EduHeart Knowledge Network and Publishing, Inc.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) PREPAREDNESS ON THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL HEADS IN REGION III: BASIS FOR A DIGITAL LEADERSHIP CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM AND FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

Zenith V. Tumpalan, MAEd, Randy Joy M. Ventayen, DBA, DIT
Pangasinan State University, Lingayen Pangasinan
Open University System
zaineharmony@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education requires not only technological infrastructure but also robust leadership readiness to manage organizational transitions. This study investigated the impact of AI preparedness on the change-management strategies of 383 public secondary school heads in Region III, the Philippines. Using a quantitative-correlational design, the study assessed levels of preparedness and effectiveness as perceived by school heads and 842 teachers. Findings reveal that school heads maintain a "High" level of overall AI preparedness (Weighted Mean = 3.97), with the highest readiness observed in Change Management Readiness and Strategy (WM = 4.29) and the lowest in Monitoring, Evaluation, and Continuous Improvement (WM = 3.19). The overall effectiveness of change management strategies was rated as "Highly Effective" by both school heads (WM = 4.34) and teachers (WM = 4.32), showing no statistically significant difference ($p = 0.599$) in their perceptions. A strong positive correlation was established between AI preparedness and the effectiveness of change management ($r = .752$, $p < .01$), indicating that higher leadership readiness significantly predicts more successful institutional shifts. Despite these successes, the study identified "Insufficient technological resources" (Mean = 4.15) and "Limited knowledge about AI" (Mean = 4.08) as serious problems encountered during implementation. Consequently, the "Digital Leadership Capacity Enhancement Program" (Project LEAD-AI) is proposed to address these gaps, focusing on infrastructure sustainability and ethical AI policy.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, AI Preparedness, Change Management Strategies, Digital Leadership, Public Secondary Schools, Region III.*

INTRODUCTION

The rapid evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has shifted from theoretical laboratory constructs to transformative real-world applications across global sectors, including healthcare, finance, and transportation. In the educational landscape, the adoption of AI—specifically "Weak AI" or narrow algorithms—has accelerated, with nearly 50% of teachers and 43% of students utilizing generative tools like ChatGPT for lesson planning and interactive learning. While AI is increasingly utilized for personalized instruction and administrative automation, its potential to revolutionize institutional administration remains a critical frontier for senior management.

However, deploying AI without a comprehensive assessment of readiness factors often leads to organizational failure. Organizational readiness—defined as the degree to which an institution possesses a clear vision, articulated purpose, and the necessary resources—is the fundamental condition for the smooth execution of AI-driven change. Educational leaders are now tasked with overseeing these transitions while ensuring ethical and responsible usage. Despite AI's ability to facilitate data-driven insights and optimize administrative procedures, many institutions remain unprepared due to a lack of robust digital infrastructure and leadership capacity.

Prior research has predominantly examined AI leadership through psychological and conceptual lenses. For instance, Lichtenthaler (2020) examined how AI reshapes leadership identity by shifting roles toward human-centered capabilities like empathy and intuition. Similarly, Canals and Heukamp

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

(2020) explored the strategic dimensions of AI adoption, emphasizing the need for "AI literacy" at the executive level to align algorithmic insights with institutional vision. While these perspectives offer valuable insights into leadership cognition, they do not fully address the operational complexities of managing technological change within public secondary schools.

In the Philippine context, the potential of AI to support personalized learning is recognized, yet empirical studies on school leaders' preparedness to manage AI-driven organizational change remain underexplored. Existing literature rarely examines the intersection of leadership readiness, strategic planning, and the systematic change management required for successful AI integration. This study addresses this gap by investigating the AI preparedness of public secondary school heads in Region III, focusing on how they plan, implement, and manage AI innovations across institutional structures and stakeholders. By identifying these readiness levels and the challenges encountered, this research provides a basis for developing a Digital Leadership Capacity Enhancement Program and Framework Development to ensure resilient, future-ready educational governance.

Statement of the Problem

The study identifies several research questions to determine the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) preparedness on the change management practices of educational leaders in Region 3, Philippines. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of school heads in terms of age, gender, marital status, highest educational attainment, position, length of service as a school head, and the number of seminars or training attended related to both AI and change management strategies?
2. What is the level of AI preparedness regarding change management strategies as perceived by both school heads and teachers in terms of: AI awareness and conceptual understanding; digital leadership and vision for AI integration; change management readiness and strategy; policy, ethics, and data privacy readiness; human resource and capacity development; technological infrastructure and resource readiness; monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement?
3. What is the level of effectiveness of the change management strategies employed by school heads as perceived by themselves and teachers in terms of: vision setting and strategic planning; stakeholder engagement and communication; capacity building and professional development; technology integration and innovation management; monitoring, evaluation, and sustainability of initiatives?
4. What is the level of seriousness of the problems encountered during the implementation of change management strategies in public secondary schools?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the level of AI preparedness on the change management strategies and the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of AI preparedness on the change management strategies of school heads in public secondary schools and their profile variables?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools and their profile variables?
8. Is there a significant difference on the level of AI preparedness on the change management strategies of school heads in public secondary schools as perceived by themselves and teachers?
9. Is there a significant difference on the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools as perceived by themselves and teachers?
10. Based on the study results, what Digital Leadership Capacity Enhancement Program may be proposed?

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

Scope and Delimitations

The study investigates how the Artificial Intelligence (AI) preparedness of school heads influences change management strategies. It specifically examines practical leadership processes, how leaders plan, implement, and manage AI-related innovations, rather than leadership identity or psychology. The research is conducted in Region III (Central Luzon), Philippines, covering chosen secondary schools to ensure sufficient representation from all seven provinces in the region. The focus is on the leadership hierarchy of public secondary schools, specifically targeting principals, assistant principals, and department heads. These individuals are chosen for their crucial roles in strategic planning, policy development, and institutional transformation. The study utilizes a quantitative-correlational approach and relies on structured survey questionnaires as the primary data-gathering tool to capture perceptions of preparedness and its link to strategy success. The findings are limited to the public education system. Private schools are excluded because they operate under different policies, leadership structures, and resource conditions, which could introduce inconsistencies in the results. To maintain a focus on leadership-level processes, the study does not analyze AI practices in the classroom or instructional settings, as these are typically covered in separate research on teaching and learning. Because the study is confined to Region III, the findings may not represent the cultural or organizational variations found in other regions of the Philippines. The research relies on self-reported survey responses, which means the findings may be influenced by the personal perceptions, experiences, and potential biases of the respondents.

Review of Related Literature

The evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) has shifted from theoretical laboratory concepts to transformative real-world applications across sectors such as healthcare, finance, retail, and transportation (Russell & Norvig, 2018; Guan et al., 2020). Within the educational landscape, the literature distinguishes between "Strong AI," which possesses human-like reasoning and emotional capabilities, and "Weak AI," which uses algorithms for narrow, specific tasks such as chess or fraud detection (Wang et al., 2024). Currently, "Weak AI" is being commercially integrated into school systems (Wang et al., 2024). Recent adoption data reveals that 50% of teachers use AI for lesson planning, while 43% of US college students utilize generative tools like ChatGPT (Businessolution.org, 2023). These technologies have demonstrated significant efficacy, with adaptive systems potentially improving student performance by 30% and boosting test scores by up to 62% through platforms such as Duolingo and Khanmigo (Businessolution.org, 2023; Bicknell, Brust, & Settles, 2023). Despite these benefits in diagnostic feedback and administrative automation (Chen et al., 2020; Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023), a pedagogical tension remains; researchers note that AI has yet to fundamentally revolutionize core teaching methods as rapidly as initially anticipated (Crompton et al., 2022; Hwang & Tu, 2021) .

The successful implementation of these technologies depends heavily on organizational readiness, defined as a clear vision and the necessary resources to adapt (Jöhnk et al., 2021). Prior research by Lichtenthaler (2020) emphasizes that AI is reshaping leadership by shifting roles from traditional administration toward human-centered capabilities such as empathy, creativity, and intuition. Furthermore, Canals and Heukamp (2020) highlight the importance of developing "AI literacy" among executives to interpret algorithm-driven insights and align them with long-term institutional goals. However, many initiatives fail due to infrastructure gaps or a lack of leadership capacity (Jöhnk et al., 2021). Change management is the systematic effort to bridge these gaps (Betsurmath & Murthy, 2023) and requires structured management that addresses both the technical and human sides of reform to help teachers navigate professional and emotional challenges (Creasy, 2018; Thompson et al., 2025). While leaders often employ task-oriented strategies to overcome resistance, the Philippine context shows that, although AI's potential for personalized learning is recognized (Marfal, 2025), there remains a lack of empirical research on how public school leaders specifically manage the organizational transitions required for its integration.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

Finally, the adoption of AI introduces significant ethical and systemic challenges. The RRL identifies risks concerning academic integrity, data privacy—specifically adherence to the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173)—and the presence of algorithmic biases and misinformation (Rasul et al., 2023; Holmes & Miao, 2023). Common barriers to implementation include a lack of AI expertise, weak policy guidance, and increased workloads (Celik et al., 2022). Furthermore, a "digital divide" in sentiment exists, with younger "digital native" staff and students often showing greater enthusiasm for AI integration than seasoned administrators and senior instructors (Suarez et al., 2025; Navales, 2024; Mallillin et al., 2020). To address these issues, high-performing systems like those in Finland and Singapore suggest that integrated reforms are necessary to prevent "siloed innovations" that lack lasting impact.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the study is anchored in two primary models: the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Lewin's Change Management Theory, which together provide a comprehensive lens for understanding how educational leaders' perceptions of AI influence organizational transformation. The study utilizes TAM, originally proposed by Fred Davis, as the foundation for the independent variable of AI Preparedness. This framework posits that a leader's willingness to adopt artificial intelligence is driven by two key factors: perceived usefulness, the belief that technology will improve school performance, and perceived ease of use, or the belief that the technology is manageable to operate. When leaders perceive AI as both beneficial and accessible, they are more likely to foster a supportive culture by creating policies, allocating resources, and providing necessary training for their staff.

Complementing this technological perspective, Lewin's Change Management Theory explains the actual process of implementing and sustaining these shifts through a three-stage model. The process begins with the "Unfreeze" stage, where leaders recognize the need for AI and prepare staff for the transition by communicating its inherent value. This is followed by the "Change" stage, involving the physical implementation of AI into school management and instructional processes. Finally, the "Refreeze" stage ensures the change becomes permanent by institutionalizing new practices into school policies, daily routines, and the broader organizational culture.

Integrating these theories, the study proposes the LEAD-AI Transformation Model, in which AI readiness serves as a critical catalyst for successful change management. This model treats leadership effectiveness as a linear-dynamic process where inputs, such as demographic profiles and specialized training, are processed through actionable strategies, the "engine" of the model, to produce the desired outcome of effective AI integration. Central to this framework is the role of training, which posits that leadership effectiveness in the digital age is not inherently tied to age or tenure but is a competency developed through targeted professional development and systemic institutional support.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of the study is the LEAD-AI Transformation Model, a linear-dynamic process that explains how school leadership evolves in the context of digital innovation. This framework is grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Lewin's Change Management Model to illustrate the relationship between AI preparedness and the effectiveness of change management strategies. The framework is structured into three main components: Input, Process, and Output (IPO) model.

Input. The Input block comprises respondents' demographic and professional characteristics, providing a foundational context for understanding variations in AI adoption and change management practices. Factors such as educational attainment, position, and length of service can influence school leaders' readiness and ability to integrate AI into their organizational strategies. Gender and marital status may also offer insights into differing perspectives and leadership approaches. AI Preparedness on Change Management Strategies measures educational leaders' current capacity to adopt and implement AI-driven change management. Awareness and conceptual understanding gauge their knowledge about AI, while digital leadership and vision reflect their strategic foresight in integrating AI. Readiness in change

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

management, ethical awareness, capacity development, technological infrastructure, and monitoring ensures a holistic perspective of AI preparedness. Inputs are critical because they define the study's baseline conditions. By analyzing these inputs, researchers can identify existing gaps, training needs, and structural barriers that may affect the successful implementation of AI-supported change management strategies.

Process. The Process block centers on the collection and analysis of data from a researcher-made questionnaire administered to public secondary school heads in Region III, Philippines. This instrument evaluates respondent profiles, AI preparedness, spanning awareness, leadership, policy understanding, and the effectiveness of change management strategies. Collected data is organized and analyzed using descriptive statistics to establish a baseline of readiness, while correlation or regression analyses identify critical patterns between AI literacy and school management. By interpreting these results in the present tense, the study uncovers how variations in leadership profiles and technological readiness directly correspond to the successful implementation of change within the educational landscape

Output. The Output block highlights the challenges educational leaders encounter during AI adoption and change management, such as technological limitations, resistance to change, unclear policies, and gaps in human resource capacity. Understanding these obstacles is essential for refining strategies and guiding leadership interventions that support effective and sustainable implementation. Based purely on findings, the output offers practical recommendations to enhance AI preparedness, leadership skills, and overall organizational effectiveness through training programs, policy guidelines, ethical frameworks, and resource strategies. The study demonstrates that AI-driven change management is both realistic and sustainable when tailored to each school's unique needs by addressing implementation challenges and supporting capacity building. Ultimately, these findings underpin the proposal for a Digital Leadership Capacity Enhancement Program, designed to bolster AI preparedness and refine change management techniques among public secondary school heads.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains how the research problems were addressed. It covers the research design, procedures, participants, tools used, and how the data were analyzed.

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative-correlational research design to examine the Artificial Intelligence (AI) preparedness of public secondary school heads and the effectiveness of change management strategies in public secondary schools in Region III, Philippines. A correlational design was appropriate for this study because it sought to determine the degree and direction of relationships among naturally occurring variables without manipulating them. Specifically, the study investigated how the level of AI preparedness of school heads is associated with their change management practices and how these variables relate to selected profile characteristics.

Respondents of the Study

The population consisted of educational leaders from public secondary schools in Region III, including principals, assistant principals, and department heads. These individuals are the primary stakeholders in institutional leadership, policy implementation, and decision-making regarding technology integration and artificial intelligence initiatives. Nueva Ecija comprises the largest proportion of respondents, with 87 persons, representing 22.7% of the sample. Subsequently, Bulacan has 81 responses (21.1%), while Zambales has 67 respondents (17.5%). Pampanga contributes a notable share, comprising 66 responses (17.2%). Bataan and Aurora constitute smaller yet significant groups, comprising 35 respondents (9.1%) and 26 respondents (6.8%), respectively. The least represented group of respondents originates from Tarlac, comprising 21 persons, which constitutes 5.5% of the overall sample.

The distribution indicated that the study encompassed participants from all seven provinces, with the largest representation in Nueva Ecija and Bulacan, and the lowest in Tarlac. This indicated a varied responder demographic throughout Central Luzon, with several provinces providing more substantial portions to the dataset.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

Data Gathering Instruments

The data gathering procedure was divided into three phases. Phase one was the preparation of the research instrument. During this period, the researcher developed a structured survey questionnaire informed by the study's literature and framework. The draft was sent to a panel of experts for validation, and a pilot test was conducted among a small group of educational leaders (not included in the main sample) to assess reliability using Cronbach's Alpha, with a target reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher.

Revisions on the questionnaire were done based on the results of the validation and pilot test. All research documents needed for the data collection, such as the survey, informed consent form, and request letters, were prepared and collated for easier access and proper documentation.

Phase two involved coordination and seeking permission. Upon the panel members' approval of the research, an application to the ethics committee followed. The primary investigator also obtained necessary permissions from the departments, schools, or institutions to conduct the data collection. Request letters were sent via e-mail through the proper channels, along with the study's objectives and questionnaire. The researcher also sought help in distributing the online survey to the target respondents. Upon approval, the online survey questionnaire was sent to the school's point person via a Google Forms link. Google Forms was chosen as it records responses easily in Google Sheets and automatically generates graphs of the responses. It is also accessible, as it can be opened and answered by anyone with an email account.

Phase three was the actual data collection part. An informed consent form outlining the study's objectives, the voluntary nature of participation, and guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity was given to each respondent prior to distribution. Only demographic information pertinent to the analysis was gathered, and respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire honestly. This phase lasted three to four weeks. To increase response rates, the researcher delivered secure survey URLs via email and other official methods, along with thorough instructions and follow-up reminders. The Google Forms link was open until the required number of responses was reached. Reminders will be sent to respondents every 4 days to reiterate the study's need for their responses.

The last phase was data checking, validation, and analysis. Every completed questionnaire was examined for accuracy and consistency. According to the predetermined exclusion criteria, responses with incomplete or inconsistent data were eliminated. Microsoft Excel or Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to encode valid responses into a data matrix for statistical analysis. Double data entry and random verification of encoded data were performed to ensure data integrity. The Data Privacy Act of 2012 (R.A. 10173) was rigorously enforced to protect data privacy. Only the researcher and adviser had secure access to all data, both digital and physical.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Data analysis was conducted with the help of a licensed statistician, who ran the final data through SPSS. The degree of AI preparedness and the change management procedures were assessed using descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations. Regression analysis will ascertain the degree to which AI preparedness predicts the effectiveness of change management techniques. Prior to running the regression, key assumptions were assessed, including normality of residuals, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity, to ensure the validity of the results. Pearson's correlation coefficient quantified the relationship between the two variables. All analyses were carried out at the 0.05 significance level.

For inferential tests, relationships and dependencies were interpreted based on the computed p-value: • $p \leq 0.05$ – Significant relationship or effect (reject null hypothesis). • $p > 0.05$ – No significant relationship or effect (fail to reject null hypothesis).

For regression results, the effect size was interpreted using the coefficient of determination (R^2), with thresholds commonly considered as: 0.02 (small), 0.13 (moderate), and 0.26 (large), indicating the proportion of variance in change management effectiveness explained by AI preparedness.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

SOP # 1: What is the profile of school heads in terms of age, gender, marital status, highest educational attainment, position, length of service as a school head, and the number of seminars or training attended related to both AI and change management strategies?

The majority of school leaders were seasoned, well-educated, and long-tenured administrators, with 45.4% aged 51 years or older and 43.1% possessing a master's degree. Nonetheless, 39.7% had never participated in AI-related training, and merely 2.6% had attended more than five AI seminars—highlighting a significant deficiency in AI-specific professional development.

SOP # 2: What is the level of AI preparedness regarding change management strategies as perceived by both school heads and teachers in terms of: AI awareness and conceptual understanding; digital leadership and vision for AI integration; change management readiness and strategy; policy, ethics, and data privacy readiness; human resource and capacity development; technological infrastructure and resource readiness; monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement?

Both school leaders and educators assessed AI preparedness as High, with educators regularly providing marginally higher ratings. Educators regarded their school leaders as better equipped in Digital leadership and vision (4.25 vs. 4.09), Human resource and capacity development (4.30 vs. 4.00), Technological infrastructure readiness (4.19 vs. 3.58), and Monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement (4.21 vs. 3.78). While both groups assessed preparation positively, school leaders self-reported diminished confidence, especially regarding infrastructure, support systems, and ongoing improvement procedures.

SOP # 3: What is the level of effectiveness of the change management strategies employed by school heads as perceived by themselves and teachers in terms of: vision setting and strategic planning; stakeholder engagement and communication; capacity building and professional development; technology integration and innovation management; monitoring, evaluation, and sustainability of initiatives?

Both groups assessed change management strategies as Highly Effective, with similar overall means (School Heads = 4.34, Teachers = 4.32). School leaders assessed their performance as markedly higher in vision formulation, strategic planning, and stakeholder involvement and communication. Educators, in contrast, evaluated their leaders more favorably in terms of technology integration and innovation management.

SOP # 4: What is the level of seriousness of the problems encountered during the implementation of change management strategies in public secondary schools?

School administrators and educators assessed the severity of implementation issues as Serious, with educators expressing marginally greater worry (WM = 3.94 vs. 3.69). The most critical issues encompassed inadequate AI expertise, the absence of training opportunities, insufficient technology resources, weak policy direction, heightened workload, and ineffective communication concerning AI-related modifications.

SOP # 5: Is there a significant relationship between the level of AI preparedness and the change management strategies and the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools?

The Pearson correlation study revealed a strong, positive, and statistically significant association between AI Preparedness and Change Management Effectiveness ($r = .752$, $p < .01$). All dimensions of AI preparation and each domain of change management. School leaders with greater AI preparation exhibited markedly enhanced efficacy in change management.

SOP # 6: Is there a significant relationship between the level of AI preparedness on the change management strategies of school heads in public secondary schools and their profile variables?

There is a statistically significant relationship between AI preparedness and school heads' profile variables, identifying change management training as the primary determinant while age and length of service act as key moderating factors in strengthening leadership readiness.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

SOP # 7: Is there a significant relationship between the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools and their profile variables?
The study confirms a significant relationship where school heads' effectiveness in implementing change is primarily determined by professional factors like specialized training, experience, and position rather than demographic traits, indicating that while overall effectiveness is high, it is significantly enhanced by continuous professional development and tenure.
SOP # 8: Is there a significant difference on the level of AI preparedness on the change management strategies of school heads in public secondary schools as perceived by themselves and teachers?
There is a significant difference in perception, revealing that teachers consistently evaluate school heads' AI preparedness more favorably than the leaders rate themselves, particularly in operational domains such as technological infrastructure and capacity development, where substantial gaps and moderate-to-large effect sizes were observed.
SOP # 9: Is there a significant difference in the level of effectiveness of change management strategies employed by school heads in public secondary schools as perceived by themselves and teachers?
While minor significant differences exist in specific domains, such as strategic planning and technology integration, the overall results reveal no statistically significant differences in perception, as both school heads and teachers consistently rate change management strategies as highly effective, with nearly identical mean scores.
SOP # 10: Based on the study results, what Digital Leadership Capacity Enhancement Program may be proposed?
Digital Enhancement Capacity Program – Project LEAD-AI (Leadership Excellence through AI-Driven Innovation) was developed. It is designed to bridge gaps in technical proficiency, infrastructure readiness, and AI-specific training, transforming seasoned administrators into digital-ready leaders capable of managing the complex transitions required for a sustainable AI-enabled school environment.

SUMMARY

Public secondary school heads in Region III are described as experienced and highly educated, but they notably lack AI-specific professional development, with almost 40% having never participated in such training. Although both school leaders and teachers consider AI preparedness to be strong and view change management strategies as very effective (Means = 4.34 and 4.32, respectively), a significant perceptual discrepancy is present, with teachers rating leadership readiness more positively than administrators rate their own capabilities, especially in areas of infrastructure and capacity development. A robust, statistically meaningful correlation (r = .752) is observed between AI readiness and the effectiveness of change management, indicating that leadership success is primarily influenced by professional factors, such as specialized training and experience, rather than demographic characteristics. Even with significant systemic challenges such as insufficient resources and lackluster policy direction, the consensus among stakeholders stays strong, providing the basis for the suggested Project LEAD-AI (Leadership Excellence through AI-Driven Innovation) to convert conventional administrators into leaders prepared for the digital age

CONCLUSIONS

Public secondary school leaders in Region III demonstrate a solid grasp of vision and policy, but their readiness for AI is hindered by gaps in technical skills, infrastructure, and hands-on training. A strong link is evident between AI preparedness and the effectiveness of change management, confirming that leaders with greater digital knowledge are more skilled at facilitating organizational transformation. Despite significant systemic obstacles such as inadequate resources and poor policy guidance, both school leaders and teachers consistently assess the implementation of change management as highly effective. However, a marked perceptual gap exists, as educators view leadership preparedness more positively than administrators do their own capabilities.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study's recommendations highlight that the Department of Education (DepEd) must require hands-on AI literacy training for school leaders, focusing on technical execution and infrastructure management rather than on theoretical knowledge alone. To close the divide between perception and reality, administrators should conduct regular feedback meetings on leadership to align their self-assessments with staff perspectives, and institutions should implement a structured "Digital Readiness Roadmap" to ensure leadership capabilities are developed before introducing new technologies. District offices need to tackle systemic barriers by offering tangible resources and high-speed internet, backed by a definitive communication plan to alleviate teacher stress and workload. Moreover, the research indicates that seasoned administrators should partner with technology-oriented "digital mentors" and spearhead "Communities of Practice" to integrate traditional leadership insights with modern technical advancements. For ongoing growth, local school boards should offer incentives or professional development credits for certified AI and change management courses, while schools should implement unbiased, third-party technology evaluations to create precise, data-driven benchmarks for resource distribution. In conclusion, for institutional alignment, school leaders need to engage teachers directly in the strategic planning and technology integration stages to guarantee that everyday operations effectively align with the collective organizational vision.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer my heartfelt gratitude to God Almighty for providing me with the wisdom, strength, and perseverance necessary to navigate the complexities of the doctoral journey. My sincerest appreciation is extended to Dr. Randy Joy M. Ventayen, my adviser, for his invaluable guidance, professional expertise, and unwavering support throughout the research process. Big shoutout to the Panel of Examiners and the Faculty of Pangasinan State University Open University Systems for their constructive critiques and academic mentorship that refined the quality of the study. Gratitude is shared with the Department of Education (DepEd) Region III and the various Public Secondary School Heads and teachers whose participation and honest responses provided the essential data for this study. Special mention to my colleagues and friends, particularly Dr. Julio Cervantes, for his encouragement and the collaborative spirit that motivated me during challenging times. Finally, my deepest love and thanks to my husband, Julius, and our children, whose sacrifices, patience, and belief in me served as the ultimate inspiration to reach this academic milestone.

REFERENCES

Akinwalere, S. N., & Ivanov, V. (2022). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. Border Crossing, 12(1), 1-15.

Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. Journal of AI, 7(1), 52-62.

Barrot, J., Llenares, I., & Rosario, L. (2021). Students' online learning challenges during the pandemic and how they cope with them: The case of the Philippines. Education and Information Technologies, 26, 7321–7338 .

Basyal, D. K., & Wan, P. D. J. (2020). Employees' resistance to change and technology acceptance in Nepal. South Asian Studies, 32(2) .

Bhargava, A., Bester, M., & Bolton, L. (2021). Employees' Perceptions of the Implementation of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence, and Automation (RAIA) on Job Satisfaction, Job Security, and Employability. Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science, 6, 106–113 .

Canals, J., & Heukamp, F. (2020). The Future of Management in an AI World. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264-75278.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.329

Chiu, T. K. F., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 4, 100118.

Guan, C., Mou, J., & Jiang, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264-75278.

Hwang, G. J., & Tu, Y. F. (2021). Roles and research trends of artificial intelligence in mathematics education: A bibliographic mapping and systematic review. Mathematics, 9(6), 584.

Jöhnk, J., Tariwul, M., & Urbach, N. (2021). Readiness for the cloud: A literature review and conceptual framework for cloud computing adoption. Information Systems Frontiers, 23, 1171-1191.

Lichtenthaler, U. (2020). Artificial intelligence and leadership: A review and research agenda. Journal of Business and Management, 26(1), 1-27 .

Luan, H., & Chin-Chung, T. (2021). A Review of using machine learning approaches for precision education. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 24, 250-266 .

Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2018). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. Pearson.

Weber, E., Buttgen, M., & Bartsch, S. (2022). How to take employees on the digital transformation journey: An experimental study on complementary leadership behaviors in managing organizational change. Journal of Business Research, 143, 225–238 .

Xue, Y., & Wang, Y. (2023). Artificial Intelligence for Education and Teaching. Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing, 2022, Article ID 4750018