Teachers' Readiness for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Classroom Pedagogy in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu

Mohammad Daniel Khann T. Akdam[1]* Mary Ann G. Lim[2]*
School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State Colllege, Jolo, Sulu, 4700, Philippines
*Corresponding author: sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This study examined teachers' readiness for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in classroom pedagogy in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu. Specifically, it assessed teachers' readiness in terms of knowledge, willingness, and concerns, and determined whether significant differences and relationships exist among these dimensions. A descriptive–exploratory research design was employed using a quantitative approach. The study involved 100 elementary school teachers selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson product-moment correlation. The findings revealed that teachers possess a general level of knowledge about Generative AI, particularly in understanding its functions, limitations, ethical considerations, and privacy issues. However, their willingness to integrate AI into classroom pedagogy is moderate, indicating cautious adoption despite recognizing its potential benefits. Similarly, teachers expressed moderate concerns, particularly regarding ethical implications, overdependence, and the impact on teaching roles. No significant differences were found in teachers' readiness when grouped according to demographic characteristics. Moreover, very high and significant relationships were observed among knowledge, willingness, and concerns, indicating that these dimensions are interconnected. The study concludes that teachers are in a transitional stage of readiness, where awareness is evident but full integration requires further support. Strengthening training programs, institutional support, and access to resources is essential to enhance teachers' readiness and promote effective integration of Generative AI in education.

KEYWORDS*: generative artificial intelligence, teacher readiness, classroom pedagogy, knowledge, willingness, concerns*

ARTICLE DETAILS
JEAS-00094; Received: February 28, 2026; Accepted: March 15, 2026; Published: March 31, 2026
CITATION:
Akdam, M. T. & Lim, M. G. (2026). Teachers' Readiness for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Classroom Pedagogy in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu. Journal of Education and Academic Settings, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/n03p5t47

1. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary education, the integration of advanced technologies has become increasingly essential in enhancing teaching and learning processes. One of the most significant developments in recent years is the emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI), which has transformed how instructional content is created and delivered. Unlike earlier digital tools, generative AI systems are capable of producing text, images, and other learning materials, enabling more dynamic and interactive educational experiences. As noted by Wayne Holmes et al. (2022), artificial intelligence in education has progressed beyond automation toward systems that can personalize and generate learning experiences in real time. Similarly, Bozkurt (2023) emphasized that generative AI has the potential to drive transformative changes across various sectors, including education.

At the global level, tools such as ChatGPT and Google Gemini have intensified discussions about the future of teaching and learning. These tools allow educators to design instructional materials, provide feedback, and support student learning more efficiently. However, the successful integration of such technologies depends largely on teachers' readiness to adopt them effectively. Olaf Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) highlighted that while AI offers opportunities for efficiency and personalization, its effectiveness is contingent upon teachers' preparedness and ability to integrate it meaningfully. In addition, the UNESCO (2023) stressed that teacher readiness, policy support, and ethical awareness are critical factors in ensuring responsible and effective AI integration in education.

In the Philippine context, the integration of artificial intelligence aligns with national efforts to improve educational quality and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 4. The Department of Education has implemented initiatives such as digitalization programs and the DepEd Computerization Project to enhance both teacher and learner competencies. Despite these efforts, challenges remain, particularly in terms of infrastructure, digital literacy, and access to training. Studies have shown that Filipino teachers often exhibit moderate readiness in adopting advanced technologies due to limited technical support and insufficient professional development opportunities (Ferrer et al., 2021; Ferrer, Avilla, & Alindongan, 2023). These findings suggest that while technological integration is being promoted, gaps in readiness still persist.

At the local level, teachers in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu face additional challenges in adopting generative AI due to geographic isolation, limited infrastructure, and varying levels of digital competence. These conditions may hinder the effective use of advanced technologies in classroom pedagogy. As a result, educators may struggle to fully utilize AI tools to enhance learning experiences and support diverse student needs. Despite these constraints, there is growing interest among teachers in exploring generative AI as a tool for improving instruction, creating engaging learning materials, and supporting learners more effectively.

Given these developments, it becomes essential to examine the readiness of teachers in adopting generative AI in classroom pedagogy. Teachers' readiness encompasses their level of knowledge, willingness to integrate the technology, and concerns regarding its use. Understanding these dimensions is crucial in identifying existing gaps and opportunities for improvement. Therefore, this study aims to assess teachers' readiness for the use of generative artificial intelligence in classroom pedagogy in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu. The findings are expected to provide valuable insights that can inform policy development, guide professional training programs, and support the effective integration of AI in education.

2. METHODS

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive–exploratory research design utilizing a quantitative approach. The descriptive component was used to determine the level of teachers' readiness in using Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in classroom pedagogy, while the exploratory aspect aimed to provide a deeper understanding of the factors influencing this readiness, particularly in terms of knowledge, willingness, and concerns.

Descriptive research is appropriate for identifying and explaining existing conditions, while exploratory design helps generate insights that may guide further investigation. This approach allowed the researcher to systematically examine teachers' readiness within their actual teaching context.

2.2. Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools within Jolo III District, Division of Sulu. These included Tanjung Elementary School, Kasanyangan Elementary School, Asturias Elementary School, Bakud Elementary School, Camp Asturias Elementary School, Jati Elementary School, and Laum Alat Elementary School.

The locale was chosen due to its relevance in examining teachers' readiness in integrating emerging technologies, particularly Generative AI, within a geographically and socio-culturally unique educational setting.

2.3. Participants of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of 100 elementary school teachers from the selected schools in Jolo III District during the School Year 2025–2026. These participants were considered appropriate for the study as they are directly involved in classroom instruction and are potential users of Generative AI in teaching.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

School	Number of Respondents
Tanjung Elementary School	15
Kasanyangan Elementary School	15
Bakud Elementary School	14
Asturias Elementary School	14
Camp Asturias Elementary School	14
Jati Elementary School	14
Laum Alat Elementary School	14
Total	100

2.4. Sampling Procedure

The study utilized a purposive sampling technique, where participants were selected based on their relevance to the research objectives. This method allowed the researcher to focus on teachers who are directly engaged in classroom instruction and are accessible within the selected schools.

Purposive sampling is appropriate in studies where participants are chosen based on specific characteristics that align with the purpose of the research.

2.5. Research Instrument

The primary data collection tool was a structured questionnaire adapted from established studies on Generative AI adoption and teacher readiness. The instrument was based on the works of Abdullatif (2024), Montero et al. (2025), and Almisad and Aleidan (2025).

The questionnaire consisted of two parts:

- Part I: Demographic profile of respondents (age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment)
- Part II: Teachers' readiness for the use of Generative AI in classroom pedagogy, measured in terms of:
  - Knowledge
  - Willingness
  - Concerns

Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale:

Table 2. Scale of Measurement

Scale	Range	Interpretation
5	4.50–5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.50–4.49	Agree
3	2.50–3.49	Moderately Agree
2	1.50–2.49	Disagree
1	1.00–1.49	Strongly Disagree

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission was secured from the School of Graduate Studies, the Schools Division Office of Sulu, and the respective school heads of the selected schools. After obtaining approval, the researcher administered the questionnaires personally to the respondents.

Clear instructions were provided to ensure accurate responses, and all completed questionnaires were collected immediately to maintain data accuracy and completeness.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the research. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured, and no harm was inflicted on participants.

The researcher maintained objectivity in data analysis and interpretation, respected the rights and dignity of respondents, and complied with all ethical requirements set by the institution.

3. RESULTS

Objective 1: Level of Teachers' Readiness in Using Generative AI

Table 2. Knowledge

Statement	Mean	SD	Description

Understanding AI limitations	3.60	.696	Agree
Need for fact verification	3.68	.789	Agree
Evaluating AI outputs	3.68	.839	Agree
Recognizing bias	3.48	.643	Moderately Agree
AI reliance on patterns	3.68	.736	Agree
Lack of emotional intelligence	3.76	.817	Agree
Improves work efficiency	3.72	.829	Agree
Evaluating AI capabilities	3.64	.745	Agree
Ethical compliance	3.68	.731	Agree
Privacy awareness	3.80	.752	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.672	.641	Agree

Teachers demonstrate a general understanding of Generative AI, with an overall rating of *Agree*. They are particularly aware of privacy, ethics, and limitations, indicating responsible and informed use. However, slightly lower scores in recognizing bias suggest that deeper critical awareness of AI outputs still needs strengthening.

Table 3. Willingness

Statement	Mean	SD	Description
Future integration	3.21	.984	Moderately Agree
Encourage student use	3.08	.895	Moderately Agree
Improve digital skills	3.16	.928	Moderately Agree
Save time	3.32	1.05	Moderately Agree
Provide insights	3.20	.922	Moderately Agree
Provide feedback	3.28	.922	Moderately Agree
24/7 tool	3.08	.849	Moderately Agree
Student support	3.20	.942	Moderately Agree
Will use AI	3.16	.928	Moderately Agree
Intend to use AI	3.20	1.02	Moderately Agree
Weighted Mean	3.188	.909	Moderately Agree

Teachers show moderate willingness to integrate Generative AI. While they recognize its benefits—such as saving time and providing feedback—they remain cautious about fully adopting it. This indicates openness to innovation but also hesitation due to possible limitations or lack of readiness.

Table 4. Concerns

Statement	Mean	SD	Description
Responsible integration	3.08	1.26	Moderately Agree
Supports collaboration	3.12	1.21	Moderately Agree
Develops skills	3.04	1.11	Moderately Agree
Avoid over-reliance	3.12	1.18	Moderately Agree
Enhances teaching	3.16	1.22	Moderately Agree
Supports teachers	3.08	1.16	Moderately Agree
Risk of dependency	3.16	1.22	Moderately Agree
Ethical concerns	3.24	1.21	Moderately Agree
Undermines teaching	3.16	1.12	Moderately Agree
Job security concerns	3.08	1.16	Moderately Agree
Weighted Mean	3.124	1.097	Moderately Agree

Teachers express moderate concerns, particularly regarding ethical issues, overdependence, and the role of educators. This indicates a cautious and critical perspective, where teachers recognize both the potential and risks of AI integration.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis

Variables	r-value	Sig.	Description
Knowledge – Willingness	.707	.000	Very High
Knowledge – Concerns	.733	.000	Very High
Willingness – Concerns	.900	.000	Very High

All variables show very high and significant relationships, indicating that teachers' readiness is interconnected. The strongest relationship is between willingness and concerns, suggesting that teachers who are more open to using AI are also more aware of its risks.

The relationship between knowledge and willingness shows that understanding AI increases teachers' readiness to adopt it.

The link between knowledge and concerns indicates that informed teachers are more critical and cautious in using AI.

Overall, teachers demonstrate a balanced perspective, combining awareness, openness, and critical thinking toward Generative AI.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings of the study reveal that teachers in Jolo III District demonstrate a generally positive level of readiness in using Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly in terms of knowledge. The overall rating of "agree" indicates that teachers possess a functional understanding of AI tools, including their capabilities, limitations, ethical considerations, and privacy implications. This suggests that teachers are not only aware of AI technologies but are also able to critically evaluate their use in educational settings. This finding aligns with the study of Pascua and Reyes (2023), which noted that Filipino educators exhibit growing awareness and familiarity with AI tools, although levels of understanding may vary across contexts.

Despite this level of knowledge, teachers' willingness to integrate AI into classroom pedagogy is only rated as "moderately agree." This indicates that while teachers recognize the potential benefits of AI—such as improving efficiency, saving time, and providing immediate feedback—they remain hesitant to fully adopt it in their teaching practices. This cautious stance may be attributed to practical challenges such as limited training, lack of institutional support, and insufficient infrastructure. These findings support the observations of David et al. (2022), who identified barriers to AI adoption in education, including accessibility issues and the need for professional development. Similarly, Cabero-Almenara et al. (2022) emphasized that teachers' willingness to adopt emerging technologies increases when adequate support systems and training opportunities are provided.

In terms of concerns, teachers expressed moderate levels of apprehension regarding the use of Generative AI. These concerns are primarily related to ethical implications, overdependence on technology, and the potential impact on traditional teaching roles. The results suggest that teachers are not passively accepting AI but are instead approaching it with a critical and reflective mindset. This finding is consistent with Dizon et al. (2023), who reported that teachers are increasingly aware of the risks associated with AI, particularly in relation to academic integrity and student overreliance. Furthermore, studies by Villena and Manalo (2023) and Zhai (2022) highlight that teachers in developing contexts often face additional challenges such as limited access to digital resources and inadequate training, which further contribute to their concerns.

Overall, the combination of high knowledge, moderate willingness, and moderate concerns suggests that teachers are in a transitional stage of readiness. They are informed and aware of AI technologies but are still developing confidence and readiness for full integration into classroom practice.

The results of the correlation analysis reveal very high and significant relationships among knowledge, willingness, and concerns. This indicates that these dimensions are strongly interconnected and collectively influence teachers' readiness to use Generative AI.

The strong relationship between knowledge and willingness suggests that as teachers become more knowledgeable about AI technologies, they are more likely to consider integrating them into their teaching practices. This supports the idea that knowledge serves as a foundation for adoption, as teachers who understand how AI works are more confident in using it.

At the same time, the strong correlation between knowledge and concerns indicates that increased awareness also leads to greater critical evaluation. Teachers who are more informed about AI are more likely to recognize its limitations, ethical implications, and potential risks. This demonstrates that knowledge does not simply lead to acceptance but also promotes critical thinking and responsible use.

The strongest relationship observed between willingness and concerns suggests that teachers who are more open to using AI are also those who are most aware of its challenges. This reflects a balanced perspective, where teachers are willing to explore new technologies while remaining cautious about their implications. Rather than viewing concerns as barriers, they may serve as guiding factors that ensure ethical and effective integration.

Overall, these findings indicate that teachers in Jolo III District approach Generative AI with a critical literacy mindset, characterized by awareness, openness, and cautious evaluation. This suggests that readiness for AI integration is not solely about acceptance but involves the ability to critically engage with technology in a meaningful and responsible way.

5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that teachers in Jolo III District, Division of Sulu demonstrate a generally positive level of readiness for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in classroom pedagogy. Teachers show a solid level of knowledge regarding AI, particularly in understanding its functions, limitations, ethical considerations, and data privacy. However, their willingness to integrate AI remains moderate, indicating that while they recognize its potential benefits, they are still cautious in fully adopting it in their teaching practices. This cautious approach is further reflected in their moderate level of concerns, particularly regarding ethical issues, overdependence on technology, and its possible impact on the role of teachers.

Furthermore, the very high and significant relationships among knowledge, willingness, and concerns indicate that these dimensions function as an interconnected system. Teachers who are more knowledgeable about AI tend to be more open to using it while also being more aware of its potential risks. This reflects a balanced and critical perspective, where readiness involves not only acceptance but also responsible and thoughtful integration.

Overall, the findings suggest that teachers are in a transitional stage of readiness, where awareness and understanding are already established, but confidence and full integration still require further development. Strengthening training, support systems, and access to resources may help enhance teachers' readiness and facilitate the effective use of Generative AI in classroom pedagogy.

Acknowledgement

The author confirms that this research is the result of independent academic work and personal analysis. All ideas, interpretations, and written discussions in this study were developed by the author. Artificial intelligence tools were used only in a limited way for minor grammar checking and language improvement. They were not used to create the research content, generate ideas, perform the analysis, interpret the results, or write the main parts of the paper. The author takes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of this study, including its analysis, discussion, and conclusions.

REFERENCES

Abdurajik, A. (2025). Supervisory Practices of Elementary School Heads at Jolo IV District, Division of Sulu: An Assessment. (2025). Journal of Education and Academic Settings, 2(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.62596/6wgcv711

Abdelghani, A., Dijkstra, A., & Ji, X. (2024). Generative AI in higher education: Opportunities and ethical considerations. Journal of Educational Technology, 21(3), 45–60.

Acedo, C., & Figueroa, M. (2021). Digital transformation and teacher readiness in Philippine schools. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 9(2), 77–89.

Acedo, P., & Figueroa, R. (2021). AI integration in Philippine classrooms: Opportunities and challenges. Philippine Journal of Educational Technology, 12(2), 45–59.

Adeshola, O., & Adepoju, T. (2023). AI adoption in K-12 education: Global trends and insights. Computers & Education, 182, 104519.

Ahmad, F., Shankar, R., & Ali, S. (2023). Faculty intentions to adopt generative AI in higher education. Journal of Educational Technology, 44(3), 45–59.

Ahmed, H., Khan, S., & Patel, R. (2022). Faculty and student attitudes toward AI adoption. International Journal of Educational Research, 115, 102–118.

Alasadi, R., & Baiz, A. (2023). Productivity enhancement through generative AI in classrooms. Journal of Learning Analytics, 10(2), 99–114.

Al-Husseini, S. (2023). Faculty perspectives on generative AI tools in teaching. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 345–362.

Al-Mughairi, S., & Bhaskar, P. (2024). Educators' perceptions of ChatGPT in Oman. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 101–119.

Al-Shamayleh, A., et al. (2024). Generative AI applications for educational content creation. International Journal of AI in Education, 33(1), 12–28.

Altun, A., Demir, B., & Kalkan, S. (2024). Faculty perceptions of generative AI in education. Computers & Education, 188, 104–118.

Altun, A., et al. (2024). Risks and benefits of generative AI in education. Computers in Human Behavior, 155, 107022.

Amani, R., Patel, K., & Johnson, L. (2023). Faculty use and attitudes toward ChatGPT in the US. Education and AI, 5(2), 21–36.

Amankwah-Amoah, J., et al. (2024). AI transformation across sectors: Implications for education. Technology in Society, 81, 102697.

Apau, J. (2017). Teacher preparation for technology integration. Journal of Technology Education, 28(1), 12–27.

Baker, R., & Hawn, A. (2022). Social inequalities in AI-assisted grading. Assessment in Education, 29(5), 600–618.

Balladares, J., & Liggayu, T. (2021). Technology integration in Mindanao: Teacher readiness and infrastructural factors. Mindanao Educational Review, 8(1), 101–118.

Bicol University Research Center. (2023). Teachers' perspectives on AI tools in Albay schools. Bicol University Press.

Bonsu, B., & Baffour-Koduah, S. (2023). Perceived usefulness and intention to use ChatGPT among Ghanaian students. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 32(1), 45–60.

Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative AI in higher education. Distance Education, 44(1), 1–15.

Cabero-Almenara, J., & Palacios-Rodríguez, A. (2022). Digital skills and ethical competencies for responsible AI use in education. International Journal of Educational Technology, 19(3), 233–249.

Cabero-Almenara, J., et al. (2022). Teacher adoption of AI technologies in Southeast Asia: The role of institutional support. Asian Journal of Education, 14(1), 77–93.

Cardona, C., et al. (2023). Intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning. Interactive Learning Environments, 31(6), 1123–1140.

Chan, F., & Colloton, T. (2024). GenAI tools in creative education. Journal of Educational Innovation, 12(2), 56–71.

Chen, L., et al. (2020). AI applications for personalized learning. Computers & Education, 145, 103733.

Chen, Y., & Vannoy, S. (2013). Skill readiness and technology adoption. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 48(4), 495–512.

Chiu, M., Lee, S., & Wang, Y. (2024). Teacher AI competence self-efficacy scale. Computers in Education, 185, 103–118.

Chiu, T., et al. (2024). Teacher readiness for AI integration: Knowledge, willingness, and concerns. Educational Technology Research and Development, 72(1), 1–20.

Cuban, L. (1986). Teachers and machines: The classroom use of technology since 1920. Teachers College Press.

Dai, X., Lin, P., & Zhou, H. (2020). AI literacy and behavioral intentions. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68, 1457–1476.

David, M., Reyes, L., & Torres, P. (2022). DepEd and CHED initiatives on AI-based digital transformation in Philippine education. Philippine Education Journal, 21(4), 12–28.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

Department of Education. (2021). Digital rise program: Enhancing AI competencies in Philippine schools. DepEd.

Dizon, R., Santos, M., & Cruz, L. (2023). Filipino teachers' perceptions of AI-assisted educational tools. Philippine Journal of ICT in Education, 10(2), 55–70.

Dorongon, F., & Sarmiento, J. (2025). AI use in Philippine classrooms: Teacher training gaps. Philippine Educational Review, 17(1), 89–102.

Dorongon, L., & Sarmiento, R. (2025). Teacher readiness for emerging technologies in Sulu. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 14(1), 25–40.

Edwards, S., Clark, R., & Thomas, M. (2018). TPACK and AI integration. Journal of Digital Learning, 4(2), 34–48.

Elsaadany, N. (2024). Faculty perceptions of GenAI in EFL education. English Language Teaching Journal, 78(2), 87–101.

Farrelly, R., & Baker, M. (2023). Academic integrity and generative AI. Journal of Higher Education Ethics, 19(4), 44–61.

Firaina, A., & Sulisworo, D. (2023). Educators' experiences with ChatGPT in Indonesia. Asian Journal of Educational Technology, 11(1), 22–35.

Gaber, S., et al. (2023). Technology acceptance in educational contexts. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 567–589.

Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. (2020). Human trust in AI: The role of perceptions and reliability. Current Opinion in Psychology, 36, 1–6.

Goli-Cruz, L. (2024). University faculty perceptions of ChatGPT in education: A qualitative study. Philippine Journal of Higher Education Research, 15(2), 101–117.

Grajeda, R., Lopez, F., & Morales, D. (2023). AI tool usage in Latin American universities. Computers & Education, 190, 104–118.

Gupta, A., & Bhaskar, P. (2020). AI applications in curriculum development. International Journal of Educational Technology, 15(2), 1–15.

Hamd, A., Zaman, R., & Abbas, M. (2023). Faculty attitudes toward GenAI adoption. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 2125–2142.

Harry, M. (2023). Generative AI in Philippine classrooms. Philippine Educational Review, 17(2), 12–29.

Hasan, M., Rafiq, N., & Khan, A. (2024). AI knowledge and attitudes in education. Journal of Learning Analytics, 11(1), 59–72.

Holmes, W., et al. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications. International Journal of AI in Education, 29, 1–17.

Humble, J., & Mozelius, P. (2019). Teacher displacement fears with AI integration. Education and AI Research, 7(2), 33–47.

Hwang, G. (2022). Faculty attitudes toward AI integration. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 51(2), 145–160.

Istenic, A., Koren, T., & Zorman, M. (2021). Preservice teachers and AI integration. Computers in Education, 178, 102–114.

Jiyoung, L., Park, S., & Kim, H. (2024). Faculty perceptions of ChatGPT in Korea. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 62(4), 567–583.

Kamalov, F., Nguyen, P., & Chen, Y. (2023). AI in personalized learning and science tasks. Computers & Education, 191, 105–122.

Kaplan-Rakowski, R., et al. (2023). Teacher acceptance of AI tools. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 52(3), 213–231.

Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). TPACK and AI integration. Computers & Education, 196, 104686.

Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2022). Teacher attitudes and adoption of innovative technologies. Computers & Education, 185, 104–118.

Kiryakova, G., & Angelova, R. (2023). ChatGPT adoption among Bulgarian faculty. Education and AI, 6(1), 33–49.

Lacuna, P. (2025). Challenges in AI adoption in public schools. Journal of Philippine Education, 13(1), 33–47.

Lee, I., & Tsai, C. (2010). Teacher technology readiness and experience. Educational Technology & Society, 13(4), 19–30.

Lee, K., Park, S., & Chang, Y. (2022). Trust and perceived usefulness of AI systems. Computers in Human Behavior, 132, 107–121.

Lee, S., Kwon, Y., & Han, J. (2021). AI-supported game-based learning and engagement. Journal of Learning Analytics, 8(3), 45–61.

Lin, T., & Yu, S. (2023). Perceived usefulness and technology adoption. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 61(2), 212–230.

Llamera, R., & Galleto, J. (2022). AI exposure and technological readiness in rural schools. Philippine Technology in Education Review, 11(3), 67–84.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. (2018). Intelligence unleashed: AI in education. Pearson Education.

Malik, A. (2024). Faculty experiences with generative AI in Pakistan. Asian Journal of Educational Technology, 12(1), 55–68.

Mamo, R., Johnson, L., & Patel, K. (2024). Faculty sentiment analysis of ChatGPT. Education and AI, 7(2), 45–60.

Marcial, E. (2019). ICT readiness of public school teachers in the Philippines: Demographic influences. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 7(2), 44–59.

Marcial, J. (2019). Digital readiness of teachers in the Philippines. Philippine Journal of Education, 98(3), 45–62.

Matsul, R., Villanueva, T., & Cruz, K. (2023). Barriers to AI integration among Filipino teachers. Asian Journal of Educational Technology, 18(4), 101–118.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054.

Nadera, J., & Banzon, R. (2021). Digital divides in Philippine public schools: AI readiness challenges. Philippine Education and Technology Journal, 9(2), 21–35.

Ng, W., Tan, C., & Chai, C. (2023). Holistic AI competency framework for teachers. Computers & Education, 192, 106–123.

Ning, C., et al. (2024). Human-centered AI adoption in education. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 2123–2140.

Oluwadiya, T., Adebayo, F., & Salami, K. (2023). Student and faculty use of AI tools. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 32(2), 145–160.

Owan, M., Zhang, H., & Smith, J. (2023). AI-driven assessment and feedback. Computers in Education, 192, 107–125.

Pascua, C., & Reyes, D. (2023). Filipino educators' awareness and preparedness for AI integration. Philippine Journal of Teacher Education, 20(1), 45–61.

Preservice Teacher Readiness Studies in the Philippines. (2023).

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). (2023). Learning in the Digital World. OECD Publishing.

Ramirez, P., & Fuentes Esparrell, M. (2024). AI for adaptive learning and problem solving. Journal of Educational Technology, 45(1), 33–50.

Sallam, M., Qasem, F., & Al-Rashid, H. (2023). ChatGPT usage and attitudes in Jordan. Computers & Education, 190, 106–122.

Shankar, R., Ahmad, F., & Ali, S. (2023). Faculty intention to adopt GenAI. Education and AI, 5(3), 67–82.

Strzelecki, A. (2023). Predictors of ChatGPT use among university students. Computers & Education, 189, 102–118.

UNESCO. (2022). AI competency framework for teachers. UNESCO.

Villena, R., & Manalo, P. (2022). Challenges in applying AI to traditional teaching in Philippine schools. Philippine Journal of Educational Technology, 10(3), 55–69.

Zhai, L. (2022). Limited AI exposure in rural public schools. Philippine Technology Education Review, 9(1), 78–92.

Zhang, J., & Aslan, M. (2021). AI applications in K–12 education. Computers & Education, 175, 104321.