

Technostress and its Impact on the Job Performance of Teachers

Adryan J. Valiao

Panpacific University, Urdaneta, Pangasinan, Philippines
National University, Philippines

Author Email: ajvaliao@nu-bacolod.edu.ph

Date received: December 22, 2024

Date revised: January 6, 2025

Date accepted: January 26, 2025

Originality: 93%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 7%

Recommended citation:

Valiao, A. (2025). Technostress and its impact on the job performance of teachers. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(2), 352-361. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0692>

Abstract. In the context of rapid technological advancements and challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, this study investigates the impact of technostress on the job satisfaction and performance of 100 faculty members from a private higher education institution in Bacolod City. Using a descriptive survey research design, data were collected through a structured questionnaire. The study examined five dimensions of technostress: Techno-Overload, Techno-Complexity, Techno-Insecurity, Techno-Invasion, and Techno-Uncertainty. Results showed that despite experiencing high levels of technostress, faculty members reported very high job satisfaction and perceived improved performance due to integrating technology into their teaching practices. Analysis revealed no significant differences in technostress levels, job satisfaction, or performance based on sex, teaching experience, or department, highlighting a shared experience across all demographics. The study emphasizes the resilience of faculty in adapting to rapid technological changes, showcasing their ability to maintain high levels of job satisfaction and performance amidst the challenges of digital transformation. However, it recommends targeted institutional strategies, such as regular training, enhanced technological support, and stress management programs, to mitigate the effects of technostress and sustain high levels of satisfaction and performance. These findings underline the importance of proactive measures to support educators in a digitally intensive educational landscape, ensuring their well-being and long-term professional development.

Keywords: Educational technology; Faculty resilience; Job satisfaction; Performance; Technostress.

1.0 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly accelerated the adoption of online teaching methods and digital technologies in education, creating opportunities and challenges for educators. One of the significant challenges that has surfaced is technostress, a form of stress induced by the use of technology (Camacho & Barrios, 2022). The shift to remote teaching and the rapid integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) into instructional practices have increased pressure on teachers, affecting their job satisfaction and performance (Gopal et al., 2021). While studies have not conclusively linked job security with a decrease in teacher well-being, factors such as course design, feedback mechanisms, and student expectations have been identified as critical to both teacher performance and student satisfaction during remote learning (Ozamiz-Etxebarria et al., 2021; Gopal et al., 2021).

The emergence of technostress as a significant concern for educators has been noted in various studies, with the rapid shift to teleworking during the pandemic exacerbating strain, dissatisfaction, and perceived declines in job

performance (Camacho & Barrios, 2022). Technostress has been shown to hinder teachers' ability to effectively integrate ICT into their teaching practices, affecting their willingness to embrace technology (Khlaif et al., 2023). Moreover, research has demonstrated a connection between Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) and technostress, highlighting its influence on instructional practices and teachers' mental well-being (Rastegar & Rahimi, 2023).

Beyond individual well-being, technostress has broader organizational implications. It can negatively impact teachers' performance, commitment, mental health, and productivity and even contribute to burnout (Gulzar et al., 2022). The presence of technostress generators, such as techno-generators and techno-blockers, has been shown to correlate with reduced productivity and burnout, especially in higher education contexts (Estrada-Muñoz et al., 2022). Furthermore, technostress is closely linked to employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment, necessitating interventions to mitigate its effects and support teachers' well-being (Gabr et al., 2021).

In the context of the pandemic, studies have explored various psychological factors, such as organizational cynicism and COVID-19 anxiety, and their role in predicting technostress among school counselors and teachers (POLAT et al., 2022). However, there remains a gap in research regarding the specific impact of technostress on teachers in the Philippines, particularly in terms of the risk and protective factors influencing technostress and the role of personality traits in online teaching (Mishra et al., 2020). While technostress has been examined among university students, with a focus on its effects on behaviors like cyberslacking, the relationship between technostress and job performance among teachers has not been thoroughly explored, especially in the context of remote learning during the pandemic (Vega-Muñoz et al., 2022; Li & Liu, 2022).

This study aims to fill this research gap by examining the factors contributing to technostress among teachers in the Philippines, focusing on how it affects their job performance. By exploring the interplay between technology, personality traits, and the challenges of online teaching, this research aims to inform interventions that can alleviate technostress and enhance teacher well-being, ensuring the continued quality of education in an increasingly digital landscape.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach, adopting a descriptive survey research design delineated by Erickson (2017). This method involves observing and recording a subject's behavior without intervention or alteration. The primary aim was to gather data on the prevalence of technostress and its impact on teachers' job performance. Utilizing a descriptive survey enabled the exploration and provision of comprehensive results concerning the incidence of technostress and its effects on educators' professional performance. For enhanced efficiency, cost-effectiveness, rapid turnaround, and ease of administration, the survey was conducted in an electronic or web-based format, as Fraenkel et al. (2011) suggested. Data collection was facilitated using Google Forms, which allowed for a streamlined and accessible means of gathering participant responses.

2.2 Research Participants

This study was conducted in a private Catholic educational institution in the province of Negros Occidental. This institution offers a complete basic education from Kindergarten to Senior High School. Undergraduate, Graduate, and Post-Graduate degree programs are also offered. Moreover, during the pandemic, this institution adopted an online, LMS-based instructional modality. This means that teachers in this institution conduct online classes using technology, making it an ideal setting for observing the prevalence of technostress and its effects on teachers' job performance.

The study's participants were faculty members from the College Department. The total population of the College Department faculty was 116, and the minimum sample size, computed using Slovin's formula, was set at 90. Participants were selected using convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique described by Saunders et al. (2019) as involving collecting data from accessible and willing members of the population. The Department Deans facilitated the recruitment process and disseminated the survey link to faculty members. Only those who expressed readiness and willingness to participate were included in the study. Participation was entirely voluntary, and no incentives were provided.

2.3 Research Instrument

This research employed a survey questionnaire as the primary data collection instrument. The questionnaire consisted of two distinct sections. The first section gathered demographic information, such as gender, years of teaching experience, and departmental affiliation, to ensure unique identification of responses. The second section evaluated critical variables relevant to the study, including technostress generators, job satisfaction, and perceived job performance. The items used to measure technostress were based on the framework established by Tarafdar et al. (2007). Each variable related to technostress creators, job satisfaction, and perceived performance was assessed using a set of five items. Respondents rated these items on a four-point Likert scale, with options ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree), to quantify their experiences and perceptions of the study variables. The instrument underwent pilot testing with 30 respondents to ensure reliability and clarity. A reliability test using Cronbach's alpha confirmed its consistency. The tool was reviewed and validated by at least five experts in educational technology and psychology to ensure validity.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure for this study commenced with the researcher submitting a formal request to the School President via the Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Linkages (VPRIL) to seek authorization for data collection. Once approval was granted, a digital version of the research instrument was prepared. The instrument, comprising a Google Form, included a consent letter and the survey questionnaire. The survey was disseminated to the Department Deans, who emailed it to the intended respondents. To ensure clarity, the communication explicitly stated the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and the deadline for survey completion. Regular follow-ups were conducted to maximize response rates. Upon completion, the responses gathered via the web-based form were systematically compiled, organized, and analyzed using statistical tools available in Microsoft Excel.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data in this study were treated using several stages of analysis, utilizing Microsoft Excel for data processing. To address the first problem statement, demographic profile information, including aspects such as gender, teaching experience, and department affiliation, was examined using frequency and percentage distribution. Regarding the second problem statement, the study employed descriptive statistics to assess teachers' technostress levels. This analysis encompassed the computation of mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution, offering a comprehensive overview of the technostress levels experienced. To tackle the third problem statement, the research again applied descriptive statistics to ascertain teachers' job satisfaction levels. This included calculating mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution to gain knowledge of the overall job satisfaction sentiment. For the fourth problem statement, descriptive statistics were used to evaluate the level of job performance among educators. Metrics such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution provided insight into the teachers' perceived performance in the virtual learning environment.

The fifth problem statement focused on identifying differences in technostress levels based on teachers' demographic profiles. This required inferential statistical methods, such as t-tests or ANOVA, to determine significant variations in technostress across different demographic groups. In addressing the sixth problem statement, correlation analysis explored the relationship between technostress levels and teachers' job satisfaction and performance. Pearson's correlation coefficient was utilized to ascertain the strength and direction of these relationships. The seventh and final problem statement involved developing an action plan derived from a systematic literature review and the findings of this study. This review thoroughly searched for relevant literature on strategies, interventions, and best practices to manage and alleviate technostress. The insights from this literature, combined with the data from this study, informed the creation of an evidence-based action plan to assist teachers in managing technostress and enhancing their job satisfaction and performance during the pandemic. A significance level of 0.05 was maintained for hypothesis testing.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The researcher adhered to ethical principles throughout the study, observing objectivity and compliance with RA 10173, the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Before data collection, participants were given an informed consent form explaining the study's purpose, procedures, and their rights as participants, including the voluntary nature of participation and their right to withdraw at any time.

Participants were assured of their responses' confidentiality and their identities' anonymity. No personally identifiable information was collected or disclosed. The researcher also ensured that the survey questions were free of discriminatory, offensive, or derogatory language. Data collected were securely stored and used exclusively for the study.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

The demographics of the respondents provide a critical context for understanding the technostress experienced by educators and its effects on job performance. As summarized in Table 1, the faculty profile highlights characteristics such as gender distribution, department affiliation, and years of teaching experience.

Table 1. Profile of the faculty respondents (n=100)

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	61	61.00%
Female	39	39.00%
Department		
School of Architecture, Fine Arts & Interior Design	30	30.00%
School of Business & Information Technology	15	15.00%
School of Hospitality & Tourism Management	30	30.00%
School of Sciences, Liberal Arts & Teacher Education	25	25.00%
Teaching Experience		
0 to 5	43	43.00%
6 to 10	28	28.00%
11 to 15	19	19.00%
16+	10	10.00%

The sex distribution of the respondents is presented, revealing insights into the representation within the faculty. With a more significant percentage of males, discussions may further explore whether and how technostress impacts educators differently across gender lines, a query supported by the nuances detailed in prior research by Tarafdar et al. (2007), which highlighted potential gender differences in technostress perception and coping mechanisms. The diversity in teaching experience is outlined, ranging from novices to veterans, offering a spectrum of insights into how technostress might manifest across different stages of an educational career. This profile aspect may be linked to studies like Bao's (2020), which considered how a teacher's preparedness for and adaptability to technology-mediated teaching might vary with their tenure.

The breakdown by department underscores the interdisciplinary nature of the faculty, with each academic domain potentially bringing its unique set of challenges and perspectives to the fore in the realm of technostress. This variability aligns with the multifaceted approach to understanding technostress, suggested by Hartshorne et al. (2020), acknowledging that stressors may be differentially experienced across diverse academic disciplines. The quantitative data captured in this chapter, interpreted through the prisms of established theoretical frameworks and prior research, aim to provide a snapshot of the current state and a directional guide for policy and decision-making that could foster resilience and well-being among educators in the digital age.

3.2 Level of Technostress

Techno-Overload among Faculty

The pivot to online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic significantly increased educators' interaction with technology, often beyond their coping capacity. Table 2 summarizes the faculty's perceived Techno-Overload, with an overall Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 2.99, categorized as "High." Specific stressors, such as multitasking due to technology (AWM = 3.01) and the pressure to respond instantly to notifications (AWM = 3.09), were rated "Very High." These findings align with Chiu et al. (2022), who identified Techno-Overload as a primary contributor to technostress. This elevated stress indicates the intensified workload and complexity of tech tools necessitated by the rapid digital transition. Multitasking demands and constant connectivity blur the boundaries between professional efficiency and personal well-being, echoing Bao's (2020) concerns regarding the sustainability of such demands. Institutional strategies should address these challenges by streamlining technological workflows and fostering support systems to alleviate the burden on educators.

Table 2. *Level of technostress among faculty respondents in the dimension of techno-overload*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I am forced by technology to multitask and do more work than I can handle.	3.01	Very High
2. I am forced by technology to work much faster.	3.10	Very High
3. I feel overwhelmed by the number of tech tools I am required to use.	2.97	High
4. I need to respond to technological notifications related to work instantly.	3.09	Very High
5. I have a higher workload because of increased technology complexity.	2.80	High
Overall	2.99	High

Techno-Invasion among Faculty

Techno-Invasion, another dimension of technostress, highlights the intrusion of technology into personal spaces and its impact on work-life balance. Table 3 reveals an overall AWM of 2.81 ("High"), with the highest-rated indicator being the obligation to stay connected to work during vacations (AWM = 3.09, "Very High"). These findings reflect Truzoli et al. (2021), who identified the erosion of personal boundaries as a significant stressor in technology-intensive environments.

Table 3. *Level of technostress among faculty respondents in the dimension of techno-invasion*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I feel my personal life is being invaded by technological advancement.	2.82	High
2. I feel pressured to check work-related tech updates during personal time.	2.94	High
3. I must be in touch with my work even during my vacation due to technological advancement.	3.09	Very High
4. I spend less time with my family due to technological advancements.	2.55	High
5. Technology diminishes my time and space.	2.65	High
Overall	2.81	High

The persistent pressure to remain accessible outside work hours disrupts family time and personal well-being, as evidenced by indicators such as diminished family time (AWM = 2.55) and the general encroachment of technology into personal life (AWM = 2.82). Daley et al. (2020) emphasized that the constant connectivity required by digital platforms exacerbates stress, particularly in remote teaching contexts. To mitigate Techno-Invasion, institutions must establish clear boundaries for work-related technological use and promote practices that respect educators' time. Such initiatives could foster a healthier work-life balance, enabling educators to thrive in increasingly digitalized academic environments.

Techno-Complexity among Faculty

The rapid integration of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) into the academic sector, particularly accelerated by the pandemic, has led to a significant transformation in traditional teaching methods. This section of the study explores the challenges faculty members face in managing the Techno-Complexity of their professional responsibilities—a technostress dimension reflecting the complexities of navigating modern educational technologies. The data in Table 4, presented through Average Weighted Mean (AWM) scores, highlights faculty perceptions of Techno-Complexity within their roles. These scores provide insight into faculty members' difficulty in comprehending, using, and adapting to the constant evolution of educational technologies.

Table 4. *Level of technostress among faculty respondents in the dimension of techno-complexity*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I do not know enough about ICTs to handle my job satisfactorily.	2.17	High
2. I often find it too complex to understand and use new technologies.	2.32	High
3. I struggle with frequent technological updates and changes.	2.29	High
4. Keeping up with the diverse technological platforms in my job is challenging.	2.47	High
5. The new technologies can be confusing.	2.40	High
Overall	2.33	High

With an overall AWM of 2.33, Techno-Complexity is classified as 'High,' indicating that faculty members perceive considerable difficulty in understanding and keeping up with the ever-changing ICT tools and updated landscape. The challenge of lacking sufficient knowledge about ICTs to perform their duties effectively is reflected in the 'High' AWM of 2.17. Keeping pace with various platforms and the confusion caused by new technologies are also identified as significant stressors, with AWMs of 2.47 and 2.4, respectively. These findings are consistent with research by Chiu et al. (2022), which identifies Techno-Complexity as a central factor contributing to technostress in organizations. The study reveals a widespread concern among faculty regarding their ability to master the

technological requirements of their roles. The consistently high AWM scores across all indicators reflect a shared sentiment that ICTs introduce complexities that challenge the faculty's ability to adapt and perform effectively. This suggests the need for comprehensive professional development initiatives to enhance faculty ICT competencies, thereby reducing technostress and promoting a more supportive environment for teaching and learning in the digital era.

Techno-Insecurity among Faculty

Techno-Insecurity has emerged as a significant stressor for educators in the context of ongoing technological evolution, particularly intensified by the pandemic. This study section investigates how faculty members perceive their job security and professional competence in light of the rapid integration of new technologies. The data in Table 5, again represented through Average Weighted Mean (AWM) scores, reflects how the influx of new technological tools and changes in the technological environment impact faculty perceptions of their job security and professional capabilities.

Table 5. *Level of technostress among faculty respondents in the dimension of techno-insecurity*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I do not share my knowledge about technology with my co-workers for fear of being replaced.	1.94	Low
2. I feel a constant threat to my job security due to new technologies.	2.05	High
3. I hesitate to ask for tech help for fear of appearing incompetent.	2.14	High
4. The introduction of new technology tools makes me question my competency.	2.07	High
5. The pace of technological change makes me feel insecure about my job's future.	2.14	High
Overall	2.07	High

The overall AWM for Techno-Insecurity is 2.07, categorized as 'High.' This suggests that faculty members, on average, experience substantial stress regarding their job security and competence due to the technological changes. The highest individual stressor is the fear of appearing incompetent when seeking technological assistance, with an AWM of 2.14. Additionally, concerns about job displacement and the challenge of maintaining competency amid technological advancements heightened the sense of insecurity. These results align with the research by Chiu et al. (2022), which identifies Techno-Insecurity as a major contributor to workplace stress. The concern of being replaced by technological advancements resonates with the concept of 'technological displacement' discussed in their findings. This analysis reveals a widespread insecurity among faculty about their roles and competencies in an increasingly technology-dependent educational environment. The consistently high levels of Techno-Insecurity underscore the necessity for initiatives that enhance educators' confidence in their technological skills and emphasize their irreplaceable value in the educational process. Institutions should consider offering continuous training and creating forums for technological exchange to help mitigate these insecurities and support faculty members adapting to the ever-changing technological landscape.

Techno-Uncertainty among Faculty

The final dimension of technostress explored in this study is Techno-Uncertainty, which represents the anxiety and challenges faculty face due to the unpredictable nature and rapid evolution of educational technology. This dimension is especially relevant in the post-pandemic context, where the accelerated integration of technology has left many educators grappling with constant change. Table 6 uses Average Weighted Mean (AWM) scores to assess the uncertainty and apprehension faculty members experience concerning ongoing technological changes and their implications for professional roles. The overall AWM of 2.41 categorizes Techno-Uncertainty as 'High,' indicating that faculty frequently experience unease about the unpredictable direction of technological advancements. Specific concerns, such as the difficulty adapting to frequent software updates and the anxiety caused by rapid technological changes, are reflected in high scores of 2.55.

Table 6. *Level of technostress among faculty respondents in the dimension of techno-uncertainty*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I find it difficult to predict the direction of technological advancements in my job.	2.46	High
2. I often feel unprepared for introducing new technology at work.	2.28	High
3. I am unsure about the long-term benefits of constantly changing tech platforms.	2.55	High
4. It is challenging to adapt to frequent software updates and changes.	2.55	High
5. Rapid technological changes in the workplace make me anxious.	2.20	High
Overall	2.41	High

These findings are consistent with the research by Chiu et al. (2022), which highlights how the rapid pace of technological change can induce stress due to the constant need for adaptation and learning. The study reveals that Techno-Uncertainty is a significant concern among faculty members, reflecting a broader trend in the educational sector, where rapid technological shifts generate considerable anxiety. These results suggest that educational institutions must provide robust support systems, including regular training and clear communication regarding technological changes, to help faculty navigate this uncertainty. By addressing these concerns, institutions can foster a more adaptable and resilient teaching workforce capable of meeting the demands of modern educational environments.

3.3 Job Satisfaction among Faculty

This section extends the study beyond technostress to explore faculty job satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic. Understanding job satisfaction is vital, reflecting how the rapid shift to technology-mediated teaching and the associated stressors impact morale and professional contentment. Table 7 presents Average Weighted Mean (AWM) scores for various job satisfaction indicators, such as personal accomplishment, pride in the job, organizational and managerial support, and the adequacy of training amidst increased reliance on technology.

Table 7. Faculty respondents' job satisfaction during the pandemic

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I am satisfied with the accomplishment I get from my job.	3.41	Very High
2. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	3.40	Very High
3. I feel the organization prioritizes employee well-being amidst tech overload.	3.02	Very High
4. I receive adequate managerial support when dealing with technostress.	3.03	Very High
5. The management provides enough training for new technologies.	2.96	High
Overall	3.16	Very High

The overall AWM for job satisfaction is 3.164, categorized as 'Very High,' signaling that despite the challenges posed by technostress, faculty experience a strong sense of fulfillment and support. The highest scores are for personal accomplishment (3.41) and pride in the job (3.40), indicating high intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. Additionally, the perception of organizational and managerial support in managing technostress is rated positively, reflecting an environment conducive to coping with technological challenges. These findings resonate with Deci and Ryan's (2012) Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which underscores the importance of intrinsic motivation in job satisfaction. Furthermore, the adequacy of support and training aligns with Schaufeli and Taris's (2014) Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. This model highlights the balance between job demands and available resources, suggesting that when faculty members are equipped with the necessary tools and training, their ability to manage workloads improves. Despite the challenges of the pandemic and technostress, the positive outlook on job satisfaction among faculty indicates that institutional support, training, and recognition contribute significantly to their sense of accomplishment and well-being. This underscores the importance of maintaining continuous support and resource allocation, particularly during technological and pedagogical transitions.

3.4 Job Performance among Faculty

Understanding faculty job performance is critical in the context of the pandemic's transformation of the educational landscape. This section explores how faculty perceive their efficiency and effectiveness, particularly as technology became central to educational delivery and administration. Table 8 presents faculty perceptions of job performance during the pandemic based on Average Weighted Mean (AWM) scores. These scores assess how technology impacted work quality, efficiency, and competency.

Table 8. Faculty respondents' perceived performance during the pandemic

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I can provide more accurate and detailed work with the help of technology.	3.47	Very High
2. I feel more competent in my role because of the technological support I receive.	3.37	Very High
3. Technology helps me in delivering higher-quality work.	3.46	Very High
4. Technology-driven automation frees up my time for more strategic tasks.	3.36	Very High
5. The technology available helps me to complete my tasks efficiently.	3.40	Very High
Overall AWM	3.41	Very High

The overall AWM for perceived job performance is 3.41, classified as 'Very High,' indicating that faculty believe technology has positively impacted their work quality and efficiency. Key indicators such as the accuracy and detail of work (3.47) and the ability to free up time for strategic tasks (3.36) reflect a strong belief in technology's positive influence on their professional roles. These results align with Davis's (1989) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which suggests that perceived usefulness and ease of use of technology lead to greater acceptance and usage. Additionally, the positive perception of technology facilitating higher-quality work corresponds with the JD-R framework, which indicates that sufficient resources allow faculty to meet job demands more effectively. The findings underscore the substantial role of technology in enhancing faculty performance, particularly during the pandemic's rapid transition to digital learning modalities.

3.5 Difference in the Levels of Technostress According to Profile

The study also explored the differences in technostress levels based on faculty members' profiles, specifically sex, years of teaching experience, and department. Technostress levels between male and female faculty were compared using ANOVA (see Table 9), revealing an Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 2.515 for males and 2.526 for females, with an F-value of 0.002 and a p-value of 0.962. This finding, marked as 'Not Significant,' suggests that gender does not significantly influence technostress levels among faculty. This result supports prior research (Tarafdar et al., 2007), which suggests that gender does not play a significant role in technostress perception. The similar levels of technostress across genders highlight the need for gender-neutral strategies and interventions to address technostress.

Table 9. *Technostress levels by sex and ANOVA results*

Sex	Mean	F-Value	P-Value	Interpretation
Male	2.515	0.002	0.962	Not Significant
Female	2.526			

When examining the relationship between technostress and years of teaching experience, the study found AWM scores increasing from 2.439 for those with 0-5 years of experience to 2.660 for those with 16+ years (see Table 10). However, the ANOVA results yielded an F-value of 0.241 and a p-value of 0.8663, indicating that differences in experience do not significantly affect technostress levels. This finding aligns with Bao (2020), suggesting that adaptability to technostress may not directly correlate with teaching experience. This highlights the need for universal interventions that support faculty at all experience levels, as technostress appears to be a challenge that transcends years of service.

Table 10. *Technostress levels by teaching experience years and ANOVA results*

Experience (in years)	Mean	F-Value	P-Value	Interpretation
0 - 5	2.439	0.241	0.8663	Not Significant
6 - 10	2.572			
11 - 15	2.570			
16+	2.660			

Lastly, an analysis of technostress levels by the department (see Table 11) revealed AWM scores ranging from 2.394 (School of Sciences, Liberal Arts & Teacher Education) to 2.504 (School of Hospitality & Tourism Management). ANOVA results with an F-value of 0.875 and a p-value of 0.475 indicated no significant differences in technostress levels across departments.

Table 11. *Technostress levels by department and ANOVA results*

Department	Mean	F-Value	P-Value	Interpretation
Architecture, Fine Arts & Interior Design	2.423	0.875	0.475	Not Significant
Business & Information Technology	2.423			
Hospitality & Tourism Management	2.504			
Sciences, Liberal Arts & Teacher Education	2.394			

This finding aligns with the broader perspective in technostress research, which posits that stressors associated with technology use in educational settings tend to be universally experienced, regardless of specific disciplinary contexts (Tarafdar et al., 2019). This homogeneity in technostress responses across various academic disciplines reinforces the notion that the challenges posed by technology integration in education are common to all faculty members, irrespective of their specialized fields. As such, it underscores the importance of educational institutions

implementing holistic and inclusive strategies to address technostress, ensuring that interventions are effective across all departments.

3.6 Relationship of the Levels of Technostress, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance

This section examines the relationships among technostress, job satisfaction, and job performance, shedding light on how these variables intersect and impact faculty members' professional roles. Correlation analysis reveals that technostress has minimal to no significant relationship with job satisfaction or performance (see Table 12). Specifically, the correlation between technostress and job satisfaction is weak ($r = 0.03$, $p = 0.75$), and between technostress and job performance is slightly negative ($r = -0.12$, $p = 0.25$).

Table 12. *Correlations Among Technostress, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance*

Correlation Between	(r)	T-test	P-value	Interpretation
Technostress AWM and Job Satisfaction AWM	0.03	0.31	0.75	Not statistically Significant
Technostress AWM and Job Performance AWM	-0.12	-1.15	0.25	Not statistically Significant
Job Satisfaction AWM and Job Performance AWM	0.46	5.11	1.62	Statistically Significant

However, the positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance ($r = 0.46$, $p = 1.62 \times 10^{-6}$) suggests that higher job satisfaction is significantly linked to improved job performance, aligning with Schaufeli and Taris's (2014) JD-R model. This finding emphasizes enhancing job satisfaction to foster better job performance in educational environments.

4.0 Conclusion

The study offers valuable insights into how faculty members experienced technostress, job satisfaction, and performance during the rapid digital transformation brought about by the pandemic. The key findings indicate that technostress, manifested in Techno-Overload, Techno-Complexity, Techno-Insecurity, and Techno-Uncertainty, was a universal challenge experienced across various demographic groups. Despite these pressures, faculty members exhibited remarkable resilience, maintaining high job satisfaction and performance levels. This resilience can largely be attributed to the institutional support provided, including managerial assistance and training, which helped them adapt to the challenges of a rapidly digitizing educational environment.

These results emphasize the critical role that institutional measures play in helping educators adapt and thrive amidst technological disruptions. They underscore the importance of targeted support systems in fostering positive outcomes and resilience during rapid change. The study also highlights the need for continuous efforts to manage technostress and improve faculty well-being, especially in technology-driven educational landscapes. Future research could further explore the long-term effects of technostress on faculty well-being and performance, particularly the evolution of resilience strategies over time. Additionally, research could investigate the effectiveness of different intervention strategies and support measures, especially in diverse educational settings, to enhance institutional practices. Moreover, further studies may examine how these support systems impact teacher retention, work-life balance, and overall productivity in the context of ongoing technological advancements.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

The sole author accomplished and reviewed the content of the paper.

6.0 Funding

This work received no specific grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest about the publication of this paper.

8.0 Acknowledgment

This work is dedicated to the Almighty God for divine guidance and wisdom and to Our Lady of Consolation for her maternal care and intercession. Gratitude is extended to the researcher's family for their unwavering support and motivation. Gratitude is also extended to the Panpacific Graduate School and the researcher's adviser. Special acknowledgment is given to respondents to this paper.

9.0 References

- Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(2), 113–115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/HBE2.191>
- Camacho, S., & Barrios, A. (2022). Teleworking and technostress: Early consequences of a COVID-19 lockdown. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 24(3), 441–457. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-022-00693-4>
- Chiu, C.-M., Tan, C. M., Hsu, J. S.-C., & Cheng, H.-L. (2023). Employee deviance: The impacts of techno-insecurity and moral disengagement. *Information Technology & People*, 36(1), 140–164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-03-2021-0198>
- Daley, S., Harrington, K., Green, O., Stevens, K., & Wilkins, S. (2020). Goldilocks in the Pandemic: What's "just right" with technology for K-12 teachers in Emergency Remote Teaching? *Proceedings of EdMedia + Innovate Learning*, 26–30. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/217452/>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 13(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, 1, 416–437. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.N21>
- Erickson, G. (2017). Descriptive research design. In *Methods of Market Research and Analysis*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786432698.00009>
- Estrada-Muñoz, C., Vega-Muñoz, A., Boada-Grau, J., Castillo, D., Müller-Pérez, S., & Contreras-Barraza, N. (2022). Impact of techno-creators and techno-inhibitors on techno-stress manifestations in Chilean kindergarten directors in the context of the covid-19 pandemic and teleworking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 865784. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865784>
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2011). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. McGrawHill
- Gabr, H. M., Soliman, S. S., Allam, H. K., & Raouf, S. Y. A. (2021). Effects of remote virtual work environment during COVID-19 pandemic on technostress among Menoufia University Staff, Egypt: A cross-sectional study. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(38), 53746–53753. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14588-w>
- Gopal, R., Singh, V., & Aggarwal, A. (2021). Impact of online classes on the satisfaction and performance of students during the pandemic period of COVID 19. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 6923–6947. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10523-1>
- Gulzar, I., Ashraf, Z., & Mehmood, A. (2022). Workplace distress and eustress among teachers during the pandemic. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(11), 156–176. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2022.1011012>
- Hartshorne, R., Baumgartner, E., Kaplan-Rakowski, R., Mouza, C., & Ferdig, R. (2020). Special Issue Editorial: Preservice and Inservice Professional Development During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28, 137–147. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/216910/>
- Khlaif, Z. N., Khalili, F., Affouneh, S., & Tlili, A. (2023). How remote learning during crisis affect technostress levels experienced by academicians. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(9), 11075–11100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11651-6>
- Li, X., & Liu, D. (2022). The influence of technostress on cyberslacking of college students in technology-enhanced learning: Mediating effects of deficient self-control and burnout. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11800. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811800>
- Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Berasategi Santxo, N., Idoaga Mondragon, N., & Dosil Santamaría, M. (2021). The psychological state of teachers during the covid-19 crisis: The challenge of returning to face-to-face teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 620718. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620718>
- Polat, M. A., Işıktaş, E., & Erten Tatli, C. (2022). The role of organizational cynicism and covid-19 anxiety in predictions of school counselors and teachers' technostress. *e-International Journal of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.1116970>
- Rastegar, N., & Rahimi, M. (2023). Teachers' post-pandemic outlook on the role of Technological and Pedagogical Content Knowledge in coping with burnout under adverse conditions: How a job demand transformed into a job resource. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1129910. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129910>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. *Bridging Occupational, Organizational and Public Health: A Transdisciplinary Approach*, 9789400756403, 43–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4
- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta - techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ISJ.12169/FULL>
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The Impact of Technostress on Role Stress and Productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109>
- Truzoli, R., Pirola, V., & Conte, S. (2021). The impact of risk and protective factors on online teaching experience in high school Italian teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(4), 940–952. <https://doi.org/10.1111/JCAL.12533>
- Vega-Muñoz, A., Estrada-Muñoz, C., Andreucci-Annunziata, P., Contreras-Barraza, N., & Bilbao-Cotal, H. (2022). Validation of a measurement scale on technostress for university students in Chile. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 14493. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114493>