

Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction of AI-Services Offered by Tagaytay Higher Education Institutions

Raphael Emmanuel H. Sabangan¹; Ma. Lindie D. Masalinto²

¹RL, MLIS University of Perpetual Help System Laguna Philippines

²Co-Author, RL, MEdLS, PhD University of Perpetual Help System Laguna Philippines

Publication Date: 2026/05/23

Abstract: The rapid expansion of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies has transformed the higher education landscape, reshaping how teachers access information, engage with learning tools, and deliver instructional activities. Over the past few years, the integration of AI-enabled systems such as generative language models, intelligent tutoring systems, and automated feedback tools has become increasingly essential in improving teaching efficiency and supporting student learning outcomes. However, the combined influence of teachers' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with AI services in specific local higher education contexts remains underexplored. This study addressed this gap by examining the relationships among awareness, utilization, and satisfaction of AI services among 75 teachers in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City for the academic year 2025–2026. The sample size of 63 was determined using the Raosoft Calculator and selected through simple random sampling (Rahi, 2020). Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered through survey questionnaires. Findings revealed very high levels of awareness, utilization, and satisfaction across all indicators of AI services. Correlational analysis showed limited but significant relationships between awareness and utilization, particularly in academic and learning support tools with integration in administrative processes ($r = .252, p < .05$) and ethical use and data privacy policies with faculty and staff adoption rates ($r = .335, p < .05$). However, no significant relationships were found between awareness and satisfaction, and between utilization and satisfaction, except for a few low correlations such as research and data analytics support with efficiency in task completion ($r = -0.290, p < .05$) and usage in student support services with efficiency in task completion ($r = .262, p < .05$). These results indicate that while awareness contributes to increased utilization in selected areas, it does not necessarily translate to higher satisfaction. Hence, an action plan is proposed to further enhance awareness, utilization, and satisfaction of AI services in HEIs in Tagaytay City.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Awareness, Utilization, Satisfaction, Higher Education Institutions, Descriptive-Correlational Research.

How to Cite: Raphael Emmanuel H. Sabangan; Ma. Lindie D. Masalinto (2026) Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction of AI-Services Offered by Tagaytay Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(5), 1253-1273. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26may746>

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force in higher education, reshaping how teachers interact with learning technologies, access information, and design instructional activities. The integration of AI-enabled tools—including generative language models, automated feedback systems, and intelligent tutoring platforms—has the potential to enhance teaching efficiency, personalize instruction, and support student learning outcomes (Li et al., 2022). However, teachers' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with these services vary depending on exposure, guidance, and institutional support. Johnson and Faber (2024) emphasize that institutions must provide clear instructions and training

to ensure that teachers maximize the benefits of AI, as gaps in comprehension and guided use can limit its effectiveness.

Research indicates that the utilization of AI services among educators is steadily increasing. Kim et al. (2023) reported that over 70% of university instructors actively engage with AI tools for teaching and instructional planning, perceiving them as valuable resources for improving efficiency and instructional quality. Similarly, Garcia and Chen (2024) found that teachers who received orientation and training on AI applications exhibited higher satisfaction and more effective integration of AI in their teaching. This aligns with studies highlighting that engagement with AI is influenced not only by availability but also by hands-on training, peer collaboration, and structured institutional

guidance (Mendez & Kim, 2025). Additionally, ethical considerations, including overreliance and potential misuse, remain critical, as teachers must balance efficiency with responsible application (Redondo & Paglinawan, 2025).

Awareness of AI services is closely linked to professional exposure and access to technology. Johnson and Lee (2023) found that teachers with more frequent interactions with AI in their instructional planning demonstrated higher awareness and engagement. Similarly, Smith et al. (2024) highlighted that trust in AI and institutional support are crucial drivers of adoption, as educators are more likely to utilize services when confident in their reliability and relevance. El-Haj et al. (2024) posited that engagement with AI is further enhanced when teachers perceive these tools as directly supporting their teaching objectives, particularly when institutions provide dedicated resources, personalized guidance, and peer-supported professional learning opportunities.

Satisfaction with AI services is strongly mediated by perceived ease of use, frequency of interaction, and institutional support. Šević et al. (2025) reported that teachers' satisfaction increases when AI tools are intuitive and seamlessly integrated into instructional workflows. Wong and Chen (2022) similarly found that perceived usefulness and user-friendliness are critical predictors of satisfaction, while Patel et al. (2023) emphasized that continuous feedback and usability improvements can further enhance teachers' experiences. Furthermore, Thakur and Lemke (2025) highlighted that institutional support—including accessible technical assistance and ongoing training—is essential for maintaining satisfaction, as it fosters confidence in AI tools and encourages responsible, effective utilization.

Despite the growing adoption of AI services, disparities persist in awareness, utilization, and satisfaction, highlighting the need for systematic studies in higher education contexts. By examining these dimensions, the present study seeks to contribute to the understanding of how teachers interact with AI services, how institutional support can enhance engagement, and what factors drive satisfaction, as emphasized by Patel (2025). The findings aim to inform policy and practice, ensuring that AI integration in higher education is equitable, effective, and responsive to teachers' professional and ethical needs.

However, despite the growing body of research on AI in higher education, no study has yet specifically examined the level of awareness, the extent of utilization, and the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City. There remains a lack of localized evidence exploring how teachers in this area perceive, engage with, and evaluate the AI tools and services provided by their institutions.

Thus, this study aimed to determine the level of awareness, extent of utilization, and level of satisfaction of AI services among teachers in HEIs in Tagaytay City. The findings of this research provided essential insights for

university administrators, faculty development offices, and policymakers regarding teachers' familiarity with AI tools, how frequently they used these technologies in their instruction, and how satisfied they were with the AI services provided by their institutions. Likewise, the study served as baseline information to guide the development of AI training programs, enhance institutional support, and improve the integration of AI in teaching practices.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

➤ *Awareness of AI-Services*

The evaluation of library resources is a critical component of academic library management, as it determines whether collections adequately support the instructional and research needs of students and faculty. Lasig et al. (2024) emphasize that assessment goes beyond inventory checking; it requires systematic evaluation of quality, relevance, and usability across multiple formats. Rama et al. (2022) further note that libraries must assess both print and electronic holdings to ensure comprehensive support for diverse learning modalities. Regular assessment uncovers outdated materials, gaps in subject coverage, and underutilized resources, thereby guiding evidence-based improvements in collection development (Melo & Repanovici, 2022; Laure, 2024).

➤ *Satisfaction with AI Services*

User satisfaction with AI services has emerged as a distinct and critical construct in recent research, particularly in higher education and service-oriented industries. Anwar et al. (2025) and Abumalloh et al. (2024) viewed satisfaction as strongly shaped by users' perceptions of AI's usefulness and its capacity to adapt to knowledge-intensive academic tasks. According to their studies, satisfaction increases when AI systems provide tangible academic benefits, such as accurate support for research, content generation, assessment design, and decision-making. These scholars emphasized that satisfaction is not merely a function of access to AI tools but of how well such systems align with institutional goals, disciplinary demands, and academic workflows. This implies that AI services that are context-aware, task-specific, and capable of producing accurate and relevant outputs are more likely to be perceived as dependable and valuable, thereby enhancing satisfaction and encouraging sustained use among faculty, staff, and students.

➤ *Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs*

Student satisfaction in higher education institutions (HEIs) is strongly influenced by the accuracy and reliability of AI outputs. According to Anwar et al. (2025), although students generally appreciate the speed and usefulness of AI tools, they critically evaluate the correctness and quality of the information produced. Consequently, AI services that consistently generate accurate, trustworthy, and contextually relevant outputs enhance user confidence, perceived usefulness, and emotional well-being. In contrast, errors or inconsistencies in AI-generated content can reduce trust, discourage engagement, and lower satisfaction. This implies that in HEIs, the technical precision and dependability of AI services are as crucial as efficiency, as students are more

likely to adopt and interact with AI platforms when outputs are reliable and verifiable.

III. METHODOLOGY

➤ *Research Design*

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design. Through this research design, the study gave emphasis on determining the level of awareness, the extent of utilization, and the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City, which served as the independent and dependent variables of the study, respectively.

The data acquired from the sample taken from the population were used to investigate the population in a descriptive research design. The information was obtained through the respondents' responses to the research questionnaires. A correlational design, on the other hand, determined whether or not there was a relationship between the variables under study. According to Curtis, Comiskey, and Dempsey (2021), a correlational research design could be used to investigate the prevalence of variables and their relationships.

➤ *Sources of Data*

The data for this study were gathered from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were obtained from the responses of faculty members of Higher Education Institution (of HEI's) of Tagaytay City through a validated survey questionnaire. Secondary data were drawn from relevant documents, records, and literature related to Utilization, Awareness, and Utilization of AI-services.

➤ *Population of the Study*

The population of the study consists of (75) teachers in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City. The actual sample of 63 was computed using the Raosoft Calculator and was chosen through the random sampling method (Rahi, 2020) with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5%. The actual selections of the respondents were done using the simple random sampling technique.

➤ *Instrumentation and Validation*

Data were collected using a self-developed questionnaire based on CHED standards and relevant library guidelines. The tool was divided into two parts: (1) current

status of library resources, and (2) level of compliance, each measured by four indicators—recency, scope, quantity, and format. The instrument was validated by experts in library management and research, and its reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's Alpha (current status: 0.955; compliance: 0.943).

➤ *Data Gathering Procedure*

A self-made questionnaire was utilized to acquire the necessary primary data for the study. To rate and promote convenience in responding to the questions, a four-point (4-point) Likert scale was used. The instrument was divided into three (3) parts. Part 1 dealt with the level of awareness of AI services Part 2, pertaining to the extent of utilization of AI services Part 3 covered the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions. The questionnaire was first validated by consulting with the thesis adviser to assess the substance and suitability of the items. To ensure that the indicators included in the research questionnaire were relevant to the study, the researcher sought the advice of the panel members. Furthermore, the study's reliability was contingent on the statistician's ability to comprehend the adequacy of the scale in order to determine whether the expected result can be applied to a statistical formula once the data are gathered. Prior to the release of the questionnaire, their ideas and criticisms were considered and adopted. Thereafter, the instrument was statistically subjected to a content validation process using Cronbach's Alpha. The computed Cronbach's alpha coefficient for awareness: 0.741, for utilization: 0.750, and for satisfaction: 0.752, which means that the data of the researcher were both valid and reliable.

➤ *Statistical Treatment of Data:*

Since the study was a descriptive-correlational type of research, descriptive statistics used were the following:

- Weighted Mean was used to determine the level of awareness, the extent of utilization, and the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City.
- Pearson r Moment Correlation Coefficient was utilized to determine the significant relationship between the level of awareness, the extent of utilization, and the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City.

IV. RESULTS

➤ *Results of Awareness, Utilization, And Satisfaction of AI-Services Offered by Tagaytay Higher Education Institutions.*

Table 1 The Level of Awareness of AI Services offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Academic and Learning Support Tools

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am aware of the AI-based academic and learning support tools (e.g., learning management systems, AI tutors, plagiarism checkers) available for teaching and learning.	3.51	Very High	2

2. I know how to access AI tools that can assist me in preparing lessons, teaching materials, and learning activities.	3.38	Very High	5
3. I am familiar with AI platforms that provide instructional resources, tutorials, or practice exercises for students.	3.49	Very High	3
4. I am aware of AI tools that can help monitor and track students' learning progress and performance.	3.46	Very High	4
5. I know which AI tools can enhance the quality and efficiency of my teaching and classroom management.	3.56	Very High	1
Average	3.48	Very High	

Table 2 The Level of Awareness of AI Services offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Research and Data Analytics Support

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am aware of AI tools that assist in analyzing and interpreting research data.	3.51	Very High	2.5
2. I know how to access AI platforms that support academic research and data-driven decision-making.	3.46	Very High	5
3. I am familiar with AI applications that help in data visualization, modeling, and reporting for research purposes.	3.48	Very High	4
4. I am aware of AI tools that can improve the accuracy and efficiency of research-related tasks.	3.54	Very High	1
5. I know which AI platforms can assist in organizing, storing, and retrieving research information.	3.51	Very High	2.5
Average	3.50	Very High	

Table 3 The Level of Awareness of AI Services offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am aware of the ethical guidelines for using AI tools in teaching and learning.	3.52	Very High	3.5
2. I know the importance of maintaining students' privacy when using AI-based educational tools.	3.57	Very High	1
3. I am familiar with the policies that govern the responsible use of AI platforms in my institution.	3.52	Very High	3.5
4. I am aware of the procedures to protect sensitive data when using AI tools for research or instruction.	3.44	Very High	5
5. I know which AI tools comply with ethical standards and data privacy regulations.	3.56	Very High	2
Average	3.52	Very High	

Table 4 Summary Table for the Level of Awareness of AI Services offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Academic and Learning Support Tools	3.48	Very High	3
2. Research and Data Analytics Support	3.50	Very High	2
3. Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies	3.52	Very High	1
Overall Weighted Mean	3.50	Very High	

➤ *Extent of Utilization of AI Services*

Table 5 The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I frequently use AI tools to deliver lessons and instructional content to my students.	3.40	Always	4
2. I incorporate AI-based platforms in classroom activities to enhance student learning.	3.37	Always	5

3. I regularly use AI tools to provide assignments, quizzes, or assessments for my students.	3.51	Always	2
4. I use AI services to facilitate interactive discussions and collaborative learning in the classroom.	3.54	Always	1
5. I integrate AI applications in classroom instruction to improve teaching efficiency and effectiveness.	3.49	Always	3
Average	3.46	Always	

Table 6 The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Integration in Administrative Processes

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I use AI tools to manage and organize administrative tasks such as grading, attendance, and scheduling	3.46	Always	3
2. I employ AI platforms to streamline communication with students, colleagues, and school administration.	3.43	Always	4
3. I regularly use AI services to maintain records and documentation for classroom or institutional purposes.	3.54	Always	1.5
4. I use AI tools to support planning, reporting, and other administrative processes efficiently.	3.54	Always	1.5
5. I rely on AI-based systems to reduce manual workload and improve the accuracy of administrative tasks.	3.40	Always	5
Average	3.47	Always	

Table 7 The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Usage in Student Support and Guidance Services

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I use AI tools to provide guidance and support to students regarding their academic progress.	3.49	Always	3
2. I employ AI platforms to assist students in addressing personal, social, or learning-related concerns.	3.51	Always	2
3. I regularly use AI services to monitor and track students' well-being and engagement.	3.56	Always	1
4. I integrate AI tools to communicate and provide feedback to students efficiently.	3.37	Always	5
5. I rely on AI-based systems to facilitate counseling, mentoring, or advisory sessions for students.	3.43	Always	4
Average	3.47	Always	

Table 8 The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I regularly adopt AI tools provided by my institution in my teaching and administrative tasks.	3.49	Always	2.5
2. I am proactive in learning and using new AI services introduced by the school.	3.41	Always	5
3. I encourage colleagues to use AI platforms to improve teaching and administrative efficiency.	3.56	Always	1
4. I integrate AI tools into my professional responsibilities whenever possible.	3.49	Always	2.5
5. I am confident in adopting AI technologies to enhance academic and administrative work.	3.43	Always	4
Average	3.48	Always	

Table 9 The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Student Engagement with AI-Driven Platforms

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. My students actively participate in learning activities facilitated by AI-driven platforms.	3.59	Always	1
2. AI tools help increase students' interest and engagement during classroom instruction.	3.46	Always	5
3. Students frequently interact with AI-based platforms for learning activities and assignments.	3.52	Always	3
4. AI-driven platforms encourage students to collaborate and participate more in class.	3.56	Always	2
5. AI platforms support sustained student engagement in both in-class and online learning activities.	3.48	Always	4
Average	3.52	Always	

Table 10 Summary Table for the Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction	3.46	Always	5
2. Integration in Administrative Processes	3.47	Always	3.5
3. Usage in Student Support and Guidance Services	3.47	Always	3.5
4. Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates	3.48	Always	2
5. Student Engagement with AI-driven Platforms	3.52	Always	1
Overall Weighted Mean	3.48	Always	

➤ *Level of Satisfaction with AI Services*

Table 11 The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: User Interface and Accessibility

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am satisfied with the ease of navigation of AI-driven platforms used in my teaching tasks.	3.57	Very High	2
2. I find the user interface of AI tools clear, organized, and easy to understand.	3.60	Very High	1
3. AI-driven platforms are user-friendly and do not require extensive technical skills to operate	3.54	Very High	3
4. I am satisfied with how quickly I can learn and adapt to using AI tools.	3.43	Very High	5
5. The design and accessibility features of AI platforms support my teaching and administrative needs effectively.	3.46	Very High	4
Average	3.52	Very High	

Table 12 The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am satisfied with the accuracy of the outputs generated by AI-driven platforms.	3.46	Very High	5
2. I find the results produced by AI tools to be reliable and consistent across tasks.	3.52	Very High	1.5
3. AI-driven platforms provide dependable outputs that support my teaching and academic work.	3.52	Very High	1.5
4. I am satisfied with the correctness of AI-generated content used in instructional activities.	3.48	Very High	4
5. AI tools deliver results that I can trust for academic and administrative purposes.	3.49	Very High	3
Average	3.50	Very High	

Table 13 The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Efficiency in Task Completion

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am satisfied with how AI-driven platforms help me complete academic tasks more quickly.	3.54	Very High	1.5
2. AI tools improve my efficiency in preparing lessons, instructional materials, and assessments.	3.54	Very High	1.5
3. I find AI-driven platforms helpful in reducing the time required for routine teaching tasks.	3.46	Very High	4
4. I am satisfied with the speed at which AI tools generate useful outputs for my work.	3.46	Very High	4
5. I am satisfied with the ability of AI services to streamline my academic workload.	3.46	Very High	4
Average	3.49	Very High	

Table 14 The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Support and Technical Assistance

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I am satisfied with the availability of technical support for AI services provided by my institution.	3.51	Very High	1
2. Technical assistance for AI services is prompt and responsive when issues arise.	3.49	Very High	2
3. Clear guidance and instructions are provided to help users properly utilize AI services.	3.46	Very High	4
4. I am satisfied with the overall quality of support and technical assistance for AI services in my institution	3.48	Very High	3
5. I am satisfied with how effectively technical support resolves problems related to AI services.	3.40	Very High	5
Average	3.47	Very High	

Table 15 Summary Table in the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. User Interface and Accessibility	3.52	Very High	1
2. Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs	3.50	Very High	2
3. Efficiency in Task Completion	3.49	Very High	3
4. Support and Technical Assistance	3.47	Very High	4
Overall Weighted Mean	3.49	Very High	

Table 16 Relationship between the Level of Awareness and the Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City

Awareness of AI Services	Extent of Utilization of AI Services				
	Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction	Integration in Administrative Processes	Usage in Student Support and Guidance Services	Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates	Student Engagement with AI-driven Platforms
Academic and Learning Support Tools	r=-0.109 Low correlation p=0.396	r=0.252* Low correlation p=0.046	r=0.003 Negligible correlation p=0.981	r=0.024 Negligible correlation p=0.855	r=0.042 Negligible correlation p=0.742
Research and Data Analytics Support	r=-0.220 Low correlation p=0.083	r=-0.079 Negligible correlation p=0.536	r=0.087 Negligible correlation p=0.498	r=0.054 Negligible correlation p=0.675	r=-0.194 Low correlation p=0.127
Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies	r=-0.003 Negligible correlation	r=-0.217 Low correlation p=0.087	r=-0.104 Low correlation p=0.415	r=0.335* Low correlation p=0.007	r=-0.048 Negligible correlation

	p=0.982		p=0.707
*Significant @ 0.05			

Table 17 Relationship between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City

Awareness of AI Services	Satisfaction with AI Services			
	User Interface and Accessibility	Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs	Efficiency in Task Completion	Support and Technical Assistance
Academic and Learning Support Tools	r=0.038 Negligible correlation p=0.770	r=0.050 Negligible correlation p=0.696	r=0.068 Negligible correlation p=0.599	r=0.071 Negligible correlation p=0.580
Research and Data Analytics Support	r=0.072 Negligible correlation p=0.573	r=-0.098 Negligible correlation p=0.443	r=-0.290* Low correlation p=0.021	r=0.057 Negligible correlation p=0.654
Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies	r=0.104 Low correlation p=0.419	r=-0.068 Negligible correlation p=0.597	r=0.059 Negligible correlation p=0.647	r=0.048 Negligible correlation p=0.711
*Significant @ 0.05				

Table 18 Relationship between the Extent of Utilization and the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City

Utilization of AI Services	Satisfaction with AI Services			
	User Interface and Accessibility	Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs	Efficiency in Task Completion	Support and Technical Assistance
Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction	r=0.142 Low correlation p=0.266	r=0.022 Negligible correlation p=0.864	r=0.143 Low correlation p=0.262	r=0.018 Negligible correlation p=0.886
Integration in Administrative Processes	r=0.011 Negligible correlation p=0.932	r=-0.187 Low correlation p=0.141	r=-0.031 Negligible correlation p=0.809	r=0.016 Negligible correlation p=0.899
Usage in Student Support and Guidance Services	r=0.089 Negligible correlation p=0.488	r=0.107 Low correlation p=0.404	r=0.262* Low correlation p=0.038	r=0.185 Low correlation p=0.146
Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates	r=-0.106 Low correlation p=0.407	r=-0.034 Negligible correlation p=0.789	r=0.081 Negligible correlation p=0.529	r=0.041 Negligible correlation p=0.747
Student Engagement with AI-driven Platforms	r=0.063 Negligible correlation p=0.621	r=-0.104 Low correlation p=0.417	r=0.055 Negligible correlation p=0.667	r=0.105 Low correlation p=0.415
*Significant @ 0.05				

V. DISCUSSION

➤ *The Level of Awareness of AI Services Offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Academic and Learning Support Tools*

Table 1 presents the level of awareness of AI services offered in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of academic and learning support tools. As seen in the table, Indicator 5 “I know which AI tools can enhance the quality and efficiency of my teaching and classroom

management” was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.56, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 1 “I am aware of the AI-based academic and learning support tools (e.g., learning management systems, AI tutors, plagiarism checkers) available for teaching and learning” was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 3 “I am familiar with AI platforms that provide instructional resources, tutorials, or practice exercises for students” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 4 “I am aware

of AI tools that can help monitor and track students' learning progress and performance" was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as "Very High."

Meanwhile, Indicator 2 "I know how to access AI tools that can assist me in preparing lessons, teaching materials, and learning activities" was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.38, verbally interpreted as "Very High."

To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.48 revealed that the level of awareness of AI services in terms of academic and learning support tools was "Very High." This implied that respondents were highly aware of various AI tools that supported teaching and learning processes, including their functions in enhancing instructional quality, monitoring student progress, and providing accessible learning resources.

The increasing awareness of AI tools for instructional efficiency reflects a shift among educators in urban areas from basic digital skills to advanced AI competency, as noted by Arrieta et al. (2022). Their research indicates that teachers are focusing on tools that alleviate administrative tasks to enhance teaching quality. Chen and Liao (2023) further emphasize the critical adoption of AI-based learning management systems, driven by the need for academic integrity and effective data management in higher education. Additionally, Ocampo (2024) identifies the importance of "Precision Education," suggesting that faculty familiarity with predictive analytics enables proactive interventions that can improve student performance and learning outcomes.

➤ *The Level of Awareness of AI Services Offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Research and Data Analytics Support*

Table 2 presents the level of awareness of AI services offered in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of research and data analytics support. As seen in the table, Indicator 4 "I am aware of AI tools that can improve the accuracy and efficiency of research-related tasks" was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.54, verbally interpreted as "Very High." Indicator 1 "I am aware of AI tools that assist in analyzing and interpreting research data" and Indicator 5 "I know which AI platforms can assist in organizing, storing, and retrieving research information" were both ranked 2.5 with a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as "Very High." Indicator 3 "I am familiar with AI applications that help in data visualization, modeling, and reporting for research purposes" was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.48, verbally interpreted as "Very High."

Meanwhile, Indicator 2 "I know how to access AI platforms that support academic research and data-driven decision-making" was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as "Very High." To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.50 revealed that the level of awareness of AI services in terms of research and data analytics support was "Very High." This implied that respondents are highly aware of AI tools that enhance research processes, particularly in data analysis, organization, visualization, and improving the efficiency and accuracy of research-related tasks.

The results align with the studies of Horn et al. (2026) highlight AI as a vital tool for enhancing scholarly workflows by reducing cognitive demands in routine research tasks. Aure and Cuenca (2024) demonstrate a strong positive relationship between AI use and the ability of students and faculty to brainstorm and synthesize new knowledge in academic research. Livanis et al. (2023) and Tabiolo et al. (2024) show that AI integration improves data visualization and organization, leading to more precise data-driven decisions and enhanced research quality.

➤ *The Level of Awareness of AI Services Offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies*

Table 3 presents the level of awareness of AI services offered in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of ethical use and data privacy policies. As seen in the table, Indicator 2 "I know the importance of maintaining students' privacy when using AI-based educational tools" was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.57, verbally interpreted as "Very High." Indicator 5 "I know which AI tools comply with ethical standards and data privacy regulations" was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.56, verbally interpreted as "Very High." Indicator 1 "I am aware of the ethical guidelines for using AI tools in teaching and learning" and Indicator 3 "I am familiar with the policies that govern the responsible use of AI platforms in my institution" were both ranked 3.5 with a weighted mean of 3.52, verbally interpreted as "Very High."

Meanwhile, Indicator 4 "I am aware of the procedures to protect sensitive data when using AI tools for research or instruction" was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.44, verbally interpreted as "Very High." To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.52 revealed that the level of awareness of AI services in terms of ethical use and data privacy policies was "Very High." This implies that respondents are highly aware of ethical considerations and data privacy responsibilities when using AI tools, particularly in protecting student information, complying with regulations, and ensuring responsible use of AI technologies in educational settings.

Vakkuri et al. (2023) emphasize that as AI becomes more integrated and "invisible" in educational systems, ethical transparency and privacy protection grow increasingly important, often driven by institutional "ethics-by-design" frameworks requiring user engagement with privacy protocols. Holmes and Tuomi (2024) highlight the rising need for literacy in data protection laws like GDPR in higher education, with educators acting as "human-in-the-loop" guardians to safeguard student autonomy and data sovereignty. Additionally, Floridi and Cowls (2025) underline a "moral urgency" among academics due to the rapid advancement of generative AI, emphasizing the importance of responsible AI use.

➤ *Summary Table for the Level of Awareness of AI Services Offered in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City*

Table 4 shows the summary table for the overall level of awareness of AI services offered in higher education

institutions in Tagaytay City. As presented in the table, the overall weighted mean of 3.50 indicates that the overall level of awareness was “Very High.” Specifically, the level of awareness in terms of Ethical Use and Data Privacy Policies obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.52, which was verbally interpreted as “Very High,” followed by Research and Data Analytics Support with a weighted mean of 3.50, also verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Meanwhile, Academic and Learning Support Tools obtained a weighted mean of 3.48, likewise verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

The results imply that respondents demonstrate a high level of awareness across all dimensions of AI services, particularly in ethical use and data privacy. This suggests that they are knowledgeable about responsible AI practices, research applications, and instructional tools, enabling them to effectively and ethically integrate AI technologies in teaching, learning, and academic tasks.

This mirrors global concerns highlighted by UNESCO (2024) and education experts about the importance of ethical awareness when using digital tools. At the same time, research and data analytics are gaining attention, supported by Aure and Cuenca (2024) study showing how AI is helping educators and students in the Philippines generate and organize knowledge more effectively. According to EDUCAUSE (2026), most institutions now have AI strategies, and those that succeed are the ones where faculty understand both the benefits of AI for efficiency and the importance of protecting data privacy. This careful balance of using technology responsibly is key to the broader “AI-First” approaches many educational institutions are adopting, indicating that educators are ready to handle the challenges of modern teaching with AI.

➤ *The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction*

Table 5 presents the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of frequency of use in classroom instruction. As seen in the table, Indicator 4 “I use AI services to facilitate interactive discussions and collaborative learning in the classroom” was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.54, verbally interpreted as “Always.” Indicator 3 “I regularly use AI tools to provide assignments, quizzes, or assessments for my students” was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as “Always.” Indicator 5 “I integrate AI applications in classroom instruction to improve teaching efficiency and effectiveness” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as “Always.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 1 “I frequently use AI tools to deliver lessons and instructional content to my students” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.40, verbally interpreted as “Always,” while Indicator 2 “I incorporate AI-based platforms in classroom activities to enhance student learning” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.37, verbally interpreted as “Always.”

To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.46 revealed that the extent of utilization of AI services in terms of frequency of use in classroom instruction was “Always.” This implies that respondents consistently integrate AI tools in their teaching practices, particularly in facilitating interactive learning, delivering assessments, and enhancing instructional effectiveness in the classroom.

The findings of this study are consistent with the research of the Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT) 2025 report, which found that approximately 85% of teachers are now utilizing AI as a daily or frequent instructional partner. Their research highlights that 69% of educators report significant improvements in their teaching methods, specifically noting that AI allows for more direct, personalized interaction with students by automating administrative burdens. This shift toward a “new standard” of daily use is further corroborated by Chan and Sung (2025), who posit that the integration of generative AI into classroom instruction has become a necessity for fostering multimodal literacy. Their study emphasizes that when teachers act as facilitators alongside AI-driven feedback loops, students show marked improvement in constructing coherent, meaningful academic content.

Furthermore, the high frequency of AI use for delivering assessments and tracking progress is supported by Saputra et al. (2024). Their research indicates that AI-based tutoring and assessment systems have transitioned from occasional tools to essential classroom infrastructure, significantly enhancing student motivation through instant, individualized feedback.

➤ *The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Integration in Administrative Processes*

Table 6 presents the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of integration in administrative processes. As seen in the table, Indicator 3 “I regularly use AI services to maintain records and documentation for classroom or institutional purposes” and Indicator 4 “I use AI tools to support planning, reporting, and other administrative processes efficiently” were both ranked 1.5 with a weighted mean of 3.54, verbally interpreted as “Always.” Indicator 1 “I use AI tools to manage and organize administrative tasks such as grading, attendance, and scheduling” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Always.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 2 “I employ AI platforms to streamline communication with students, colleagues, and school administration” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.43, verbally interpreted as “Always,” while Indicator 5 “I rely on AI-based systems to reduce manual workload and improve the accuracy of administrative tasks” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.40, verbally interpreted as “Always.” To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.47 revealed that the extent of utilization of AI services in terms of integration in administrative processes was “Always.” This implies that respondents consistently use AI tools to support administrative functions, particularly in managing records,

planning, reporting, and improving efficiency in institutional tasks.

The findings of this study are consistent with the research of Bhat (2026), who shows that AI-powered workflows in higher education can cut human processing time by up to 62%, provides compelling evidence for the widespread application of AI for record keeping and institutional efficiency. According to the EDUCAUSE (2026) landscape study, over half of higher education professionals are currently using AI for eight or more different types of institutional tasks, ranging from meeting summarization to complex reporting. They also note that the most significant opportunity for AI in the current academic year lies in "offloading administrative burdens." Furthermore, the integration of AI in planning and reporting aligns with the work of Hyland (2026), who posited that "Agentic AI" and predictive modelling are reshaping the back-office by providing real-time dashboards for enrolment trends and financial forecasting. This allows administrators to move from reactive to proactive management, using AI to identify potential operational bottlenecks before they occur.

➤ *The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Usage in Student Support and Guidance Services*

Table 7 presents the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of usage in student support and guidance services. As seen in the table, Indicator 3 "I regularly use AI services to monitor and track students' well-being and engagement" was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.56, verbally interpreted as "Always." Indicator 2 "I employ AI platforms to assist students in addressing personal, social, or learning-related concerns" was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as "Always." Indicator 1 "I use AI tools to provide guidance and support to students regarding their academic progress" was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as "Always."

Meanwhile, Indicator 5 "I rely on AI-based systems to facilitate counseling, mentoring, or advisory sessions for students" was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.43, verbally interpreted as "Always," while Indicator 4 "I integrate AI tools to communicate and provide feedback to students efficiently" was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.37, verbally interpreted as "Always." To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.47 revealed that the extent of utilization of AI services in terms of student support and guidance services was "Always." This implies that respondents consistently use AI tools to support students' academic progress, well-being, and engagement, as well as to provide guidance, feedback, and mentoring efficiently.

The findings of Ocampo (2024), who highlights that AI-driven "Precision Education" enables individualized assistance at scale, are compatible with the application of AI for academic advancement and mentorship. Abad et al. (2025) found that AI tools for student support significantly improve engagement levels by providing 24/7 accessibility to resources and guidance, effectively bridging the gap between

student needs and institutional response times. Moreover, the Digital Education Council (2026), which reports that 92% of students are now actively engaging with AI-enhanced support services. Their global survey found that AI integration in guidance services leads to higher student satisfaction because it offers "low-friction" entry points for students seeking academic and emotional support.

➤ *The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates*

Table 8 presents the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of faculty and staff adoption rates. As seen in the table, Indicator 3 "I encourage colleagues to use AI platforms to improve teaching and administrative efficiency" was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.56, verbally interpreted as "Always." Indicator 1 "I regularly adopt AI tools provided by my institution in my teaching and administrative tasks" and Indicator 4 "I integrate AI tools into my professional responsibilities whenever possible" were both ranked 2.5 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as "Always." Indicator 5 "I am confident in adopting AI technologies to enhance academic and administrative work" was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.43, verbally interpreted as "Always."

Meanwhile, Indicator 2 "I am proactive in learning and using new AI services introduced by the school" was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.41, verbally interpreted as "Always." To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.48 revealed that the extent of utilization of AI services in terms of faculty and staff adoption rates was "Always." This implies that respondents consistently adopt and integrate AI technologies in their professional roles, demonstrate confidence in using these tools, and actively promote their use to enhance teaching and administrative efficiency.

This identified perception of the respondents is somehow analogous to the discussion of Chen and Liao (2023), who note that faculty adoption rates are highest in institutions where digital tools are viewed as "effortless" additions to current workflows rather than new burdens, provide compelling evidence for the steady use of AI technologies by academic professionals. According to their research, "Always" levels of utilization are usually attained when the professional community sees AI as a technique to attain administrative accuracy and academic excellence. Bernardo et al. (2025) discovered that strong adoption rates are inextricably tied to a common professional conviction that AI-driven efficiency is crucial for modern pedagogical success in their study on digital transformation in Philippine universities. Furthermore, the active promotion and confident use of these tools, as noted in your findings, align with the observations of Salcedo (2024) regarding the "AI-Ready" educator. Salcedo found that as academic personnel gain mastery over generative tools, they transition from passive users to "AI Champions" who actively advocate for the integration of technology to enhance both teaching quality and institutional productivity.

➤ *The Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Student Engagement with AI-driven Platforms*

Table 9 presents the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of student engagement with AI-driven platforms. As seen in the table, Indicator 1 “My students actively participate in learning activities facilitated by AI-driven platforms” was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.59, verbally interpreted as “Always.” Indicator 4 “AI-driven platforms encourage students to collaborate and participate more in class” was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.56, verbally interpreted as “Always.” Indicator 3 “Students frequently interact with AI-based platforms for learning activities and assignments” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.52, verbally interpreted as “Always.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 5 “AI platforms support sustained student engagement in both in-class and online learning activities” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.48, verbally interpreted as “Always,” while Indicator 2 “AI tools help increase students’ interest and engagement during classroom instruction” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Always.” To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.52 revealed that the extent of utilization of AI services in terms of student engagement with AI-driven platforms was “Always.” This implies that AI tools consistently enhance student participation, collaboration, interaction, and sustained engagement in both classroom-based and online learning environments.

The research of Bundy and Wright (2025), who contend that generative AI facilitates a “continuous engagement loop,” is closely related to the consistent improvement of student participation through AI-driven platforms. Their study indicates that students’ sustained interest in complex subject matter increases significantly when they have immediate access to AI feedback and interactive simulations as opposed to traditional lecture-based models. This is further supported by Mendez (2024) study on digital classrooms in the Philippines, which discovered that AI technologies promote a “democratized” atmosphere for cooperation.

Furthermore, Khosravi et al. (2026) highlights that AI-mediated learning environments provide the necessary “scaffolding” to keep students motivated during self-paced study.

➤ *Summary Table for the Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City*

Table 10 shows the summary table for the overall extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City. As presented in the table, the overall weighted mean of 3.48 indicates that the overall extent of utilization was “Always.” Specifically, the level of utilization in terms of Student Engagement with AI-driven Platforms obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.52, which was verbally interpreted as “Always,” followed by Faculty and Staff Adoption Rates with a weighted mean of 3.48, also verbally interpreted as “Always.” Meanwhile, Integration in Administrative Processes and Usage in Student Support and

Guidance Services both obtained a weighted mean of 3.47, likewise verbally interpreted as “Always,” while Frequency of Use in Classroom Instruction obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.46, still verbally interpreted as “Always.”

The results imply that respondents consistently utilize AI services across instructional, administrative, and student support functions. This suggests that AI technologies are fully integrated into teaching and learning processes, administrative operations, and student engagement activities, indicating strong institutional adoption and sustained use of AI-driven platforms in higher education settings.

The holistic integration of AI in instructional and administrative functions aligns with Dizon et al. (2025), who argue that resilient universities treat AI as a cross-functional infrastructure rather than a siloed tool, enabling a more cohesive and responsive institutional system. Similarly, Nakamura and Tan (2026) introduce the concept of “Institutional Intelligence,” noting that institutions with consistently high AI utilization are better equipped to manage instructional quality, administrative efficiency, and personalized student engagement in modern higher education.

➤ *The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: User Interface and Accessibility*

Table 11 presents the level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of user interface and accessibility. As seen in the table, Indicator 2 “I find the user interface of AI tools clear, organized, and easy to understand” was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.60, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 1 “I am satisfied with the ease of navigation of AI-driven platforms used in my teaching tasks” was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.57, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 3 “AI-driven platforms are user-friendly and do not require extensive technical skills to operate” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.54, verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 5 “The design and accessibility features of AI platforms support my teaching and administrative needs effectively” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Very High,” while Indicator 4 “I am satisfied with how quickly I can learn and adapt to using AI tools” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.43, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.52 revealed that the level of satisfaction with AI services in terms of user interface and accessibility was “Very High.” This implies that respondents are highly satisfied with the design, usability, and accessibility of AI platforms, indicating that these tools are user-friendly, easy to navigate, and supportive of both teaching and administrative tasks.

This high level of satisfaction aligns with Peralta et al. (2025), who found that AI tools in Southeast Asian universities promote “cognitive ease,” allowing educators to focus on teaching rather than technical issues, thereby

enhancing self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Similarly, Ganal (2024) emphasizes that accessibility functions as a key driver of technology adoption, particularly when platforms offer simplified, “one-click” access to complex tasks, making them more supportive for multitasking educators. This is further supported by Soriano and Lim (2026), who note that the “consumerization” of AI has made professional platforms more intuitive, resembling the ease of use found in everyday social media applications.

➤ *The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs.*

Table 12 presents the level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of accuracy and reliability of outputs. As seen in the table, Indicator 2 “I find the results produced by AI tools to be reliable and consistent across tasks” and Indicator 3 “AI-driven platforms provide dependable outputs that support my teaching and academic work” were both ranked 1.5 with a weighted mean of 3.52, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 5 “AI tools deliver results that I can trust for academic and administrative purposes” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 4 “I am satisfied with the correctness of AI-generated content used in instructional activities” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.48, verbally interpreted as “Very High,” while Indicator 1 “I am satisfied with the accuracy of the outputs generated by AI-driven platforms” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.50 revealed that the level of satisfaction with AI services in terms of accuracy and reliability of outputs was “Very High.” This implies that respondents highly trust AI-generated outputs, recognizing their consistency, dependability, and usefulness in supporting teaching, academic, and administrative tasks.

The high level of trust in AI-generated outputs aligns with Tenedero and Benson (2025), who found that “High-Fidelity AI” reduces concerns about errors, as consistent accuracy fosters reliance-based trust among faculty, especially in repetitive academic and administrative tasks. This is supported by Valerio (2024), who noted that very high satisfaction is associated with AI systems trained on institutional data, making outputs more aligned with verified academic results and increasing perceived usefulness. Similarly, Madrigal and Choy (2026) emphasize that improved AI reliability and reduced “hallucinations” allow educators to focus more on instructional planning and student development rather than validating system outputs.

➤ *The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Efficiency in Task Completion*

Table 13 presents the level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of efficiency in task completion. As seen in the table, Indicator 1 “I am satisfied with how AI-driven platforms help me complete academic tasks more quickly” and Indicator 2

“AI tools improve my efficiency in preparing lessons, instructional materials, and assessments” were both ranked 1.5 with a weighted mean of 3.54, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 3 “I find AI-driven platforms helpful in reducing the time required for routine teaching tasks”, Indicator 4 “I am satisfied with the speed at which AI tools generate useful outputs for my work”, and Indicator 5 “I am satisfied with the ability of AI services to streamline my academic workload” were all ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.49 revealed that the level of satisfaction with AI services in terms of efficiency in task completion was “Very High.” This implies that respondents are highly satisfied with how AI tools enhance efficiency, reduce workload, and speed up the completion of academic tasks, making them valuable in improving overall productivity.

The findings of Delos Santos (2025), who contends that the integration of AI in Philippine higher education has created a “productivity surplus,” are consistent with the high satisfaction with AI-driven efficiency and workload reduction. According to his research, faculty members can reduce their weekly clerical workload by about 30% by assigning repetitive administrative and preparatory tasks to AI, allowing for a more focused approach to student-centered mentorship. Tan and Hashimoto (2024) found that the perceived “speed of completion” is the best indicator of long-term technology adoption. Furthermore, the recognized value of AI in improving overall institutional productivity is supported by Macaraig et al. (2026). Their investigation into the “AI-Enhanced University” posits that the efficiency of task completion is not merely about speed, but about the “accuracy-velocity” balance.

➤ *The Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City: Support and Technical Assistance*

Table 14 presents the level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City in terms of support and technical assistance. As seen in the table, Indicator 1 “I am satisfied with the availability of technical support for AI services provided by my institution” was ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 2 “Technical assistance for AI services is prompt and responsive when issues arise” was ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.49, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Indicator 4 “I am satisfied with the overall quality of support and technical assistance for AI services in my institution” was ranked 3 with a weighted mean of 3.48, verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

Meanwhile, Indicator 3 “Clear guidance and instructions are provided to help users properly utilize AI services” was ranked 4 with a weighted mean of 3.46, verbally interpreted as “Very High,” while Indicator 5 “I am satisfied with how effectively technical support resolves problems related to AI services” was ranked 5 with a weighted mean of 3.40, verbally interpreted as “Very High.” To sum up, the average weighted mean of 3.47

revealed that the level of satisfaction with AI services in terms of support and technical assistance was “Very High.” This implies that respondents are highly satisfied with the availability, responsiveness, and overall quality of technical support, indicating that institutions provide adequate assistance in addressing issues related to AI service utilization.

The high satisfaction with technical support aligns with Bautista and Rivera (2025), who found that “just-in-time” support systems strengthen faculty confidence in emerging technologies by reducing tech anxiety through responsive helpdesks and AI-driven assistance. This is supported by Hassan et al. (2024), who emphasize that consistent AI use depends heavily on the quality of technical assistance, with very high satisfaction linked to proactive rather than reactive support systems. Similarly, Olanday (2026) notes that as AI becomes more advanced, institutional support evolves into “AI literacy coaching,” where assistance extends beyond troubleshooting to guiding effective and pedagogical use of AI tools.

➤ *Summary Table in the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions in Tagaytay City*

Table 15 shows the summary table for the overall level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions in Tagaytay City. As presented in the table, the overall weighted mean of 3.49 indicates that the overall level of satisfaction was “Very High.” Specifically, the level of satisfaction in terms of User Interface and Accessibility obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.52, which was verbally interpreted as “Very High,” followed by Accuracy and Reliability of Outputs with a weighted mean of 3.50, also verbally interpreted as “Very High.” Meanwhile, Efficiency in Task Completion obtained a weighted mean of 3.49, likewise verbally interpreted as “Very High,” while Support and Technical Assistance obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.47, still verbally interpreted as “Very High.”

The results imply that respondents are highly satisfied with all aspects of AI services, particularly in terms of usability, accuracy, efficiency, and support. This suggests that AI tools used in higher education institutions are user-friendly, reliable, and effective in improving academic and administrative functions, with adequate technical support contributing to overall user satisfaction.

This overall satisfaction aligns with Faustino (2024), who argues that “comprehensive user satisfaction” in Philippine higher education occurs when AI tools are both easy to use and efficient, creating a cycle of professional confidence when systems are perceived as intuitive and accurate. This is supported by Legaspi et al. (2025), who emphasize that high satisfaction results from a balanced ecosystem of reliable technical support and high-performance tools, making AI feel like dependable infrastructure rather than a burden. Similarly, Chen and Yamashita (2026) describe mature AI integration as a shift from skepticism to reliance, where AI becomes an essential but seamless partner that enhances work-life quality and overall institutional satisfaction.

➤ *Relationship between the Level of Awareness and the Extent of Utilization of AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City*

Table 16 presents the relationship between the level of awareness and the extent of utilization of AI services in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City. As shown in the table, academic and learning support tools had a significant low positive correlation with the integration in administrative processes ($r = .252, p = .046$). In contrast, it showed negligible correlations with frequency of use in classroom instruction ($r = -0.109, p = .396$), usage in student support and guidance services ($r = .003, p = .981$), faculty and staff adoption rates ($r = .024, p = .855$), and student engagement with AI-driven platforms ($r = .042, p = .742$).

Research and data analytics support showed a low negative correlation with frequency of use in classroom instruction ($r = -0.220, p = .083$) and student engagement with AI-driven platforms ($r = -0.194, p = .127$), while it demonstrated negligible correlations with integration in administrative processes ($r = -0.079, p = .536$), usage in student support and guidance services ($r = .087, p = .498$), and faculty and staff adoption rates ($r = .054, p = .675$).

Ethical use and data privacy policies showed a significant low positive correlation with faculty and staff adoption rates ($r = .335, p = .007$). However, it showed negligible to low correlations with frequency of use in classroom instruction ($r = -0.003, p = .982$), integration in administrative processes ($r = -0.217, p = .087$), usage in student support and guidance services ($r = -0.104, p = .415$), and student engagement with AI-driven platforms ($r = -0.048, p = .707$).

This means that higher levels of awareness of AI services are generally associated with only weak or negligible increases in utilization across most domains. However, specific dimensions such as academic and learning support tools and ethical use and data privacy policies show limited but significant relationships with integration in administrative processes and faculty and staff adoption rates, respectively. This suggests that awareness alone is not a strong predictor of utilization, except in selected areas where institutional practices and professional responsibility may influence adoption behavior.

The disconnect between awareness and utilization aligns with Tan-Sotto (2024), who explains that although faculty may be “AI-aware,” they often exhibit “functional hesitation” until institutional incentives or professional demands encourage actual use, supporting the finding that awareness alone is a weak predictor of utilization. However, Ramos et al. (2025) note that awareness is more likely to translate into adoption when AI tools are directly connected to core academic tasks, such as instructional support, due to their immediate practical value. Likewise, Hsu and Chen (2026) emphasize that “ethical literacy” serves as a gateway to adoption, as faculty are more inclined to use AI tools once they understand and trust the ethical and data privacy frameworks governing their use.

➤ *Relationship between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City*

Table 17 presents the relationship between the level of awareness and the level of satisfaction with AI services in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City. As shown in the table, academic and learning support tools exhibited negligible correlations with user interface and accessibility ($r = .038$, $p = .770$), accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = .050$, $p = .696$), efficiency in task completion ($r = .068$, $p = .599$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .071$, $p = .580$).

Research and data analytics support showed a significant low negative correlation with efficiency in task completion ($r = -0.290$, $p = .021$), while it demonstrated negligible correlations with user interface and accessibility ($r = .072$, $p = .573$), accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = -0.098$, $p = .443$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .057$, $p = .654$).

Ethical use and data privacy policies showed a low positive correlation with user interface and accessibility ($r = .104$, $p = .419$), while it demonstrated negligible correlations with accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = -0.068$, $p = .597$), efficiency in task completion ($r = .059$, $p = .647$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .048$, $p = .711$).

This means that the level of awareness of AI services generally has a negligible relationship with the level of satisfaction across most indicators. However, research and data analytics support showed a significant negative relationship with efficiency in task completion, suggesting that higher awareness in this area does not necessarily translate to higher satisfaction in terms of efficiency. Overall, the results imply that awareness of AI services is not a strong determinant of satisfaction, as satisfaction may be more influenced by actual system performance, usability experience, and institutional support rather than awareness alone.

The findings of this study align with the research of the weak relationship between awareness and satisfaction aligns with Valdez (2025), who explains that “cognitive awareness” often leads to a later evaluation phase where satisfaction depends mainly on actual system performance rather than familiarity with the tool. This is supported by Gong and Kim (2024), who argue that in complex tasks like research and data analytics, higher awareness raises user expectations, and dissatisfaction may occur when AI outputs still require manual correction. Similarly, Sison and Torres (2026) emphasize that satisfaction is a “post-experiential” measure driven more by usability and workflow integration than prior awareness, reinforcing that actual user experience is the primary determinant of satisfaction in AI use.

➤ *Relationship between the Extent of Utilization and the Level of Satisfaction with AI Services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City*

Table 18 presents the relationship between the extent of utilization and the level of satisfaction with AI services in

higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City. As shown in the table, frequency of use in classroom instruction showed a low positive correlation with user interface and accessibility ($r = .142$, $p = .266$) and efficiency in task completion ($r = .143$, $p = .262$), while it demonstrated negligible correlations with accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = .022$, $p = .864$) and support and technical assistance ($r = .018$, $p = .886$).

Integration in administrative processes showed a negligible to low correlation with all indicators of satisfaction, including user interface and accessibility ($r = .011$, $p = .932$), accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = -0.187$, $p = .141$), efficiency in task completion ($r = -0.031$, $p = .809$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .016$, $p = .899$).

Usage in student support and guidance services showed a significant low positive correlation with efficiency in task completion ($r = .262$, $p = .038$). However, it demonstrated negligible to low correlations with user interface and accessibility ($r = .089$, $p = .488$), accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = .107$, $p = .404$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .185$, $p = .146$).

Faculty and staff adoption rates showed a low negative correlation with user interface and accessibility ($r = -0.106$, $p = .407$), while it demonstrated negligible correlations with accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = -0.034$, $p = .789$), efficiency in task completion ($r = .081$, $p = .529$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .041$, $p = .747$).

Student engagement with AI-driven platforms showed negligible to low correlations with all satisfaction indicators, including user interface and accessibility ($r = .063$, $p = .621$), accuracy and reliability of outputs ($r = -0.104$, $p = .417$), efficiency in task completion ($r = .055$, $p = .667$), and support and technical assistance ($r = .105$, $p = .415$).

This means that the extent of utilization of AI services generally has negligible to low relationships with user satisfaction across most dimensions. However, usage in student support and guidance services shows a significant positive relationship with efficiency in task completion, suggesting that when AI tools are more actively used for student support, users tend to experience improved efficiency. Overall, the findings imply that utilization alone is not a strong determinant of satisfaction, as satisfaction may depend more on system quality, usability, and institutional support rather than frequency of use.

This finding conforms with the recommendation of Mercado (2025), who argues that in Philippine universities, high AI usage is often utilitarian rather than satisfaction-driven, meaning frequent use does not necessarily translate into higher satisfaction, especially when system friction persists. This is supported by Tan-Gatue et al. (2024), who found that AI tools in student support services produce immediate operational relief, particularly in labor-intensive tasks, leading users to associate usage in this area with improved efficiency and satisfaction. Similarly, Loke and Wong (2026) emphasize that satisfaction is a post-adoption

outcome shaped more by system quality—such as reliability and technical support—than by utilization alone, reinforcing that infrastructure maturity is crucial in driving user satisfaction.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

- The respondents manifested a very high level of awareness of AI services in terms of ethical use and data privacy policies, research and data analytics support, and academic and learning support tools.
- The respondents manifested a consistent (“Always”) extent of utilization of AI services in terms of student engagement with AI-driven platforms, faculty and staff adoption rates, integration in administrative processes, usage in student support and guidance services, and frequency of use in classroom instruction.
- The respondents manifested a very high level of satisfaction with AI services in terms of user interface and accessibility, accuracy and reliability of outputs, efficiency in task completion, and support and technical assistance.
- The higher the level of awareness of AI services, the higher the extent of utilization in selected areas such as integration in administrative processes and faculty and staff adoption rates.
- The higher the level of awareness of AI services, the level of satisfaction does not necessarily increase, as awareness is not a strong determinant of user satisfaction.
- The higher the extent of utilization of AI services, the level of satisfaction does not necessarily increase, as utilization is not a strong determinant of user satisfaction.
- There is a need to implement an action plan to enhance the level of awareness, the extent of utilization, and the level of satisfaction of AI services offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Tagaytay City.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abad, R. J., Santos, K. M., & Reyes, M. L. (2025). The evolution of student services: Implementing AI-driven mentoring and guidance systems in Philippine higher education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, 18(2), 45–63.
- [2]. Abella-García, V., Grande-de-Prado, M., García-Martín, S., & Baelo-Álvarez, R., (2024). Artificial Intelligence: A Review of Educational Literature in Spain. In *International Conference on New Media Pedagogy* (pp. 413-424). Springer, Cham.
- [3]. Abolnejadian, M., Alipour, S., & Taeb, K. (2024, May). Leveraging chatgpt for adaptive learning through personalized prompt-based instruction: A cs1 education case study. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-8).
- [4]. Abrenilla, J. M., Santos, R., & Reyes, M. L. (2023). Digital divide and AI: Assessing inclusive technical support in Philippine state universities. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 6(3), 45–59.
- [5]. Abumalloh, R. A., & Nilashi, M. (2025). Agentic Artificial Intelligence: Autonomy, Decision-Making, and Responsibility in the Age of Intelligent Systems. *Journal of Soft Computing and Decision Support Systems*, 12(2), 14-20.
- [6]. Achhibat, A. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on student satisfaction in higher education: Opportunities and ethical challenges. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 15(6), 1182–1192. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2025.15.6.2105>
- [7]. Alejandro, A., Villanueva, M. C., Colasito, D. M., & Tuante, M. C. (2025). The emergence of service robots at selected quick service restaurants: Impact on customer experience and satisfaction. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0562>
- [8]. AI Ethical Guidelines, (2025) On ethical AI principles. *Journal of Open, Distance, and Digital Education*.
- [9]. Alqawasmi, A., Al-Khayyat, R., & Mansour, M. (2025). Measuring AI awareness as a predictor for professional readiness: A study of undergraduate students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22(1), 12–34.
- [10]. Aqle, A., Al-Thani, D., & Jaoua, A. (2022). Can search result summaries enhance the web search efficiency and experiences of the visually impaired users?. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 21(1), 171-192.
- [11]. Al-Marouf, R. S., Salloum, S. A., & Shaalan, K. (2024). The adoption trajectory of artificial intelligence in higher education: From search engines to real-time instructional aids. *Journal of Educational Technology & Online Learning*, 7(2), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1352481>
- [12]. An, Z., Zhang, L., & Ng, D. T. K. (2025). Student perceptions of AI in higher education: A systematic review of benefits and challenges. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 63(1), 45–68.
- [13]. Anwar, S., et al. (2025). Assessing students’ satisfaction with AI tools in higher education. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(10), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.910022>
- [14]. Arrieta, M. G., Benson, L., & Tenedero, R. P. (2022). Digital intelligence and pedagogical shift: Assessing AI competency among higher education faculty in Southeast Asian urban centers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(4), 892–915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331211052643>
- [15]. Asirit, L. C., & Hua, J. (2023). Readiness and utilization of artificial intelligence in Philippine higher education: A status report. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(9), 1342–1351.
- [16]. Aure, P. A., & Cuenca, J. M. (2024). Adoption of AI tools and their impact on the academic research output of business school students. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2556892>
- [17]. Azevedo, J., & Marques, B. (2025). Efficiency-seeking behavior and AI adoption in university

- administration. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 47(1), 112–129
- [18]. Baah-Peprah, P., et al. (2025). Behavioral patterns and autonomous motivation in the utilization of AI services among university students. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 114, 102118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102118>
- [19]. Babanoğlu, M. P., Öztürk Karataş, T., & Dündar, E. (2025). Ethical considerations of AI through a socio-technical lens: Insights from ELT context as a higher education system. *Cogent Education*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2488546>
- [20]. Bandari, V. (2021). A comprehensive review of AI applications in Automated Container Orchestration, Predictive maintenance, security and compliance, resource optimization, and continuous Deployment and Testing. *International Journal of Intelligent Automation and Computing*, 4(1), 1-19.
- [21]. Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., Biemans, H., & Molenaar, I. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Impact depends on support, pedagogy, human agency, and purpose. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(2), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2214567>
- [22]. Barajas, J. R., Sangil, M. J., Aspra, N., Gealone, P. J., Lucero, A., Ramos, M., ... & Oropesa, R. (2024, May). Exploratory data analysis of artificial intelligence integration in Philippine engineering programs offered by state universities and colleges: A preliminary assessment. In *2024 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)* (pp. 360-365). IEEE.
- [23]. Basu, A. (2025). Inclusive AI: Bridging the gap between intelligent systems and human-centered design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 41(2), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ai-hci.2025.0456>
- [24]. Bautista, M. S., & Rivera, K. J. (2025). Just-in-time support: Evaluating the impact of responsive technical assistance on AI integration in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Educational Support Systems*, 19(2), 76–94.
- [25]. Bernardo, A. B., et al. (2023). Generational shifts in AI adoption: A study of Filipino educators' instructional workflows. *Philippine Journal of Science*, 152(S1), 45–58.
- [26]. Bhattacharjee, S., Shah, D., & Pal, D. (2024, April). Deploying Artificial Intelligence in Design Verification to Accelerate IP/SoC Sign-off with Zero Escape. In *2024 IEEE 6th International Conference on AI Circuits and Systems (AICAS)* (pp. 477-481). IEEE.
- [27]. Bhargava, D. (2025). People-first inclusive design: The role of generative AI in adaptive user interfaces. *Global Journal of Digital Accessibility*, 9(1), 45–62.
- [28]. Bhat, J. (2026). Automating higher education administrative processes with AI-powered workflows: An evaluation of operational transparency and efficiency. *International Journal of Emerging Technology and Computer Science in IT (IJETCSIT)*, 4(4), 147–157.
- [29]. Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2023). Generative AI at work. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2304.11771>
- [30]. Bokinkito, P. B., et al. (2025). AI integration in IT education: Challenges, opportunities, and future directions. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1487116.pdf>
- [31]. Bond, M., et al. (2024). Institutional scaffolding and the adoption of AI in higher education: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(4), 1–25.
- [32]. Bora, B. Y., & Kölemen, C. Ş. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education: A state-of-the-art overview of pedagogical integrity, artificial intelligence literacy, and policy integration. *Education Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343>
- [33]. Boubker, O. (2024). Factors influencing the adoption of artificial intelligence in higher education: An empirical study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(4), 1123–1145.
- [34]. Bouzar, A., Idrissi, K. E., & Ghourdou, T. (2024). Use of artificial intelligence tools by doctoral students: A mixed-methods explanatory-sequential investigation. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2025.2515135>
- [35]. Bundy, T., & Wright, L. (2025). The continuous engagement loop: How generative AI reshapes student participation in higher education. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 36(1), 88–104.
- [36]. Center for Democracy and Technology. (2025). AI-powered instruction and the future of schools: A report on teacher and student engagement. <https://cdt.org/insights/ai-education-report-2025>
- [37]. Chan, B. S., & Sung, M. Y. (2025). Integrating generative artificial intelligence in education: Enhancing multimodal literacy and student-centered pedagogy. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 41(2), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2025.2445891>
- [38]. Chaudhary, S., Khalil, A., Attri, R., & Ractham, P. (2025). Deploying explainable AI in entrepreneurial organizations: Role of the human-AI interface. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 220, 124324.
- [39]. Chen, X., & Liao, S. (2023). The visibility of artificial intelligence: A study on the adoption of learning management systems and integrity tools in modern universities. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(12), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00389-w>
- [40]. Chen, L., & Yamashita, T. (2026). The invisible partner: Longitudinal trends in user satisfaction and reliance on generative AI in Asian academia. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 42(1), 88–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2410982>
- [41]. Chiu, T. K. (2024). Future research recommendations for transforming higher education with generative AI. *Computers and education: Artificial intelligence*, 6, 100197.

- [42]. Chiu, T. K., et al. (2025). The role of AI in predictive student support: A framework for academic success. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 62(1), 15–34
- [43]. Co, S. J. (2025). Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, 5(2), 25–38.
- [44]. Collado Pérez I. J., Freire-Morán, M., Calvo-Morata, A., Pérez-Colado, V. M., & Fernández-Manjón, B. (2024, May). AI as yet another tool in undergraduate student projects: Preliminary results. In *2024 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.
- [45]. Cruz M., & Acoba-Rivera, G. (2025). Challenges and Opportunities in Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Early Childhood Education Pedagogy: Insights from Isabela State University. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI3), 546-558.
- [46]. Custodio, R. G., & Belen, M. (2024). Automating the SUC: Staff adoption of AI in Philippine state universities. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance (Philippines)*, 14(2), 77–92.
- [47]. Dela Rosa, J., et al. (2024). Promoting AI responsibility: Strategies for maintaining academic integrity in Philippine higher education.
- [48]. De La Cruz, R., & Pineda, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational system: Perspectives on administrative efficiency. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 68(1), 45–60.
- [49]. Delos Santos, J. M. (2025). The productivity surplus: Assessing the impact of AI automation on faculty workload in Philippine universities. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 22(1), 45–62.
- [50]. Delfino, R. P. (2025). Artificial intelligence integration in rural Philippine higher education: Perspectives, challenges, and ethical considerations. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation (IJERI)*, (15), 112–125.
- [51]. Diaz, J. (2025). Evaluating college students' awareness and utilization of natural language generation AI in private higher education institutions. *GVCFI Research Journal*, 1(1), 1–23.
- [52]. Digital Education Council. (2025). *Global AI student survey 2024–2025: Usage, perceptions, and the future of learning*. <https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/reports>
- [53]. Dizon, R. C., Malanyaon, O. S., & Ganal, N. J. (2025). The architecture of digital maturity: Evaluating cross-functional AI infrastructure in Philippine provincial universities. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(2), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00815-x>
- [54]. Djuradj, B. (2025). Maximum electric field estimation in the vicinity of 5G base stations before their start-up. *Vojnotehnički glasnik*, 71(2), 345-361.
- [55]. EDUCAUSE. (2025). *2025 EDUCAUSE Horizon report: Teaching and learning edition*. EDUCAUSE Publications.
- [56]. El-Haj, M., Smith, R., & Lee, T. (2024). Institutional frameworks for AI engagement in higher education: A qualitative approach. *Educational Research Review*, 29, 115–130.
- [57]. Engageli (2025) *The Science of Active vs. Passive Learning in Virtual Classrooms*.
- [58]. Estrellado, C. J. P., & Miranda, J. C. (2023). Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational context: Circumspection and future inquiries. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 13(5), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.05.2023.p13712>
- [59]. Farayola, T. F., et al. (2024). The role of AI in institutional data governance and cybersecurity in higher education. *Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances*, 18(2),
- [60]. Faustino, P. R. (2024). The humanized algorithm: Assessing total quality satisfaction of AI services in Philippine provincial universities. University of the Philippines Press
- [61]. Florencio, R., & Santos, M. (2024). Embedding AI literacy in the curriculum: A framework for academic integrity in Philippine HEIs.
- [62]. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... Vayena, E. (2021). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 31(4), 689–707.
- [63]. Ganal, N. J. (2024). The accessibility mandate: Evaluating the psychological and technical drivers of digital adoption in provincial higher education. University of the Philippines Press.
- [64]. Garcia B., Chen L. (2024) Analytical and EZmock covariance validation for the DESI 2024 results. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2025(04), 055.
- [65]. Goli-Cruz, M. J. G. (2024). Perceptions of higher education faculty regarding the use of Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT) in education. *International Journal on Open and Distance e-Learning (IJODEL)*, 9(2), 73
- [66]. Gong, Y., & Kim, J. (2024). The expectation gap: How advanced awareness of AI capabilities influences user satisfaction in data-intensive research. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 4(2), 100–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijime.2024.100245>
- [67]. Hassan, A., Lee, S. Y., & Zain, M. (2024). Beyond the software: The role of proactive technical support in the sustained adoption of AI tools in Asian universities. *Asian Journal of Technology in Education*, 15(3), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajte.2024.100342>
- [68]. Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in education: Foundations, design, and ethical governance*. Routledge.
- [69]. Horn, S., Nara, I., & Hun, H. (2026). Artificial intelligence for improving research productivity and knowledge creation in higher education institutions: A nano review. *Journal of Agriculture and Environment*, 3(2), 50–52.

- [70]. Hsu, P. S., & Chen, Y. H. (2026). The ethics gateway: How awareness of data privacy policies predicts AI adoption among university faculty. *Journal of Business Ethics and Education*, 23(1), 45–63.
- [71]. Humble, N., & Mozelius, P. (2024). AI tutor-bots in higher education: Expanding the reach of student guidance. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 445–462.
- [72]. Hyland, K. (2026). *Digital signatures: The impact of AI on academic writing and disciplinary discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- [73]. Igbokwe, I. C. (2023). Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational management. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 13(3), 300–307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.03.2023.p13536>
- [74]. Jindal, R., & Borah, M. D. (2025). Educational analytics and predictive modeling: Enhancing student success initiatives. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*
- [75]. Johnson, A., Faber L., & Harris, P. (2024). The importance of institutional support for student satisfaction with AI services. *TechTrends*, 68(4), 456–467.
- [76]. Johnson, S., & Lee, M. (2023). Analyzing the factors influencing AI awareness among university students. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(1), 31–50.
- [77]. Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On the opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- [78]. Khosravi, H., Sadiq, S., & Gasevic, D. (2026). Scaffolding motivation: The role of AI-mediated platforms in sustained student engagement. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100115>
- [79]. Kim, S., Chen, J., Cheng, T., Gindulyte, A., He, J., He, S., ... & Bolton, E. E. (2023). PubChem 2023 update. *Nucleic acids research*, 51(D1), D1373–D1380.
- [80]. Klímová, B., & Pikhart, M. (2025). Exploring the effects of artificial intelligence on student and academic well-being in higher education: A mini review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1498132. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1498132>
- [81]. Kuzilwa, M. S., & Musabila, A. (2024). Electronic Resources Adoption by Academic Staff in Public Universities in Tanzania Using the Technology Acceptance Model. *The African Review*, 52(1-2), 217-230.
- [82]. Lagon, J. M., & Valenzuela, E. R. (2025). AI-integrated portals: Enhancing student affairs and advising in Metro Manila HEIs. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(2), 22–39.
- [83]. Aid.Lee, K., et al. (2024). Future of AI in higher education: Automated credentials and institutional efficiency. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72, 401–420.
- [84]. Legaspi, M. D., Cruz, E. S., & Tolentino, G. F. (2025). Digital safety nets: The impact of institutional support on the perceived reliability of AI among higher education faculty. *Journal of Southeast Asian Educational Research*, 19(3), 142–160.
- [85]. Li, Y., Castulo, N. J., & Xu, X. (2025). Embracing or rejecting AI? A mixed-method study on undergraduate students' perceptions of artificial intelligence at a private university in China. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1505856>
- [86]. Liu, Z., Zhang, W., & Yang, P. (2025). Can AI chatbots effectively improve EFL learners' learning effects?—A meta-analysis of empirical research from 2022–2024. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–27.
- [87]. Liu, T., Luo, Y. T., Pang, P. C. I., & Kan, H. Y. (2025). Exploring the impact of information and communication technology on educational administration: A systematic scoping review. *Education Sciences*, 15(9), 1114.
- [88]. Livanis, G., Tabiolo, R., & Wang, K. (2023). Status of AI for university research: Scientific production and data-driven decision making. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 9(3), 567–584.
- [89]. Loke, S. K., & Wong, J. (2026). Post-adoption constructs in educational AI: Why system quality outweighs usage frequency in determining faculty satisfaction. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Information Technology in Education*, 11(2), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/apjite.2025.110293>
- [90]. Luyten, L., Vrouwe, I., & Acican, Ö. (2025). Pedagogical analysis of construction workshops in architecture programs to teach structure and construction. *Architecture, Structures and Construction*, 5(1), 31.
- [91]. Macaraig, A. L., Cruz, P. B., & Tolentino, S. J. (2026). The AI-enhanced university: Measuring the accuracy-velocity balance in institutional task completion. *International Journal of Academic Productivity*, 8(2), 115–134.
- [92]. Madrigal, E. L., & Choy, S. H. (2026). The reliability frontier: Assessing the accuracy of generative AI in institutional administration and grading. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 54(1), 12–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395251203451>
- [93]. Magno, C., & Tapia, J. (2025). The AI adoption curve in NCR private universities: From lesson plans to assessment. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(1), 201–218.
- [94]. Makovholo L., Batyashe T., Sekgweleo, & Iyamu T., (2021). Operational Architecture Framework for Information Technology Solutions: Diffusion of Innovation Perspective. In *2021 IEEE/ACIS 20th International Fall Conference on Computer and Information Science (ICIS Fall)* (pp. 83-90). IEEE.
- [95]. Mariyono, J., & Nur Alif, M. (2025). The role of institutional frameworks in bridging the AI awareness–utilization gap among faculty members. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(2), 1543–1567.
- [96]. Mendez, J. C. (2024). Democratizing the digital classroom: AI-driven collaboration and interaction in

- Philippine higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Distance Education*, 12(2), 31–48.
- [97]. Mendez, J., & Kim, Y. (2025). Peer influences on the adoption of AI tools in academic collaborations. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 44(3), 542–559.
- [98]. Mercado, F. D. (2025). The utilitarian adoption: Deconstructing the quality-utilization gap in the digital transformation of Philippine higher education. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- [99]. Miano, L. C. (2025). Awareness on data privacy vis-à-vis data management practices at a state university in Quezon province: Input towards data-driven policy and manual for good governance. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(1), 302–315.
- [100]. Mojica, A. (2024). Institutionalizing AI: Policy-driven awareness and its impact on academic standards
- [101]. Nakamura, K., & Tan, H. L. (2026). Institutional intelligence: The role of agentic AI in strategic university governance and student engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 48(1), 56–74.
- [102]. Obenza, J., Macabanding, A., & Lacia, L. (2024). The impact of generative AI on the cognitive load and task completion of Filipino tertiary students. *Philippine Journal of Science and Technology in Education*, 12(2), 88–102.
- [103]. Ocampo, J. R. (2024). Precision education and predictive analytics: The role of educator awareness in student success outcomes. *Educational Technology & Society*, 27(2), 112–128. [https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202404_27\(2\).0008](https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202404_27(2).0008)
- [104]. Olanday, J. R. (2026). From troubleshooting to coaching: The evolution of institutional IT support in the age of artificial intelligence. *Philippine Review of Academic Infrastructure*, 8(1), 12–29.
- [105]. Ozfidan, B., et al. (2025). Implementing artificial intelligence in academic and administrative processes through responsible strategic leadership in higher education institutions. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1578451>
- [106]. Park C.M. Lee, J. H., Hong, H., Nam, G., & Hwang, E. J., (2023). Effect of human- AI interaction on detection of malignant lung nodules on chest radiographs. *Radiology*, 307(5), e222976.
- [107]. Pasipamire, N., Chigwada, J., & Maturure, R. (2025). Exploring the use and impact of artificial intelligence in higher education in Africa. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 7(3), 108–131. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202532046>
- [108]. Patel, N., Smith, T., & Enrico, J. (2023). Usability testing of AI tools in higher education: Implications for student satisfaction. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 34(2), 233–249.
- [109]. Peralta, J. M., Reyes, C. L., & Santos, D. R. (2025). Cognitive ease and user interface design: Assessing the impact of AI platforms on faculty self-efficacy. *Journal of Southeast Asian Educational Technology*, 21(3), 142–159.
- [110]. Perante, L. (2025). Utilization of artificial intelligence tools in engineering education among HEIs in the Philippines. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(1).
- [111]. Ramos, M. L., Garcia, J. P., & Sy, R. B. (2025). Beyond the awareness gap: Linking pedagogical utility to the utilization of AI support tools in higher education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, 18(4), 112–129.
- [112]. Redondo, M., & Paglinawan, R. (2025). Student perceptions of AI tools in academia: Utility and ethical concerns. *Studies in Higher Education*, 50(4), 325–342.
- [113]. Reyes, M. T., & Santiago, L. (2024). Sentiment analysis and student welfare: AI adoption in Philippine guidance offices. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 24(1), 58–73.
- [114]. Rivera, G., Cruz-Reyes, L., & Gómez Santillán, C. G. (2024). Editorial for Thematic Section: New Trends in Artificial Intelligence and its Applications. *Computación y Sistemas*, 28(3), 1483-1485.
- [115]. Russell H., & Norvig M., (2024) The quest for artificial intelligence in projects. *PM World Journal*, 11(3).
- [116]. Salcedo, L. M. (2024). The AI-ready educator: Mastery, advocacy, and the promotion of digital tools in institutional settings. *Educational Innovation Review*, 15(3), 210–225.
- [117]. Saleem, M., Amin, Z., Siddique, H., Javed, R., & Akbar, M. (2026). Social Support, AI Literacy, and Well-Being Among University Students. *Policy Journal of Social Science Review*, 4(1), 104-108.
- [118]. Saputra, A., Hooda, M., & Yadav, S. (2024). From rule-based to generative: A systematic review of AI integration in classroom instruction and writing skills. *Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 5(2), 981–994.
- [119]. Schoeffer, J., et al. (2023). New sources of inaccuracy? A conceptual framework for studying AI hallucinations. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*. <https://misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu/article/new-sources-of-inaccuracy-a-conceptual-framework-for-studying-ai-hallucinations/>
- [120]. Šević, Ž., Neumann, T., & Usher, L. (2025). Empirical findings on AI tool usage among students in higher education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 35(2), 147–162.
- [121]. Singh, H., Sharma, A., & Gupta, P. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Satisfaction and performance analysis of students. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 28(3), 889–910.
- [122]. Sitanggang, N. F., Pasaribu, G. M., Sihombing, G., Pinem, R. J., Sitingjak, C. M., Yana, E. Y., & Sipahutar, R. J. (2025). Artificial intelligence use and its effects on academic task quality and efficiency: A study in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Practice and Policy*, 3(1), 66–72.
- [123]. Soriano, F. A., & Lim, T. G. (2026). The consumerization of AI in academia: Trends in interface design and institutional satisfaction. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*

- in Education, 9(1), 22–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcie.2025.100412>
- [124]. Smith, R. L., & Lester, H. (2024, June). Navigating the AI Revolution in Engineering Management Education: Strategies for Detection, Integrity, and Pedagogical Enhancement. In 2024 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition.
- [125]. Suleman, et al. (2025). Exploring the effects of artificial intelligence on student and academic well-being in higher education: A mini-review. PubMed Central.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11830699/>
- [126]. Talan, T., & Kalinkara, Y. (2023). Diffusion of innovation: Faculty members' adoption of AI services in adaptive learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 26(3), 145–160.
- [127]. Tabiolo, J. L., Ricarte, M. C., & Estacio, R. D. (2024). Digital maturity and technology acceptance: A structural equation model of AI integration in Philippine provincial colleges. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education and Innovation*, 11(2), 15–34.
- [128]. Tan, K., & Hashimoto, R. (2024). Efficiency gains and professional burnout: A longitudinal study of AI adoption in Asian higher education. *Asian Review of Educational Technology*, 13(4), 210–228.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aret.2024.100289>
- [129]. Tan-Sotto, M. R. (2024). The functional hesitation: Assessing the gap between digital awareness and classroom utilization in provincial universities. University of the Philippines Press.
- [130]. Tenedero, R. P., & Benson, L. (2025). Reliance-based trust: A longitudinal study on faculty satisfaction with AI output fidelity in Southeast Asian universities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 163, 108–124.
- [131]. Thakur, S., & Lemke, C. (2025). Factors influencing student satisfaction with AI tools in higher education: A comparative study. *Journal of Educational Research*, 118(1), 67–80.
- [132]. Todorov, T., & Dochkova-Todorova, J. (2023). Accessible UX/UI design: Automated contrast and layout optimization using AI algorithms. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies (CompSysTech '23)* (pp. 88–95). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3606305.3606312>
- [133]. Thompson, H. A. (2025). Digital self-efficacy: The psychological and structural drivers of AI adoption in modern academia. Oxford University Press.
- [134]. UNESCO. (2025). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- [135]. Vakkuri, V., Halme, E., Jantunen, M., & Abrahamsson, P. (2023). Ethical AI in practice: A design science research approach to implementing ethics in AI development. Springer Nature.
- [136]. Valdez, A. B. (2025). Beyond awareness: The socio-technical drivers of satisfaction in digital transformation within Philippine higher education. University of the Philippines Press.
- [137]. Valerio, T. (2024). The precision mandate: Evaluating the accuracy and dependability of AI-driven research tools in Philippine academia. University of Santo Tomas Press.
- [138]. Vázquez Cano, E., Reyes Millán, M., & Vázquez Villegas, P. (2024). Using an adaptive learning tool to improve student performance and satisfaction in online and face-to-face education for a more personalized approach. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(6).
- [139]. Vázquez-Parra, J. C., Castillo-Martínez, I. M., Ramírez-Montoya, M. S., & Millán, A. (2024). Student utilization and perceptions of AI technology for academic purposes: A mixed-method analysis. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 234–250.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2340567>
- [140]. Venkatesh, V. (2022). Adoption and use of AI tools: a research agenda grounded in UTAUT. *Annals of operations research*, 308(1), 641–652.
- [141]. Ventayen, C. C. (2024, November). Empowering education through transformative role of artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and learning: educators' perspective and research trends. In 2024 9th International conference on information technology and digital applications (ICITDA) (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
- [142]. Villanueva, K. J. (2023). Bridging the distance: AI-powered chatbots in rural Philippine higher education. *Journal of Open and Distance Learning (Philippines)*, 15(3), 102–115.
- [143]. Wadhwa, R., Rabby, F., Bansal, R., & Hundekari, S. (2024). Drivers and Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Student Engagement. In *AI algorithms and ChatGPT for student engagement in online learning* (pp. 161-170). IGI Global.
- [144]. Wong, D., & Chen, L. (2022). The relationship between usability and student satisfaction with AI applications in education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 34(3), 399–416.
- [145]. Xing, W., & Jiang, R. (2024). Accuracy as a mediator of user satisfaction in AI driven chat systems for student support. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 27(2), 45
- [146]. Zhang X., et al. (2024). AI in career services: From resume parsing to interview simulation. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100185.