perceptions at a single point in time; a longitudinal design could better explore how SEC and SEL understanding evolve throughout teacher education. Fourth, although the self-developed SEC rating scale underwent a multi-step development process including literature review, expert panel validation, pilot testing, and internal consistency reliability assessment, the present study did not examine additional psychometric properties such as construct validity, convergent validity, or discriminant validity. These aspects are critical for establishing the scale’s robustness and generalizability beyond the current sample.

Future research should employ exploratory and/or confirmatory factor analysis, alongside validity testing against established SEC measures, to strengthen the instrument’s empirical foundation and ensure cross-cultural applicability. Importantly, this study contributes to the discourse on SEL in developing contexts by conceptualizing SEC not merely as a checklist of skills but as a developmental process embedded in institutional culture and professional identity formation. Participants’ struggles with emotional regulation, institutional ambiguity, and the gap between rhetoric and reality underscore the urgent need for systemic transformation. One potential pathway to address this governance gap is the establishment of cross-departmental SEL committees that include representatives from psychology, pedagogy, and school counseling units. Such committees could coordinate faculty training, align course content, and oversee the integration of SEL into both theoretical coursework and practicum components. Addressing these challenges requires a shift from fragmented, theory-heavy training to emotionally grounded, relationally driven educational practice. This includes elevating SEC from peripheral to central in curriculum design, mentorship, and assessment frameworks.

5. CONCLUSION

This study underscores the urgent need to re-examine how SEC is conceptualized, cultivated, and institutionalized within pre-service teacher education in Vietnam. Using a mixed-methods approach, we revealed that pre-service teachers generally exhibit moderate SEC, with particular deficits in self-awareness and self-management. More importantly, through a phenomenological lens, we gained insight into how these limitations are experienced: as confusion, disengagement, and a sense of emotional marginalization within the university training environment. The findings point to a significant disconnect between the national agenda for competency-based education and the lived realities of teacher candidates. While SEL is increasingly included in official rhetoric, its implementation remains fragmented, unsupervised, and under-resourced. Pre-service teachers are expected to promote emotional literacy in students while being offered little opportunity to develop such competencies themselves. This paradox reveals a critical policy-practice gap and calls for a rethinking of teacher preparation as a site for emotional as well as instructional development.

To address these challenges, future research should explore the longitudinal development of SEC across the entire span of teacher education programs, from entry to graduation. Additionally, experimental studies testing the impact of specific SEL training modules, such as reflective supervision, scenario-based workshops, or embedded counseling interventions, on pre-service teachers' emotional growth would provide stronger causal evidence for reform. Cross-cultural comparative studies could also examine how contextual variables shape the implementation and effectiveness of SEL in developing countries. Such research directions will enhance the applicability of findings, inform policy reforms, and help construct more emotionally responsive teacher education systems in Vietnam and beyond.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Authors state no funding involved.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

This journal uses the Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT) to recognize individual author contributions, reduce authorship disputes, and facilitate collaboration.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Duc-Hoi Dinh	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓
Thien-Vu Giang		✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Van-Son Huynh	✓					✓	✓			✓			✓	✓

C : **C**onceptualization

M : **M**ethodology

So : **S**oftware

Va : **V**alidation

Fo : **F**ormal analysis

I : **I**nvestigation

R : **R**esources

D : **D**ata Curation

O : **O**riting - **O**riginal Draft

E : **E**riting - **R**eview & **E**ditng

Vi : **V**isualization

Su : **S**upervision

P : **P**roject administration

Fu : **F**unding acquisition

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

Authors state no conflict of interest.

INFORMED CONSENT

We have obtained informed consent from all individuals included in this study.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The research related to human use has been complied with all the relevant national regulations and institutional policies in accordance with the tenets of the Helsinki Declaration and has been approved by the authors' institutional review board or equivalent committee.

DATA AVAILABILITY





Derived data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author [T-VG] on request.

REFERENCES





- [1] S. Samanta, "Featuring significant tenets accelerating socio emotional integrity for holistic development in school going students," *Educational Quest- An International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 75–82, 2025, doi: 10.30954/2230-7311.1.2025.10.
- [2] B. G. Gimbert, D. Miller, E. Herman, M. Breedlove, and C. E. Molina, "Social emotional learning in schools: the importance of educator competence," *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 3–39, 2023, doi: 10.1177/19427751211014920.
- [3] M. J. Elias *et al.*, *Promoting social and emotional learning: guidelines for educators*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1997.
- [4] P. A. Jennings and M. T. Greenberg, "The prosocial classroom: teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 79, no. 1, pp. 491–525, 2009, doi: 10.3102/0034654308325693.
- [5] K. A. Schonert-Reichl, "Social and emotional learning and teachers," *Future of Children*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 137–155, 2017, doi: 10.1353/foc.2017.0007.

- [6] R. P. Weissberg, J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, and T. P. Gullotta, "Social and emotional learning: past, present, and future," in *Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice*, J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, and T. P. Gullotta, Eds., New York: The Guilford Press, 2015, pp. 3–19.
- [7] I. Ahmed, A. B. Hamzah, and M. N. L. Y. B. Abdullah, "Effect of social and emotional learning approach on students' social-emotional competence," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 663–676, 2020, doi: 10.29333/iji.2020.13441a.
- [8] C. Cipriano *et al.*, "The state of evidence for social and emotional learning: a contemporary meta-analysis of universal school-based SEL interventions," *Child Development*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 1181–1204, 2023, doi: 10.1111/cdev.13968.
- [9] D. T. Dung and A. Zsolnai, "Teachers' social and emotional competence: a new approach of teacher education in Vietnam," *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 131–144, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1556/063.2021.00050.
- [10] K. M. Hoang and T. Q. Vu, "Teaching social and emotional skills to students in Vietnam: challenges and opportunities," *AsTEN Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.56278/asten.v1i1.144.
- [11] D. M. Le, O. T. Dao, H. P. Nguyen-Thi, and T. A. T. Nguyen, "Identifying social-emotional skills among elementary school students in Vietnam: a cross-sectional study," *International Journal of Education and Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 277–286, 2022, doi: 10.18488/61.v10i3.3140.
- [12] R. P. Corcoran and J. O'Flaherty, "Social and emotional learning in teacher preparation: pre-service teacher well-being," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 110, p. 103563, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2021.103563.
- [13] W. Rekha and G. Pranita, "Role of self-awareness in the promotion of health and well-being of college students," *Archives of Depression and Anxiety*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2024, doi: 10.17352/2455-5460.000086.
- [14] V. S. Huynh, T. V. Giang, V. K. Nguyen, C. H. Nguyen, and H. Q. Bui, "The possibility of applying the social-emotional learning model in teaching of primary teachers: a Vietnamese case study," *European Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 387–395, 2023, doi: 10.12973/eu-jer.12.1.387.
- [15] V. S. Huynh, T. V. Giang, T. T. Do, and T. H. Nguyen, "A cross-sectional study of SEL-based practice in teaching of Vietnamese primary teachers," *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 81–90, 2023, doi: 10.36941/jesr-2023-0008.
- [16] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2017.
- [17] R. F. DeVellis and C. T. Thorpe, *Scale development: theory and applications*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2021.
- [18] L. S. Nowell, J. M. Norris, D. E. White, and N. J. Moules, "Thematic analysis: striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2017, doi: 10.1177/1609406917733847.
- [19] H. Esen and C. Sahin, "Teachers' views of social-emotional skills and their perspectives on social-emotional learning programs," *Journal of Education and Practice*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 205–215, 2017.
- [20] P. T. Nguyen, K. N. V. Nguyen, H. T. T. Do, and Q. T. Nguyen, "Confucian educational thought and its relevance to contemporary Vietnamese education," *Philosophies*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1–21, 2025, doi: 10.3390/philosophies10030070.
- [21] M. S. Poulou, "An examination of the relationship among teachers' perceptions of social-emotional learning, teaching efficacy, teacher-student interactions, and students' behavioral difficulties," *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 126–136, 2017, doi: 10.1080/21683603.2016.1203851.
- [22] K. A. Schonert-Reichl, J. L. Hanson-Peterson, and S. Hymel, "SEL and pre-service teacher education," in *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*, J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, and T. P. Gullotta, Eds., New York: The Guilford Press, 2015, pp. 406–421.
- [23] K. W. Merrell, *Behavioral, social, and emotional assessment of children and adolescents*, 3rd ed. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2008.
- [24] B. Waajid, P. W. Gamer, and J. E. Owen, "Infusing social emotional learning into the teacher education curriculum," *International Journal of Emotional Education*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 31–48, 2013.
- [25] L. J. Hunter, J. C. DiPerna, S. C. Hart, S. Neugebauer, and P. Lei, "Examining teacher approaches to implementation of a classwide SEL program," *School Psychology*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 285–297, 2022, doi: 10.1037/spq0000502.
- [26] D. Donahue-Keegan, E. Villegas-Reimers, and J. M. Cressey, "Integrating social-emotional learning and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education preparation programs," *Teacher Education Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 150–168, 2019.
- [27] J. Sugishita and R. Dresser, "Social-emotional learning (SEL) in a field course: preservice teachers practice SEL-supportive instructional strategies," *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 36–67, 2019.
- [28] M. Hen and M. Goroshit, "Social-emotional competencies among teachers: an examination of interrelationships," *Cogent Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 1151996, 2016, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151996.
- [29] J. Bridgeland, M. Bruce, and A. Hariharan, "The missing piece: a national teacher survey on how social and emotional learning can empower children and transform schools," 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://casel.org/the-missing-piece/>
- [30] R. F. DeVellis, *Scale development: theory and applications*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2003.
- [31] J. A. Durlak, R. P. Weissberg, and M. Pachan, "A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 45, no. 3–4, pp. 294–309, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6.





BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS

Duc-Hoi Dinh     is an associate professor of psychology and currently serves as vice dean and senior lecturer at the Faculty of Early Childhood Education, Thai Nguyen University of Education, Vietnam. He earned his Ph.D. in Psychology from the Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences in 2012, following a master's and bachelor's degree in Psychology from Hanoi National University of Education. His academic specialization lies in personality psychology, developmental psychology, and applied psychology. Over more than two decades of academic work, Dr. Hoi has been actively involved in teacher education, curriculum development, and psychological research with a particular focus on early childhood and ethnic minority education. He can be contacted at email: hoidd@tnue.edu.vn.



Thien-Vu Giang     is a lecturer and researcher at the Department of Psychology, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education (HCMUE), Vietnam. He holds a Ph.D. in Psychology, with his doctoral and postgraduate studies focusing on school counseling, adolescent mental health, and social-emotional learning (SEL). His academic background includes both theoretical and applied training in psychological research methods, group therapy, and digital mental health interventions. He has supervised numerous undergraduate and postgraduate theses and has actively participated in national and institutional-level research projects on student well-being and trauma-informed practices in schools. He can be contacted at email: vugt@hcmue.edu.vn.



Van-Son Huynh     is a full professor in Educational Psychology and currently serves as the president of Ho Chi Minh City University of Education (HCMUE), Vietnam. He earned his Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from the Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences in 2003, following a master's degree in Psychology from Hanoi National University of Education and a bachelor's degree from HCMUE in 1996. He was conferred the title of associate professor in 2012 and full professor in 2019 by the Vietnamese State Council for Professorship. In his academic career, Prof. Son has held various leadership roles including head of the Department of Psychology, dean of the Faculty of Psychology, and vice president of HCMUE. He is actively engaged in the reform of teacher education and mental health support in Vietnamese schools, contributing both as a scholar and policymaker. He can be contacted at email: sonhv@hcmue.edu.vn.