Received: April 9, 2023 | Accepted: May 2, 2023 | Published: June 20, 2023
JPAIR Institutional Research Volume 20 (June 2023)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7719/irj.v20i1.849

Techno-Stress of the Faculty Members in a Higher Education Institution: Basis for a Faculty Development Program

CECILE de MESA ESPIRITU
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2658-9509
cecileespiritu98@gmail.com
Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Pasig
Pasig City, Philippines

Originality: 100% Grammarly: 99%Plagiarism: 0%

ABSTRACT

Technology is one of the greatest inventions of humankind, which is utilized in all sectors of society. Teachers' integration of technology leads them to facilitate and enhance the teaching-learning process. Teachers must develop their competence to use these with ease and confidence. The abrupt transition to online learning has significantly changed the learning experiences. Teachers are pressured to adapt to technological trends. The inability to adapt to technology may lead to techno-stress, a modern adaptation disorder due to failure to cope with technologies. The study adopted the descriptive method with 57 full-time and 110 part-time teacher-respondents. The data were analyzed through frequency, percentage, weighted mean, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson r. The findings show that most faculty members are integrating technology into teaching activities, using it for more than 5 hours a week. They had moderate levels of techno-stress in the learning-teaching process and social and technical

issue orientations, while they had low-stress levels in professional and personal orientations. There is a significant relationship between technology usage and the assessed level of techno-stress of the teacher-respondents. Counter-measures against techno-stress must be developed through a faculty development program with activities on stress, mental health issues, and technology adaptation.

Keywords **—** Social Science, technology integration, descriptive method, Pasig City, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

This study provides the school management and the human resource professional the empirical evidence related to designing work-life balance in organizations. It presupposes that the teachers and the learners should be able to select, develop, manage, and use appropriate technological processes and resources to attain the intended outcomes of instruction. Teachers' integration of technology should lead them to facilitate and enhance the teaching-learning process. Thus, teachers must develop their ability or competence to use the equipment, tools, gadgets, techniques, and methodologies easily and confidently. Technology in education provides important tools to support knowledge construction for presenting the learner's ideas, understandings, and beliefs, as well as for producing organized multimedia knowledge for them. It further serves as information vehicles for exploring knowledge to support learning by constructing, and it can also be used for comparing perspectives, philosophy, and world views (Tabbada & Buendia, 2015). Therefore, teachers should integrate technology in their classrooms and make it function as their intellectual partner in increasing the students' learning, understanding, and achievement but more so to augment and motivates learning, encourage collaborative learning, and support the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Schacter & Fagnano, 1999 as cited by Tabbada & Buendia, 2015).

However, teachers are pressured to adapt to the current technological trends. The use of technology in teaching requires knowledge of ICT, the need for devices that they can use, and other technical support from administrations. Unfortunately, not all people can keep up with the rapid technological changes, which can lead to people acquiring techno-stress. In the technology integration and utilization process, teachers are having problems and difficulties integrating it into their teaching, and therefore they resist doing so (Howard, 2013). The

results of research from the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) show that teachers do not effectively employ technology in their teaching procedures even though they have access to it in their institution (Moursund & Bielefeldt, 1999). From this perspective, techno-stress is present. According to Brod (1984), techno-stress is a condition of modern adaptation brought on by an inability to adapt to new technology healthily. Techno-stress refers to the anxiety and stress that result from frequently or consistently having trouble using technological devices (Brillhart, 2004). When people struggle to adapt to ICT, it results in a particular type of stress and a situation where negative perception is displayed (Wang et al., 2008). According to Nisafani et al. (2020), some causes of techno-stress are a lack of fit between demand and ability, the existing mismatch between a person's ability and the expected performance, lack of fit between supply and need, when the currently available tools do not satisfy the person's need in technology-related work; techno-complexity, where people are forced to learn how to use the enhanced or new technologies and its software applications; and techno-uncertainty, the wariness that people experience due to the continuous rapid development in technology. They also mentioned in their study the impacts of techno-stress on productivity, job satisfaction, engagement, and intention to use ICT. These mentioned impacts of techno-stress may be visible in the teachers' performance, which, in turn, may also affect the student's overall satisfaction with the teacher.

Due to the difficulties that teachers experience using ICT, they develop stress due to adjusting to conduct online classes (Besser et al., 2022). As the teachers feel stress, it can decrease their confidence in teaching affecting their ability to cope with the challenges related to their profession. Furthermore, because of stress, they may show unwanted behavior in their job and lack interest in the subject matter; likewise, this may decrease student satisfaction in learning. Based on Salanova's (2003, as cited by Estrada-Muñoz et al., 2021), in the situation of the Covid-19 pandemic and under a teleworking or tele-teaching scheme, the results showed that the teachers suffer higher fatigue and anxiety or having different techno-stress dimension because of the use of technology as educational material. According to Çoklar et al. (2016), teachers have a medium level of overall techno-stress and a medium level of learning-teaching process-oriented, technical-issue-oriented, and social-oriented techno-stress. Teachers have low levels of profession-oriented techno-stress and personal-oriented techno-stress. While the differences between female and male gender teachers when it comes to their feelings about having a lot of technology, the result is that female teachers

show higher techno-stress than male teachers (Estrada-Muñoz et al., 2021). Teachers with 16–30 years of experience were more stressed than those with experience of 0–15 years, and female teachers experienced more stress than male teachers (Syvänen et al., 2016). In comparison, the study of Cahapay and Bangoc II (2021) showed that married female teachers that are 45 years and older, with an experience of 21 years and above, tend to have a higher level of techno-stress.

The study intends to utilize its findings in crafting activities for the faculty development program focusing on enhancing the teachers' technology capability knowledge and reducing stress in the utilization of technology in PLPasig since they had experienced the difficulties of managing various platforms in the flexible learning modality applied in delivering education during the pandemic period. Though there were available technological platforms to be used, there is a need to train the teachers on how to properly utilize these in their classes to maximize their potential.

FRAMEWORK

In the organizational context, stress leads to job dissatisfaction, lack of job involvement, and poor job performance (Kahn et al., 1981; Jackson & Schuler, 1985, Jex & Beehr, 1991, as cited by Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). In line with this, the Stressor-Strain-Outcome Model was used as the theoretical framework of this study. The model was originally developed by Koeske and Koeske in 1993 to illustrate how stressors affect individuals' work and life. This model shows the relationship between the stressors, the resulting stress, strain, and the outcome. The rapid growth of technology is one example of a stressful situation that the SSO Model refers to as a "stressor." Strain is the disruptive effect on people's emotions that stressors have on them. The final category is outcomes, which are the negative behavioral or psychological implications on a person's life or career. In this study, technology's continuous development and enhancement serve as stressors. The techno-stress of the faculty members is the stress resulting from the stress of online teaching and technology integration in their classes.

Another framework that was used in this study is the Transaction-Based Approach (Lazarus 1966; McGrath 1976, Lazarus & Folkman 1984, Cooper et al. 2001, as cited by Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008) which has provided the foundation for several studies on stress. It describes the phenomenon of stress as a combination of a stimulating condition and the individual's response to it. Stressors are the events, demands, stimuli, or conditions encountered by individuals in the work/

organizational environment as factors that create stress (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997, as cited by Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Situational factors are organizational mechanisms that can buffer or reduce the impact of stressors. These mechanisms include job re-design, role re-structuring (Burke, 1993 as cited by Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008), stress management training, information sharing, social support, wellness programs, counseling, and assistance (Davis & Gibson, 1994 as cited by Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008).

The study further utilized the Conceptual Model for Understanding Techno-Stress created by Ragu-Nathan et al. (2008). In the study of Ragu-Nathan et al. (2008), they explain that *Techno-Stress Creators* parallel *Stressors*, *Techno-Stress Inhibitors* correspond to *Situational Factors*, *Job Satisfaction* is equivalent to *Strain*; and *Organizational Commitment* and *Continuance Commitment* parallel *Other Organizational Outcomes*. Moreover, differences in age, education, prior experience, familiarity with IT, and others, are relevant to individual beliefs about the usefulness and ease of use (Agarwal & Prasad, 1999; Burton-Jones & Hubona, 2005). They expect that these variables influence ICT-related stress and have therefore included *individual differences* in the model.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of the study was to assess the technology usage and techno-stress level of the full-time and part-time faculty members of the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Pasig. Furthermore, this study sought to look into the demographic and professional profiles of the respondents and determine if there are significant differences in the respondents' technology usage and techno-stress level when grouped according to the selected demographic variables. The study also tried to determine if there is a significant relationship between technology usage and the techno-stress level of the faculty respondents.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In order to assess the techno-stress level of PLPasig's faculty members, the researchers used the descriptive method of research, particularly the correlational research design, as it allows for scientific investigating to describe the current conditions and investigates relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. It describes the nature of a situation as it

exists at the time of the study and explores the course of a particular phenomenon. Accurate observations and assessments from the data that ascertain the nature and incidence of prevailing conditions, practices, or descriptions of objects, processes, or persons, are all the objectives of descriptive research. A Likert-type of the survey questionnaire was used to gather information. Descriptive research aims to examine various current issues or problems by collecting data describing the characteristics and/or behavior of the sample population. It can be justified by describing, explaining, and validating the research findings (Shuttleworth, 2008). According to Siedlecki (2020), descriptive studies look at the characteristics of the population and identify a problem within it. This is aligned with the quantitative research method that this study used, which focused on numerical analysis of data and produced objective data that can be clearly communicated through statistics and numbers.

Research Site

This study occurred at the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Pasig in the First Semester of the Academic Year 2022-2023. The full-time and part-time faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and Accountancy, College of Computer Studies, College of Education, College of Engineering, and College of Nursing were considered in this study. The decision to include the entire population in all colleges is consistent with the desire of the Researchers to establish explicitly the validity of this study.

Research Respondents

The Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Pasig has 62 full-time and 129 part-time faculty members from the six colleges for the First Semester of the Academic Year 2022-2023. Out of the said population, 91.94% of the full-time and 85.27% of the part-time became the respondents for this study. This study distributed the survey questionnaire to all teachers in the said semester. Still, due to unforeseen circumstances, the researchers could not get 100 percent of the total population as respondents. This was due to the non-submission of the survey instrument on the given original and extended submission dates after a series of follow-ups.

Research Instruments

The Researchers used a survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering instrument in this study. The instrument was a researcher-made survey by Çoklar et al. (2017). The questionnaire is designed to measure the level of stress of

the faculty members in the areas of learning-teaching process-oriented techno-stress; profession-oriented techno-stress; technical issue-oriented techno-stress; personal-oriented techno-stress; and social-oriented techno-stress.

The first part deals with the Personal Profile. The checklist elicits pertinent information about the faculty members regarding sex, age, and civil status. The second part is about the respondents' professional profile on the college they are part of, faculty member function, highest educational attainment, employment status, academic rank, number of regular teaching load, number of additional teaching load, number of years in the service as a classroom teacher, courses/subjects taught in the current semester, and average class size handled in the current semester. The third part concentrates on the faculty members' experiences with technology. The last part contains statements on the five areas of the respondents' techno-stress. The instruments underwent validity and reliability testing, yielding the CVI-CVR results of 1 and Cronbach alpha of .88 for using the said instruments. Informed consent was also given to the respondents. The proposal and the instruments also underwent evaluation by the University Research Evaluation Committee and the Research Ethics Committee leading to the approval of the conduct of the study. The survey was distributed on a face-to-face basis.

Data Analysis

For the computation and analysis of the gathered data, SPSS Version 23 was used by the Researchers.

Frequency and percentage were applied to obtain the data on the respondents' profiles as to the personal and professional aspects like their sex, age, civil status, college being part of, faculty member function, highest educational attainment, employment status, academic rank, number of regular teaching load, number of additional teaching load, number of years in the service as a classroom teacher, courses/subjects taught in the current semester, average class size handled in the current semester, and usage of technologies.

Weighted mean was used to measure the level of techno-stress of the faculty members in learning-teaching process-oriented techno-stress; profession-oriented techno-stress; technical issue-oriented techno-stress, personal-oriented techno-stress; and social-oriented techno-stress.

Table 1
Scale and Description in Interpreting the Level of Techno-Stress of the Teachers

Range	Verbal Interpretation
3.00 - 4.00	High Stress
2.00 - 2.99	Moderate Stress
1.00 - 1.99	Low Stress

ANOVA and t-test were employed to compute the differences in the respondents' usage of technologies when grouped according to the college being part of, faculty member function, number of regular teaching loads, number of additional teaching loads, and courses/subjects taught in the current semester. More so, the statistical tools were used to find the differences in the respondents' level of techno-stress when grouped according to the college being part of, faculty member function, number of regular teaching load, number of additional teaching load, courses/subjects taught in the current semester, and average class size handled in the current semester.

Pearson r was used to determine the usage of technology and the level of techno-stress of the faculty members.

Table 2
Correlation Interpretation

Correlation Value	Interpretation
.90 - 1.00 (-.90 to -.100)	Very High Positive (Negative) Correlation
.70 - .90 (-.70 to -.90)	High Positive (Negative) Correlation
.50 - .70 (-.50 to -.70)	Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation
.30 - .50 (-.30 to -.50)	Low Positive (Negative) Correlation
.00 - .30 (-.00 to -.30)	Negligible Positive (Negative) Correlation

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of the full-time faculty members, 59.6% are female, while 40.4% are male. Regarding the part-timers, 49.1% of the part-time educators are male, while 48.2% are female. Among the full-time teachers, 26.3% are between 46 to 50 years old; 17.5% of the teachers are between 41 to 45 years of age, while 15.8% are between 51 to 55 years old. Of the part-time teachers, 19.1% are between

31 and 35 years old, 15.5% are between ages 41 and 45, and another 15.5% are aged 46-50. Regarding civil status, 59.6% of the full-time faculty respondents are married, while 29.8% are single. Half (50%) of the part-time faculty respondents are married, while 35.5% are single.

For the college affiliation of the full-time faculty members, 22.8% of the respondents are connected with the College of Business and Accountancy, 17.5% are from the College of Education, and 15.8% each under the College of Computer Studies and the College of Nursing. Concerning the part-time teachers, 29.0% are teaching in the College of Business and Accountancy, 19.0% are from the College of Nursing, and 13.6% are from the College of Education. In line with the current function of the faculty members, 52.6% are regular faculty members, and 45.6% are simultaneously teaching and handling a special designation in various offices in PLPasig. Of the special designees who responded, 17.5% were given the department chairmanship assignment; 8.8% were tasked to become deans of their respective colleges, and another 8.8% for other functions, which could be concurrent designations. Regarding educational background, 47.4% of the full-time faculty members are master's degree holders, 36.8% have units in their doctoral programs, and 16.8% are doctors already in their respective programs.

As for the part-time faculty members, 54.5% are master's degree holders, 22.7% are doctors, and 15.5% have units in their doctoral programs. For the plantilla position status, 68.4% of the full-time faculty respondents are in permanent plantilla positions. On the other hand, there are 28.1% who have a temporary status for their appointment. The majority, or 47.3%, of the part-time faculty members of PLPasig, work full-time in public institutions, organizations, and companies. In comparison, 26.4% are connected with private institutions, organizations, and companies. A few have retired or resigned from their full-time job and are working part-time. Some also had part-time jobs in other institutions besides part-time work in PLPasig.

Regarding academic rank, 78.9% of the full-time faculty respondents are Assistant Professors, 15.8% are in an Associate Professor position, and one is still in the Instructor position while one has a Professor item. As for the regular teaching load of the full-time teachers, 47.4% were given 18 units, 24.6% were assigned 12 units, 10.5% were given 6 units, 5.3% with 3 units, another 5.3% with 15 units, and 3.5% who have 9 units. The faculty members were also given additional load; 33.3% had 9 units, 21.1% had 6 units, 15.8% were given 3 units, and 12.3% had 12 units overload. Most part-time faculty respondents

(36.4%) were given 9 units as teaching load, 17.3% were assigned 15 units while 15.5% were given 6 units, and 14.5% had 12 units load.

Regarding the number of years in the service as teachers, 24.6% of full-time faculty members are teaching for 21-25 years, 22.8% are in the teaching force for 11-15 years, and 19.3% are in the service for 6-10 years. There are 17.5% of them teaching for 16-20 years, 5.3% are in their first five years of instruction, and another 5.3% are in their 26-30 years. For the part-time teachers, 22.7% are in their first few years of teaching, 20.0% are in the teaching force for 11-15 years, 19.1% are in the service for 16-20 years, and 18.2% are in their 6-10 years of instruction.

As to the courses the full-time faculty members teach in the semester, 42.1% were assigned a specialization, major, and even technical courses; 33.3% were teaching professional courses, and another 24.6% were into general education subjects. Of the part-time faculty members, 33.6% were given specialization, major and technical courses; 32.7% were teaching professional courses, and another 32.7% were teaching general education subjects. For the class size being handled by the teachers, 36.8% have classes with an average number of 41-45 students; 24.6% handle classes with 36-40 students; and 10.5% with 46-50 students. As for the part-time faculty members, 35.5% have classes with an average number of 36-40 students; 21.8% handle classes with 41-45 students, and 12.7% have 31-35 students in a class.

Regarding technology usage, 35.1% of full-time faculty members always integrate technology into their teaching activities. Another 35.1% almost always use it in teaching, while 26.3% frequently incorporate technology into their activities. As for the part-time teachers, 32.8% almost always integrate technology into their teaching activities, while 29.1% always incorporate technology. According to a survey of CDW Government LLC (2010), as cited by Rathore and Sonawat (2015), only 8% of the teachers surveyed fully integrate technology into the classroom. Further, the survey found that teachers use technology primarily to teach (e.g., to give presentations), and 60% of the teachers reported using technology in the classroom.

Table 3

Distribution of the Respondents According to the Frequency of their Technology Integration in Their Teaching Activities

How often do you integrate technology into your teaching activities?	Full-Time		Part-Time	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not at All	0	0	2	1.8
Rarely	0	0	3	2.7
Occasionally	2	3.5	8	7.3
Frequently	15	26.3	28	25.5
Almost Always	20	35.1	36	32.7
All the Time	20	35.1	32	29.1
No answer	0	0	1	.9
Total	57	100	110	100

Regarding the full-time faculty members' number of hours spent using technology for teaching activities, 54.4% of them spent more than 10 hours a week; 19.3% of them used it for 5-7 hours; 15.8% of them utilized technology for 8-10 hours a week; and 7.0% are into technology for 2-4 hours. Alternatively, the part-time faculty members' numbers of hours spent using technology for teaching activities were as follows: 32.7% of them spent more than 10 hours a week, 24.5% of them used it for 5-7 hours, and 20.9% of them utilized technology for 8-10 hours a week.

Table 4

Distribution of the Respondents According to the Number of Hours per Week They Spent Using Technology in their Teaching Activities

On average, how many hours per week do you spend using a computer for your teaching activities?	Full-Time		Part-Time	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	0	0	3	2.7
Less than 2 hours	2	3.5	6	5.5
2-4 hours	4	7.0	14	12.7
5-7 hours	11	19.3	27	24.5
8-10 hours	9	15.8	23	20.9
More than 10 hours	31	54.4	36	32.7
No answer	0	0	1	.9
Total	57	100	110	100

Regarding the full-time faculty members' personal use of technology outside their teaching activities, 28.1% of them spent 5-7 hours, 26.3% consumed 2-4 hours weekly; and 21.1% spent more than 10 hours of technology used for personal activities. Conversely, 32.7% of the part-time teachers use technology outside their teaching activities for 8-10 hours; 29.1% spend more than 10 hours, and another 25.5% consume 5-7 hours weekly.

The full-time faculty members had a moderate level of techno-stress in terms of the learning-teaching process (2.12), social (2.10), and technical issue (1.83) orientations, while they had a low-stress level on professional (1.83) and personal (1.77) orientations. As for the part-time faculty members, they were moderately stressed about technical issues (2.27), the learning-teaching process (2.25), and social (2.20) orientations. They have low techno-stress levels in professional (1.97) and personal (1.92) orientations. Therefore, the full-time faculty members have a low level of techno-stress (1.98), while the part-time teachers have a moderate level of techno-stress (2.12). In the findings of Çoklar et al. (2016), teachers have a medium level of overall techno-stress and a medium level of learning-teaching process-oriented, technical-issue-oriented, and social-oriented techno-stress. Teachers have low levels of profession-oriented techno-stress and personal-oriented techno-stress.

Table 5

Summary of the Level of Faculty Members' Techno-Stress in Terms of the Five Sub-Variables

Sub-Variables	Full-Time		Part-Time	
	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Learning-Teaching Process-Oriented Techno-Stress	2.12	Moderate Stress	2.25	Moderate Stress
Profession-Oriented Techno-Stress	1.83	Low Stress	1.97	Low Stress
Technical Issue-Oriented Techno-Stress	2.09	Moderate Stress	2.27	Moderate Stress
Personal-Oriented Techno-Stress	1.77	Low Stress	1.92	Low Stress
Social-Oriented Techno-Stress	2.10	Moderate Stress	2.20	Moderate Stress
Grand Weighted Mean	1.98	Low Stress	2.12	Moderate Stress

There are no significant differences in the faculty members' usage of technology when grouped according to college being part of (with a p-value of .404), faculty member function (with a p-value of .803), number of regular teaching load (with a p-value of .577), number of additional teaching load (with a p-value of .763), and courses/subjects taught in the current semester (with a p-value of .763). The computed p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypotheses were accepted. There are no significant differences in the faculty member's level of techno-stress when grouped according to the faculty member function (with a p-value of .159), number of regular teaching loads (with a p-value of .102), number of additional teaching loads (with a p-value of .827), courses/subjects taught in the current semester (with a p-value of .080), and average class size handled in the current semester (with a p-value of .912). The computed p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypotheses were accepted.

In contrast, there is a significant difference in the techno-stress level of the teacher-respondents according to the colleges they are affiliated with the computed p-value of .000, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since there "IS" a significant difference in the respondents' level of techno-stress when grouped according to their colleges. Though there were no significant differences in the stated variables except for the techno-stress level of the teacher-respondents, according to the colleges, there is still a need to address the prevailing conditions of the faculty members to avoid possible problems.

The computed r of -0.352 was used to determine the degree of relationship between the technology usage and the assessed level of techno-stress of the faculty members identified as having a low negative correlation. The p-value of .000 is lesser than the level of significance, which is 0.05. Thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between technology usage and the assessed level of techno-stress of the faculty members of PLPasig is "Rejected." The results show an inverse relationship between the two variables, which means that the more often the teachers use technology, the less stressed they become. This might be because they have already adapted to this flexible learning modality that always utilizes technology in the teaching process.

CONCLUSIONS

The full-time and part-time faculty members of the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Pasig are integrating technology into their teaching activities all the time; they

are using it for more than 5 hours a week devoted to their teaching activities while they also spend an average of 5-7 hours using technology for personal activities. This is a manifestation that PLPasig has further enhanced information and communication technologies (ICT), such as promoting mobile learning, blended learning, and virtual reality-based instruction, which benefit the learners.

The full-time faculty members have a low level of techno-stress, while the part-time teachers have a moderate level of techno-stress. However, they still have to constantly adapt to the demands of the rapid changes and advancement of ICT and try to further lessen their stress in the learning-teaching process and social-oriented techno-stress. This implies that a program to de-stress the teachers is necessary to maintain their academic and mental health, specifically for faculty members experiencing moderate stress levels to avoid work burnout. Collaborations were made between and among the College of Nursing, College of Education, and College of Computer Studies in designing programs that will further address techno-stress and technology utilization issues of the faculty members of PLPasig.

TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH

The findings of the study became the basis of the University in developing counter-measures against techno-stress by adjusting the University management on the use of ICT. A faculty development program that includes various activities that address stress and mental health issues of the faculty members was created and subsequently implemented, considering the teachers with techno-stress to use and integrate ICT aligned with the University's objectives with ICT affordances and their actual needs. The faculty members were involved in the information and communication technology planning, purchase, and implementation phases.

Faculty members were given activities to learn how to regulate their emotional and psychological responses to external challenges. More importantly, they were provided with seminars to develop their capabilities and skills to effectively cope with the challenges associated with ICT-enhanced learning and teaching paradigm. The faculty members were introduced to digital technologies and how to implement them in educational activities with various examples.

The University continuously provides teachers with training on the intersection of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (TPACK). Technology integration in the classroom will require the ongoing collaborative efforts of teachers, educational technology professionals, school administrators, researchers, and educational software personnel.

LITERATURE CITED

Agarwal, R., & Prasad, J. (1999). Are individual differences germane to the acceptance of new information technologies?. *Decision sciences*, *30*(2), 361-391.

Besser, A., Lotem, S., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2022). Psychological stress and vocal symptoms among university professors in Israel: implications of the shift to online synchronous teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of voice*, *36*(2), 291-e9.

Brillhart, P. E. (2004). Technostress in the workplace: Managing stress in the electronic workplace. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, *5*(1/2), 302-307.

Brod, C. (1984). *Technostress: The human cost of the computer revolution*. Basic books.

Burton-Jones, A., & Hubona, G. S. (2005). Individual differences and usage behavior: revisiting a technology acceptance model assumption. *ACM SIGMIS Database: the DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, *36*(2), 58-77.

Cahapay, M. B., & Bangoc II, N. F. (2021). Technostress, work performance, job satisfaction, and career commitment of teachers amid COVID-19 crisis in the Philippines. *IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, (16), 260-275.

Çoklar, A. N., Efilti, E., Sahin, Y. L., & Akçay, A. (2016). Investigation of Techno-Stress Levels of Teachers Who Were Included in Technology Integration Processes. *Online Submission*.

Estrada-Muñoz, C., Vega-Muñoz, A., Castillo, D., Müller-Pérez, S., & Boada-Grau, J. (2021). Technostress of Chilean Teachers in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Teleworking. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *18*(10), 5458.

Howard, S. K. (2013). Risk-aversion: Understanding teachers' resistance to technology integration. *Technology, pedagogy and Education*, *22*(3), 357-372.

Koeske, G. F., & Koeske, R. D. (1993). A preliminary test of a stress-strain-outcome model for reconceptualizing the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *17*(3-4), 107-135.

Moursund, D., & Bielefeldt, T. (1999). Will new teachers be prepared to teach in a digital age? A national survey on information technology in teacher education.

Nisafani, A. S., Kiely, G., & Mahony, C. (2020). Workers' technostress: A review of its causes, strains, inhibitors, and impacts. *Journal of Decision Systems*, *29*(sup1), 243-258.

Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information systems research*, *19*(4), 417-433.

Rathore M.K. and Sonawat R. (2015). Integration of technology in education and its impact on learning of students. *International Journal of Applied Home Science*, 2(7&8): 235-246.

Shuttleworth, M. (2008). Descriptive research design-Observing a phenomenon. *url: http://explorable. com/descriptive-research-design, date retrieved: February*, *10*, 2013.

Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(1), 8-12.

Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(1), 8-12.

Tabbada, E. V., & Buendia, M. M. (2015). Educational Technology 1. Cubao Quezon City, Manila.

Wang, K., Shu, Q., & Tu, Q. (2008). Technostress under different organizational environments: An empirical investigation. *Computers in human behavior*, *24*(6), 3002-3013.