






AI Anxiety and Technostress: The Buffering Role of Growth Mindset

Elizabeth. Mangundu¹, Sinokuthokoza. Segun Oyeyiola^{2*}

¹ Computer Science Education, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

² Department of Career Guidance and Counselling, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

* Corresponding author email address: segunoyeyiola@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić  Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh  Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Masoud Asadi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran. Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Methods and Materials portion of the abstract (“...440 participants recruited across various professional and academic sectors in South Africa”), clarify how convenience sampling was applied alongside the Morgan and Krejcie table. Currently, the wording implies probability sampling but later indicates convenience; this could confuse readers about representativeness.

In the paragraph beginning “Although technostress has been explored globally, studies in the South African context remain limited...”, the context is compelling but underdeveloped. Include socio-economic or infrastructural data on digital readiness and AI adoption rates in South Africa to justify why this population is especially relevant.

In the section “Given these risks, psychological resilience factors... Growth mindset, a belief system conceptualized by Dweck...”, expand the theoretical rationale for selecting growth mindset over other coping resources (e.g., digital self-efficacy, resilience). This strengthens the argument for your moderator choice.

In Study Design and Participants (“440 participants were recruited using convenience sampling”), explain how potential self-selection bias was addressed. Were any efforts made to diversify sectors or regions within South Africa to reduce sampling bias?

In the Measures section describing the AI Anxiety Scale (AIAS) , consider testing measurement invariance since the scale was developed outside South Africa. Without this, cross-cultural validity may be questioned.

In “At the organizational level, this evidence provides an actionable path...” , add more practical examples: e.g., integrating mindset training into onboarding, or designing AI tool rollouts with gradual complexity. This will make recommendations actionable.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the first introduction paragraph where technostress and AI anxiety are introduced (“...technostress—the psychological strain arising from the need to adapt to constantly evolving digital tools... AI anxiety, a specific form of technology-related apprehension”), add a more precise theoretical distinction. Currently, the boundary between the two constructs seems thin; cite and define their unique domains explicitly.

In Data Analysis (“Prior to inferential analysis, assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity were checked”), briefly report skewness and kurtosis numeric thresholds, not just “within acceptable ± 1 .” Readers will appreciate exact values to judge data normality.

In the Findings and Results section (“Of these, 321 participants (73.02%) identified as female...”), comment on the gender imbalance. Discuss how the predominantly female sample might influence the technostress–AI anxiety dynamic, especially if digital adaptation attitudes differ by gender.

In Table 1’s commentary (“participants reported a moderate level of technostress ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.78$)”), add context: compare these mean values to published normative data or previous studies. This gives readers a benchmark for interpreting stress levels.

In Table 3 “Model Fit Indices” , add comparative discussion of the chosen fit thresholds (e.g., $RMSEA < .06$, $CFI > .95$). Explicitly stating that your values meet or exceed these cutoffs will improve clarity for readers unfamiliar with SEM standards.

In Table 4 “Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects” , explain the practical significance of $\beta = .61$ for AI anxiety \rightarrow technostress. Does this indicate a large effect by Cohen’s standards? Provide interpretive language beyond significance.

In the Discussion and Conclusion (“First, AI anxiety was positively and significantly correlated with technostress...”), temper causal language. Some sentences imply causation (e.g., “AI anxiety predicts technostress”) though the study is cross-sectional.

In the paragraph “Another significant insight is how these findings relate to well-being and productivity frameworks...” , strengthen the link to existing technostress models (e.g., Tarafdar et al.). Specify how your moderation finding refines or extends those models.

In “By providing evidence from South Africa...” , expand on cultural nuances that may explain why growth mindset is protective in this population. For example, mention educational emphasis on adaptability or socio-economic adversity fostering resilience.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.