



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



## Evaluation of the impact of technology on the students in the new education setting

Dann Mark Nisperos Dela Cruz \*

*College of Tourism and Hospitality Management, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales, Philippines.*

Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews, 2023, 07(02), 068–075

Publication history: Received on 28 February 2023; revised on 09 April 2023; accepted on 12 April 2023

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2023.7.2.0047>

### Abstract

This study focused on the impact of technology on the student's academic performance in terms of personal, emotional, and financial in the new education setting. One hundred (100) respondents were composed of Hospitality Management Students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University Iba Campus.

The study utilized the quantitative approach and the descriptive-survey research methodology. Survey research means collecting information about a group of people by asking them questions and analyzing the results.

Based on the summary of the investigations conducted, the researchers have concluded that the majority of the respondents were females, young adults, and had a family monthly income of 20,000 and below. The respondents "Strongly Agree" on the personal, emotional, and financial on evaluation of the respondents on impact of technology on academic performance. And perceived no significant difference on the evaluation of the respondents on the impact of technology on academic performance in terms of personal, emotional, and financial.

It is highly recommended that the institution considers strengthening students' personal and emotional aspects in this new normal setting of education while considering financial capability. And a friendly application operating system should be used for easy access of the students that can lessen their personal and emotional stress.

**Keywords:** Hospitality; Students; Impact; Technology; Education

### 1. Introduction

Due to this current health crisis, the world is facing right now, the everyday routine in every aspect changed, in terms of economic, social, financial, and education. And as a consequence of this global pandemic that is going on now, "New Normal" is frequently heard as the new terminology for the sudden shift of everything. In addition, the "new normal" shakes the norms people have lived through. In the daily human routine, the "new normal" means wearing a face mask every time people go out and maintaining social distancing. In terms of transactions, almost everything must first be done online or with less physical interaction to ensure the safety of everyone. These technological advances greatly changed the education landscape in that teaching is no longer confined to the traditional face-to-face delivery of lessons. Now, via the internet, we can also learn in the classroom and outside the school. Students can now benefit from the best of both worlds because to the convergence of new and ancient ways. They can learn from school and get additional information or lessons through the web and the internet [1].

In this new normal approach, the term "technology" is an important issue in many fields, especially in education. This is because technology has become the primary mode of knowledge transfer in most fields. Today, technology integration has gone through innovations and transformed our societies, completely changing the way people think, work, and live.

\* Corresponding author: Dann Mark Nisperos Dela Cruz

As a result, schools and other educational institutions that are supposed to prepare students to live in "a knowledge society" must consider technology integration in their curriculum [2].

From this point of view, the researchers intended to study and evaluate the impact of technology on students in the new education setting. This includes the profile of the respondents and the impacts of technology in the new education setting such as personal, emotional, and financial. The result can be the basis for the enhancement of the student's performance in the new education setting. The result can be the basis for the enhancement of the student's performance in the new education setting. One hundred (100) respondents were composed of Hospitality Management Students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba Campus.

## 2. Material and methods

### 2.1. Research Design

This is quantitative research in which a descriptive survey was used. A descriptive survey is gathering information to describe the object of study as it is, has been, or is viewed. As to Villanueva (2013), descriptive surveys provide information regarding how things are. Descriptive surveys are used most frequently to begin research in a new area. These surveys gather data and descriptive information without making judgments. Descriptive research can lead to the identification of key variables that may then be used in normative research.

### 2.2. Respondents and Location

This study was conducted locally, focusing on one hundred (100) selected Hospitality Management Students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba Campus, in Iba, Zambales.

Simple random sampling was one of the probability sampling strategies. The most basic sampling strategy is simple random sampling, in which we select a set of participants (a sample) for a research from a larger population. (a population). Every individual is chosen at random, and each member of the population has an equal chance of being included in the sample. Every sample of a particular size has the same chance of being chosen.

### 2.3. Research Instrument

The study used a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire made by the researchers which composed of two (2) parts: Part 1 covered the demographic profile of the respondents as to their age, sex, and monthly income. Part 2 covered the impact of technology on the students in the new normal in terms of personal, emotional, and financial. The 4-point Likert scale will be used to get the descriptive interpretation from the respondents, 4 – Strongly Agree; 3 - Agree; 2 - Disagree; and 1 – Strongly Disagree.

To test the reliability of the questionnaire Cronbach Alpha was used.

**Table 1** Cronbach Alpha Summary of the Assessment of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology in the New Education Setting

Parameters	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Interpretation (Extent of Reliability)
Personal	0.716	Acceptable
Emotional	0.822	Good
Financial	0.911	Excellent

Table 1 shows Cronbach Alpha Summary of the Assessment of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology in the New Education Setting.

Based on the result, the Perception of the Cronbach Alpha Summary on the Assessment of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology in the New Education Setting as to Emotional (0.828) was Good; Personal (0.719) was Acceptable; Financial (0.901) was Excellent. Thus, it is indicative that all questions can provide the necessary information to answer the objectives of the study.

## 2.4. Data Analysis

To analyze the collected data, the researcher used descriptive statistical tools such as the frequency to count the occurrence of variables, percentage to obtain the profile of respondents and the impact of technology in the New Education Setting, and weighted mean to calculate the average on the Impact of Technology in the New Education Setting. The researcher also used analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the significance of differences in the mean of variables. The software SPSS was utilized to compute ANOVA. The researcher used ANOVA to test the hypothesis regarding Ho1, which is whether there is a significant difference in the Impact of Technology in the New Education Setting when grouped according to profile variables.

The researchers will use the SPSS Statistical for Psychological Software System to determine the significance of the data. If the computed P value is greater than ( $>$ ) 0.05, the null hypothesis will be accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference. Conversely, if the computed P value is less than ( $<$ ) 0.05, the alpha level of significance, the null hypothesis will be rejected, indicating that there is a significant difference.

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Profile of the Respondents.

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondent's profiles.

**Table 2** Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Profile

Profile Variables		Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	27	27.00
	Female	73	73.00
	Total	100	100.00
Age	19	30	30.00
	20	24	24.00
	21	27	27.00
	22 and above	19	19.00
	Total	100	100.00
Monthly Income	20,000 and Below	85	85.00
	20,001 - 25,000	10	10.00
	25,001 - 30,000	1	1.00
	30,001 - 35,000	1	1.00
	35,001 - 40,000	2	2.00
	45,001 and Above	1	1.00
	Total	100	100.00

#### 3.1.1. Sex

As could be gleaned from the table, the majority with 73, or equivalent to 73.00% were females while 27 or equivalent to 27.00% were males. This means the majority of replies were clearly female, with male students varying little.

#### 3.1.2. Age

Out of the one hundred (100) respondents, the majority with 30 or equivalent to 30.00% were nineteen (19) years old; 27 or equivalent to 27.00% twenty-seven (27) years old; 24 or equivalent to 24.00% were twenty (20) years old; and 19 or equivalent to 19.00% were from twenty-two and above (22-above) years old. According to the findings of this study, 19 years old students are anecdotally thought to be not more anxious about technology than older students.

### 3.1.3. Monthly Income

Out of the one hundred (100) respondents, the majority with 85 or equivalent to 85.00% have a monthly income of 20, 000 and below; 10 or equivalent to 10.00% have a monthly income of 20, 001 - 25, 000; 2 or equivalent to 2.00% have a monthly income of 35, 001 - 40, 000; and 1 or equivalent to 1.00% have a monthly income of 25, 001 - 30, 000, 30, 001 - 35, 000, and 45, 001 and above. This means that the family's monthly income is one factor in the of the students in the new normal setting. Also, technology is a strong predictor of academic success, even after controlling for family income.

## 3.2. Evaluation of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology

### 3.2.1. Personal

Table 3 shows the evaluation of the respondents on the impact of technology as to personal.

**Table 3** Evaluation of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology as to Personal

	<b>Personal</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Qualitative Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1	Technology in the new normal affects the way individuals communicate, learn, and think.	3.40	Strongly Agree	1
2	Technology helps vastly increase the learning productivity of the students in the new normal.	3.18	Strongly Agree	4.5
3	Technology in the new normal provides easy access for an interactive discussion.	3.20	Strongly Agree	2
4	Technical skills development is evidently using technology in the new normal.	3.18	Strongly Agree	4.5
5	The use of technology in the new normal provides self-growth or individual learning.	3.19	Strongly Agree	3
	<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	

The respondents "Strongly Agree" on technology in the new normal affects the way individuals communicate, learn, and think with a weighted mean of 3.40 and ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, while technology helps vastly increase the learning productivity of the students in the new normal and technical skills development is evidently using technology in the new normal with a weighted mean of 3.18 and ranked 4.5<sup>th</sup>, respectively. The computed overall weighted mean on the assessment of the respondents on the impact of technology on the personal was 3.23 with a qualitative interpretation of "Strongly Agree".

It indicates that technology has an impact on students' personalities. The manner in which people communicate, learn, and think. It teaches people how to engage with one another. Social media might be entertaining, but studies have proven that use can be harmful to our mental health.

There is no doubt that technology has had and will continue to have a significant impact on our lives in some way [4]. Since computers' ability to solve complicated mathematical equations has allowed them to speed up virtually any operation, technology has dramatically enhanced productivity. Our personal lives may be even more technologically advanced than our professional lives. Technology has become so ingrained in our lives that being without it can cause serious anxiety in certain people. It's easy to see why. Technology has seized control [5].

### 3.2.2. Emotional

Table 4 shows the evaluation of the respondents on the impact of technology as to emotional.

The respondents "Strongly Agree" on the use of technology in the new normal creates social pressures to acquire knowledge with a weighted mean of 3.28 and ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, and technology in the new normal improves student attitudes towards learning new things with a weighted mean of 2.90 and ranked 5<sup>th</sup>. The computed overall weighted mean on the assessment of the respondents on the impact of technology as to emotional was 3.10 with a qualitative interpretation of "Strongly Agree".

This demonstrated that the emotional aspect had an impact on students. Because of advances in technology, we now have less experience dealing with uncertainty and are less equipped to cope with ambiguity when it happens. When you start employing technology, it will not completely relieve you of exam tension.

**Table 4** Evaluation of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology as to Emotional

	<b>Emotional</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Qualitative Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1	The use of technology in the new normal creates social pressures to acquire knowledge.	3.28	Strongly Agree	1
2	Technology helps students to understand concepts easier in this new normal.	2.99	Agree	4
3	Technology in the new normal improves student attitudes toward learning new things.	2.90	Agree	5
4	Technology in the new normal put a negative impact on psychological health that can result from stress.	3.22	Strongly Agree	2
5	The use of technology in the new normal declines the performance of the students.	3.11	Strongly Agree	3
	<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	

These technologies are said to take over people's lives, creating time and social pressures that put people at risk for the negative physical and psychological health effects that can result from stress. Stress might come from maintaining a large network of Facebook friends, feeling jealous of their well-documented and well-appointed lives, the demands of replying to text messages, the addictive allure of photos of fantastic crafts on Pinterest, having to keep up with status updates on Twitter, and the "fear of missing out" on activities in the lives of friends and family [6].

### 3.2.3. Financial

Table 5 shows the evaluation of the respondents on the impact of technology on the academic performance as to financial.

**Table 5** Evaluation of the Respondents on the Impact of Technology on the Academic Performance as to Financial

	<b>Financial</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Qualitative Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1	Insufficient monthly income to sustain learning in the new normal using technology.	3.17	Strongly Agree	5
2	Insufficient funds allocation for mobile data/load for an online class.	3.21	Strongly Agree	2
3	Need to work for extra income due to insufficient family allowance.	3.18	Strongly Agree	4
4	The lack of financial resources intensifies educational and economic inequality.	3.19	Strongly Agree	3
5	Inadequate capacity to provide proper devices and equipment for new normal learning approaches such as personal computers and laptops.	3.24	Strongly Agree	1
	<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	

The respondents "Strongly Agree" on the inadequate capacity to provide proper devices and equipment for new normal learning approaches such as personal computers and laptops with a weighted mean of 3.24 and ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, and insufficient monthly income to sustain the learning in the new normal using technology with a weighted mean of 3.17 and ranked 5<sup>th</sup>. The computed overall weighted mean on the assessment of the respondents on the impact of technology on the academic performance as to financial was 3.20 with a qualitative interpretation of "Strongly Agree".

The findings revealed that respondents desire a sufficient family income to support their technological study. Because devices and the Internet have grown so important, digital inequality can exacerbate educational and economic inequality. The question of whether low- and moderate-income families have access to the Internet and digital devices remains a critical national issue. Families without internet access are severely limited in their access to a wide range of opportunities, especially as more and more information and services move online [8]. Furthermore low-income working students work longer hours than their high-income peers. Students who work less are also more likely to enroll in bachelor's degree programs rather than an associate degree and certificate programs. Working experiences vary according on students' income. Work for high-income students is more likely to be related to long-term career and academic aspirations [9].

### 3.3. Test of difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal when grouped according to their profile variables

#### 3.3.1. Personal

Table 6 shows the Analysis of Variance to test the difference in the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Personal when group according to their profile variables.

**Table 6** Analysis of Variance to test differences on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Personal when group according to their profile variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision
Sex	Between Groups	0.098	1	0.098	0.410	0.524	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	23.452	98	0.239			
	Total	23.550	99				
Age	Between Groups	0.970	3	0.323	1.375	0.255	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	22.580	96	0.235			
	Total	23.550	99				
Monthly Income	Between Groups	1.912	5	0.382	1.661	0.152	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	21.638	94	0.230			
	Total	23.550	99				

The computed value of 0.524 for sex, 0.255 for age, and 0.152 for monthly income was greater than > the 0.05 Alpha level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, hence, there is no significant difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Personal when group according to their profile variables.

#### 3.3.2. Emotional

Table 7 shows the Analysis of Variance to test difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Emotional when group according to their profile variables.

The computed value of 0.799 for sex, 0.455 for age, and 0.713 for monthly income was greater than > the 0.05 Alpha level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, hence, there is no significant difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Emotional when group according to their profile variables.

With this technology, burnout which is characterized by a state of emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion that is caused by excessive and prolonged stress. Burnout occurs when you feel overwhelmed and unable to meet constant demands. As the stress continues, you begin to lose the interest or motivation that led you to take on a certain role in the first place. Describing burnout as psychological exhaustion and a complete lack of interest in things that lead to a decline in performance, parents and teachers usually do not believe that a child or adolescent would have suffered from burnout. Panic and overexertion may lead to burnout. Some people experience significant stress and anxiety when they

are separated from their phones and can even exhibit withdrawal-like symptoms, comparable to those usually seen when someone has an addiction [3].

**Table 7** Analysis of Variance to test difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Emotional when group according to their profile variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision
Sex	Between Groups	0.013	1	0.013	0.065	0.799	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	19.147	98	0.195			
	Total	19.160	99				
Age	Between Groups	0.512	3	0.171	0.878	0.455	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	18.648	96	0.194			
	Total	19.160	99				
Monthly Income	Between Groups	0.576	5	0.115	0.583	0.713	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	18.584	94	0.198			
	Total	19.160	99				

### 3.3.3. Financial

Table 8 shows the Analysis of Variance to test difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Financial when group according to their profile variables.

**Table 8** Analysis of Variance to test difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Financial when group according to their profile variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision
Sex	Between Groups	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	0.983	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	33.399	98	0.341			
	Total	33.400	99				
Age	Between Groups	1.758	3	0.586	1.778	0.156	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	31.641	96	0.330			
	Total	33.400	99				
Monthly Income	Between Groups	1.559	5	0.312	0.920	0.471	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	31.841	94	0.339			
	Total	33.400	99				

The computed value of 0.983 for sex, 0.156 for age, and 0.471 for monthly income was greater than > the 0.05 Alpha level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, hence, there is no significant difference on the impact of technology on the academic performance of the students in the new normal as to Financial when group according to their profile variables.

According to Nagel (2013), lack of adequate, ongoing professional development for teachers who are required to integrate new technologies into their classrooms yet who are unprepared or unable to understand new technologies. Working is now a fundamental responsibility for many undergraduates. But understanding how employment affects students' educational experiences is complicated by why students work. Many students must work to pay the costs of attending college.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the summary of the investigations conducted, the researchers have concluded that the majority of the respondents were females, 19 years old, and had a monthly income of 20,000 and below. The respondents “Strongly Agree” on personal, emotional and financial with a computed overall weighted mean of 3.18 on the evaluation of the respondents on the impact of technology in the academic performance. And perceived no significant difference on the assessment of the respondents on the impact of technology in academic performance in terms of personal, emotional and financial.

The following recommendations may be considered: Strengthening the personal and emotional aspects of students in this new normal setting of education while considering financial capability. A friendly application operating system should be used for easy access of the students that can lessen their personal and emotional stress.

---

#### Compliance with ethical standards

##### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

No conflict of interest.

##### *Statement of informed consent*

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

---

#### References

- [1] Espinosa J.P.M.(2016 September 17) Learning with the help of technology. Retrieved from <http://www.manilatimes.net/learning-with-the-help-of-technology/286384/>
- [2] Ghavifekr, S. & Rosdy, W.A.W. (2015). Teaching and learning with technology: Effectiveness of ICT integration in schools. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 1(2), 175-191.
- [3] Harrison, G. & Lucassen, M. (2018). Stress and anxiety in the digital age: The dark side of technology. Retrieved from <https://openlearn.medium.com/stress-and-anxiety-in-the-digital-age-the-dark-side-of-technology-ac9b44be3161>
- [4] Jack, T. (2021). The 7 Main Ways Technology Impacts Your Daily Life. Retrieved from <https://tech.co/vpn/main-ways-technology-impacts-daily-life>
- [5] Kazmeyer, M. (2016). The Importance of Modern Technology. Retrieved from <https://itstillworks.com/importance-modern-technology-2077.html>
- [6] Lee, S. W. Y. (2013). Investigating students’ learning approaches, perceptions of online discussions, and students’ online and academic performance. *Computers & Education*, 68, 345–352.
- [7] Nagel, D. (2013). 6 Technology Challenges Facing Education. Retrieved from <https://thejournal.com/articles/2013/06/04/6-technology-challenges-facing-education.aspx>
- [8] Rideout, V., and Katz, V. (2016). Opportunity for all? Technology and learning in lower-income families. Retrieved from [https://www.joanganzcooneycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/jgcc\\_opportunityforall.pdf](https://www.joanganzcooneycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/jgcc_opportunityforall.pdf)
- [9] St. Amour, M. (2019). Working College Students. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/11/18/most-college-students-work-and-thats-both-good-and-bad>