

Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Religiosity to Prosocial Behavior in College Students

Mujidin¹, Husnul Khotimah Rustam², Ilham Setyo Aji³

Abstract

Honesty is essential in all fields of life, including education. Based on our preliminary findings, students are typically dishonest and ignorant of others. This statement is accordance with our research objective to determine whether emotional intelligence influence students prosocial behavior. We targeted a suitable sample, namely 132 Psychology undergraduate students selected through random cluster sampling. The students filled out three scales: the prosocial scale, the emotional intelligence scale, and the religiosity scale. The prosocial scale and emotional intelligence reliability are 0.948 and 0.920, respectively. The religiosity scale, on the other hand, has a reliability of 0.955. This study's results indicate a significant relationship between emotional intelligence, religiosity, and prosocial behavior. We conclude that emotional intelligence and religiosity are significantly related to prosocial behavior. The practical contribution of emotional intelligence and religiosity to prosocial behavior is 68.97%. Specifically, emotional intelligence contributed 10.53% and religiosity contributed 58.44%. Emotional intelligence helps students become more sensitive and open with other people, which leads to a strong desire to rise with one another. Religiosity also has a significant impact when students increase their belief in God. This study specifically explores the positive prosocial behavior that can be assisted by emotional intelligence and religiosity. Future studies can expand this research's discussion by exploring the negative side of prosocial under different conditions.

Keywords: *Emotional Intelligence, Religiosity, Prosocial Behavior, Students.*

Introduction

As with willingness and generosity, prosocial behavior also benefits others. With generosity, people can quickly help others. The most striking characteristics of prosocial behavior include helping, sharing, and harmonizing with others (Li & Shao, 2022). However, the primary reason behind people's prosocial behavior is still debated. Regardless of the motive, what is most important, is that through prosocial relation, individuals provide mutual support for one another, which lead to harmony and peace (Luengo et al., 2014). Prosocial applies to everyone, including students, who communicate and interact with many people.

Prosocial interactions in students lead to positive relationships with other people, such as family, lecturers, and peers, which materializes familiarity (Carlo & Padilla-Walker, 2020). Subsequently, familiarity influences desire to benefit others voluntarily. Another positive impact of prosocial behavior is the development of good social relations which subsequently affect adaptability until adulthood (Caprara et al., 2014). Additionally, prosocial behavior help protects individuals from aggressive behavior and other problems. Individuals can notice requests for help from others which encourages sympathy, gratitude, and appreciation (Malonda et al., 2019). In other words, prosocial individuals tend to be more popular and labeled as being helpful to others. This trait allows them to spread positive emotions better and show honesty to others, which makes others admire and like prosocial people.

Prosocial behavior needs to be given attention because it is an inherent part of human life as social beings. The need for prosocial behavior is especially true because people have shown more individualistic nature as of late. Pitaloka and Ediati (2015) stated that ignorance of small things in that need attention in surrounding environments frequently occurs, including in students. Some examples of this individualistic attitude are being ignorant when seeing peers having difficulty moving their vehicle out of the parking area, staying away from community activities, and only caring about themselves. Students should have developmental tasks to achieve responsible social behavior. Sembiring (2015) stated that students seeking

¹ Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia, Jl. Kapas No 9 Yogyakarta, 55161, Indonesian, Email: mujidin.230760@gmail.com

² Institut Teknologi Kesehatan dan Sains Muhammadiyah Sidrap, Indonesia.

³ Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

knowledge in lectures are social beings that need relationships with other human beings. Students need reciprocal interaction with the people around them, be it friends, lecturers, or even the surrounding community. Someone with a high level of independence still needs others at certain times. Prosocial behavior is a form of reciprocity, a mutual fulfillment of needs between individuals, including in the context of the student environment in college.

Apparently, many students often commit negative actions toward others for over a decade. A study found that students voluntarily celebrated alcohol parties (Peacock, 2022), implying that prosocial behavior among university students may expose them to the risk of drinking alcohol and sexually deviant behavior. Honesty is one value of prosocial behavior that students are starting to lose; as reported in Kompas.com (2022) accessed August 30, 2022, at 23.00, approximately 400 Aceh students faked statements of incapability to receive scholarship funds.

Based on information collected by the Ditreskrim Investigation team of the Aceh Regional Police, some economically capable students deliberately faked certificates of incapacity to receive scholarships. The estimated loss suffered by the country reached more than Rp. 10 billion. Scholarship funds that eligible students should have obtained were misdirected and caused detrimental to students who should have met the requirements. However, Theall et al., (2009) provide a different perspective on this phenomenon through prosocial lens. Not all students show unfavorable behavior; exceptions exist in student participating in community service and religious organizations. They tend to not be associated with negative prosocial activities. In respect to religious and spiritual values, a person should not be motivated to drink alcohol or engage in deviant behavior (Au & Wong, 2022).

According to Xia et al., (2022), religious values refer to a supernatural power that encourages humans to absolutely depend and feel the protection of God. Individuals naturally develop a belief in religion to feel the warmth and harmony of other people in their surroundings (Hallett & McCoy, 2015). Religious value grows a strong bond called emotional and psychological intelligence, which eventually motivates individuals to adapt and become better individuals (Hercik et al., 2004; O'Connor et al., 2006)

Students are motivated to help others based due to an innate good intention and display it in the act of helping behaviors (Glazer, 2021). Helping behaviors have been displayed by assisting friends in trouble, teaching friends to understand lecture material, and other positive behaviors. This statement is supported by the research results of Kaltwasser et al., 2017; Mayer et al., 2004). Emotional intelligence is the ability to determine and manage emotions properly. This also includes managing the emotions of those around you. Emotional intelligence has three forms of skills. Firstly, emotional awareness, which refers to awareness of emotions in oneself and others. Second, the ability to manage or control emotions and skills utilizing emotional states of mind. Previous researchers also defined this emotional intelligence as the ability to understand, interpret, and manage our own emotions. Others also defined it as the ability to understand, interpret, and influence others. This definition is supported by the statement of Wang et al., (2021) that individuals perceive that they must help people who are in trouble and in need of help. Individuals assess the assistance provided as a form of active involvement with others

This study will examine more regarding students' organizational activities, which have yet to be addressed in previous studies. Students were asked about their organizational activities, social responsibility, disaster management, disaster volunteers, donors, sharing books and stationery, empathy for others, and honesty in the lecture process. We assume the conditions mentioned earlier had little to do with student prosocial behavior. Students' attitudes and behavior are heavily influenced by controllable factors such as a sense of religiosity that has been instilled from an early age. Additionally, emotional intelligence helps them adapt to social environments.

This research is urgent and involves other factors when viewing student prosocial behavior. We involve social media, mental health issues, opinion leadership, morals, and social adaptation. This study is critical and can inspire other parties to examine current prosocial behavior more deeply. For this reason, we hypothesize that there is an influence of emotional intelligence on prosocial behavior in students. The higher the emotional intelligence, the higher the prosocial behavior of students; conversely, the lower the

emotional intelligence, the lower the prosocial behavior of students. Second, there is a positive relationship between religiosity and prosocial behavior in students. The higher the religiosity, the higher the prosocial behavior of students; conversely, the lower the religiosity, the lower the prosocial behavior.

Research Method

Population and Sample

The population of this study includes 319 students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of Ahmad Dahlan. This total number students were divided into five classes: A, B, C, D, and E, with 65, 65, 64, 65, and 60 total students, respectively. Psychology students were chosen because the most representative cluster was psychology students. In addition, the symptoms of prosocial decline were also slightly reflected in this large group, so the research team was interested in conducting this research. From the 319 people, we used two classes for research trial and the remaining three for final research. We pre-tested the two trial classes with the scale that had been prepared. Then, the following three classes became research targets with the number items that had been eliminated accordingly. Some items were eliminated due to it having low index coefficients. The three classes that were used as research sample were class A, B, and C. The three classes had a total number of 132 students.

Design

This study was designed using quantitative observational techniques. Before conducting the research, the research team made observations to determine how urgent the problems were in Psychology student sample. After observing, the researchers gave open ended questions to students. Next, the researcher makes a research proposal and validates it to professional judgment. The goal is to acquire a scale that is most suitable for the target that is easily understood by students. The researchers then grouped the samples and researchers divided them into two large groups. After that, the researcher conducted research to test the hypothesis. The researchers found many different answers to be analyzed according to the participants responses.

Instrument

There are three major scales, namely the prosocial behavior scale, emotional intelligence, and religiosity. All instruments were designed using a Likert Scale. These Likert scales were used to measure attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a person or group about social phenomena. That social phenomenon is defined by the researchers as the research variable. In the Likert scale used in this study, the variables to be measured are translated into variable indicators. These indicators are then used as a starting point for compiling instrument items as statements or questions. We provide four alternative answers: very appropriate, appropriate, inappropriate, and very inappropriate. We used professional judgment and Cronbach's alpha for validity and reliability. Validity examines to what extent the items in the test include all parts of the appropriate content and do not exceed the limits of the measurement objectives assessed by experts. Whereas, determining the reliability of the value > 0.60 is said to be a reliable or consistent instrument. As a result, several scales are less reliable, so they are not included in the research scale.

Prosocial Behavior Scale

Prosocial behavior refers to the act of sincerely or voluntarily helping other individuals with the intention of improving the situation individuals that need assistance, without basing this assistance on any interest despite it potentially posing risks to the one providing assistance. The scale used in this study refers to Eisenberg and Mussen, (1989) that suggested five aspects of prosocial behavior: sharing, working together, helping, giving, and acting honestly. The researcher modified the scale according to the discussion and professional judgment results which resulted to a total of 20 items in this scale. The highest index is 0.845 in item 24, and the lowest index is 0.244 in item 2, with an overall reliability coefficient of 0.948. Examples of prosocial behavior items include "I prefer to tell the truth to others," "I send a message of condolences if a friend gets into a disaster," and "When there is a natural disaster, I am moved to donate some of the

clothes I have, "I do an assignment which is difficult with friends," and "I congratulate if a friend wins a competition." These previously mentioned item represents students' prosocial behavior.

Emotional Intelligence Scale

Emotional intelligence is a person's ability to control and respond to their emotions. The scale used in this study refers to Watson (2016) which states that there are five aspects of Emotional Intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. There are 25 items, with the highest index of 0.709 in item number 17 and the lowest index of 0.292 in item number 7, with a reliability coefficient of 0.920. Emotional intelligence in this study is illustrated by the example of the items "I know environmental situations that make me sad or happy," "When contacting lecturers, I always include opening and closing greetings, and apologies and thanks," "Everyone and myself deserve to be happy," "I often listen to podcasts, watch YouTube or read something that can increase my enthusiasm to achieve my goals," and "I easily get along in new environments such as meeting new friends or living in a boarding house."

Religiosity Scale

Religiosity refers to humans' attachment regarding belief in religious teachings and behavior in daily life, which will have an impact on humans in everyday life. In this study, we refer to the theory of Stark and Glock (1968) to determine the research aspects. These aspects are belief, worship, experience, knowledge, and consequences. There are 30 valid and reliable items, with the highest index of 0.817 on item number 20 and the lowest index of 0.395 on item number 22, with a reliability coefficient of 0.955. Religious items include "I never feel alone because there are angels who are ready to record every deed I do," "The rules in religion make my life more nuanced in religion," and "When I get a disaster, I try to leave everything to Allah," "I know that disobeying parents is an act of disobedience," and "I believe Allah sees all the deeds done by His servants."

Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis techniques, which is a measurement to test the hypothesis of the relationship of two or more independent variables together with one dependent variable, was used as the data analysis technique to test the hypothesis in this study. In this analysis, the researcher also looked at descriptive data, such as each variable's minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values. Then, the researcher determines the categorization of each scale, starting from the low, medium, and high categories. This study found that the prosocial behavior variables had values of 20, 80, 50, and 10. Meanwhile, the empirical scores were 51, 79, 65, and 4.7. Then, the emotional intelligence variable has a hypothetical score including min = 25, max = 100, mean = 62.5, and SD = 12.5, while the empirical score is min = 63, max = 97, mean = 80, and SD = 5.7. Then for the religiosity variable, the hypothetical score is min = 30, max = 120, mean = 75, and SD = 15. The empirical score is min = 77, max = 120, mean = 98.5, and SD = 7.2.

Based on the categorization mentioned above, it was found that most student display high prosocial behavior (83.33% → 110 students), with the remaining (16.67% → 22 students) displayed moderate prosocial behavior. For the emotional intelligence variable, it was found that most students had high category (51.5% → 68 students), while 64 other students were in the moderate category. Furthermore, the low religiosity category variables were low, with a percentage of (20.5% → 27 students). In comparison, 105 students (79.5%) displayed high religiosity. It can be concluded that students in this study predominantly had high levels of prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, as well as religiosity.

Result

This study found that emotional intelligence and religiosity significantly influence prosocial behavior. The findings show that the hypothesis is accepted unconditionally. The hypothesis is proven to be the strength and novelty which builds previous research findings. We also assume that the p-value can measure research

success, which is proven in this research. The significance level (p) used was $p < 0.01$, which means it is very significant, and $p \leq 0.05$, which is significant, as shown in the table below.

Table 1. Multiple Regression Analysis Result

Variable	Coefficient (R)	F	Sig. level (p)	Description
Emotional Intelligence and Religiosity on Prosocial Behavior	0.831	143.567	0.000	Very significant, accept hypothesis

Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis tests. The results obtained using multiple regression techniques between emotional intelligence and religiosity with prosocial behavior displayed a coefficient (R) of 0.831, an F value of 143.567, and the significance level (p) of 0.000, meaning $p < 0.01$ confirming that the hypothesis can be accepted. Therefore, the higher students' emotional intelligence and religiosity are, the higher students' prosocial behavior become. Conversely, the lower students' emotional intelligence and religiosity are, the lower the possibility of prosocial behavior such as helping, giving, and telling the truth. In addition, researchers ensure research findings from the contribution of each variable. The coefficients and contribution of each variable are described in the table below:

Table 2. Minor Hypothesis Testing Results

Variable	Partial Correlation Coef. (r)	Sig. level (p)	Description
Emotional Intelligence and Prosocial Behavior	0.210	0.016	Significant, hypothesis accepted
Religiosity and Prosocial Behavior	0.684	0.000	Very Significant, hypothesis accepted

Based on minor hypothesis test results, the emotional intelligence variable with prosocial behavior obtains a partial correlation coefficient (r) of 0.210 with a significance level (p) of 0.016 ($p < 0.05$), meaning it is significant and the first minor hypothesis can be accepted. A positive relationship exists between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior in Psychology students at Ahmad Dahlan University. So, the higher the emotional intelligence of students, the higher the prosocial behavior, and vice versa; if students' emotional intelligence is low, the lower the prosocial behavior of Psychology students at Ahmad Dahlan University. The religiosity variable with prosocial behavior obtains a partial correlation (r) of 0.684 with a significance level (p) of 0.000 ($p < 0.01$), which means it is very significant, and the second minor hypothesis can be accepted. A positive relationship exists between religiosity and prosocial behavior in Psychology students at Ahmad Dahlan University. The higher the student's religiosity, the higher the prosocial behavior, and vice versa; if the student's religiosity is low, the lower the prosocial behavior of Psychology students at Ahmad Dahlan University.

As explained earlier, we also look for the details of the contribution of each variable. The practical contribution of this study aims to find out and see the contribution made by each independent variable to the dependent variable. Based on the formula $SE = \text{Beta} \times r \text{ (zero order)} \times 100\%$. The results of the effective contribution of each variable are as follows:

Table 3. Effective Contribution

Number	Variable	Effective Contribution
1.	Emotional Intelligence	10.53%
2.	Religiosity	58.44%
	Total	68.97%

Based on the effective contribution table above, the variables of emotional intelligence and religiosity simultaneously contribute 68.97% to prosocial behavior. To be specific, emotional intelligence contributed to prosocial behavior as much as 10.53%, whereas religiosity contributed to prosocial behavior as much as 58.44%. Thus, it is concluded that religiosity contributes more effectively than emotional intelligence towards prosocial behavior.

Discussion

This study examines the relationship between emotional intelligence and religiosity with prosocial behavior in Psychology students at Ahmad Dahlan University. This study has one major hypothesis and two minor hypotheses based on the results of multiple regression analysis. The results obtained using multiple regression techniques between emotional intelligence and religiosity with prosocial behavior show a coefficient (R) of 0.831, F value of 143.567, and significance level (p) of 0.000, meaning $p < 0.01$, which suggest that the hypothesis can be accepted. Therefore, the higher students' emotional intelligence and religiosity, the higher these students' prosocial behavior. Whereas the lower students' emotional intelligence and religiosity are, the chance for prosocial behavior such as helping, giving, and telling the truth lowers. This statement is in line with previous study which suggest that religious people show sensitivity and concern for the welfare of others (Donahue & Benson, 1995; Maiya et al., 2021). Furthermore, other study supports the finding of this study as they suggest high religious behavior of students were actualized due to individuals' generosity and benevolence towards others (Einolf, 2011). On the one hand, the ease with which students can assist is also supported by the findings of Getahun Abera (2021).

The variables of emotional intelligence and religiosity directly influence prosocial behavior variables. The religiosity variable has a more significant influence than the emotional intelligence variable. In this study, a total of 83.33% of students in the Faculty of Psychology, University of Ahmad Dahlan, were categorized as having high prosocial behavior. In regards to emotional intelligence, 51.5% of students of the Faculty of Psychology at Ahmad Dahlan University was included in the high category. The level of religiosity categorization for students of the Faculty of Psychology at Ahmad Dahlan University showed that 79.5% of students were included in high category.

According to Martí-Vilar et al., (2019) emotional intelligence critical predictor compared to other predictor variables. In their study, 180 Spanish students aged 18 to 25 showed prosocial characteristics. The findings of this study are in line the results of Hanana's, research (2019) which state that emotional intelligence influences prosocial behavior, especially on the dimensions of self-recognition and social skills. The ability to monitor oneself, understand strengths and weaknesses, and overcome existing problems. Social skills such as socializing well can also help individuals act according environmental norms around them (Hanana, 2019). Students can manage feelings and behave according to the conditions around them, therefore giving the ability to interact well, be attractive to other, and respond quickly to their surroundings (Brackett et al., 2004).

Emotional intelligence helps bring out behaviors such as sharing, teamwork, helping each other, acting honestly, and willingness to share owned assets. Previous studies by Triantasya et al., (2021) stated that there was a relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior in student X. The results showed that 27 students had high prosocial behavior, 107 students were in the medium category, and 27 others were in a low category. Their study finding suggest that medical student in campus X can manage emotions. In fact, having negative emotions did not discourage them from helping others. Zhao et al., (2020) support the statement as they suggest that emotionally intelligent individuals can assess the emotions of others and quickly respond accordingly.

Masela (2020) states that individuals with emotional intelligence must be able to feel emotions appropriately to provide convenience in living life as social beings, where social beings will help each other and reflect other prosocial behavior. In other research related to emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior, Batool and Lewis (2020) concluded that they advise parents to provide emotional intelligence training to adolescents to introduce them to prosocial behavior due to the relationship between these two variables.

The results of previous research are in line with the results of this study, where when an individual with the ability to have self-awareness, can self-regulate, motivation, and empathy, as well as the ability to develop social skills such as communicating, building relationships, and conflict management, will show prosocial behaviors such as helping, cooperating, giving, sharing, and helping. The research results by (Muryadi & Matulesy, 2012) also obtained the categorization of emotional intelligence on prosocial behavior of 98.7% in the high category and 1.25% in the medium category.

We found research that differs from this research's findings, where individuals who tend to be aggressive cannot practice prosocial behavior (Moffitt, 2013; Nelson et al., 2007; Saleme et al., 2020). The individual's aggressive actions reduce his intentions and sincerity towards others, which is different from this study's results. In contrast, this research supports the power of emotional intelligence to strengthen prosocial relations among students regardless of social strata and economic status.

The results of further studies state a very significant relationship between religiosity and prosocial behavior. The higher the religiosity of the students of the Faculty of Psychology, Ahmad Dahlan University, the higher the prosocial behavior, and the lower the religiosity, the lower the emergence of prosocial behavior. Previous research shows that religiosity and prosocial behavior have a significant relationship, where religiosity effectively contributes 42.9% to prosocial behavior, and the rest is not detected by other variables not examined by Arvianna et al., (2021).

Other previous studies state a positive relationship between religiosity and prosocial behavior. Someone with a high level of religiosity will have a way of life such as the Al-Quran in Islam. That person will have an inner attachment to religious teachings, such as sharing feelings when friends are happy or sad, being able to work together, helping and assisting fellow human beings, and acting honestly. This is in line with Myer's opinion, which says that apart from being an influential factor in shaping helping behavior, it also promises protection and a sense of security for someone to find their existence (Silfiyah et al., 2019). Silfiyah et al also states in their study that religiosity influences prosocial behavior. Saroglou state that when individuals are genuinely religious, these individuals tend to show prosocial behavior, be more empathetic, and follow moral guidelines according to religion.

A study by Satrio et al., (2020) showed that religiosity variable and prosocial behavior obtained a regression coefficient of 0.816 and a significance of 0.013 in a statistical testing. Therefore suggesting a $p < 0.05$, that indicate that religiosity variable has a significant relationship with prosocial behavior. Religion can form strong individuals who act honestly, work together, are tolerant, respect rights and welfare, are optimistic, and help each other. Schumann (2020) specifically explains that research related to relationships shows that religious individuals tend to be more empathetic and generous, want to volunteer, be forgiving, cooperate, and help. In line with several previous experimental studies, individuals with religion also tend not to show criminal and aggressive behavior, which further increase that religiosity also directs individuals to prosocial behavior such as helping, sacrificing themselves for others, and reducing feelings of revenge.

Xia et al., (2021) made a novel finding that Buddhists, Christians, and Chinese do not show a sense of concern in playing games. Even though the subjects are different, from this research, we can conclude that religious values do not affect individual prosocial behavior. They display more indifferent actions towards others and do not show social concern. These findings were in line with a study by Barton et al., (2020) which opposes the results of this research. This is something new that has yet to be found in previous studies.

This research can be a starting point to find out more deeply how students can behave prosocial regardless of others economic and social status. In addition, this study provides insight into the influence of emotional intelligence on explaining prosocial behavior. Moreover, it becomes the main foundation in the strategy to arouse students' religious concerns to do better and mean more to others. Behind it all, this research has limitations. The limitations encountered in conducting this research were that data collection took quite a long time because of the number of subjects needed to meet the number following the error level requirements. Data was collected online so that the data distributed were returned partially.

Conclusion

The findings of this study conclude that there is a very significant relationship between emotional intelligence and religiosity with prosocial behavior in students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of Ahmad Dahlan. Then, a significant relationship exists between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior in students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of Ahmad Dahlan. Therefore, the higher the emotional intelligence, the higher the prosocial behavior; conversely, the lower the emotional intelligence, the lower the prosocial behavior in students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of Ahmad Dahlan.

Acknowledgements

We like to thank you all participants included student on faculty Psychology Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for give us a chance and support to complete research.

Author Biography/ Biographies

Mujidin, a lecturer at Ahmad Dahlan University in the field of educational psychology. He has research related to the field of education, especially motivation, optimism, emotional intelligence, academic procrastination and other research themes.

Husnul Khotimah Rustam is a lecturer working at the Muhammadiyah Sidrap Institute of Health and Science Technology. Currently he teaches several psychology-related courses such as psychosocial, psychology in dental health, midwifery psychology and health psychology. In addition, Husnul also has research experience in the field of educational psychology

Ilham Setyo Aji, as assistant lecturer at Ahmad Dahlan University in the field of general psychology.

Declaration of Conflicts Of Interests:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Arvianna, L. F., Mashabi, N. A., & Hasanah, U. (2021). Hubungan Antara Religiusitas Dengan Perilaku Prosocial Pada Remaja Di Perumahan Patria Jaya. *JKKP (Jurnal Kesejahteraan Keluarga Dan Pendidikan)*, 8(01), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jkkp.081.07>
- Au, G. W. Y., & Wong, D. S. W. (2022). Desistance from Crime among Chinese Delinquents: The Integrated Effects of Family Bonding, Prosocial Models, and Religious Bonding. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19105894>
- Barton, H., Thorpe, J., & Dufur, M. (2020). Social capital and prosocial behavior among german children. *Social Sciences*, 9(11), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9110215>
- Batool, S. S., & Lewis, C. A. (2020). Does positive parenting predict pro-social behavior and friendship quality among adolescents? Emotional intelligence as a mediator. *Current Psychology*, Walker 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00719-y>
- Brackett, M. A., Mayer, J. D., & Warner, R. M. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(6), 1387–1402. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00236-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00236-8)
- Caprara, G. V., Kanacri, B. P. L., Gerbino, M., Zuffianò, A., Alessandri, G., Vecchio, G., Caprara, E., Pastorelli, C., & Bridgllall, B. (2014). Positive effects of promoting prosocial behavior in early adolescence: Evidence from a school-based intervention. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 38(4), 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025414531464>
- Carlo, G., & Padilla-Walker, L. (2020). Adolescents' Prosocial Behaviors Through a Multidimensional and Multicultural Lens. *Child Development Perspectives*, 14(4), 265–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12391>
- Donahue, M. J., & Benson, P. L. (1995). Religion and the Well-Being of Adolescents. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(2), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1995.tb01328.x>
- Einolf, C. J. (2011). The link between religion and helping others: The role of values, ideas, and language. *Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review*, 72(4), 435–455. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/srr017>
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). The roots of prosocial behavior in children. Cambridge University Press.
- Getahun Abera, W. (2021). Emotional Intelligence and Pro-Social Behavior as Predictors of Academic Achievement Among University Students. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272684X211033447>

- Glazer, T. (2021). Emotion regulation and cooperation. *Philosophical Psychology*, 34(8), 1125–1145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2021.1942812>
- Hallett, M., & McCoy, J. S. (2015). Religiously motivated desistance: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(8), 855–872. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14522112>
- Hanana, N. F. (2019). Pengaruh Self-Esteem dan Kecerdasan Emosi Terhadap Perilaku Prososial. *TAZKIYA: Journal of Psychology*, 6(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v6i1.11011>
- Hercik, J., Lewis, R., Myles, B., Gouvis, C., Zweig, J., Whithy, A., Rico, G., & McBride, E. (2004). Development of a Guide to Resources on Faith-Based Organizations in Criminal Justice Final Report. 182. https://proxy.library.upenn.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/reports/development-guide-resources-on-faith-based/docview/9736615/se-2?accountid=14707%0Ahttps://upenn.alma.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/openurl?institution=01UPENN_INST&vid=01UPENN_INST:S
- Kaltwasser, L., Hildebrandt, A., Wilhelm, O., & Sommer, W. (2017). On the relationship of emotional abilities and prosocial behavior. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 38(3), 298–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.10.011>
- Li, J., & Shao, W. (2022). Influence of Sports Activities on Prosocial Behavior of Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116484>
- Luengo, B. P., Pastorelli, C., Zuf, A., Eisenberg, N., Ceravolo, R., & Vittorio, G. (2014). Trajectories of prosocial behaviors conducive to civic outcomes during the transition to adulthood : The predictive role of family dynamics *. 37.
- Maiya, S., Carlo, G., Landor, A. M., & Memmott-Elison, M. K. (2021). Ethnic-Racial and Religious Identity as Mediators of Relations Between Ethnic-Racial Socialization and Prosocial Behaviors Among Black Young Adults. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 47(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798420971388>
- Malonda, E., Llorca, A., Mesurado, B., Samper, P., & Vicenta Mestre, M. (2019). Parents or peers? Predictors of prosocial behavior and aggression: A longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(OCT), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02379>
- Martí-Vilar, M., Serrano-Pastor, L., & Sala, F. G. (2019). Emotional, cultural and cognitive variables of prosocial behaviour. *Current Psychology*, 38(4), 912–919. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-0168-9>
- Masela, M. S. (2020). Pengaruh Antara Konsep Diri Dan Kecerdasan Emosi Terhadap Perilaku Prososial Pada Remaja. *Psikovidya*, 23(2), 214–224. <https://doi.org/10.37303/psikovidya.v23i2.149>
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Findings, and Implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
- Moffitt, T. E. (2013). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *The Science of Mental Health: Volume 7: Personality and Personality Disorder*, 100(4), 90–117.
- Muryadi, & Matulesy, A. (2012). Religiusitas, Kecerdasan Emosi Dan Perilaku Prososial Guru. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 7(2), 544–561.
- Nelson, C. A., Thomas, K. M., & de Haan, M. (2007). Neural Bases of Cognitive Development. In *Handbook of Child Psychology (Issue March)*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0201>
- O'CONNOR, T. P., DUNCAN, J., & QUILLARD, F. (2006). Criminology and Religion: the Shape of an Authentic Dialogue. *Criminology <html_ent Glyph="&" Ascii="&"> Public Policy*, 5(3), 559–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2006.00390.x>
- Peacock, J. (2022). Relationships between prosocial factors and college student health. *Journal of American College Health*, 70(2), 347–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2020.1750413>
- Pitaloka, D. A., & Ediat, A. (2015). Rasa Syukur Dan Kecenderungan Perilaku Prososial Pada Mahasiswa Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Diponegoro. *Jurnal Empati*, 4(2), 43–50.
- Saleme, P., Pang, B., Dietrich, T., & Parkinson, J. (2020). Prosocial digital games for youth: A systematic review of interventions. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 2(October), 100039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100039>
- Satrio, D., Budiharjo, A., & Prasetyani, D. (2020). Hubungan Religiusitas Dan Kepribadian Terhadap Perilaku Prososial Pada Perawat. *Pena Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Dan Teknologi*, 34(1), 77. <https://doi.org/10.31941/jurnalpena.v34i1.1205>
- Schumann, K. (2020). A Force for Good: When and Why Religion Predicts Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Moral Theology*, 9(1), 34–50.
- Sembiring, M. (2015). HUBUNGAN KECERDASAN EMOSI DAN KECERDASAN SPIRITUAL DENGAN PERILAKU PROSOSIAL MAHASISWA CALON KATEKIS PADA SEKOLAH TINGGI PASTORAL SANTO BONA VENTURA KEUSKUPAN AGUNG MEDAN. *Universitas Medan Area*.
- Silfiyah, K., Suroso, & Amanda, R. P. (2019). Hubungan Antara Religiusitas dan Kewarganegaraan. *Jurnal Keislaman*. Vol., 8(2), 26–38.
- Stark, R., & Glock, C. Y. (1968). *American piety: The nature of religious commitment*. University of California Press.
- Theall, K. P., Dejong, W., Scribner, R., Mason, K., Schneider, S. K., & Simonsen, N. (2009). Social capital in the college setting: The impact of participation in campus activities on drinking and alcohol-related harms. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(1), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.58.1.15-25>
- Trianatasya, R. A. S., Yudianti, E., & Affah, S. (2021). Kecerdasan Emosi dan Perilaku Prososial pada Mahasiswa. *Indonesian Journal of Behavioral Studies*, 1(2), 196–205. <https://doi.org/10.19109/ijobs.v1i2.9284>
- Wang, H., Wu, S., Wang, W., & Wei, C. (2021). Emotional Intelligence and Prosocial Behavior in College Students: A Moderated Mediation Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(September), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713227>

- Watson, E. J. (2016). *Emotional intelligence: A practical guide on how to raise your EQ and achieve lifelong social success*. Amazon Digital Services LLC.
- Xia, W., Guo, X., Luo, J., Ye, H., Chen, Y., Chen, S., & Xia, W. (2021). Religious identity, between-group effects and prosocial behavior: Evidence from a field experiment in China. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 91(January), 101665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2021.101665>
- Xia, W., Guo, X., Luo, J., Ye, H., Chen, Y., Chen, S., & Xia, W. (2022). Religious affiliations of Chinese people and prosocial behavior: evidence from field experiments. *Review of Economic Design*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10058-022-00317-3>
- Zhao, J. L., Cai, D., Yang, C. Y., Shields, J., Xu, Z. N., & Wang, C. Y. (2020). Trait Emotional Intelligence and Young Adolescents' Positive and Negative Affect: The Mediating Roles of Personal Resilience, Social Support, and Prosocial Behavior. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 49(3), 431–448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-019-09536-2>.