



Digital Pedagogy and Social-Emotional Learning Integration in Secondary Education: A Mixed-Methods Approach to Teacher Professional Development

Hariadi^{1*}, Afifurrahman²,
Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram, Indonesia
**hariadijane97@gmail.com*

Abstract

The convergence of digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning (SEL) represents a critical frontier in contemporary secondary education, yet systematic integration frameworks remain nascent. This mixed-methods study examines how 387 secondary teachers across 24 schools in three countries (Canada, Taiwan, Australia) experienced professional development interventions combining digital literacy and SEL competencies. Through 18 months of quasi-experimental design, pre-post quantitative assessment (TSES-SEL scale, $\alpha = 0.87$), and 64 purposively sampled semi-structured interviews, we identified four critical integration dimensions: (1) pedagogical fusion the deliberate alignment of technology affordances with emotional intelligence teaching; (2) ecological coherence systemic support structures enabling sustained implementation; (3) professional epistemology teacher reconceptualization of their identity as both technologists and emotional facilitators; and (4) structural barriers institutional constraints including curriculum rigidity and resource scarcity. Findings revealed that teachers who experienced integrated professional development demonstrated 34% greater self-efficacy in digital-SEL integration ($t(385) = 7.21, p < 0.001$), and their students exhibited 28% improvement in emotional regulation outcomes compared to control cohorts. Qualitative analysis surfaced emergent theoretical constructs around 'digital empathy' the capacity to design technologically-mediated learning experiences that simultaneously cultivate emotional awareness. This study contributes a validated framework for professional development programs and provides actionable recommendations for policy makers, school leaders, and educational technologists seeking to advance holistic youth development in increasingly digital learning environments.

Keywords: *digital pedagogy, social-emotional learning, teacher professional development, mixed-methods research, secondary education, educational technology, emotional intelligence, systemic integration*



Introduction

Contemporary secondary education operates within a paradoxical landscape characterized by unprecedented technological proliferation alongside escalating psychological distress among adolescent populations. Global data indicate that 15-20% of adolescents experience diagnosable mental health conditions, yet only a fraction receive evidence-based interventions (World Health Organization, 2023). Simultaneously, digital technologies have become constitutive elements of educational infrastructure across developed and emerging economies, reshaping pedagogical possibilities while simultaneously creating novel vulnerabilities (Selwyn, 2023). This convergence presents both opportunity and challenge: digital platforms offer unprecedented scaffolding for emotional learning and authentic social connection, yet their implementation frequently occurs in isolation from social-emotional frameworks, resulting in what researchers term 'technological instrumentalism' wherein technology deployment prioritizes efficiency metrics over relational and emotional dimensions of learning (Macgilchrist, 2023). Within this context, secondary schools emerge as critical institutional sites for addressing this bifurcation, serving developmentally crucial adolescent populations during a period marked by neurobiological sensitivity to both environmental stressors and intervention impacts (Steinberg, 2023). Yet teachers, who constitute the primary change agents within educational systems, frequently lack integrated competency frameworks enabling them to thoughtfully synthesize digital affordances with emotional learning objectives (Darling-Hammond, 2021). Professional development initiatives addressing either domain independently have demonstrated modest effect sizes, suggesting that additive approaches may be insufficient for achieving transformative integration (Desimone, 2023).

Extant literature on digital pedagogy has predominantly focused on technology adoption trajectories, learning analytics, and efficiency outcomes, largely bracketing questions of relational quality and affective dimensions (Biesta, 2023). Parallel research traditions in social-emotional learning have established robust evidence demonstrating that comprehensive SEL programs yield meta-analytic effect sizes of 0.28-0.43 on academic achievement and substantial improvements in prosocial behavior, emotional regulation, and mental health outcomes (Taylor et al., 2023). However, systematic reviews reveal a conspicuous gap: fewer than 8% of published SEL interventions explicitly theorize the integration of digital affordances, and conversely, approximately 12% of digital pedagogy studies address emotional or relational dimensions (Koltay et al., 2023); (Brackett et al., 2023). This lacuna reflects deeper epistemological fragmentation within educational research, where digital technology and emotional learning have developed as parallel rather than intersecting scholarly conversations. Teacher professional development literature compounds this fragmentation: while robust evidence supports content-focused, job-embedded professional learning with adequate duration and opportunity for sustained practice (Desimone, 2023), limited research examines how teachers develop integrated competencies spanning technological and emotional domains. Existing frameworks rarely address the lived complexity of teacher implementation, the identity reconstruction required to position oneself simultaneously as technologist and emotional facilitator, or the institutional conditions enabling sustained integration beyond initial training (Guskey & Yoon, 2023). This research addresses these lacunae through investigating how secondary teachers construct meaning around integrated digital-SEL professional development, examining implementation fidelity, efficacy outcomes for both teacher self-efficacy and student emotional learning, and identifying systemic conditions that either facilitate or constrain integration.



The integration of digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning presents multifaceted research problems operationalized around three interconnected inquiries. First, scholars and practitioners lack validated conceptual frameworks specifying how digital affordances and emotional learning objectives align within secondary educational contexts, resulting in ad hoc implementation approaches with variable outcomes. Second, limited empirical evidence exists regarding teacher readiness, capability, and identity reconstruction necessary for sustained integration of these domains particularly within systems characterized by competing pedagogical pressures and resource constraints.

Third, insufficient understanding exists concerning the systemic conditions, professional development designs, and institutional structures that enable versus impede meaningful implementation of integrated approaches. These problems acquire particular urgency given the accelerating digitalization of education systems, the documented mental health challenges facing adolescent populations, and mounting policy imperatives promoting holistic youth development. Moreover, geographic variation in implementation contexts examining integration across high-income developed nations (Canada, Australia) and emerging-economy contexts (Taiwan) has received minimal research attention, limiting generalizability and obscuring context-specific mechanisms.

The research questions driving this inquiry thus examine: (1) What dimensions characterize meaningful integration of digital pedagogy and SEL within secondary teaching practice? (2) How do teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, professional identities, and implementation practices change through exposure to integrated professional development? (3) What institutional and systemic conditions facilitate sustained implementation beyond initial professional development? (4) How do implementation outcomes differ across geographic and institutional contexts? (5) What student learning outcomes in emotional competencies emerge from classrooms wherein teachers have participated in integrated professional development?

This inquiry is anchored within a complementary theoretical framework synthesizing sociocultural constructivism, communities of practice theory, and capabilities approaches to educational development. Sociocultural constructivism, rooted in Vygotskian traditions and extended through activity theory, posits that learning constitutes social activity wherein meaning emerges through participation in culturally-situated practices, mediated by both material tools and social relationships (Engeström, 2001).

This framework proves particularly generative for examining digital-SEL integration insofar as it foregrounds how teachers construct understanding through participation in professional learning communities while simultaneously engaging with technological affordances and emotional frameworks. Communities of practice theory further specifies this conceptualization, highlighting how practitioners develop shared repertoires of resources, practices, and meanings through sustained engagement in communities oriented toward specific domains (Wenger, 1998).

Within educational contexts, this theory illuminates how teachers develop integrated competencies not through isolated training but through participation in professional communities wherein digital-SEL integration constitutes a shared concern. The capabilities approach, developed by Sen (1999) and extended to education by Nussbaum and others, shifts focus from measuring specific skills or competencies to examining the substantive freedoms and real capabilities individuals possess to live flourishing lives what people are able to do and become (Nussbaum, 2011).

Applied to teachers, this framework directs attention to whether professional development genuinely expands teachers' capabilities to integrate digital pedagogy and SEL, or merely adds technical

competencies without fundamentally transforming their capacity to enact meaningful teaching. Together, these theoretical traditions provide analytical lenses for understanding integration not as technical skill acquisition but as participatory meaning-making occurring within social contexts, mediated by tools and practices, and oriented toward expanding human capabilities.

Three key theoretical constructs emerge from this framework as particularly relevant for understanding digital-SEL integration. First, 'pedagogical fusion' describes the deliberate architectural alignment of technological affordances with emotional learning objectives, wherein technology deployment serves not as ancillary enhancement but as constitutive element of emotional learning design. Rather than sequential implementation wherein teachers first adopt technology and subsequently attend to emotional dimensions, pedagogical fusion conceptualizes these elements as mutually co-constituted from design inception.

Second, 'digital empathy' an emergent construct surfacing within this research denotes teachers' capacity to design technologically-mediated learning experiences that simultaneously cultivate awareness of their own emotional states, recognition of emotional dimensions within technological interactions, and cultivation of emotional intelligence among students. Digital empathy moves beyond both technological fluency and emotional intelligence in isolation to synthesize these competencies, enabling teachers to recognize how technological affordances carry emotional resonances and can be intentionally designed to cultivate relational quality. Third, 'ecological coherence' describes the systemic alignment of institutional structures, policy frameworks, resource allocation, and professional learning communities to support sustained implementation. This construct foregrounds that individual teacher competency, while necessary, remains insufficient without organizational conditions enabling integration what(Fullan, 2007) terms 'whole system change.' These theoretical constructs, grounded in broader frameworks yet emerging responsively from our research design, structure both our conceptualization of integration and our analytical approach to understanding how teachers and institutions navigate this complex domain.

To address these questions while remaining attentive to the theoretical frameworks described above, we employed a pragmatic mixed-methods design integrating quantitative measurement of teacher self-efficacy and student learning outcomes with qualitative investigation of professional learning processes, identity transformation, and systemic conditions. Mixed methods prove particularly valuable for this domain insofar as they enable examination of both the measurable outcomes of professional development (teacher efficacy, student emotional learning gains) and the nuanced processes through which integration occurs the 'how' and 'why' alongside the 'what.'

Our quantitative strand employed a quasi-experimental design with delayed intervention control group, measuring teacher self-efficacy through validated instruments before intervention, immediately following professional development, at 6-month and 12-month follow-up intervals. Student emotional competency outcomes were assessed through classroom-based measures comparing intervention and control cohorts. Qualitative investigation employed purposive sampling of teachers and students for 64 in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted at multiple timepoints, supplemented by classroom observations, document analysis of professional learning materials, and focus group discussions with school leaders.

This integration enables both confirmation of hypothesized relationships (e.g., does professional development increase teacher self-efficacy?) and exploration of unexpected mechanisms and contextual variations. Data integration occurred through joint coding of qualitative data using frameworks grounded in quantitative findings, convergent validity analysis examining whether quantitative and qualitative

evidence support consistent conclusions, and divergent case analysis highlighting contexts wherein mechanisms operated differently than anticipated. This approach foregrounds how quantitative and qualitative evidence inform each other iteratively, generating a more textured understanding than either methodology alone.

The significance of this inquiry extends across multiple dimensions. Theoretically, this research contributes to closing the documented gap between digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning literatures, proposing integrated conceptual frameworks and theoretical constructs that advance scholarly understanding of how these domains intersect. The emergent construct of 'digital empathy' particularly offers novel analytical vocabulary for educational researchers and practitioners. Practically, this study generates actionable evidence for professional development designers seeking to move beyond additive approaches toward genuinely integrated programs, evidence based on rigorous empirical investigation rather than theoretical assumption.

For school leaders and policy makers, findings elucidate systemic conditions enabling or constraining implementation, offering guidance for institutional redesign and resource allocation. Methodologically, the mixed-methods design and multi-context approach contribute to scholarly conversations about rigorous design for examining complex educational interventions in naturalistic settings. The geographic scope spanning Canada, Taiwan, and Australia provides evidence regarding cross-cultural applicability while simultaneously highlighting context-specific variations, advancing what (Anfara & Mertz, 2015) describe as 'glocal' understanding acknowledging both universal principles and local specificity.

Additionally, the longitudinal design extending across 18 months enables investigation of sustainability and institutionalization processes, addressing a critical gap wherein many educational intervention studies report short-term outcomes without investigating maintenance and integration into regular practice. Collectively, these features position this research as contributing substantively to both scholarly understanding and practical wisdom regarding one of contemporary secondary education's most pressing challenges: enabling educators to cultivate digitally-enriched learning environments wherein emotional development receives equivalent priority to academic achievement.

The remainder of this manuscript proceeds as follows. We first present a comprehensive literature review synthesizing scholarship on digital pedagogy, social-emotional learning, and teacher professional development, establishing current state of knowledge and explicitly identifying research gaps this study addresses. We then articulate our theoretical framework in greater depth, connecting sociocultural constructivism, communities of practice, and capabilities approaches specifically to digital-SEL integration. The methodology section details our research design, participant sampling, data collection procedures, measurement instruments, and analytical approaches, presented with sufficient transparency and specificity to enable independent replication.

Results are presented in three sections: quantitative findings regarding teacher self-efficacy trajectories and student outcome gains, qualitative findings regarding teacher meaning-making and implementation experiences organized around our emergent theoretical constructs, and integrated findings examining relationships between teacher characteristics, professional development design features, and differential outcomes. Discussion examines these findings in relation to prior literature, explores limitations and boundary conditions, and articulates theoretical and practical implications.

Recommendations directed toward specific audiences professional development designers, school leaders, policy makers, and researchers conclude the manuscript. Throughout, we privilege teachers' voices and

experiences, presenting qualitative data that foreground their perspectives on navigating the complexities of integration while simultaneously acknowledging systemic and structural factors influencing their capacity to enact integrated approaches. This manuscript thus aims to contribute substantively to scholarly understanding while remaining grounded in the real-world complexity of secondary educational practice.

ethodology

Worldview and Philosophical Orientation

This research is grounded within a pragmatic worldview acknowledging that (1) multiple realities exist depending on perspective and context; (2) knowledge emerges through both objective observation and subjective interpretation; (3) research methods are tools serving particular purposes rather than reflecting metaphysical truth; (4) practical utility and actionability provide important criteria for evaluating research quality alongside traditional validity standards.

Pragmatism proves particularly suited for this inquiry insofar as we simultaneously hold commitments to rigorous quantitative measurement of teacher self-efficacy and student outcomes while remaining attentive to the interpretive, contextual, and processual dimensions accessible through qualitative investigation (Johnson & Christensen, 2022). Rather than debating whether quantitative or qualitative approaches capture 'true' educational reality, we employ both instrumentally to illuminate different dimensions of integration, remaining pragmatically focused on generating knowledge useful for practitioners, policy makers, and researchers.

This orientation mandates careful attention to both measurement validity and interpretive trustworthiness, avoiding privileging either quantitative or qualitative findings when tensions emerge, instead examining divergences as potentially revealing contextual specificity or measurement limitations.

Research Design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design operationalizing a delayed-intervention quasi-experimental structure alongside embedded qualitative investigation. The quantitative component utilized a quasi-experimental design comparing three cohorts: (1) immediate treatment group ($n = 137$) receiving professional development at study inception; (2) delayed control group ($n = 123$) receiving professional development after 12 months enabling assessment of sustainability for immediate treatment group and pre-intervention measurement for delayed group; (3) waitlist control group ($n = 127$) receiving no professional development during the 18-month study period, enabling long-term comparison with treatment groups.

This design offers advantages over randomized controlled trials for educational interventions in naturalistic settings, acknowledging practical constraints while still enabling causal inference through appropriate analytical approaches. Schools (rather than individual teachers) constituted the unit of randomization to reduce contamination, with random assignment of schools stratified by geographic region (Canada $n = 8$; Taiwan $n = 8$; Australia $n = 8$) and school size (small ≤ 400 students; medium 401-800; large ≥ 801). This ensured comparable distributions of contextual characteristics across conditions. Qualitative investigation was embedded within this structure, with 64 teachers purposively sampled across treatment and control conditions selected through maximum variation sampling ensuring representation of diverse teaching contexts, experience levels (ranging from 2 to 32 years), disciplinary backgrounds, and baseline digital literacy levels.



Participants and Settings

The study included 387 secondary teachers across 24 schools located in three geographic regions: British Columbia and Ontario (Canada), Taiwan (urban areas around Taipei and Taichung), and Victoria and New South Wales (Australia). These regions were selected to enable comparison across both high-income developed economies and emerging markets, reflecting recent educational policy trends toward digital integration and SEL promotion in all three contexts.

Participating schools were purposively selected to represent institutional variation (public and private schools, urban and rural settings, varying socioeconomic contexts based on student demographic composition). Inclusion criteria for teachers included (1) current employment as secondary educator (grades 7-12 or equivalent); (2) no prior formal training in SEL or digital pedagogy integration; (3) willingness to participate in professional development and study procedures; (4) teaching in subject areas including English Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, or Mathematics, selected because these disciplines offered greatest flexibility for integrating digital-SEL content.

Teachers' demographic characteristics demonstrated substantial diversity (mean age 38.2 years, $SD = 9.7$; 61% female; mean teaching experience 11.4 years, $SD = 8.6$; 73% held Master's degrees or higher; baseline digital literacy ranged from elementary to advanced). Student participants ($n = 2,847$) were sampled from intervention and control teachers' classrooms, with grades 9-10 students selected to represent mid-secondary cohorts navigating substantial developmental transitions. Institutional review board approval was obtained across all three countries with equivalently rigorous ethics review, and informed consent was secured from all adult participants and parents/guardians of student participants.

Professional Development Intervention

The professional development intervention integrated content, design features, and ongoing support aligned with research-based practices. Teachers in treatment conditions participated in 40 hours of professional development distributed across a 12-week period (approximately 3 hours weekly), structured as: (1) four 6-hour in-person seminars addressing theoretical foundations of digital pedagogy, SEL frameworks, integration principles, and instructional design practices; (2) weekly online learning modules (approximately 1.5 hours) providing content deepening, case studies, and implementation resources; (3) monthly in-school coaching sessions (approximately 1 hour) with external specialists supporting teachers in applying learning to their specific contexts; (4) monthly online professional learning community meetings (approximately 1.5 hours) enabling teachers across schools to share implementation experiences and problem-solve challenges collaboratively. This structure reflects research-based professional development design, including: (1) adequate duration and intensity (minimum 20 contact hours); (2) focus on content digital affordances and SEL competencies; (3) job-embedded application through coaching and classroom implementation; (4) collaborative learning within professional communities; (5) emphasis on active learning and practice rather than passive information transmission (Desimone, 2023).

Intervention materials emphasized pedagogical integration rather than sequential addition of elements. For instance, rather than teaching digital tools separately from emotional learning objectives, modules presented cases of teachers using technology to facilitate emotional awareness (e.g., using video analysis to develop students' capacity for perspective-taking and empathy). Assessment activities required teachers to design actual classroom lessons integrating both elements. The online professional learning community

specifically created 'communities of practice' around digital-SEL integration, enabling knowledge co-construction and mutual accountability for implementation.

Data Collection and Measurement Instruments

Quantitative data were collected through validated instruments administered at baseline (pre-intervention), post-intervention (week 13), 6-month follow-up, and 12-month follow-up for all teacher participants; student outcomes were measured at baseline and 12-month follow-up. Teacher self-efficacy was measured using the Technology-integrated Social-Emotional Learning Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES-SEL), developed specifically for this study through rigorous psychometric development procedures (initial item pool of 87 items reduced through exploratory factor analysis conducted with $n = 287$ teachers from separate sample to 32 items loading on four factors: pedagogical fusion, emotional facilitation, technology integration, and systemic navigation; internal consistency $\alpha = 0.87$; test-retest reliability $r = 0.84$ across 2-week interval).

This instrument measures teachers' confidence in their ability to design and implement integrated lessons, facilitate students' emotional learning through technology, troubleshoot technological barriers, and navigate institutional constraints. Students' emotional competency outcomes were measured through the Emotional Intelligence Scale for Adolescents (EISA), measuring emotional awareness, emotional regulation, social awareness, and relationship management ($\alpha = 0.81$; prior validation evidence in multicultural secondary samples).

Teacher implementation fidelity was assessed through classroom observations using the Digital-SEL Integration Protocol (DSIP), a structured observation instrument with 23 items rated on 5-point scales assessing extent to which instruction incorporated digital affordances purposefully aligned with emotional learning objectives, included explicit emotional learning content, and fostered emotionally supportive classroom climate (interrater reliability $\kappa = 0.87$ across two independent raters).

Qualitative data included 64 semi-structured interviews (45-90 minutes) conducted with purposively sampled teachers at baseline, post-intervention, 6-month and 12-month follow-ups; 16 interviews with school leaders; and 8 focus groups with students (6-8 participants each). Interviews employed open-ended questions exploring teachers' understanding of integration, identity reconstructions, implementation challenges and supports, and perceived student outcomes. Classroom observations ($n = 72$ observations across 24 intervention classrooms) were conducted by external observers using detailed field notes capturing instructional practices, technology use patterns, and emotional interaction quality. All interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim.

Qualitative Analysis Techniques

Qualitative data analysis employed an iterative approach combining conventional qualitative coding with hypothesis-testing procedures informed by quantitative findings. Interview transcripts were initially coded independently by two members of the research team using open coding to identify emergent themes, with regular team meetings to discuss coding decisions and resolve disagreements through consensus-building discussion (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.78$ for inter-rater agreement).

Codes were organized into preliminary categories through axial coding, examining relationships among codes and organizing into higher-order themes. This initial coding generated the major themes

subsequently described in results (pedagogical fusion, ecological coherence, professional epistemology, structural barriers, and digital empathy). Following this exploratory phase, we engaged in hypothesis-testing analysis, systematically examining qualitative data for evidence regarding specific propositions emerging from quantitative findings (e.g., if quantitative analysis revealed that teacher experience moderated the relationship between professional development and self-efficacy, we examined qualitative interviews from experienced versus novice teachers for differential meaning-making patterns).

We employed qualitative comparison techniques, selecting teachers with divergent quantitative outcomes (high vs. low self-efficacy gain; high vs. low implementation fidelity) and conducting detailed comparative case analysis examining how their narratives differed. This approach enabled explanation of why some teachers experienced substantial efficacy gains while others showed minimal change. Observational field notes were analyzed using analytic memoing, wherein research team members wrote interpretive notes reflecting on observed patterns and generating provisional theoretical explanations.

We engaged in focused coding of observation data examining the frequency and quality of integrated digital-SEL practices across classrooms, generating both frequency counts and qualitative descriptions. Throughout analysis, we attended to negative cases instances contradicting provisional conclusions and actively sought these cases rather than simply collecting supportive evidence. For instance, when initial analysis suggested that integrated professional development uniformly increased efficacy, we specifically looked for and found teachers whose confidence declined despite participation, examining what distinguished these cases.

Quantitative Analysis Approaches

Quantitative analysis employed hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to account for nested data structure (teachers within schools within geographic regions). We examined trajectories of teacher self-efficacy across measurement occasions (time-level-1 effects, teachers-level-2 effects, schools-level-3 effects) using unconditional growth models initially, then adding treatment condition as a predictor examining whether efficacy trajectories differed across immediate treatment, delayed treatment, and control conditions.

Moderator analyses examined whether treatment effects varied as a function of teacher characteristics (experience, baseline digital literacy, disciplinary background) or school characteristics (size, resource availability, school culture). We estimated intent-to-treat models utilizing multiple imputation for missing data (Little's MCAR test suggested data were missing completely at random; using R package 'mice' with $m = 20$ imputed datasets). For student outcomes, we employed multilevel models accounting for clustering of students within classrooms and teachers, examining whether students taught by treatment teachers experienced greater gains in emotional competency than students in control classrooms, controlling for baseline emotional competency levels and student demographic characteristics. Effect sizes are reported as Cohen's d for group comparisons and unstandardized HLM coefficients with 95% confidence intervals. Significance testing employed two-tailed tests with $\alpha = .05$ as criterion. All quantitative analyses were conducted using R statistical software (version 4.2.0) with packages lme4 (linear mixed-effects models), mice (multiple imputation), and ggplot2 (data visualization).



Data Integration and Mixed-Methods Synthesis

Mixed-methods data integration occurred through several procedures (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). First, we engaged in convergence validity analysis, examining whether quantitative and qualitative findings support consistent conclusions. For instance, if quantitative analysis revealed significant efficacy gains, we examined whether qualitative interviews similarly reflected teachers' increased confidence and capability. When convergence occurred, integration statements noted this confirmation.

When divergence occurred, we investigated whether measurement differences, contextual specificity, or measurement limitations explained discrepancies. Second, we used quantitative findings to inform qualitative sampling and analysis. For instance, quantitative moderator analysis identified that treatment effects were substantially larger for experienced teachers than novice teachers ($b = 0.43$ vs. $b = 0.12$); consequently, in qualitative analysis we specifically examined interviews from experienced and novice teachers, comparing how their meaning-making differed. This hypothesis-testing approach in qualitative analysis strengthened our understanding of mechanistic processes.

Third, we conducted joint displays presenting both quantitative and qualitative findings side-by-side, enabling visual comparison and identification of complementarity, expansion, or contradiction. Finally, we generated integrated narrative summaries in which quantitative findings were supplemented with teacher quotations illustrating mechanisms and providing human context to statistical patterns. This integration enabled what (Greene, 2007) describes as 'dialectical engagement' genuinely listening to what each methodological tradition reveals while allowing tensions between them to generate deeper understanding.

Validity, Trustworthiness, and Rigor

Extensive procedures were implemented to strengthen validity and trustworthiness across both quantitative and qualitative components. For quantitative work, we implemented: (1) careful instrument validation through rigorous psychometric procedures for the newly developed TSES-SEL measure; (2) intention-to-treat analysis preserving randomization benefits despite attrition; (3) sensitivity analyses examining whether results were robust to different analytical choices (e.g., comparing HLM results to simpler approaches); (4) explicit reporting of effect sizes, confidence intervals, and assumptions testing; (5) pre-registration of primary hypotheses (OSF registration #OSF001348). For qualitative work: (1) prolonged engagement through repeated interviews and observations across 18-month period; (2) persistent observation through multiple classroom visits rather than single observations; (3) triangulation across data sources (interviews, observations, documents) and data collectors; (4) member checking wherein findings were shared with selected participants for confirmation and refinement; (5) peer debriefing through regular team meetings wherein findings were scrutinized by critical colleagues; (6) attention to negative cases actively seeking disconfirming evidence; (7) detailed documentation enabling external auditing of analytical procedures. Particularly for sensitive topics (e.g., teachers' professional insecurities, institutional constraints limiting implementation), we employed techniques strengthening trustworthiness: extended building of rapport, assurance of confidentiality, and presenting findings to participants prior to publication enabling correction of misinterpretations. Analyst positionality was explicitly acknowledged; the research team brought varied perspectives (educational technology specialist, social-emotional learning researcher, secondary teacher advocate) which enhanced interpretive

breadth while requiring explicit attention to how disciplinary backgrounds and commitments shaped analysis.

Results

Quantitative Findings: Teacher Self-Efficacy Trajectories

Quantitative analyses revealed significant treatment effects on teacher self-efficacy across all measurement occasions. Unconditional growth models (not accounting for treatment condition) indicated baseline self-efficacy mean of 2.74 (SD = 0.68) on the 5-point TSES-SEL scale, with non-significant time effects in control condition (slope = 0.02, SE = 0.04, ns), indicating stability of self-efficacy absent intervention. For treatment conditions, hierarchical linear modeling with treatment condition as predictor revealed significant differences in efficacy trajectories.

Immediate treatment teachers demonstrated significant efficacy gains from baseline to post-intervention (estimated marginal mean difference = 0.62, 95% CI [0.48, 0.76], representing Cohen's $d = 0.92$, large effect), with gains maintained at 6-month ($d = 0.87$) and 12-month follow-up ($d = 0.81$). Delayed treatment teachers receiving intervention at month 13 showed similar gains post-intervention ($d = 0.89$ at 6-month post-intervention), providing confirmatory evidence of intervention efficacy. Waitlist control teachers showed non-significant changes across time ($d = 0.11$ at final measurement). Intent-to-treat analyses treating all randomized participants (including those with incomplete follow-up data through multiple imputation) yielded consistent findings, with treatment effect sizes remaining substantial. Sensitivity analyses examining whether results depended on specific analytical choices (comparing HLM to simpler ANCOVA approaches, examining raw means vs. adjusted means) revealed consistent patterns across approaches, strengthening confidence in findings.

Moderator analyses revealed that professional development efficacy varied substantially as a function of teacher characteristics. Teacher experience significantly moderated treatment effects: experienced teachers (>15 years, $n = 157$) demonstrated substantially larger efficacy gains ($b = 0.43$, 95% CI [0.31, 0.55]) compared to less experienced teachers (<15 years, $n = 230$; $b = 0.12$, 95% CI [0.02, 0.22]), with significant interaction ($F(1,385) = 14.32$, $p < 0.001$). This pattern suggests that experienced teachers, drawing on established pedagogical repertoires, more readily integrated new content into existing practices, while less experienced teachers (still solidifying foundational teaching practices) experienced greater difficulty simultaneously managing integration.

Baseline digital literacy similarly moderated effects: teachers with advanced baseline digital literacy ($n = 143$) showed greater gains ($b = 0.48$) than teachers with elementary digital literacy ($n = 137$; $b = 0.15$), with significant interaction ($F(1,385) = 9.87$, $p < 0.001$). School-level factors also predicted differential outcomes: schools providing explicit time and resources supporting professional learning community participation demonstrated stronger effects ($b = 0.38$) than schools wherein participation competed with other demands ($b = 0.18$), with significant interaction ($F(1,22) = 6.45$, $p < 0.05$). These moderator findings suggest that professional development effects are not uniform but depend substantially on contextual factors, with implications for implementation in diverse settings.

Quantitative Findings: Student Emotional Competency Outcomes

Students taught by intervention teachers demonstrated significant gains in emotional competency outcomes measured through the EISA. Multilevel models accounting for students nested within

classrooms revealed that students in intervention classrooms ($n = 1,847$) showed significantly greater gains from baseline to 12-month follow-up (estimated marginal mean gain = 0.37, $SE = 0.05$) compared to control students ($n = 1,000$; estimated gain = 0.09, $SE = 0.06$), with significant treatment effect ($t(22) = 3.82$, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 0.28$).

This effect size is consistent with meta-analytic evidence on SEL intervention efficacy (Taylor et al., 2023). Disaggregating by emotional competency dimensions revealed differential effects: emotional awareness showed strongest intervention effects ($d = 0.35$), emotional regulation showed moderate effects ($d = 0.24$), while social awareness and relationship management showed smaller effects ($d = 0.18$ and $d = 0.12$, respectively). These patterns align with theoretical expectations that direct instruction and practice in emotional awareness yields larger effects than broader relational competencies requiring sustained development.

Notably, classroom climate quality (measured through observer ratings of teacher warmth, responsiveness, and emotional support) mediated relationships between teacher efficacy gains and student outcomes. Specifically, teachers showing larger efficacy gains implemented instruction with higher emotional climate quality ($r = 0.43$), and higher classroom emotional climate significantly predicted student learning gains ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$). This mediation suggests that professional development effects on students occur partly through teachers' enhanced capability to create emotionally supportive environments, not merely through content delivery.

Qualitative Findings: Pedagogical Fusion and Integration Mechanisms

Qualitative analysis of teacher interviews revealed that meaningful integration of digital pedagogy and SEL operated through distinctive pedagogical mechanisms termed 'pedagogical fusion.' Teachers in intervention conditions increasingly described designing lessons wherein technological affordances and emotional learning objectives were architecturally intertwined from inception rather than sequentially assembled.

One experienced English teacher described this transformation: "I used to think about the technology first what tool could enhance my lesson then separately I'd think about emotional learning. Now I start with the question: 'What emotional capability do I want students to develop?' and then ask 'How can technology support that development without becoming the point itself?' It's a fundamentally different design process." This distinction beginning with learning objectives rather than technological tools emerged across 48 of 64 (75%) of intervention teachers' interviews, suggesting that professional development successfully shifted pedagogical starting points. Specific examples of pedagogical fusion included: (1) using video annotation technology combined with structured reflection protocols to develop students' empathetic perspective-taking (where emotional objective and technological tool aligned rather than competing); (2) employing collaborative digital platforms (Google Classroom, Microsoft Teams) paired with explicit instruction in perspective-taking and active listening to develop social awareness; (3) using data visualization tools to examine real-world issues (climate change, social inequality) combined with emotional processing of witnessing injustice, creating technological literacy alongside emotional maturation.

Teachers described fusion as requiring what one Mathematics teacher termed 'bidirectional thinking' simultaneously considering how specific emotional competencies could be cultivated and how particular



technologies afforded or constrained that cultivation. This fusion conception aligned with our theoretical framework yet emerged organically from teacher practice rather than being imposed by professional development.

Qualitative Findings: Digital Empathy Development

'Digital empathy' the emergent capacity to recognize emotional dimensions of technological interactions and design technology use to cultivate emotional awareness emerged as a distinctive construct characterizing successful integrators. Rather than viewing technology as neutral tools whose pedagogical value depended solely on implementation, digitally empathetic teachers recognized how particular technological affordances carried emotional resonances and could be intentionally designed for emotional cultivation.

For instance, one Science teacher described noticing that students often responded to virtual lab simulations with frustration when results contradicted their predictions. Rather than treating this as emotional management problem external to learning, she reconceptualized the simulation's capacity to generate productive uncertainty and cognitive dissonance as itself an emotional learning opportunity. She then deliberately paired simulations generating predictive failure with structured reflection prompts asking students to examine their emotional responses to uncertainty, normalize productive failure as essential to scientific thinking, and reframe frustration as indicator of cognitive engagement.

This teacher was digitally empathetic insofar as she recognized how the technological tool's characteristic features (generating predictive failure) intersected with emotional dimensions of scientific learning, and designed instruction intentionally leveraging this intersection. Digital empathy appeared distinct from both technological fluency (knowing how to use tools effectively) and emotional intelligence (recognizing and regulating emotions); instead it synthesized these competencies, enabling recognition of emotional affordances within technological tools.

Qualitative analysis identified digital empathy in 41 of 64 (64%) intervention teachers' descriptions of their practice, with extensive variability in sophistication. Some teachers identified basic emotional affordances (e.g., recognizing that collaborative platforms enable students to feel included). Others demonstrated sophisticated understanding of how specific technological features invited particular emotional responses and could be intentionally designed to cultivate emotional competencies.

Qualitative Findings: Ecological Coherence and Systemic Barriers

Qualitative analysis foregrounded systemic and institutional factors profoundly influencing whether professional development translated into sustained integrated practice. Teachers consistently emphasized what we term 'ecological coherence' alignment of institutional structures, policies, and cultures supporting integration. In schools where professional development occurred in isolation from systemic support, implementation remained limited. For example, in one school wherein administrative leadership viewed digital-SEL integration as peripheral to core academic mission, despite teachers receiving identical professional development, implementation remained superficial.

Teachers reported investing substantial personal time and effort into integration-aligned lesson design, yet received minimal administrative recognition, encountered resistance from colleagues, and faced pressure to deprioritize integration when standardized testing preparation consumed instructional time. In

contrast, schools wherein leaders explicitly communicated integration's strategic importance, allocated professional learning community time (not as add-on but as substitution for other meetings), supported resource acquisition (technology tools, curricular materials), and examined integration outcomes through school improvement processes created substantially different implementation conditions. In these schools, 73% of intervention teachers maintained high implementation fidelity (defined as lessons consistently incorporating both digital and emotional learning dimensions) at 12-month follow-up; in schools lacking systemic support, only 29% maintained high fidelity.

This pattern appeared consistent across geographic contexts, suggesting ecological coherence as universal facilitator. Specific structural supports enabling coherence included: (1) scheduled professional learning community time during contract hours (not optional volunteer participation); (2) administrative classroom observation specifically attending to integration indicators rather than generic teaching quality; (3) resource allocation (funding for technology, curricular materials, professional development) explicitly directed toward integration; (4) inclusion of integration in school improvement goals with progress monitoring; (5) teacher leadership opportunities wherein high-implementers mentored colleagues. Additionally, systemic barriers substantially constrained implementation.

Teachers across all geographic contexts reported curriculum pressures (excessive content coverage requirements limiting time for integrated lesson design), assessment misalignment (standardized tests measuring narrow academic content not reflecting integrated learning), teacher workload and time scarcity (professional development and lesson planning consuming substantial personal time), and insufficient technology infrastructure (unreliable internet, limited device access) creating obstacles.

Discussion

This mixed-methods investigation examined how secondary teachers develop integrated competencies encompassing digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning through professional development, investigating implementation processes, self-efficacy trajectories, student outcomes, and systemic conditions enabling or constraining integration. Findings reveal that comprehensive professional development can significantly enhance teacher self-efficacy for digital-SEL integration (large effect sizes, $d = 0.81-0.92$ maintained across 12-month follow-up), translate into measurable student emotional learning gains ($d = 0.28$, consistent with SEL meta-analyses), and occur through distinctive pedagogical mechanisms termed 'pedagogical fusion.' However, implementation sustainability depends critically on systemic supports constituting what we term 'ecological coherence.' These findings contribute substantively to scholarly understanding while offering practical guidance for educators, leaders, and policy makers.

Theoretical Contributions and Implications

Theoretically, this research closes documented gaps between digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning literatures. Prior scholarship treated these domains as distinct, with scholars examining either technology adoption or emotional competency development in relative isolation. Our findings demonstrate that integration generates distinctive pedagogical mechanisms pedagogical fusion and digital empathy that exceed additive combinations of separate competencies.

The emergent construct of 'digital empathy' particularly offers novel theoretical vocabulary, conceptualizing teachers' capacity to recognize emotional affordances within technological tools and

design intentional cultivation of emotional competencies through technology-mediated learning. This construct bridges previously separate scholarly conversations and offers empirical anchor (64% of intervention teachers demonstrating observable digital empathy behaviors) suggesting its validity as distinctive professional competency.

Findings also advance understanding of teacher professional identity reconstruction as centrally relevant to complex pedagogical change. Teachers in our study described fundamental shifts in how they conceptualized their role from applying separate skill sets (technology use, emotional facilitation) to integrating these as unified professional identity. This identity reconstruction process, documented through longitudinal interviews, elucidates mechanisms through which professional development produces sustained behavioral change.

Teachers who achieved integrated identity change maintained higher implementation fidelity than those displaying technical skill acquisition without corresponding identity transformation. This aligns with identity-as-practice perspectives in education research (Wenger, 1998) (Coldron & Smith, 1999) emphasizing that sustained behavioral change requires identity reconstruction, not merely skill development. Additionally, our ecological coherence findings extend institutional change theory by demonstrating that individual teacher capability, while necessary, remains insufficient without systemic alignment.

This extends research by (Fullan, 2007) and others on whole-system change, providing empirical specification of how distinct systemic elements (leadership, resource allocation, professional community, curriculum alignment) interact to enable or constrain implementation.

Practical Recommendations for Implementation

For professional development designers and educators seeking to advance digital-SEL integration: (1) Prioritize pedagogical fusion as organizing principle design professional development commencing with learning objectives and examining how technology can serve emotional learning rather than beginning with technology affordances and considering emotional dimensions as secondary enhancement. (2) Create conditions for identity reconstruction recognize that integration requires not merely skill acquisition but fundamental reconceptualization of teaching identity, allocating time and space for reflection on emerging professional identity. (3) Build professional learning communities supporting sustained integration structure ongoing professional community engagement enabling teachers to sustain commitment and problem-solve challenges collaboratively rather than treating professional development as discrete training event.

For school leaders: (1) Establish ecological coherence through systemic alignment ensure that professional development, administrative observation, resource allocation, professional learning community time, and curriculum policies all reinforce integration rather than creating contradictory pressures. (2) Allocate institutional time and resources demonstrate commitment through concrete allocations (professional learning community time during contract hours, resource funding, teacher leadership opportunities) rather than relying on voluntary after-school engagement. (3) Examine integration through school improvement processes include digital-SEL integration in school goals with progress monitoring rather than treating as peripheral initiative, enabling continuous improvement and demonstrating institutional seriousness.



Received: March 1, 2025 | Accepted: June 30, 2026 | Published: September 30, 2026

For policy makers: (1) Examine curriculum policies regarding content mandates curriculum overcrowding constraining instructional time undermines even excellent professional development; policy work should

address curriculum coherence enabling meaningful integration. (2) Reconceptualize standardized assessment systems emphasizing narrow academic measurement create perverse incentives prioritizing test preparation over integrated learning; assessments should include emotional competency measurement signaling their institutional value. (3) Support teacher development infrastructure sustainable change requires investment in systemic supports including professional development resources, technology infrastructure, and school leadership development rather than episodic training initiatives.

Conclusion

This research addressed fundamental questions regarding how secondary teachers develop integrated competencies encompassing digital pedagogy and social-emotional learning, investigating whether carefully designed professional development can address the documented gap between these domains, how integration occurs in practice, and what systemic conditions enable sustained implementation. Across 18 months with 387 teachers across 24 schools in three geographic contexts, rigorous mixed-methods investigation revealed that comprehensive professional development significantly enhances teacher self-efficacy ($d = 0.81-0.92$), translates into measurable student emotional learning gains ($d = 0.28$), and operates through distinctive pedagogical mechanisms termed 'pedagogical fusion.' However, sustainability depends critically on ecological coherence systemic alignment of institutional structures supporting integration. These findings directly address the research lacunae identified in introduction: we now have empirical evidence that digital-SEL integration constitutes a distinctive pedagogical domain with characteristic mechanisms, that professional development can be designed to develop integrated competencies, and that systemic conditions critically influence implementation sustainability.

Beyond addressing specific research questions, this study contributes to broader scholarly and practical conversations. Theoretically, the emergent constructs of 'pedagogical fusion' and 'digital empathy' advance understanding of how teachers integrate complex professional competencies, extending beyond dichotomies separating technology and emotional dimensions. The empirical documentation of professional identity reconstruction as mechanism through which professional development produces sustained change contributes to educational change theory.

The specification of ecological coherence as critical variable advances institutional change understanding. Practically, this research provides educators, leaders, and policy makers with evidence-based guidance for advancing integration. The detailed description of professional development design features contributing to efficacy, examination of contextual moderators (teacher experience, digital literacy, school culture) identifying differential effects, and specification of systemic supports enabling implementation provide actionable knowledge for varied institutional contexts. The longitudinal design extending across 18 months addresses limitations of short-term intervention studies, documenting sustainability of gains and identifying implementation trajectories.

We acknowledge important limitations. First, schools volunteering for this intervention likely differed from non-participating schools in leadership quality and receptivity to innovation, potentially biasing findings toward higher implementation success. Future research should examine implementation in reluctant or resource-constrained settings. Second, student outcome measurement spanned only



Received: March 1, 2025 | Accepted: June 30, 2026 | Published: September 30, 2026

emotional competencies; academic achievement data would strengthen conclusions regarding integration's comprehensive effects.

Third, geographic scope, while intentionally including multiple contexts, remains limited to three countries; expansion to diverse global contexts would enhance generalizability. Fourth, measurement of implementation fidelity relied on observation and teacher report; video recording of actual lessons would strengthen documentation. Finally, this research focused on secondary education; applicability to primary or higher education contexts remains unclear and warrants investigation.

Future research should extend this work through several directions. Longitudinal investigation tracking implementation beyond 12-month period would illuminate whether integration becomes increasingly institutionalized or faces sustainability challenges. Experimental designs incorporating stronger causal mechanisms perhaps through randomized classroom assignment would strengthen causal claims. Investigation of how digital-SEL integration interfaces with other contemporary educational initiatives (culturally responsive teaching, trauma-informed practice) would advance understanding of integration with multiple dimensions.

Research examining implementation in under-resourced contexts would address critical equity questions regarding whether integration benefits remain accessible to vulnerable populations or instead deepen inequities. Qualitative investigation of student experiences and perspectives regarding digitally-mediated emotional learning would complement teacher-centered analysis. Finally, research investigating institutional mechanisms through which ecological coherence develops would advance understanding of change leadership and systemic implementation.

In conclusion, contemporary secondary education faces urgent imperatives: advancing digital literacy essential for meaningful participation in increasingly technological societies, while simultaneously attending to adolescent mental health and emotional development. Rather than addressing these imperatives separately through parallel initiatives, this research demonstrates that thoughtfully integrated approaches rooted in pedagogical principles, supported by comprehensive professional development, and enabled by systemic alignment can advance both simultaneously.

Teachers, when provided with robust professional development, access to professional learning communities, and institutional support, demonstrate substantial capacity to develop integrated digital-SEL competencies, implement these with fidelity, and cultivate measurable emotional learning gains among students. The challenge is not whether integration is possible but how to create educational systems wherein it becomes normative rather than exceptional. This requires not merely professional development but systemic transformation aligning curriculum, assessment, leadership, resource allocation, and school culture toward integration. This research provides evidence-based foundation for such transformation while acknowledging the substantial organizational change work required. For researchers, the path forward involves deepening investigation of mechanisms through which systemic conditions enable integration, extending findings to diverse contexts, and illuminating how teachers navigate the genuine tensions inherent in transforming practice.

For educators and leaders, findings provide both encouragement (professional development does enhance capability and produce student benefit) and realism (sustainability requires more than training, demanding systemic coherence). For policy makers, the evidence suggests that curriculum and assessment policies requiring fundamental reconsideration to enable rather than constrain integration. Collectively,



Received: March 1, 2025 | Accepted: June 30, 2026 | Published: September 30, 2026

this research contributes to the urgent scholarly and practical work of creating secondary educational systems wherein students develop both technological competency and emotional wisdom, preparing them not merely for employment in digital economies but for flourishing in increasingly complex, interconnected, and emotionally demanding worlds.

References

- Anfara, V. A., & Mertz, N. T. (Eds.). (2015). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2023). *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future*. Routledge.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2023). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88-103.
- Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(6), 711-726.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2023). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product_files/Effective_Teacher_PD_FINAL_PDF.pdf
- Desimone, L. M. (2023). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better causal inference. *Educational Research Review*, 10, 1-21.
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133-156.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. Jossey-Bass.
- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2023). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 490-500.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2022). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Koltay, T., Sørensen, B. M., & Špiranec, S. (2023). *The smart society: Strengthening inclusion through digital literacy*. UNESCO.
- Macgilchrist, F. (2023). Educational technology as a field of research: Emergence, challenges and trajectories. *Educational Review*, 75(2), 234-256.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Selwyn, N. (2023). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Steinberg, L. (2023). *Age of opportunity: Lessons from the new science of adolescence*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.



Received: March 1, 2025 | Accepted: June 30, 2026 | Published: September 30, 2026

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2023). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 42, 25-39.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1998). The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky: Child psychology (Vol. 5). Plenum Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

World Health Organization. (2023). *Mental health of adolescents: Issues and challenges*. WHO Publications.