Available Online at www.ijcsmc.com

International Journal of Computer Science and Mobile Computing

A Monthly Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology

ISSN 2320–088X
IMPACT FACTOR: 7.056

IJCSMC, Vol. 15, Issue. 5, May 2026, pg.72 – 77

Perceptions and Readiness for Artificial Intelligence Integration in Higher Education: A Quantitative Descriptive Study at Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc.

Luzvim B. Perez[1]; Ross Ann Gill A. Gellegani[2]; Jerome J. Doria[3]; Kristine T. Soberano, Ph.D[4]

Masters in Information Technology Department, State University of Northern Negros, Philippines
[1] vimbahian@gmail.com; [2] gelleganirossanngillamora@gmail.com; [3] jeromejimenezdoria@gmail.com; [4] ksoberano@sunn.edu.ph

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47760/ijcsmc.2026.v15i05.008

Abstract: This study examined the perceptions and readiness for Artificial Intelligence (AI) integration in higher education at Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc. using a quantitative descriptive research design. A total of 120 respondents, composed of students and faculty members, participated in the study through a structured questionnaire. The instrument underwent expert validation, yielding a Scale-Content Validity Index (S-CVI) of 0.95, indicating excellent content validity, and demonstrated high reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.92. Descriptive statistics revealed that respondents exhibited a high level of perception regarding AI integration, particularly in terms of perceived benefits and conceptual understanding. However, readiness levels especially in technical and institutional aspects were only moderate. Inferential analysis showed that educational attainment and role significantly influenced readiness, while age and sex did not. The findings suggest that while awareness of AI is well established, practical readiness remains limited due to gaps in skills, infrastructure, and institutional support. The study concludes that institutional strategies such as training, curriculum integration, and policy development are necessary to enhance AI readiness in higher education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI Integration, Higher Education, Perception, Readiness, Educational Technology, Quantitative Descriptive Study

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence has become a transformative force in higher education, influencing instruction, assessment, academic support, and administrative efficiency. Recent studies show that universities are already experimenting with AI for personalized learning, administrative automation, and student support, but adoption remains uneven because of policy gaps, training deficits, and ethical concerns. For instance, Dwivedi, Yogesh K. et al. (2021) emphasized that AI technologies enhance organizational efficiency and competitive advantage. In the study of Metzgar. et al. (2025), is was stated that in one recent multi-country survey, students reported that they were using AI more quickly than institutions were able to support it, while faculty studies show a similar pattern of cautious adoption focused on low-risk tasks such as course preparation and administrative work.

Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc. is part of this broader transition. Students, faculty members, and staff may already be encountering AI tools in learning and administrative tasks, yet institutional readiness may vary depending on exposure, literacy, and policy clarity. A local study can help determine how prepared the academic community is, what benefits they recognize, and what risks they perceive before the institution commits to wider adoption.

This study examined the perceptions and readiness of respondents regarding AI integration in the institution. Specifically, it sought to determine the respondents' demographic profile, their level of awareness of AI integration, and whether significant differences existed in perceptions when grouped according to selected demographic variables.

This study seeks to answer the following questions: First, the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, academic role, educational attainment, and years of exposure to AI tools. Second, the level of perception and readiness of respondents regarding AI integration in higher education in terms of awareness of AI concepts, familiarity with AI tools, perceived usefulness, perceived challenges, and readiness for institutional adoption. Lastly is to determine if there's a significant difference in the respondents' perception and readiness when grouped according to the selected demographic variables.

II. METHODS

Research Design. The study employed a quantitative descriptive research design. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researchers to describe respondents' perceptions and readiness regarding AI integration without manipulating variables.

Research Locale. The study was conducted at Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc., a higher education institution where AI integration is relevant to instruction, academic support, and administrative efficiency.

Respondents. The respondents were anonymous members of the academic community, consisting of 120 participants: 78 students, 28 faculty members, and 14 staff members. No names were collected to protect confidentiality.

TABLE I
Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variable	Categories	f	%
Age	18–24	44	36.7
	25–34	38	31.7
	35 and above	38	31.6
Sex	Male	52	43.3
	Female	68	56.7
Academic Role	Student	78	65.0
	Faculty	28	23.3
	Staff	14	11.7
Educational Attainment	Undergraduate	54	45.0
	Graduate	66	55.0
Years of Exposure to AI Tools	Less than 1 year	27	22.5
	1–3 years	49	40.8
	4 years and above	44	36.7

Table I shows a sample skewed toward students and graduate-level respondents, which is useful when interpreting readiness for AI integration.

A. Research Instrument

The study used a structured questionnaire divided into two parts. The first part gathered demographic information. The second part measured perceptions and readiness for AI integration in higher education in terms of awareness, familiarity, usefulness, challenges, and institutional readiness. Responses were rated using a five-point Likert scale.

B. Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire was reviewed by three experts in educational technology, research methodology, and higher education administration to establish content validity. The resulting S-CVI was 0.95. A pilot test involving 30 respondents produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92, indicating high internal consistency.

TABLE II
Validity of the Instrument

Dimension	**I-CVI**	**Interpretation**
Clarity	0.96	Very Good
Relevance	0.94	Very Good
Simplicity	0.95	Very Good
Applicability	0.95	Very Good
S-CVI	**0.95**	**Excellent**

Table II shows that all indicators obtained very good to excellent validity ratings from the experts. The high I-CVI values indicate that the items were judged to be clear, relevant, simple, and applicable to the study of AI integration in higher education. The overall S-CVI of 0.95 suggests that the instrument is highly appropriate for measuring respondents' perceptions and readiness, and that the content of the questionnaire is well aligned with the objectives of the study.

TABLE III
Reliability of the Instrument

Scale	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Interpretation**
AI Awareness	0.90	High Reliability
AI Familiarity	0.91	High Reliability
Perceived Usefulness	0.93	High Reliability
Perceived Challenges	0.89	High Reliability
Institutional Readiness	0.94	High Reliability
Overall	**0.92**	**High Reliability**

Table III shows that the questionnaire obtained high reliability across all subscales, with an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.92. This indicates that the items consistently measure the same underlying construct and that the instrument produces stable and dependable responses. The high internal consistency strengthens the credibility of the data gathered, making the questionnaire suitable for the main survey.

C. Data Gathering Procedure

Permission was secured from the appropriate institutional authorities before data collection. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the anonymity of their responses. The questionnaire was then distributed, collected, encoded, and prepared for statistical treatment.

D. Statistical Treatment

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic profile. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of perception and readiness. Independent t-test was used for sex. One-way ANOVA was used for age, academic role, educational attainment, and years of exposure to AI tools. Tukey post hoc analysis was applied when ANOVA results were significant.

TABLE IV
Statistical Treatment of the Data

Statistical Tool	Purpose
Frequency and Percentage	To describe the demographic profile of the respondents
Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation	To determine the level of perception and readiness for AI integration
Independent t-test	To test for significant differences according to sex
One-Way ANOVA	To test for significant differences according to age, academic role, educational attainment, and years of exposure to AI tools
Tukey Post Hoc Test	To identify which specific groups differ when ANOVA is significant

Table IV presents the statistical tools used in analyzing the data. Frequency and percentage were applied to summarize the respondents' demographic profile, while weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the overall level of perception and readiness toward AI integration. Inferential tests such as the t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to determine whether significant differences existed when the respondents were grouped according to selected variables. When ANOVA results were significant, Tukey post hoc analysis was used to identify the specific groups that differed. This set of statistical tools ensures that the study's findings are both descriptive and inferential, allowing a clearer interpretation of patterns in the respondents' perceptions and readiness.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results showed that respondents generally had favorable perceptions of AI integration in higher education. Most respondents recognized that AI can support teaching preparation, learning assistance, information organization, and administrative efficiency. AI was commonly viewed as useful for saving time, improving access to learning resources, and supporting academic productivity.

At the same time, respondents expressed concern about potential misuse of AI, especially in relation to academic dishonesty, overreliance on generated content, privacy risks, and inaccurate outputs. Some respondents also indicated that they were not fully confident about how AI should be used appropriately in academic tasks.

TABLE V
Level of Perception and Readiness for AI Integration

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Awareness of AI concepts	4.24	Very High
Familiarity with AI tools	3.88	High
Perceived usefulness	4.31	Very High
Perceived challenges	4.02	High
Readiness for institutional adoption	4.15	High
Overall Mean	**4.12**	**High**

Table V shows education. The highest rating was observed in perceived usefulness, which suggests that respondents recognize AI as a practical support tool for teaching, learning, and administrative tasks. Familiarity with AI tools received a slightly lower mean than the other indicators, which indicates that while respondents are aware of AI's value, they may still need more hands-on exposure and training to use it confidently and effectively.

TABLE VI
Test of Significant Difference in Perception and Readiness

Grouping Variable	Test Used	Computed Value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	ANOVA	1.12	0.34	Fail to Reject H_0	Not significant
Sex	t-test	0.88	0.38	Fail to Reject H_0	Not significant
Academic Role	ANOVA	2.06	0.13	Fail to Reject H_0	Not significant
Educational Attainment	ANOVA	4.91	0.009	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Exposure to AI Tools	ANOVA	5.44	0.005	Reject H_0	Significant

Table VI indicates that educational attainment and years of exposure to AI tools produced significant differences in perception and readiness, while age, sex, and academic role did not. This suggests that respondents who are more educated and more familiar with AI tools are also more prepared to integrate AI into academic work. The result implies that exposure and educational background matter more than basic

demographic factors when it comes to AI readiness. It also supports the need for targeted training and institutional orientation, especially for respondents with limited experience in using AI.

The findings suggest that educational attainment and years of exposure to AI tools significantly influenced perception and readiness for AI integration. Age, sex, and academic role did not show significant differences and it also suggest that AI integration in higher education is viewed positively by the academic community at Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc., but support structures are still needed. Respondents recognized the practical value of AI in instructional preparation, academic support, and administrative tasks, which matches recent literature showing that higher education stakeholders often see AI first as a productivity and support tool.

However, favorable perception does not automatically translate into responsible use. Recent studies on student and faculty perceptions repeatedly note academic integrity, privacy, bias, and overreliance as major concerns. Metzgar. et al. (2025). For that reason, AI integration must be accompanied by rules on acceptable use, disclosure, privacy, and accountability.

The responses also show that training is essential. A higher education institution cannot rely only on access to tools; it must build competence in evaluating, using, and supervising AI-supported tasks. Faculty members need guidance on assessment design, while students need instruction on the ethical and critical use of AI in learning and research. Recent instrument-development papers also support the need for valid tools to measure readiness, literacy, and impact systematically.

Institutional readiness, therefore, depends on more than technology. It depends on policy clarity, digital literacy, and a shared understanding of what AI is for in the academic environment. If these are addressed, AI can become a support for teaching and learning rather than a source of confusion or misconduct.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study assessed the perceptions and readiness for artificial intelligence (AI) integration in higher education at Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias, Inc. Results indicate that respondents exhibit a high level of perception, particularly in awareness and perceived usefulness, suggesting strong recognition of AI's value in teaching, learning, and administrative functions. However, readiness remains moderate, reflecting limitations in technical competence, institutional support, and structured implementation.

Findings further reveal that educational attainment and years of AI exposure significantly influence readiness, whereas age, sex, and academic role do not. This implies that AI readiness is primarily shaped by experience and knowledge rather than demographic factors. Despite favorable perceptions, the gap between awareness and practical capability highlights the need for institutional intervention.

To address these gaps, the following are recommended:

1. Implement structured AI training programs for students, faculty, and staff focusing on practical skills and ethical use.
2. Integrate AI concepts into the curriculum to strengthen both theoretical knowledge and applied competencies.
3. Develop clear institutional AI policies and guidelines covering academic integrity, data privacy, and responsible usage.
4. Enhance technological infrastructure, including access to AI tools and reliable digital resources.
5. Provide targeted support for users with limited AI exposure through beginner-focused training and continuous assistance.
6. Strengthen faculty development programs on AI-assisted teaching, learning strategies, and assessment design.
7. Establish continuous monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess AI adoption and institutional readiness.
8. Encourage further research using broader samples and mixed-method approaches to deepen understanding of AI integration in higher education.

REFERENCES

[1]. Al-Ali, M., Marks, A., Umirzokov, J., & Metawa, N. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in higher education: Opportunities and challenges*. Iraqi Journal for Computer Science and Mathematics.

[2]. Asirit, L. B. L., & Hua, J. H. (2023). *Converging perspectives: Assessing AI readiness and utilization in Philippine higher education.* Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends, 2(3).

[3]. Bazgan, M. (2025). *Education in the era of artificial intelligence: Benefits, challenges, and perspectives.* Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brașov: Series VII: Social Sciences, Law.

[4]. Benayoune, A., Slimi, Z., & Al Habsi, A. (2026). *Artificial intelligence policy challenges and institutional readiness in Omani higher education.* Discover Education.

[5]. Biagini, G., Cuomo, S., & Ranieri, M. (2023). *Developing and validating a multidimensional AI literacy questionnaire: Operationalizing AI literacy for higher education.* AIxEDU@AIIA*.

[6]. Capinding, A. T. (2024). *Development and validation of instruments for assessing the impact of artificial intelligence on students in higher education.* International Journal of Educational Methodology.

[7]. George-Reyes, C. E., López-Caudana, E., & Avello-Martínez, R. (2025). *Artificial intelligence adoption test based on UTAUT2 and complex thinking: Design with K coefficient and reliability analysis using structural equation modeling.* Cogent Education.

[8]. Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R. A., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). *The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments.* Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence.

[9]. Jiménez-Perona, M., Fernández-Jiménez, M.-Á., Pareja-de-Vicente, D., & Leiva-Olivencia, J. (2025). *Evaluation of the impact of the use of generative artificial intelligence in higher education: EPGAI-ES scale.* Journal of Technology and Science Education.

[10]. Khan, N. A., Ahmad, M., Akhtar, M., Rajeyyagari, S., & Siddiqi, A. M. U. (2025). *Transformative impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: A comprehensive analysis of pedagogical innovation, institutional transformation, and future learning ecosystems.* Asian Journal of Applied Science and Technology.

[11]. Lund, B. D., Mannuru, N. R., Teel, Z. A., Lee, T. H., Ortega, N. J., Simmons, S., & Ward, E. (2025). *Student perceptions of AI-assisted writing and academic integrity: Ethical concerns, academic misconduct, and use of generative AI in higher education.* AI in Education, 1(1), 2.

[12]. Musawa, I. H., Almalik, R. A., & Khan, R. M. (2024). *Artificial intelligence adoption in education: A study on attitudes, readiness, and intention.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management.

[13]. Patricio, D., Broqueza, E. W., Molacruz, A., & Oliveros, J. R. (2025). *Teachers' readiness in integrating AI into classroom instruction.* Teachers' Readiness in Integrating AI into Classroom Instruction.

[14]. Plecerda, L. P. (2024). *Academic integrity surrounding the use of generative AI in higher education: Lenses from ICT college students.* Environment and Social Psychology.

[15]. Savu, S., Pires, I., Klobčar, D., Dávíd, A., Casalino, G., Gonzalez Sanchez, M., Putz, L.-M., Stoica, M. S., & Ashonibare, A. (2025). *Perception and adoption of artificial intelligence in technical higher education.* SUDURA.

[16]. Smolansky, A., Cram, A., Raduescu, C., Zeivots, S., Huber, E., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2023). *Educator and student perspectives on the impact of generative AI on assessments in higher education.* ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale.

