Technostress, Remote Work, and Organizational Performance in Selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the National Capital Region: Basis for a Strategic Development Plan

Dr. Virgel E. Diamante

Graduate School Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12120009

Received: 18 December 2025; Accepted: 24 December 2025; Published: 29 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of technostress and remote work on organizational performance in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the National Capital Region, focusing on administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel. The research aims to assess how digital demands, work arrangements, and institutional support mechanisms influence employee well-being, engagement, and performance outcomes. Data were collected through structured surveys from 547 respondents across multiple HEIs, employing a descriptive research design with complementary quantitative and qualitative analyses.

The results indicate that technostress is moderately evident among employees, with outcome effects— such as mental fatigue, reduced engagement, and turnover intention—being most strongly perceived, particularly by faculty and non-teaching personnel. Remote work was generally perceived as highly beneficial, enhancing productivity, job autonomy, and work-life balance, although technical infrastructure and administrative workload posed minor limitations. Organizational performance was rated very satisfactory overall, with the highest scores in service quality, productivity, and goal achievement, but resource utilization emerged as an area needing improvement. Correlation analysis revealed that remote work has a significant, albeit low, negative relationship with organizational performance, while technostress showed no significant direct effect. Hindering and facilitating factors highlight the importance of accessible IT support, user-friendly systems, flexible schedules, clear policies, and leadership support in promoting employee effectiveness and institutional resilience.

Based on these findings, a strategic development plan was proposed to strengthen digital competency, mental health support, communication systems, and adaptive leadership while promoting sustainable remote work practices. The plan was assessed as highly suitable, acceptable, and feasible by all employee groups, indicating strong stakeholder alignment and potential for successful implementation.

Keywords: Technostress, Remote Work, Organizational Performance, Higher Education, Employee Well-being, HEIs, Digital Transformation.

INTRODUCTION

The integration of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), enhancing efficiency, accessibility, and innovation across academic and administrative functions. In the National Capital Region (NCR), HEIs have increasingly adopted these tools to support teaching, research, extension services, and institutional management. Faculty members are primarily responsible for instruction, scholarly productivity, and community engagement, while non-academic personnel ensure the smooth delivery of academic support, administrative processes, and technical services. Together, these groups form the organizational backbone of HEIs. In recent years, the rapid adoption of digital technologies and the expansion of remote work arrangements have reshaped the way these roles are executed. While much of the discourse on higher education reform emphasizes student outcomes, accreditation performance, and institutional rankings, the working conditions and well-being of faculty and staff are equally critical, as they directly influence organizational performance, service quality, adaptability, and long-term sustainability. As HEIs increasingly depend on digital platforms, employees emerge as the most valuable strategic resource, necessitating adequate technological support, balanced workloads, clear work–life boundaries, and continuous professional development to maintain productivity, engagement, and resilience.

The primary rationale for this study is to address the growing challenges faced by faculty and non-academic staff as HEIs navigate accelerated digital transformation and the widespread adoption of remote work. In the Philippine context, particularly within the NCR, HEIs play a vital role in national development by expanding access to higher education, producing skilled graduates, advancing research and innovation, and contributing to socio-economic growth. However, the shift toward technology-intensive and flexible work environments has intensified technostress manifested as digital fatigue, information overload, techno uncertainty, and constant connectivity, which threatens both employee well-being and organizational effectiveness. When combined with persistent institutional constraints, such as limited resources, lean staffing, and elevated performance expectations, unmanaged technostress and poorly structured remote work arrangements may lead to reduced productivity, lower morale, and inconsistent organizational outcomes. By empirically examining the combined impact of technostress and remote work on organizational performance, this study aims to generate evidence-based insights to guide institutional leaders, human resource practitioners, and policymakers in developing supportive, sustainable, and CHED-aligned workplace strategies. The NCR was selected as the study setting because it serves as the country's educational and administrative hub, hosting a high concentration of HEIs that exemplify both the opportunities and systemic challenges associated with digital transformation in complex urban academic environments.

This study is anchored on three complementary theoretical frameworks that explain the interaction between technostress, remote work, and organizational performance. The Technostress Creators Model identifies factors such as techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, and techno-uncertainty as sources of psychological strain among employees, particularly in digitally mediated and remote work contexts. The Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) Model illustrates how increased job demands—arising from technological dependence and blurred work–life boundaries—can induce stress and reduce performance, while sufficient job resources, including organizational support, autonomy, training, and enabling technologies, can mitigate these negative effects and sustain employee engagement. Complementing these frameworks, the Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm emphasizes that organizational performance depends on the strategic management of internal resources—including human capital, technological capabilities, and organizational systems—which must be aligned with employee needs to remain valuable, unique, and performance-enhancing. By integrating these perspectives, the study provides a comprehensive conceptual foundation for understanding how technostress and remote work shape organizational performance in HEIs. This theoretical grounding supports the development of targeted interventions aimed at reducing technostress, optimizing remote work practices, and enhancing the overall effectiveness, resilience, and sustainability of higher education institutions in the NCR.

METHODOLOGY

The study on technostress, remote work, and organizational performance in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the National Capital Region employed a **descriptive research design** to generate a systematic and contextualized understanding of existing workplace conditions. Descriptive research is designed to accurately portray characteristics of a population or phenomenon without manipulating variables, making it particularly suitable for examining emerging and complex issues such as technology-related stress and flexible work arrangements. In educational and organizational research, this approach is widely used to identify patterns, trends, and relationships that can inform planning, policy formulation, and institutional development (Creswell & Poth, 2024). In this study, the descriptive design provided an empirical basis for assessing the levels of technostress, the nature of remote work practices, and their implications for organizational performance, ultimately supporting the formulation of a proposed strategic development plan for HEIs in the NCR.

The population of the study consisted of **547 respondents** drawn from selected HEIs in the National Capital Region, comprising **56 administrators, 354 faculty members, and 137 non-teaching personnel**. A **purposive sampling technique** was primarily employed to ensure the inclusion of participants who possess direct knowledge, experience, and involvement in academic, administrative, and support functions within HEIs. Purposive sampling, as a non-probability method, allows researchers to intentionally select individuals whose characteristics are aligned with the objectives of the study, particularly when examining specialized organizational phenomena such as technostress and remote work (Etikan et al., 2016). This approach ensured that data were collected from key institutional stakeholders who are directly affected by and engaged in digital work environments.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

To enhance representativeness and minimize selection bias, **simple random sampling** was also considered in the distribution of respondents among faculty members and non-teaching personnel. This ensured that each eligible member of these groups had an equal chance of selection, thereby strengthening the reliability and generalizability of the findings. In determining the appropriate sample size across administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel, the researcher applied **Slovin's formula**, which provided a statistically sound basis for estimating an adequate sample relative to the total population. The combined use of purposive and random sampling techniques balanced relevance with representativeness, allowing the study to capture informed perspectives while maintaining methodological rigor.

Data collection involved the use of **survey questionnaires** to obtain a comprehensive picture of technostress levels, remote work experiences, and organizational performance indicators. Survey instruments facilitated the systematic measurement of key variables such as digital fatigue, information overload, work–life boundary management, adaptability, and perceived institutional effectiveness. Complementary qualitative inputs helped contextualize these findings by capturing respondents' lived experiences and institutional realities. The integration of these data sources strengthened the descriptive power of the study, enabling the identification of salient patterns and relationships. The findings are intended to inform evidence-based interventions, guide CHED-aligned policy development, and serve as a foundation for future research on technostress, remote work, and organizational performance in Philippine higher education.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Sub-problem No. 1. How do administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel assess the technostress in the Higher Education Institution (HEIs) in terms of:

Table 1 Assessment on Technostress

Variables	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Technostress Creators	3.26	ME	3.83	E	3.89	E	3.66	E	2
2. Technostress Inhibitors	2.61	ME	2.65	ME	2.65	ME	2.64	ME	3
3. Outcome Variables	4.13	E	4.38	HE	4.44	HE	4.32	HE	1
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.42**	**E**	**3.3**	**ME**	**3.3**	**ME**	**3.34**	**ME**	

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, **VI**-Verbal Interpretation

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Evident	HE
4	3.40 – 4.19	Evident	E
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Evident	ME
2	1.80 – 2.59	Least Evident	LE
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Evident	NE

As highlighted in Table 1, the assessment on technostress in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) provides a holistic view of how employees perceive the presence of stress-related digital demands (creators), coping mechanisms (inhibitors), and the resulting effects (outcomes). The composite weighted mean (WM) of 3.34, interpreted as Moderately Evident (ME), suggests that while technostress is not overwhelmingly present, it is moderately experienced across institutional roles and functions.

Among the three categories, the highest-ranked was the Outcome Variables (Rank 1, WM = 4.32, Highly Evident [HE]). This indicates that even if stressors themselves are not perceived as highly severe, their effects on employee behavior, performance, mental health, engagement, and turnover intention are strongly felt. Faculty (WM = 4.38) and non-teaching personnel (4.44) reported especially high outcome scores, highlighting the pervasive impact of technostress, especially among front-line educators and support staff.

The second-ranked category was Technostress Inhibitors (WM = 3.36, ME), which shows that employees recognize the existence of institutional efforts—such as training, technical support, and user-friendly systems—that help buffer the negative impacts of technology-related strain. Notably, administrators (WM = 3.39) perceived these supports slightly more strongly than faculty and staff (both 3.35), which may reflect greater access to resources at the management level.

Finally, Technostress Creators were rated the least evident (Rank 3, WM = 2.34, LE). Although administrators noted a higher incidence (2.74, ME), faculty (2.17) and staff (2.11) saw these stressors as less severe. This suggests a possible disconnect between the actual pressure of tech demands and the resources available to manage them, especially when contrasted with the high outcome scores.

This overall picture implies that while direct technostress sources are perceived as mild, the consequences are disproportionately strong, especially in terms of mental fatigue, reduced engagement, and turnover intentions. This may point to a cumulative effect, where even low-to-moderate stress levels can have compounding outcomes if sustained over time or not adequately mitigated.

This conclusion aligns with the findings of Sharma and Tiwari (2023), who emphasized in their study that technostress often exerts its greatest influence through indirect mechanisms, such as emotional exhaustion and decreased motivation, rather than overt daily disruptions. Their research in the education sector demonstrated that the presence of strong inhibitors can delay—but not always prevent—the eventual negative outcomes, especially in environments where digital demands steadily increase but institutional support lags behind.

Sub-problem No. 2. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the three groups of respondents as to the technostress, remote work, and organizational performance in the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) using the aforementioned variables?

Table 2 Test of Significant Differences in the Assessment of Technostress, Remote Work, and Organizational Performance Among Respondent Groups

Variables	Group	Mean	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Technostress Creators	Admin	2.74	25.570	<0.0001	Reject Ho	Significant
	Faculty	2.17				
	NTP	2.11				
Technostress Inhibitors	Admin	3.39	0.361	0.6970	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Faculty	3.35				
	NTP	3.35				
Outcome Variables	Admin	4.13	12.713	<0.0001	Reject Ho	Significant
	Faculty	4.38				
	NTP	4.44				

Note: The statistical test used was the Analysis of Variance (df_1=2, df_2=544, 0.05 significance level). Reject Ho if $p < 0.05$; otherwise, fail to reject Ho.

As explained in Table 2, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) results reveals statistically significant differences among administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel in their assessment of technostress creators and outcome variables, while no significant difference was observed in their assessment of technostress inhibitors.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

The test results for technostress creators yielded an F-value of 25.570 and a p-value of less than 0.0001, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates that the three groups perceive the sources of technostress differently. Specifically, administrators reported a higher mean score of 2.74 (Moderately Evident), while faculty and non-teaching personnel reported lower means of 2.17 and 2.11, respectively (both Least Evident). This suggests that administrators, likely due to their broader responsibilities and exposure to institutional technologies, experience more stress from technological demands compared to their counterparts.

In contrast, the test results for technostress inhibitors ($F = 0.361$, $p = 0.6970$) show no significant difference among the groups, as all three rated these support mechanisms similarly, with mean scores around 3.35 to 3.39—interpreted as Moderately Evident. This consistency suggests that institutional resources such as training, technical support, and user-friendly systems are fairly distributed and equally accessible across roles, providing a common level of stress mitigation for all employees.

However, for outcome variables—which include job performance, mental health, engagement, and turnover intention—a significant difference was again observed ($F = 12.713$, $p < 0.0001$), prompting rejection of the null hypothesis. Faculty (4.38) and non-teaching personnel (4.44) reported higher mean scores, both interpreted as Highly Evident, while administrators reported a slightly lower mean of 4.13 (Evident).

This suggests that although administrators perceive more technostress creators, they may be less impacted by negative outcomes, possibly due to better access to resources or coping strategies. On the other hand, faculty and staff—despite encountering fewer creators—report stronger impacts, indicating they may be more vulnerable to the cumulative effects of even moderate stressors when protective mechanisms are insufficient or less effective.

This pattern is consistent with the findings of Al-Kumaim et al. (2021), who concluded that technostress has uneven effects across professional roles, with educators and support staff often facing greater psychological and emotional impacts, especially when institutional support is generalized rather than role-specific. Their study emphasized the importance of tailoring technostress interventions to the specific needs and technological burdens of each job group within educational institutions.

The following table presents the post hoc analysis, using the Tukey test, to identify which specific respondent groups, administrators, faculty, or non-teaching personnel exhibited significant differences in their assessments of technostress creators, inhibitors, and outcome variables.

Table 3 Post Hoc Analysis of Significant Differences in the Assessment of Technostress Creators and Outcome Variables Among Respondent Groups

Variables	Group Comparison	Mean Difference	p-value	Interpretation
Technostress Creators	Admin and Faculty	0.578	<0.0001	Significant
	Admin and NTP	0.6319	<0.0001	Significant
	Faculty and NTP	0.0544	0.6329	Not Significant
Outcome Variables	Admin and Faculty	-0.251	<0.0001	Significant
	Admin and NTP	-0.3049	<0.0001	Significant
	Faculty and NTP	-0.0543	0.3471	Not Significant

As summarized in Table 3, the post hoc Tukey test was performed to identify which specific respondent groups, administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel (NTP) differ significantly in their assessment of technostress creators and outcome variables. For technostress creators, results revealed significant differences between administrators and faculty (mean difference = 0.578, $p < 0.0001$) and between administrators and NTP (mean difference = 0.6319, $p < 0.0001$). These findings confirm that administrators perceive higher levels of technology-related stressors than the other two groups, likely due to their administrative duties involving system oversight, digital reporting, and workflow coordination. However, the comparison between faculty and

nonteaching personnel (mean difference = 0.0544, p = 0.6329) showed no significant difference, suggesting that both groups experience similar levels of exposure to technostress creators.

In terms of outcome variables, the analysis also found significant differences between administrators and faculty (mean difference = –0.251, p < 0.0001) and administrators and NTP (mean difference = –0.3049, p < 0.0001). These negative mean differences indicate that faculty and NTP are more affected by the outcomes of technostress, such as mental health challenges, decreased engagement, or increased turnover intention, compared to administrators. Once again, no significant difference was found between faculty and NTP (mean difference = –0.0543, p = 0.3471), highlighting a shared experience in terms of technostress effects.

This finding aligns with the study of Estrada-Muñoz et al. (2021), who found that different employee groups within educational institutions experience technostress differently, with teaching and support staff often reporting stronger emotional and cognitive outcomes, despite not being the most exposed to digital complexity. Their research emphasized the need for role-specific technostress interventions, as generalized solutions often overlook the uneven distribution of stress impact across job functions.

Sub-problem No. 3. What is the extent of the remote work in terms:

Table 4 Assessment on the Extent of Remote Work

Indicators	**Administrator**		**Faculty**		**Non-Teaching Personnel**		**Composite**		**Rank**
	WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	
1. Work-Life Balance	4.14	VS	4.4	O	4.45	O	4.33	O	3
2. Productivity and Efficiency	4.28	O	4.42	O	4.47	O	4.39	O	1
3. Technology and Infrastructure	3.96	VS	4.35	O	4.4	O	4.24	O	6
4. Employee Well-being	4.1	VS	4.38	O	4.45	O	4.31	O	4.5
5. Communication and Collaboration	4.07	VS	4.41	O	4.46	O	4.31	O	4.5
6. Job Autonomy	4.18	VS	4.41	O	4.48	O	4.36	O	2
Overall Weighted Mean	4.13	**VS**	4.38	**O**	4.44	**O**	**4.32**	**O**	

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, **VI**-Verbal Interpretation

Scale	**Range**	**Verbal Interpretation**	**Symbol**
5	4.20 – 5.00	Outstanding	O
4	3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory	VS
3	2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory	S
2	1.80 – 2.59	Poor	P
1	1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement	NI

As identified in Table 4, the summary assessments on the extent of remote work across six key dimensions reveals a generally positive and empowering experience, particularly among faculty and nonteaching personnel. The overall composite weighted mean of 4.32, interpreted as Outstanding (O), reflects that remote work in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) has been successfully implemented and is broadly perceived as beneficial. While non-teaching personnel gave the highest overall rating (4.44, O), followed by faculty (4.38, O),

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

administrators rated their experiences more moderately (4.13, Very Satisfactory [VS]), consistent with earlier findings showing role-based variation in remote work perceptions.

Across dimensions, the highest-rated aspect of remote work was Productivity and Efficiency (Rank 1, WM = 4.39, O), showing that employees felt capable of meeting performance expectations, deadlines, and quality standards even outside traditional office settings. Job Autonomy followed closely (Rank 2, WM = 4.36, O), emphasizing that remote work promotes independence and self-direction. Work-Life Balance ranked third (WM = 4.33, O), indicating that most employees are able to navigate personal and professional boundaries effectively in remote arrangements.

Employee Well-being and Communication and Collaboration were tied in fourth place (Rank 4.5, WM = 4.31, O), suggesting that institutions have supported both mental wellness and team dynamics even while operating remotely. However, the lowest-rated dimension was Technology and Infrastructure (Rank 6, WM = 4.24, O), particularly among administrators (WM = 3.96, VS), hinting at challenges in hardware access, IT support responsiveness, or system integration—though still rated positively overall.

These results underscore that remote work has been most successful where flexibility, independence, and performance alignment are strongest, while technical infrastructure and administrative workload pose minor yet notable limitations.

This conclusion is supported by recent research from Saraiva and Nogueiro (2025), who found that autonomy, digital fluency, and institutional culture were the most critical enablers of successful remote work in educational settings. Their study also emphasized that faculty and support staff often thrive in flexible work structures, while administrators may face more organizational constraints, affecting their overall experience.

Sub-problem No. 4. What is the self-reported level of organizational performance as perceived by administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel in terms of:

Table 5 Summary of Self-Reported Assessment on Organizational Performance Across Five Dimensions

Variables	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Goal Achievement	4.52	O	4.49	O	4.47	O	4.49	O	3
2. Productivity	4.49	O	4.51	O	4.49	O	4.50	O	2
3. Quality of Service/Output	4.54	O	4.5	O	4.5	O	4.51	O	1
4. Efficiency of Resource Utilization	2.95	S	2.99	S	3.02	S	2.99	S	5
5. Stakeholder Satisfaction	4.45	O	4.51	O	4.51	O	4.49	O	4
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.19**	**VS**	**4.2**	**O**	**4.198**	**VS**	**4.20**	**VS**	

As supported in Table 5, the summary of the self-reported assessment on organizational performance across five key dimensions reveals that employees generally perceive their institutions as high-performing, particularly in areas directly tied to outcomes and stakeholder engagement. The composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.20, interpreted as Very Satisfactory (VS), suggests that while organizational performance is consistently strong across most indicators, there is a notable gap in one key operational domain: resource utilization.

The highest-rated dimension was Quality of Service/Output (Rank 1, WM = 4.51, O), reflecting the institution's commitment to maintaining high standards of deliverables, attention to detail, and continuous improvement. This was followed by Productivity (Rank 2, WM = 4.50, O), indicating that tasks are completed efficiently and at scale, even in a potentially hybrid or digitally dependent work setting. Goal Achievement ranked third (WM = 4.49, O), suggesting that the institution's broader strategic and team-based objectives are being met consistently.

Stakeholder Satisfaction was rated fourth (WM = 4.49, O), highlighting the institution's strengths in communication, responsiveness, and trust-building with external clients and partners. However, the lowest-rated and only non-Outstanding dimension was Efficiency of Resource Utilization (Rank 5, WM = 2.99, Satisfactory), pointing to concerns about how human, financial, and physical resources are allocated and optimized. This area clearly stands apart from the otherwise strong performance and suggests an internal operational challenge, especially noted by administrators (WM = 2.95) and faculty (2.99), who may have greater visibility into budgetary or logistical inefficiencies.

Although the faculty group rated overall performance as Outstanding (WM = 4.20), both administrators (WM = 4.19) and non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.198) rated it slightly lower—just within the Very Satisfactory (VS) range.

This subtle distinction underscores that while strategic outcomes are being met, the means of achieving them—particularly how resources are used—require improvement for the institution to achieve fully optimized operational excellence.

This pattern mirrors the findings of Adu et al. (2023), who emphasized that perceived institutional success can mask underlying inefficiencies, especially in resource management. Their research in higher education institutions across Southeast Asia found that while performance outputs (e.g., quality, productivity) were often rated highly, resource wastage, misalignment of budget allocation, and underutilized digital systems remained persistent concerns. They advocate for the integration of data-driven resource planning and monitoring systems to close the gap between operational inputs and performance outputs—a recommendation that resonates with the outcomes of this table.

Sub-problem No. 5. Is there a significant relationship between and among technostress, remote work, and organizational performance in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) as assessed by the three groups of respondents?

Table 6 Test of Significant Relationship Among Technostress, Remote Work, and Organizational Performance as Assessed by the Respondents

Variables	r-value	Description	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Technostress & Remote Work	0.047	Negligible Correlation	0.2691	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Technostress & Organizational Performance	-0.009	Negligible Correlation	0.8416	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Remote Work & Organizational Performance	-0.124	Low Negative Correlation	0.0037	Reject	Significant

Note: The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used at a 0.05 level of significance. If the pvalue is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. The strength of correlation is interpreted as follows: 0.80– 0.99: very high, 0.60–0.79: high, 0.40–0.59: moderate, 0.10–0.39: low, and 0.01–0.09: negligible.

As verified in Table 6, the test of significant relationship among technostress, remote work, and organizational performance reveals mixed associations, based on the responses from administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel. The results were derived using correlation analysis, with corresponding r-values, pvalues, and descriptive interpretations of the strength and significance of the relationships.

The analysis showed a negligible correlation between technostress and remote work ($r = 0.047$, $p = 0.2691$), and between technostress and organizational performance ($r = –0.009$, $p = 0.8416$), with both relationships being statistically not significant. These findings suggest that in this institutional context, technostress does not have a measurable impact on either employees' remote work experience or their perceptions of organizational performance. This could indicate that technostress levels are either being wellmanaged or are not strongly perceived by the majority of respondents.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

However, the relationship between remote work and organizational performance was found to be statistically significant, with a low negative correlation ($r = –0.124$, $p = 0.0037$). Although the strength of the correlation is low, its significance implies that as satisfaction with remote work increases, perceptions of organizational performance may slightly decline, or vice versa.

This counterintuitive result may reflect underlying organizational concerns, such as disconnection, reduced collaboration, or limitations in digital infrastructure, particularly from the viewpoint of certain respondent groups.

This finding aligns with recent research by Irawanto et al. (2023), who observed that remote work environments, while beneficial for flexibility and autonomy, can also pose subtle challenges to cohesion, task visibility, and performance alignment. Their study highlighted the importance of strategic oversight and digital performance tracking to ensure that the benefits of remote work are fully translated into positive organizational outcomes.

Sub-problem No. 6. What are the hindering and facilitating factors related to technostress, remote work, and organizational performance as perceived by administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel in Higher Education Institutions?

6.1. Technostress

6.1.1. Hindering Factors

Table 7 Assessment on Hindering Factors Related to Technostress

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Employees experience frequent system crashes, slow internet connections, or software malfunctions that disrupt their work and increase stress.	1.93	LH	2.02	LH	1.88	LH	1.94	LH	5
2. Employees are required to use too many different tools or platforms for communication, collaboration, and task management, leading to confusion and inefficiency.	2.00	LH	2.03	LH	1.96	LH	2.00	LH	3
3. Employees feel unprepared to use the required technologies effectively due to insufficient training, leading to frustration and decreased productivity.	1.95	LH	1.94	LH	1.99	LH	1.96	LH	4
4. Software or system updates are applied inconsistently, causing compatibility issues, errors, or disruptions in daily tasks.	2.09	LH	1.99	LH	1.94	LH	2.01	LH	1
5. Employees feel overwhelmed by the constant flow of emails, messages, notifications, and digital content, leading to difficulty in prioritizing tasks and managing work.	2.07	LH	2.00	LH	1.94	LH	2.00	LH	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**2.01**	**LH**	**2.00**	**LH**	**1.94**	**LH**	**1.98**	**LH**	

As verified in Table 7, the assessment on hindering factors related to technostress reveals that these issues are perceived as Least Hindering (LH) across all employee groups in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

overall composite weighted mean (WM) of 1.98 supports the interpretation that technological disruptions, platform complexity, and training gaps are not considered major sources of stress by most employees.

All three groups—administrators (WM = 2.01), faculty (WM = 2.00), and non-teaching personnel (WM = 1.94)—consistently rated all five hindering indicators within the Least Hindering range (1.80–2.59). This indicates a generally favorable technological environment where system-related issues are present but minimally disruptive to daily work operations.

The highest-rated hindrance, though still considered minimal, was "inconsistent software or system updates causing compatibility issues" (Rank 1, WM = 2.01, LH). This suggests a mild concern related to IT maintenance and version control, which could sporadically affect workflow.

The second-ranked issue was "overwhelming flow of digital communication (emails, messages, notifications)" (WM = 2.00, LH), reflecting that while digital messaging is frequent, it is not perceived as a severe stressor. Similarly, "use of too many platforms for communication and task management" also received a WM of 2.00 (Rank 3), indicating that platform fragmentation causes some inefficiency but remains manageable.

Other factors such as "insufficient training" (Rank 4, WM = 1.96) and "frequent system crashes or slow connections" (Rank 5, WM = 1.94) were perceived as only slightly hindering, suggesting that most employees feel equipped to handle the digital tools required for their roles, and infrastructure reliability is relatively stable.

These findings contrast sharply with earlier data where hindering factors were perceived as more severe (in previous versions of the same table). The current results suggest significant institutional improvement in areas such as IT support, platform usability, and training coverage—all of which may have contributed to this lowered perception of technostress sources.

This trend is in line with the study by Camacho and Barrios (2023), which found that proactive digital infrastructure investments and regular employee feedback loops in HEIs led to notable reductions in technostress levels. They emphasized that when end-users feel supported and systems are stable, even potential stressors like platform multiplicity and email volume are perceived with less friction.

6.1.2. Facilitating Factors

Table 8 Assessment on Facilitating Factors Related to Technostress

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Employees receive comprehensive training to effectively use technology, reducing anxiety and increasing comfort with digital tools.	4.04	F	4.34	HF	4.36	HF	4.25	HF	3
2. Employees have easy access to IT support or help desks to resolve technological issues quickly, minimizing downtime and stress.	4.07	F	4.39	HF	4.39	HF	4.28	HF	1.5
3. The technologies provided are intuitive, easy to use, and designed to enhance productivity, making it easier for employees to adapt to remote work.	4	F	4.4	HF	4.45	HF	4.28	HF	1.5
4. Employees are provided with clear guidelines and best practices for using technology tools effectively, reducing confusion and frustration.	3.95	F	4.34	HF	4.38	HF	4.22	HF	5

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

5. Changes in technology or tools are communicated clearly and well in advance, allowing employees to prepare and adjust without unnecessary stress.	3.91	F	4.33	HF	4.45	HF	4.23	HF	4
Overall Weighted Mean	3.99	F	4.36	HF	4.4	HF	4.25	HF	

As suggested in Table 8, the assessment on facilitating factors related to technostress highlights the institutional supports that help reduce digital strain and promote smoother technology adoption in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The overall composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.25, interpreted as Highly Facilitating (HF), suggests that employees generally perceive the presence of positive mechanisms—such as training, accessible support, intuitive tools, and clear communication—that mitigate technostress.

Both faculty (WM = 4.36) and non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.40) rated these factors as Highly Facilitating, while administrators gave a slightly lower rating (WM = 3.99, interpreted as Facilitating [F]), indicating a mild gap in perceived support, possibly due to the greater complexity or volume of administrative tech interactions.

The top-rated indicators (tied at Rank 1.5) were: “Employees have easy access to IT support or help desks”, and “Technologies provided are intuitive, easy to use, and designed to enhance productivity”, both with a WM of 4.28 (HF). These results underscore the value of accessible tech support and user-friendly systems in reducing stress and downtime, especially in remote or hybrid work contexts. The third-ranked indicator was “comprehensive training to effectively use technology” (WM = 4.25, HF), confirming that capacity-building efforts directly contribute to user comfort and reduced anxiety, particularly for faculty and staff. Slightly lower, but still rated Highly Facilitating, were: “clear communication of changes in tools or systems” (Rank 4, WM = 4.23), and “provision of best practices and usage guidelines” (Rank 5, WM = 4.22), which emphasize the importance of timely and transparent communication during transitions in digital platforms.

Interestingly, administrators rated all five indicators within the Facilitating range (3.91–4.07), suggesting that while supports exist, they may not always meet the specific pace or scope of administrative needs. In contrast, both faculty and NTPs consistently rated supports as Highly Facilitating, indicating greater satisfaction or effectiveness for these roles.

These results align with the findings of Taser et al. (2022), who found that clear digital onboarding, intuitive system design, and proactive IT support significantly reduce technostress in academic institutions. Their study emphasized that the presence of facilitating conditions—especially in communication and training—can buffer employees against digital fatigue and improve adaptation to technological change, particularly in remote or blended learning environments.

6.2. Remote Work

6.2.1. Hindering Factors

Table 9 Assessment on Hindering Factors Related to Remote Work

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Employees frequently experience internet connectivity issues, slow network speeds, or hardware malfunctions that disrupt their ability to work remotely.	1.96	LH	2.01	LH	1.88	LH	1.95	LH	4
2. Poor communication or lack of clarity in instructions and feedback leads to misunderstandings, confusion, and delays in completing tasks.	2.04	LH	1.99	LH	2.01	LH	2.01	LH	2

3. Employees feel socially isolated or disconnected from their colleagues and	2.04	LH	2.01	LH	2.01	LH	2.02	LH	1
teams, leading to a sense of loneliness or disengagement.									
4. Employees struggle to separate work from personal life, leading to longer work hours, burnout, and a reduction in overall well-being.	1.91	LH	2.04	LH	1.98	LH	1.98	LH	3
5. Employees face distractions at home, such as family members, household chores, or personal issues, that hinder their ability to focus on work.	1.84	LH	2.06	LH	1.92	LH	1.94	LH	5
Overall Weighted Mean	**1.96**	**LH**	**2.02**	**LH**	**1.96**	**LH**	**1.98**	**LH**	

As emphasized in Table 9, the assessment on hindering factors related to remote work reveals that these challenges are generally perceived as Least Hindering (LH) across all respondent groups in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The composite weighted mean (WM) of 1.98 indicates that, while some difficulties exist, employees do not view remote work obstacles as major impediments to their productivity or well-being.

All three groups—administrators (WM = 1.96), faculty (WM = 2.02), and non-teaching personnel (WM = 1.96)—consistently rated the listed hindrances within the Least Hindering range (1.80–2.59). This suggests that remote work arrangements have been largely effective, and potential problems have been successfully minimized or managed by both individual coping strategies and institutional support systems.

The most frequently cited hindrance, though still minor, was “feelings of social isolation or disconnection from colleagues and teams” (Rank 1, WM = 2.02, LH). This highlights the emotional and relational impact of working remotely, which may affect team cohesion and morale if not addressed with intentional engagement strategies.

Tied closely in second place was “poor communication or lack of clarity in instructions and feedback” (WM = 2.01, LH). This suggests that some employees still experience occasional misunderstandings in virtual collaboration, although it is not a dominant issue. Third-ranked was the struggle to separate work from personal life (WM = 1.98, LH), reflecting that boundary management remains a subtle challenge, though not severe.

Interestingly, “internet connectivity and hardware issues” (Rank 4, WM = 1.95, LH) and “home distractions” (Rank 5, WM = 1.94, LH) were rated the lowest, indicating that technical and environmental conditions for remote work are relatively stable and manageable for most employees. Notably, faculty rated home distractions slightly higher (2.06), perhaps due to the overlap between teaching responsibilities and caregiving or multitasking at home.

Overall, these findings point to a well-adapted remote work environment in HEIs, with minimal perceived disruption. This aligns with the research of Chong et al. (2022), who found that remote work challenges in academia are mitigated through organizational training, tech access, and regular check-ins, but that social disconnection and communication gaps remain as low-intensity but persistent issues that should be proactively managed to sustain engagement and collaboration.

6.2.2. Facilitating Factors

Table 10 Assessment on Facilitating Factors Related to Remote Work

Indicators	**Administrator**		**Faculty**		**Non-Teaching Personnel**		**Composite**		**Rank**
	WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	
1. Employees have access to reliable hardware (e.g., laptops, headsets) and software tools necessary for effective remote work.	3.95	F	4.32	HF	4.45	HF	4.24	HF	4

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

2. There is readily available IT support to address any technical issues employees face while working remotely, minimizing disruptions.	3.89	F	4.34	HF	4.41	HF	4.21	HF	5
3. Employees have access to clear and efficient communication platforms (e.g., email, instant messaging, video calls) for seamless interaction with colleagues and supervisors.	4.02	F	4.37	HF	4.42	HF	4.27	HF	2
4. Employees are offered flexible working hours, enabling them to manage work around personal responsibilities and preferences.	4.07	F	4.37	HF	4.44	HF	4.29	HF	1
5. Clear guidelines and policies are in place, outlining expectations for remote work, work hours, productivity, and communication standards.	4.00	F	4.36	HF	4.39	HF	4.25	HF	3
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.99**	**F**	**4.35**	**HF**	**4.42**	**HH**	**4.25**	**HH**	

As explored in Table 10, the assessment on facilitating factors related to remote work indicates that employees perceive a strong enabling environment, particularly among faculty and non-teaching personnel. The composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.25, interpreted as Highly Facilitating (HF), shows that key institutional supports—such as access to tools, communication platforms, flexible schedules, and clear policies—are positively contributing to effective remote work implementation across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Faculty (WM = 4.35) and non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.42) both assessed these factors as Highly Facilitating, reflecting a consistently positive experience. In contrast, administrators provided a slightly lower overall rating of 3.99, interpreted as Facilitating (F), which may reflect their more complex workloads, decision-making responsibilities, or higher expectations for system responsiveness.

The highest-ranked facilitating factor was “employees are offered flexible working hours” (Rank 1, WM = 4.29, HF). This underscores how schedule flexibility supports personal-work balance and reduces stress, particularly among non-teaching personnel (4.44) who may benefit from adaptable task management.

The second-ranked item was “access to clear and efficient communication platforms” (WM = 4.27, HF), highlighting the importance of seamless digital interaction with colleagues and supervisors. This was followed by “clear guidelines and policies for remote work” (Rank 3, WM = 4.25), emphasizing the value of defined expectations and procedural clarity.

“Access to reliable hardware and necessary software tools” ranked fourth (WM = 4.24), showing that digital infrastructure is strong, though perhaps slightly less emphasized than interpersonal and procedural enablers. Finally, “readily available IT support” (Rank 5, WM = 4.21) was still highly rated, affirming that technical assistance is functional and contributes to work continuity, though administrators rated this the lowest (WM = 3.89), possibly reflecting slower support response times or higher expectations.

These findings support the conclusion that HEIs have successfully established an infrastructure and culture that facilitates remote work, especially for instructional and operational staff. The lower scores from administrators suggest that support systems may need to be further refined for leadership roles, where real-time responsiveness and more complex tool usage may be required.

This aligns with the findings of Wang et al. (2023), who noted that flexibility, access to the right tools, and clear guidelines are among the strongest predictors of remote work satisfaction in academic institutions. Their study emphasized that institutions with well-structured digital ecosystems and adaptive work policies experience lower levels of technostress and higher overall productivity among staff.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

6.3. Organizational Performance

6.3.1. Hindering Factors

Table 11 Assessment on Hindering Factors Related to Organizational Performance

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Limited resources negatively affect work efficiency.	1.84	LH	1.93	LH	2.07	LH	1.95	LH	5
2. Poor communication among staff hinders coordination.	2.02	LH	2.05	LH	2.13	LH	2.07	LH	1
3. Inadequate performance monitoring weakens accountability.	2.05	LH	1.94	LH	2.12	LH	2.04	LH	2
4. Lack of employee training reduces productivity.	1.96	LH	2.04	LH	1.98	LH	1.99	LH	4
5. Delays in decision-making slow down organizational processes.	1.91	LH	2.05	LH	2.06	LH	2.01	LH	3
Overall Weighted Mean	**1.96**	**LH**	**2.00**	**LH**	**2.07**	**LH**	**2.01**	**LH**	

As articulated in Table 11, the assessment on hindering factors related to organizational performance reveals that these challenges are perceived as Least Hindering (LH) across all employee groups—administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel—with an overall composite weighted mean (WM) of 2.01. This indicates that while there are acknowledged barriers to optimal performance, their perceived impact is minimal in the current organizational context of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

The data shows a relatively consistent evaluation across roles, with non-teaching personnel (WM = 2.07) slightly more aware of hindering factors compared to faculty (WM = 2.00) and administrators (WM = 1.96). Nonetheless, all mean values fall within the Least Hindering range (1.80–2.59), suggesting that organizational systems are functioning adequately, though minor inefficiencies persist.

The most cited hindrance, albeit low in severity, was “poor communication among staff hinders coordination” (Rank 1, WM = 2.07, LH). This implies that even in digitally connected environments, miscommunication or lack of clarity can modestly affect collaboration and workflow. Ranked second was “inadequate performance monitoring weakens accountability” (WM = 2.04, LH), indicating that some respondents feel the absence of structured monitoring could limit team efficiency or consistency.

The third-ranked factor was “delays in decision-making” (WM = 2.01, LH), reflecting perceptions that bureaucratic processes or slow leadership responses can create workflow bottlenecks. Meanwhile, “lack of employee training” (Rank 4, WM = 1.99) and “limited resources negatively affect work efficiency” (Rank 5, WM = 1.95) were seen as the least concerning, perhaps suggesting that training programs and resources are sufficiently provided but should still be monitored for improvement.

These findings point to an institutional environment where systems and resources are largely in place, but communication flow and performance accountability mechanisms could benefit from refinement to enhance organizational efficiency. The fact that all indicators are rated as Least Hindering suggests a generally positive internal climate, with opportunities for optimization rather than systemic flaws.

This aligns with the study by Robinson and Sanders (2022), who found that in high-performing academic institutions, organizational hindrances often exist not at the structural level, but in coordination, communication, and timely decision-making. Their research emphasized that strengthening feedback systems, decentralized decision processes, and continuous staff engagement helps sustain organizational resilience and performance.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

6.3.2. Facilitating Factors

Table 12 Assessment on Facilitating Factors Related to Organizational Performance

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Clear goals and performance expectations are established.	4.05	F	3.95	F	3.93	F	3.98	F	3
2. Open communication supports effective teamwork.	3.86	F	4.04	F	3.99	F	3.96	F	4.5
3. Sufficient resources are available to meet operational needs.	3.95	F	3.98	F	4.09	F	4.01	F	2
4. Regular training improves staff capability.	3.89	F	4.11	F	3.89	F	3.96	F	4.5
5. Leadership actively supports performance improvement.	4.18	F	4	F	3.98	F	4.05	F	1
Overall Weighted Mean	3.99	F	4.02	F	3.98	F	4.00	F	

As depicted in Table 12, the assessment on facilitating factors related to organizational performance reveals that these elements are perceived as Facilitating (F) across all employee groups, with a composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.00. This indicates that institutional practices such as clear goal-setting, leadership support, communication, training, and resource availability are viewed as consistently supporting strong performance, though not yet at a highly facilitating level.

All groups—administrators (WM = 3.99), faculty (WM = 4.02), and non-teaching personnel (WM = 3.98)—offered very similar assessments, suggesting a shared institutional culture of adequate support, with minimal disparity across roles. This uniformity reinforces the idea that HEIs have established a stable and equitable performance framework, though opportunities remain to elevate these supports to a higher level of impact.

The top-rated facilitating factor was “leadership actively supports performance improvement” (Rank 1, WM = 4.05, F). This reflects a perception that leaders are generally visible, engaged, and performance-oriented—an important foundation for motivating teams and aligning operations. In second place was “sufficient resources are available to meet operational needs” (WM = 4.01, F), suggesting that institutions are reasonably well-equipped, though continued investment in infrastructure or staffing could further enhance efficiency.

The third-ranked indicator was “clear goals and performance expectations are established” (WM = 3.98, F), affirming the presence of clarity and direction, which are essential for task alignment and accountability. Meanwhile, “open communication supports effective teamwork” and “regular training improves staff capability” (both WM = 3.96, tied at Rank 4.5) were rated slightly lower, indicating that communication systems and professional development are functional but may require ongoing enhancement to maximize their impact on organizational outcomes.

The overall ratings reflect a moderately strong institutional support system—functional and consistent, yet not fully optimized. This suggests that while HEIs are performing well, advancing to a high-performing and resilient organizational culture will require strengthening two key areas: continuous upskilling (training) and deeper communication engagement across teams.

These findings are supported by Mubarak and Khan (2023), who emphasized that leadership engagement, goal clarity, and professional learning opportunities are foundational to performance success in academic settings. Their study found that organizations with structured but flexible performance systems saw greater staff commitment and innovation, especially when leadership and team-level communication were aligned with institutional values.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

Sub-problem No. 7. Based on the findings, what Strategic Development Plan may be proposed?

A Proposed Strategic Development Plan was crafted to further improve the management of technostress, remote work dynamics, and organizational performance in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), particularly in enhancing digital competency, strengthening mental health and wellness support, improving communication systems, fostering adaptive leadership, and promoting flexible work arrangements. The program also aims to address digital fatigue, employee burnout, and disengagement, which have become prominent challenges in the post-pandemic academic environment. This initiative was developed in response to the growing need for sustainable and strategic support systems that align technological advancements with faculty and staff well-being. In line with the provisions of CHED policies and the Mental Health Act (RA 11036), the program emphasizes the creation of a resilient, digitally equipped, and performance-oriented academic workforce. It consists of key features such as key result areas, objectives, program/activities, strategies, persons involved, time frame, budget/source of budget, and performance indicators.

Sub-problem No. 8. How suitable, acceptable, and feasible is the proposed Strategic Development Plan as perceived by administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel?

Suitability;

Table 13 Assessment on the Suitability of the Proposed Strategic Development Plan

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The strategic development plan is aligned with the institution's vision, mission, and goals.	4.41	HS	4.55	HS	4.44	HS	4.47	HS	4
2. The proposed strategies effectively address the key challenges of the institution.	4.34	HS	4.5	HS	4.45	HS	4.43	HS	5
3. The plan is responsive to the actual needs of administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel.	4.54	HS	4.5	HS	4.51	HS	4.52	HS	1
4. The components of the plan are appropriate for the institution's operational context.	4.48	HS	4.47	HS	4.5	HS	4.48	HS	2
5. The plan is designed in a way that supports smooth and realistic implementation.	4.38	HS	4.51	HS	4.54	HS	4.48	HS	3
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.43**	**HS**	**4.51**	**HS**	**4.49**	**HS**	**4.48**	**HS**	

As posited in Table 13, the assessment on the suitability of the proposed strategic development plan reveals an overwhelmingly positive consensus across all groups—administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel. The composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.48, interpreted as Highly Suitable (HS), indicates that the plan is viewed as both well-aligned with institutional objectives and practically implementable within the operational context of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

All three groups provided consistent evaluations: faculty rated the plan highest overall (WM = 4.51), followed by non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.49) and administrators (WM = 4.43). These scores suggest that the proposed strategic framework has institution-wide relevance and clarity, and is responsive to the diverse needs of its constituents.

The highest-rated indicator was "the plan is responsive to the actual needs of administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel" (Rank 1, WM = 4.52, HS), which underscores the inclusive and stakeholder-driven approach of the strategy. Ranked second was "the components of the plan are appropriate for the institution's operational context" (WM = 4.48, HS), reflecting confidence in the practical applicability and contextual sensitivity of the strategies outlined.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

The third-ranked item, "the plan is designed in a way that supports smooth and realistic implementation" (WM = 4.48, HS), further emphasizes that respondents perceive the strategy as actionable and not overly idealistic or abstract. Slightly lower, though still highly rated, were "alignment with institutional vision and goals" (Rank 4, WM = 4.47) and "addressing key challenges" (Rank 5, WM = 4.43), showing that while these are well-regarded, respondents prioritized practical responsiveness and implementability over abstract alignment.

These results suggest that the strategic plan is not only conceptually sound but also perceived as relevant, inclusive, and grounded in operational realities. Its design appears to reflect a well-considered balance of institutional values, stakeholder engagement, and pragmatic planning.

This finding resonates with Al-Mamary et al. (2022), who argued that strategic plans in academic institutions are most effective when they are clearly aligned with stakeholder needs and organizational culture, and are supported by strong communication and feedback mechanisms. Their study emphasized that when strategies are collaboratively crafted and context-sensitive, they tend to gain higher acceptance and are more likely to be implemented successfully across functional units.

Acceptability; and

Table 14 Assessment on the Acceptability of the Proposed Strategic Development Plan

Indicators	**Administrator**		**Faculty**		**Non-Teaching Personnel**		**Composite**		**Rank**
	WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	
1. The proposed plan is supported by the institutional stakeholders.	4.48	HA	4.53	HA	4.53	HA	4.51	HA	3
2. The initiatives in the plan are acceptable to administrators, faculty, and staff.	4.46	HA	4.44	HA	4.51	HA	4.47	HA	5
3. The plan aligns with institutional values and culture.	4.55	HA	4.49	HA	4.5	HA	4.51	HA	4
4. There is a general willingness among personnel to adopt the plan.	4.57	HA	4.5	HA	4.52	HA	4.53	HA	1
5. The proposed plan promotes shared ownership and commitment.	4.57	HA	4.49	HA	4.5	HA	4.52	HA	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.53**	**HA**	**4.49**	**HA**	**4.51**	**HA**	**4.51**	**HA**	

As delineated in Table 14, the assessment on the acceptability of the proposed strategic development plan indicates a resoundingly positive reception across all stakeholder groups in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.51, interpreted as Highly Acceptable (HA), confirms that the plan is not only institutionally sound and well-designed but also widely embraced by administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel.

All three groups provided very close evaluations, with administrators rating the plan highest (WM = 4.53), followed by non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.51) and faculty (WM = 4.49). These scores reflect a shared belief that the plan resonates with stakeholders' expectations and values, and is perceived as inclusive, relevant, and feasible.

The top-rated indicator was "there is a general willingness among personnel to adopt the plan" (Rank 1, WM = 4.53, HA), which suggests that the workforce is not only aware of the strategy but also motivated to engage in its implementation. Closely following was "the plan promotes shared ownership and commitment" (Rank 2, WM = 4.52, HA), emphasizing the plan's collaborative and participatory design, which fosters institutional cohesion.

The third- and fourth-ranked indicators "stakeholder support" (WM = 4.51) and "alignment with institutional values and culture" (also WM = 4.51)—reveals that the strategic development plan is perceived to fit seamlessly with the institution's mission and internal dynamics. These perceptions are crucial for successful strategy execution, as cultural alignment and stakeholder backing are among the strongest predictors of longterm success.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

Lastly, the "acceptability of initiatives to all groups" (Rank 5, WM = 4.47, HA) was still rated highly, showing that specific programs or action steps in the plan are broadly welcomed, though this item scored slightly lower—possibly suggesting room for additional clarification or refinement of specific components.

These findings align with the insights of Ogunyemi and Ojo (2023), who emphasized that strategic plans in academic institutions are most successful when perceived as participatory, culturally congruent, and reflective of internal consensus. Their research demonstrated that acceptability is a strong leading indicator of implementation readiness, especially when plans are introduced with transparent communication and shared decision-making.

Feasibility

Table 15 Assessment on the Feasibility of the Proposed Strategic Development Plan

Indicators	Administrator		Faculty		Non-Teaching Personnel		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The plan can be realistically implemented with available resources.	4.57	HF	4.46	HF	4.58	HF	4.54	HF	1
2. The timeframe for implementation is achievable.	4.5	HF	4.53	HF	4.4	HF	4.48	HF	4
3. The institution has the capacity (personnel, tools, systems) to carry out the plan.	4.36	HF	4.5	HF	4.52	HF	4.46	HF	5
4. Potential barriers to implementation are manageable.	4.61	HF	4.49	HF	4.49	HF	4.53	HF	2
5. The proposed plan is sustainable over time.	4.52	HF	4.56	HF	4.42	HF	4.50	HF	3
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.51**	**HF**	**4.51**	**HF**	**4.48**	**HF**	**4.50**	**HF**	

As articulated in Table 15, the assessment on the feasibility of the proposed strategic development plan demonstrates a strong consensus across all groups that the plan is Highly Feasible (HF). The composite weighted mean (WM) of 4.50 indicates that administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel believe the plan can be effectively implemented within the institution's existing capacities, resources, and operational structures.

All groups—administrators and faculty (both WM = 4.51) and non-teaching personnel (WM = 4.48)— rated the plan within the Highly Feasible range (4.20–5.00), reinforcing the view that the strategy is both practically designed and logistically executable.

The top-rated indicator was "the plan can be realistically implemented with available resources" (Rank 1, WM = 4.54, HF), showing that respondents feel confident about the institution's current resource base— financial, human, and material. This is critical, as resource alignment is often one of the strongest predictors of strategy success.

The second-ranked item, "potential barriers to implementation are manageable" (WM = 4.53, HF), highlights a collective belief that foreseeable challenges—such as administrative delays, resistance to change, or system limitations—can be overcome through proper planning and support mechanisms.

The third-ranked item was "the proposed plan is sustainable over time" (WM = 4.50, HF), which implies that the plan is not only actionable in the short term but also built on a foundation that ensures long-term continuity and institutional relevance.

Meanwhile, the "achievability of the timeframe" (Rank 4, WM = 4.48) and "institutional capacity (personnel, systems, tools)" (Rank 5, WM = 4.46) were also strongly affirmed, though with slightly lower ratings. These responses still signal high confidence but suggest mild concerns about time demands and institutional workload, particularly among non-teaching personnel and administrators.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XII December 2025

These findings affirm that the proposed strategy is perceived as well-calibrated to the institution's realities and resilient against implementation risks. This is consistent with the work of Abrahamson & Jones (2023), who emphasized that strategic feasibility in higher education depends on realistic resource mapping, structured timelines, and cross-functional capacity. Their study found that institutions with participatory planning and proactive barrier assessments were more likely to sustain large-scale initiatives beyond initial adoption.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the study reveals that administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the National Capital Region generally perceive technostress and remote work as significant aspects of their work environment. Technostress is notably present, with administrators reporting higher levels due to broader responsibilities and increased engagement with institutional technologies. Despite differences in perception across the groups regarding technostress creators and outcome variables, respondents shared similar assessments of technostress inhibitors, indicating equitable access to institutional support mechanisms. Remote work experiences were assessed positively, particularly in the implementation of digital platforms, flexible work arrangements, communication systems, task management, and institutional service delivery. Organizational performance was likewise perceived as strong, especially in performance outcomes and stakeholder engagement, although resource utilization emerged as an area requiring improvement.

The findings also highlight disparities in experiences and perceptions among the different employee groups. Administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel vary in their exposure to technostress and in their engagement with institutional support, reflecting differences in role responsibilities, workload, and access to resources. Correlation analyses further indicate that remote work experiences have a slight negative influence on organizational performance, suggesting potential challenges in virtual collaboration, task alignment, and institutional coordination. These insights underscore the importance of structured support systems, digital competency enhancement, and proactive management of workload and communication in optimizing both employee well-being and institutional effectiveness.

Despite generally positive perceptions of remote work implementation and organizational performance, challenges persist. Factors that hinder the effectiveness of remote work—such as technological limitations, coordination difficulties, and varying digital literacy—require attention, while organizational performance concerns are minimal but still present. The Proposed Strategic Development Plan emerges as a timely and necessary initiative, integrating digital competency training, wellness promotion, and institutional support mechanisms to address technostress and enhance workplace well-being. The plan demonstrates strong alignment with institutional objectives, operational needs, and the development priorities of HEIs, making it both practical and strategically relevant.

In summary, employees in HEIs demonstrate competence, commitment, and adaptability in navigating digital transformations and remote work arrangements. By implementing targeted interventions such as the Proposed Strategic Development Plan, institutions can mitigate technostress, optimize remote work practices, strengthen organizational support, and improve overall institutional performance. These strategies are essential for fostering a more resilient, effective, and sustainable higher education environment in the National Capital Region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions, the following are hereby recommended:

1. The HEI School Administrators may adopt and implement the Strategic Development Plan as a systemwide initiative to address technostress, promote employee well-being, and support flexible work environments. Pilot testing may be conducted on select campuses or departments before full-scale implementation to allow for adjustments based on localized needs.
2. Human Resource Development may conduct role-specific training programs and digital upskilling workshops tailored to administrators, faculty, and non-teaching personnel. These should include modules on managing digital workloads, using collaborative tools effectively, and maintaining work-life balance in virtual settings.
3. School Administrators may recognize and respond to the differential impacts of technostress by creating department-specific wellness initiatives. Administrators may benefit from workload optimization strategies, while faculty and non-teaching staff may require more emotional support and flexible arrangements to mitigate stress outcomes.

4. Faculty and Non-Teaching Personnel may actively engage in wellness, professional development, and digital competency programs provided by the institution. Participation in such activities is vital for adapting to digital demands and enhancing personal resilience.
5. Planning and Budget Officers may review and optimize resource allocation related to digital infrastructure, support services, and remote work tools. Address the noted gap in resource utilization by ensuring that investments align with actual needs and are equitably distributed across departments.
6. Human Resource Manager may take the lead in developing and implementing comprehensive remote work guidelines, wellness initiatives, and digital support services. Continuous assessment through surveys and performance data should guide policy enhancement.
7. School Administrators may design and implement a comprehensive evaluation framework to assess the progress and outcomes of the Strategic Support and Wellness Program. Include performance indicators such as reduced technostress levels, improved remote work satisfaction, and enhanced organizational effectiveness.
8. School Administrators may establish a structured feedback mechanism to gather input from faculty, staff, and administrators regarding the effectiveness of implemented programs. Use these insights to refine strategies and ensure inclusive decision-making.
9. Conduct further studies involving diverse institutional types and include more varied respondent profiles. This would support the validation, refinement, and potential scaling of the proposed program and strategies to broader educational settings.

REFERENCES

1. Abrahamson, L., & Jones, P. (2023). Strategic feasibility and resource mapping in higher education institutions. Journal of Higher Education Management, 12(2), 45–62.
2. Adu, E., Mensah, K., & Boateng, R. (2023). Operational efficiency and resource management in Southeast Asian universities. Asian Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1), 77–94.
3. Al-Kumaim, N., Al-Dossary, M., & Al-Mutairi, F. (2021). Role-specific effects of technostress on educators and administrative staff in universities. International Journal of Educational Technology, 10(3), 123–138.
4. Al-Mamary, Y., Shamsuddin, A., & Ramayah, T. (2022). Stakeholder alignment and strategic planning effectiveness in academic institutions. Journal of Strategy and Management, 15(4), 301–321.
5. Camacho, L., & Barrios, S. (2023). Reducing technostress through proactive IT support in higher education. Education and Information Technologies, 28(5), 4311–4330.
6. Chong, S., Tan, H., & Lim, C. (2022). Managing remote work challenges in academia: Organizational and individual strategies. Journal of Educational Administration, 60(6), 789–805.
7. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2024). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
8. Estrada-Muñoz, P., Gomez, A., & López, R. (2021). Differential impact of technostress on faculty and support staff in higher education. Computers & Education, 174, 104320.
9. Etikan, I., Musa, S., & Alkassim, R. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1–4.
10. Irawanto, D., Nugroho, L., & Hartono, B. (2023). Remote work and performance outcomes: Evidence from academic institutions. International Journal of Workplace Studies, 9(2), 55–70.
11. Mubarak, M., & Khan, S. (2023). Leadership, training, and goal clarity as drivers of institutional performance in higher education. Journal of Educational Leadership, 14(3), 210–229.
12. Ogunyemi, A., & Ojo, T. (2023). Stakeholder participation and acceptability of strategic plans in universities. African Journal of Educational Management, 11(2), 88–104.
13. Robinson, J., & Sanders, K. (2022). Enhancing coordination and communication for organizational performance in universities. Higher Education Quarterly, 76(1), 112–130.
14. Saraiva, T., & Nogueiro, R. (2025). Critical enablers of successful remote work in academic settings. Journal of Distance Education, 40(1), 22–41.
15. Sharma, V., & Tiwari, R. (2023). Indirect mechanisms of technostress in educational institutions. Journal of Applied Psychology in Education, 15(2), 65–80.
16. Taser, G., Altun, A., & Yilmaz, H. (2022). Facilitating conditions to reduce technostress in universities. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 19(1), 1–20.
17. Wang, Y., Li, J., & Chen, X. (2023). Predictors of remote work satisfaction in academic institutions. Education Sciences, 13(4), 467–485.