Bodhi International Journal of
Research in Humanities, Arts and Science

Vol. 10 Special Issue 2 March 2026
E-ISSN: 2456-5571

Resilient Pedagogues in the Digital Era: Advancing Mental Health and Well Being in Technology Driven Teacher Education

Dr. N. Devaki[1], P. Nithish[2] & K. Ramya[3]

[1]Associate Professor, [2-3]M.ED., Scholars
Department of Education, Gandhigram Rural Institute
(Deemed to be University), Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu- 624302, India

Open Access

Manuscript ID:
BIJ-SPL2-MAR26-EDU-064

Subject: Education

Received : 23.01.2026
Accepted : 08.02.2026
Published : 20.03.2026

DOI: 10.64938/bijsi.v10si2.26.Mar064

Abstract

The rapid integration of digital technologies into teacher education has transformed pedagogical practice while simultaneously introducing new psychological pressures. This study examines the intersection of mental health, technostress, and digital resilience among pre-service teachers within a sustainability-oriented framework aligned with SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being) and SDG 4 (Quality Education). Using a mixed-methods design, the research explores how technology-rich learning environments influence emotional well-being, cognitive load, and professional identity formation. Data were collected from 248 pre-service teachers across teacher education institutions through validated psychometric scales and semi-structured interviews. Statistical analysis revealed moderate technostress levels correlated with reduced emotional well-being, while digital resilience acted as a protective factor. Qualitative findings indicated that structured support systems, reflective pedagogy, and emotional skill development mitigate negative effects. The study proposes a sustainable model of teacher preparation that integrates digital competence with psychological resilience. Strengthening mental health frameworks within teacher education is essential for cultivating adaptive, future-ready educators capable of thriving in technologically evolving learning ecosystems.

Keywords: SDG 3, SDG 4, digital resilience, technostress, teacher well-being, emotional health, sustainable education

Introduction

Teacher education is undergoing a historic transformation driven by digital acceleration. Classrooms have expanded into hybrid, virtual, and AI-supported environments, redefining what it means to teach and learn. While technological innovation promises increased access, personalization, and efficiency, it simultaneously introduces psychological strain that often remains invisible in policy discussions. The paradox is stark: systems designed to empower educators may inadvertently undermine their well-being. Sustainable education cannot exist without sustainable educators.

Mental health in teacher education is no longer a peripheral concern. The integration of educational technology has increased cognitive demands, blurred professional boundaries, and intensified performance expectations. Pre-service teachers must navigate continuous digital adaptation while forming professional identities. The emotional labor associated with this transition is significant. Research increasingly frames technostress as a structural phenomenon rather than an individual weakness. Technostress refers to the psychological strain arising from excessive technological demands, rapid change, and perceived loss of control over digital systems. When unaddressed, it contributes to burnout, anxiety, and disengagement.

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals offer a compelling lens through which to interpret this issue. SDG 3 emphasizes health and well-being as a foundation for human development.

SDG 4 promotes inclusive and equitable quality education. These goals are interconnected: educational quality depends on educator well-being. A technologically driven teacher education system that neglects emotional health contradicts the spirit of sustainability. Preparing resilient pedagogues requires integrating mental health frameworks into digital pedagogy.

Digital resilience has emerged as a critical protective construct. It refers to the capacity to adapt positively to technological challenges while maintaining psychological stability. Unlike mere digital competence, resilience includes emotional regulation, coping strategies, and reflective awareness. Teacher education programs traditionally emphasize technical skill acquisition but rarely address the emotional dimension of technological engagement. This imbalance produces graduates who are digitally capable yet psychologically vulnerable.

The COVID-era shift to online learning exposed systemic fragilities. Many teacher candidates reported increased isolation, screen fatigue, and performance anxiety. Simultaneously, those with strong social support networks and adaptive coping skills demonstrated greater persistence and innovation. These patterns highlight the necessity of embedding mental health literacy into pedagogical training. Sustainable education demands educators who can model well-being while navigating complexity.

This study investigates how technostress interacts with emotional well-being in technologically intensive teacher education contexts. It also examines the mediating role of digital resilience. The research seeks to move beyond deficit narratives by identifying institutional practices that foster psychological sustainability. Teacher education must evolve into a holistic ecosystem where cognitive, emotional, and digital competencies develop in tandem.

The significance of this research extends beyond individual welfare. Teacher well-being influences classroom climate, student outcomes, and institutional stability. Educators experiencing chronic stress are more likely to disengage professionally, reducing instructional quality. Conversely, emotionally resilient teachers cultivate supportive learning environments that enhance student motivation. The ripple effects are systemic.

The central premise guiding this investigation is simple but profound: technology should expand human capacity, not erode it. Sustainable innovation requires psychological scaffolding. A resilient pedagogue is not one who resists technology, but one who integrates it with self-awareness and emotional balance. Teacher education programs must intentionally design structures that protect mental health while promoting digital growth.

Literature Review

Recent studies situates teacher well being as a cornerstone of educational sustainability. Studies demonstrate that high technostress correlates with burnout and reduced job satisfaction (Li & Wang, 2020; Syvänen et al., 2019). The concept of emotional labor explains how educators regulate feelings to meet institutional expectations, often at personal cost (Burić & Kim, 2021).

Digital resilience research suggests that adaptive coping mechanisms buffer the negative effects of technological overload (Rasheed et al., 2020). Emotional intelligence training has been linked to improved digital adaptability (Brackett et al., 2019). Teacher education institutions that integrate mindfulness and reflective practice report lower anxiety levels among trainees (Jennings, 2018).

The sustainability discourse frames well-being as an ethical imperative. UNESCO (2021) emphasizes educator support systems as essential for SDG 4 achievement. Studies connecting SDG 3 and SDG 4 highlight the reciprocal relationship between mental health and educational effectiveness (Votruba et al., 2020).

Emerging research on AI-enhanced education identifies a new layer of psychological complexity. Teachers must negotiate trust in automated systems while preserving professional agency (Holmes & Tuomi, 2022). Without adequate support, this negotiation produces cognitive dissonance and stress.

Cross-cultural analyses reveal that collectivist institutional cultures mitigate technostress through

collaborative support networks (Tondeur et al., 2021). Conversely, competitive performance metrics intensify emotional strain (Kim & Asbury, 2020). The literature converges on a central insight: institutional design matters more than individual resilience alone.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of mental health and well-being among pre-service teachers in technologically driven teacher education. The quantitative phase examined measurable relationships among technostress, digital resilience, and emotional well-being. The qualitative phase followed to interpret and contextualize statistical findings through lived experiences.

The mixed-methods design was selected because mental health in digital learning environments is both measurable and experiential. Quantitative data captured patterns and relationships, while qualitative narratives explained mechanisms behind those patterns.

Population and Sample

The target population consisted of pre-service teachers enrolled in technology-integrated teacher education programs in India.

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure representation across gender, specialization, and institutional type.

1. Sample size: 248 participants
2. Age range: 20–26 years
3. Gender distribution: 61% female, 39% male
4. Institutional representation: 4 teacher education colleges

The sample size met statistical adequacy requirements for regression and mediation analysis.

Instruments

Three standardized and validated instruments were used:

1. *Technostress Creators Scale (TCS)*
   Measures perceived digital overload, Complexity, and uncertainty. Reliability (Cronbach's alpha): 0.89
2. *Digital Resilience Inventory (DRI)*
   Assesses adaptive coping and emotional regulation in digital contexts. Reliability: 0.87
3. *Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS)*
   Measures psychological well-being and emotional functioning. Reliability: 0.91
   All instruments used a 5-point Likert scale.

Reliability Analysis

Table 1: Reliability Coefficients

Instrument	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Technostress Scale	23	0.89
Digital Resilience Inventory	18	0.87
Well-being Scale	14	0.91

All reliability values exceed 0.80, indicating strong internal consistency. This confirms that instruments measured constructs reliably and were suitable for inferential analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS.

The analysis included:

- Descriptive statistics
- Reliability analysis
- Pearson correlation
- Multiple regression
- Mediation analysis
- ANOVA
- Independent t-test

Each statistical step is presented below with tabulation and interpretation.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Technostress	248	3.42	0.61	1.90	4.80
Digital Resilience	248	3.87	0.54	2.10	4.90
Emotional Well-being	248	47.3	8.2	22.0	63.0

The mean technostress score indicates moderate stress levels among participants. Digital resilience scores were comparatively high, suggesting strong adaptive capacity. Emotional well-being scores fall within the normal psychological range but show variability, indicating unequal emotional experiences across participants.

Pearson Correlation Analysis

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Technostress	Digital Resilience	Well-being
Technostress	1	-0.46**	-0.52**
Digital Resilience	-0.46**	1	0.58**
Emotional Well-being	-0.52**	0.58**	1

Note: p < .01

Technostress is negatively correlated with emotional well-being, meaning higher stress reduces psychological health. Digital resilience is positively correlated with well-being and negatively correlated with technostress. This indicates resilience acts as a psychological buffer.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 4: Regression Predicting Emotional Well-being

Predictor	B	SE	Beta	t	p
Technostress	-4.12	0.68	-0.41	-6.05	.000
Digital Resilience	5.63	0.74	0.44	7.61	.000

Model Fit: **$R^2 = 0.48$**

$F(2,245) = 113.6, p < .001$

The regression model explains 48% of the variance in well-being. Technostress significantly predicts reduced emotional health. Digital resilience significantly predicts improved well-being. Both predictors independently contribute to mental health outcomes.

Mediation Analysis

Digital resilience was tested as a mediator between technostress and well-being using bootstrapping.

Table 5: Mediation Effects

Path	Effect	SE	p
Technostress → Well-being	-0.52	.05	.000
Technostress → Resilience	-0.46	.06	.000
Resilience → Well-being	0.44	.05	.000
Indirect Effect	-0.20	.03	.000

Digital resilience partially mediates the relationship. This means technostress harms well-being both directly and indirectly by reducing resilience. Strengthening resilience weakens the negative psychological impact of technological stress.

ANOVA: Institutional Differences

Table 6: Institutional Comparison

Institution	Mean Well-being	SD
A	50.1	7.2
B	45.8	8.5
C	47.9	7.9
D	44.6	8.8

ANOVA: $F(3,244) = 6.72, p < .01$

Significant differences exist across institutions. Colleges with structured mentoring and digital training reported higher well-being scores. Institutional culture influences mental health outcomes.

Independent t-test: Gender Comparison

Table 7: Gender Differences

Gender	Mean Well-being	SD	t	p
Male	48.6	7.8	1.92	.05
Female	46.5	8.4		

Gender differences were marginally significant. Male participants reported slightly higher well-being, but effect size was small. This suggests stress is widespread and not confined to a single demographic group.

Statistical Findings

The statistical evidence confirms:

1. Technostress significantly reduces emotional well-being

2. Digital resilience protects mental health
3. Institutional support systems matter
4. Psychological adaptation is teachable
5. Well-being is structurally influenced, not purely individual

Descriptive statistics indicated moderate technostress levels (M = 3.42, SD = 0.61). Emotional well-being scores averaged 47.3 (SD = 8.2). Digital resilience scores averaged 3.87 (SD = 0.54).

Correlation analysis showed a negative relationship between technostress and well-being ($r = -0.52$, $p < .01$). Regression modeling revealed digital resilience as a significant mediator ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < .001$). ANOVA indicated institutional differences in support structures affecting outcomes.

Result and Findings

Higher technostress predicted lower emotional health. Participants with strong digital resilience maintained stable well-being despite technological pressure. Interview data highlighted three protective factors: peer collaboration, structured digital training, and reflective emotional practices.

Participants described resilience as a learned capacity rather than a fixed trait. Institutions offering mentorship programs showed reduced anxiety scores. Emotional literacy training improved adaptability to digital change.

Discussion

The findings align with prior research linking technostress to burnout while extending the literature by quantifying resilience as a mediating mechanism. Studies by Rasheed et al. (2020) and Holmes & Tuomi (2022) similarly emphasize adaptive capacity as critical in AI-rich environments. This research confirms that resilience can be intentionally cultivated.

Teacher education must shift from reactive support to proactive psychological design. Embedding well-being practices within curriculum normalizes emotional care. Sustainable pedagogy emerges when institutions treat mental health as infrastructure, not an optional add-on.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Technological progress without psychological safeguards is unsustainable. Teacher education programs must integrate mental health frameworks aligned with SDG 3 and SDG 4. Recommended actions include mandatory emotional resilience modules, institutional mentorship systems, and ongoing well being assessments. Resilient pedagogues are architects of sustainable education. Supporting their mental health ensures the continuity of educational ecosystems capable of thriving amid technological transformation.

References

1. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2019). Emotional intelligence and teacher well-being.
2. Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art in AI and the future of education.
3. Jennings, P. A. (2018). Mindfulness for teachers.
4. Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). Teachers' well-being during digital transition.
5. Li, L., & Wang, X. (2020). Technostress and teacher burnout.
6. Rasheed, R. A., et al. (2020). Digital resilience in online learning.
7. Syvänen, A., et al. (2019). Technostress in educational settings.
8. Tondeur, J., et al. (2021). Institutional culture and digital adaptation.
9. UNESCO. (2021). Reimagining education for sustainability.
10. Votruba, N., et al. (2020). Mental health and sustainable development.