Teachers' Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence Readiness for Curriculum Integration in Basic Education

Adonis Don G. Oplo[1], Kruzette Jane M. Bual[2], Dohly V. Bucarile[3], Maricel M. Evilla[4], Kyla Bianca M. Ajos[5]

[1,2,3,4]Department of Education, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Philippines

[5]Saint Thomas Aquinas Mentoring Center, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.68050/JAMS.2026.504

Received: 16 Sept 2026; Accepted: 17 Sept 2026; Published: 22 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly influencing curriculum planning, classroom instruction, and assessment, making teacher readiness critical to meaningful integration in basic education. This study explored teachers' perceptions and experiences of AI readiness for curriculum integration and identified emerging themes that could inform effective AI-supported educational practices. Using a qualitative basic interpretive research design, the study involved 15 licensed basic education teachers from the San Miguel, Tandag, and Tago Districts, Surigao del Sur, selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered through individual semi-structured interviews and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework served as a sensitizing lens for interpreting the technological and pedagogical dimensions, while ethical and institutional factors emerged from participants' accounts and relevant interview prompts. Findings revealed that teachers perceived AI readiness as a developing and multidimensional process encompassing technological, pedagogical, ethical, and institutional factors. AI supported lesson preparation, differentiated and engaging instruction, assessment development, feedback, and teaching efficiency. However, participants identified challenges involving technological access, teacher competency, accuracy and verification of AI-generated content, data privacy, academic integrity, student misuse, and overreliance on AI. They further emphasized the need for sustained professional development, adequate infrastructure, technical assistance, and clear institutional policies for responsible AI use. The study concludes that AI readiness extends beyond technology acceptance or digital competence and requires teachers' capacity to use AI critically, pedagogically, ethically, and responsibly within supportive institutional conditions.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, AI readiness, basic education, curriculum integration, teacher perceptions, TPACK, qualitative research

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become an increasingly influential innovation in education, reshaping how teachers plan lessons, deliver instruction, assess learning, and engage students. As generative AI applications, intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, and automated assessment tools become more accessible, teachers are increasingly expected to consider how these technologies can be meaningfully integrated into the curriculum. However, effective AI integration requires more than access to technological tools. Teachers need appropriate knowledge, confidence, pedagogical competence, ethical awareness, and institutional support to use AI responsibly and effectively. This study therefore explored basic education teachers' perceptions and experiences regarding their readiness to integrate AI into curriculum planning, classroom instruction, and assessment.

Existing literature suggests that AI can support personalized learning, assessment, feedback, and curriculum delivery (Holmes et al., 2022; UNESCO, 2023). Mishra and Koehler's (2006) Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework emphasizes that meaningful technology integration requires the

coordinated use of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. In the present study, AI readiness was conceptualized through four interrelated factors evident in the literature and study objectives: technological factors, referring to teachers' AI knowledge, skills, access, and ability to evaluate AI outputs; pedagogical factors, referring to the purposeful alignment of AI with curriculum planning, instruction, assessment, learner needs, and content requirements; ethical factors, referring to accuracy, fairness, privacy, academic integrity, transparency, and responsible use; and institutional factors, referring to infrastructure, professional development, technical assistance, school policies, and leadership support. AI readiness was therefore defined as teachers' perceived preparedness to use AI purposefully, critically, ethically, and pedagogically within the institutional conditions of basic education. This differs from technology acceptance, which concerns willingness or intention to adopt technology; digital competence, which broadly concerns knowledge and skills for using digital technologies; and actual classroom integration, which refers to observable use in practice. Dela Cerna (2026), although focused on inclusive leadership communication rather than AI, was retained only as contextual literature because it illustrates how educational practices are shaped by context-bound experiences and institutional conditions; it was not used as evidence of AI readiness or as an operative framework for the analysis.

Despite growing interest in artificial intelligence in education, limited qualitative evidence explains how basic education teachers themselves perceive and make sense of their readiness to integrate AI into curriculum implementation. Much of the existing literature has focused on technology acceptance, digital competence, or measurable levels of readiness, which may not fully explain teachers' experiences, concerns, and perceived needs in actual classroom contexts. Research has also frequently concentrated on higher education or technologically advanced settings, leaving a need for context-specific inquiry in basic education environments where access to infrastructure, professional development, institutional guidance, and AI experience may vary. This gap supports the use of qualitative inquiry to understand how teachers interpret their readiness for AI-supported curriculum planning, instruction, and assessment.

This study is significant because it provides context-specific insights into teachers' perceptions of AI readiness for curriculum integration in basic education. The emerging themes may help school leaders, curriculum developers, policymakers, and teacher education institutions identify appropriate professional development, technological support, institutional policies, and curriculum guidance for responsible AI integration. The study may also contribute to the growing literature on artificial intelligence in education by presenting teachers' perspectives on the opportunities, challenges, and support conditions associated with AI-supported teaching and learning, while providing a basis for future research on AI readiness and curriculum innovation.

Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to explore teachers' perceptions of artificial intelligence readiness for curriculum integration in basic education.

Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. explore teachers' perceptions and experiences regarding their readiness to integrate artificial intelligence into curriculum planning, instruction, and assessment.
2. identify the emerging themes from teachers' perceptions that can inform the development of recommendations for effective artificial intelligence-supported curriculum integration in basic education.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative basic interpretive research design, also referred to as a generic qualitative inquiry, to explore teachers' perceptions of artificial intelligence (AI) readiness for curriculum integration in basic education. Basic interpretive qualitative research seeks to understand how individuals make sense of their experiences and interpret phenomena within their natural contexts (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This

design was appropriate because the study sought to describe and interpret teachers' perceived preparedness, experiences, concerns, and support needs rather than measure readiness statistically, determine technology acceptance, or generate a formal theory.

According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), basic qualitative research focuses on how individuals interpret their experiences and construct meaning from them, while Patton (2015) emphasizes the value of open-ended inquiry for obtaining rich accounts of participants' perspectives. TPACK (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) was used as a sensitizing conceptual framework specifically for the technological and pedagogical dimensions of AI readiness. It shaped the interview questions on teachers' AI knowledge and skills, lesson and curriculum planning, classroom instruction, assessment, curriculum/content alignment, and adaptation to learner needs. Ethical and institutional factors were not treated as TPACK constructs; these were examined through separate prompts informed by the study objectives and UNESCO's (2023) guidance on responsible AI use. During analysis, TPACK helped the researchers interpret how technological capability interacted with pedagogical and curriculum decisions, while ethical and institutional factors were retained as inductively developed dimensions when supported by participants' accounts. Thus, TPACK informed the inquiry without serving as a rigid or exhaustive coding template.

Data were gathered through individual semi-structured interviews using a researcher-developed interview guide. Open-ended questions allowed participants to describe their perceptions and experiences in their own words, while probes elicited examples and clarification concerning AI use in planning, instruction, assessment, opportunities, challenges, and support needs. Interviews were audio-recorded with consent and transcribed verbatim. The data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis through six recursive phases: familiarization with the transcripts, generation of initial codes, searching for candidate themes, reviewing themes against the coded extracts and full data set, defining and naming themes, and producing the analytic account. Coding remained primarily inductive and semantic, with attention to both recurring patterns and meaningful differences across participants.

Research Participants

The final sample consisted of 15 licensed basic education teachers from the San Miguel, Tandag, and Tago Districts, Surigao del Sur, who were selected through purposive sampling. Eligible participants were currently teaching at the elementary or secondary level, had at least two years of teaching experience, and had prior awareness, exposure, or experience using AI tools for teaching-related tasks such as lesson preparation, instruction, or assessment. Pre-service teachers, non-teaching administrators, teachers with less than two years of experience, and teachers without prior awareness or exposure to AI in educational settings were excluded. After permission from the appropriate school authorities was obtained, eligible teachers were invited to participate voluntarily and were enrolled after providing informed consent. The sample was intended to provide variation in teaching experience and school contexts while retaining direct relevance to the phenomenon under study. Consistent with Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006), data adequacy was judged through saturation: interviewing continued while new information relevant to the research objectives was still emerging and was concluded when successive interviews no longer produced substantively new codes or themes. Thus, the final sample size was determined by both the purposive inclusion criteria and the adequacy of the information generated, rather than by statistical representativeness.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide as the primary data-gathering instrument. The guide was organized around the two research objectives and the study's operational meaning of AI readiness. Questions examined teachers' perceived knowledge, skills, confidence, practical AI experience, critical and ethical judgment, and perceived institutional and technological support in relation to curriculum planning, classroom instruction, and assessment. Additional questions explored perceived opportunities, challenges, support needs, and recommendations for effective AI-supported curriculum integration.

The development of the interview guide was informed by Mishra and Koehler's (2006) TPACK framework and UNESCO's (2023) Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. TPACK directly shaped questions on technological factors (AI familiarity, knowledge, skills, confidence, and use of AI tools) and pedagogical factors (lesson planning, classroom instruction, assessment, curriculum alignment, and adaptation to learner needs). Separate questions and probes addressed ethical factors, including accuracy, privacy, academic integrity, student misuse, and responsible use, and institutional factors, including internet connectivity, device access, professional development, technical support, school policies, and leadership support. Losdo and Dela Cerna (2026) further provided an empirical basis for examining digital competence, curriculum integration, assessment practices, professional development, and institutional support. The four-factor organization ensured that the interview guide examined AI readiness comprehensively, while the open-ended format allowed unanticipated issues and themes to emerge from participants' accounts.

The guide consisted of open-ended core questions and optional probes. The probes were used flexibly to clarify responses, request concrete examples, and deepen discussion without requiring identical wording or sequencing for every participant. Before administration, the instrument was reviewed by experts for clarity, relevance, comprehensiveness, neutrality, and alignment with the research objectives, and revisions were incorporated into the final interview guide.

Data Collection

Data collection began after formal institutional approval was obtained. Potential participants who met the inclusion criteria were identified through purposive recruitment in the selected districts, informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, and invited to participate voluntarily. After informed consent was secured, individual face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted at mutually convenient times and locations. The interviewer followed the core guide while using probes when clarification or elaboration was needed. With explicit permission, interviews were audio-recorded to preserve the accuracy and completeness of participants' accounts.

Each recording was transcribed verbatim and checked against the audio before analysis. Participants were given an opportunity to review the accuracy of their interview accounts through member checking. Data collection and preliminary analysis proceeded iteratively so that emerging issues could be examined across interviews. Interviewing continued until the study's criterion for thematic saturation was met, after which the verified transcripts were organized for formal thematic analysis.

Data Analysis

The interview transcripts were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis. First, the researchers familiarized themselves with the data through repeated reading of the verified transcripts. Second, meaningful segments related to the research objectives were assigned initial semantic codes. Third, related codes were compared and grouped into broader categories, from which candidate themes were developed. Fourth, the candidate themes were reviewed against both the coded excerpts and the complete data set. Fifth, the themes were refined, defined, and named according to their central meanings. Finally, the themes were organized into an analytic narrative following the sequence of the two research objectives and supported with representative anonymized quotations. Coding was primarily inductive. TPACK was used only to sensitize interpretation of technological and pedagogical interactions, while ethical and institutional factors were analyzed from participants' accounts and the relevant interview prompts rather than imposed as TPACK categories. A coding matrix documented the progression from meaning units to initial codes, categories, the four readiness factors, and final themes, preserving an audit trail between evidence and interpretation.

Trustworthiness of the Findings

Credibility and analytic transparency were strengthened through several procedures. Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim and checked against the original recordings, and participants were given an opportunity to verify the accuracy of their interview accounts through member checking. During analysis, codes and themes were repeatedly compared with the original transcripts to ensure that interpretations remained grounded in

participants' responses. Representative quotations were retained in the Results and Discussion to show the evidentiary basis of the themes. Data collection and preliminary analysis proceeded iteratively, and data sufficiency was judged through thematic saturation, defined in this study as the point at which successive interviews no longer yielded substantively new codes, categories, or themes relevant to the research objectives. The coding matrix served as an audit trail of key analytic decisions.

Ethical Considerations

The research strictly adheres to institutional ethical guidelines and the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012 to ensure the highest standards of integrity. Participation is entirely voluntary, and participants are provided with informed consent, retaining the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. To protect participant privacy and maintain confidentiality, all research data are stored securely. Furthermore, all identifying information is removed in final reports and publications, where pseudonyms or unique codes are used to guarantee complete anonymity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The interview data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis to understand how basic education teachers perceived and interpreted their readiness to integrate AI into curriculum planning, classroom instruction, and assessment. The researchers first became familiar with the transcripts through repeated reading, then generated initial codes from meaningful segments of participants' accounts. Related codes were clustered into categories and candidate themes, which were reviewed against both the coded extracts and the complete data set, refined, defined, and named before the final analytic narrative was developed. The analysis was primarily inductive; TPACK functioned as a sensitizing lens during interpretation by drawing attention to the interaction of technological capability, pedagogy, and curriculum/content decisions, but themes were retained only when supported by participant data. The findings are presented in the sequence of the two research objectives, with representative quotations used to distinguish participants' accounts from the researchers' interpretations.

Objective 1. Teachers' Perceptions and Experiences Regarding Readiness to Integrate AI into Curriculum Planning, Instruction, and Assessment

Analysis of the participants' responses showed that AI readiness was not perceived simply as willingness to adopt AI, general digital competence, or the frequency of AI use in the classroom. Rather, participants described readiness as perceived preparedness to use AI purposefully and responsibly across curriculum planning, instruction, and assessment. Their accounts reflected four interrelated factors: technological factors (AI familiarity, skills, confidence, access, and output verification), pedagogical factors (planning, instruction, assessment, curriculum alignment, and learner responsiveness), ethical factors (accuracy, fairness, privacy, academic integrity, and responsible use), and institutional factors (infrastructure, training, technical assistance, policies, and leadership support). These factors intersected across the data and were synthesized into three overarching themes: (1) Developing Readiness Through Practical AI Use, (2) AI as Pedagogical Support Across Curriculum Processes, and (3) Human Judgment and Institutional Conditions as Essential Components of Readiness.

Table 1. Emerging Themes on Teachers' AI Readiness for Curriculum Integration

Overarching Theme	Primary Readiness Factors	Indicative Codes
1. Developing Readiness Through Practical AI Use	Technological	AI familiarity, skills, confidence, prompt writing, repeated use, output verification, continuous learning
2. AI as Pedagogical Support Across Curriculum Processes	Pedagogical	lesson preparation, curriculum alignment, differentiated activities, instruction, quizzes, rubrics, feedback

3. Human Judgment and Institutional Conditions as Essential Components of Readiness	Ethical and Institutional	accuracy, fairness, privacy, academic integrity, responsible use, internet, devices, training, policies, technical support

Theme 1. Developing Readiness Through Practical AI Use

Participants described different levels of experience with AI. Some had incorporated AI into their regular teaching routines, whereas others had only recently begun exploring the technology. For example, P01 reported using AI for basic tasks such as drafting lesson plans and generating ideas, while P05 stated, "I use AI almost every day, especially in preparing my lessons, since it gives me more ideas, activities, and assessments that help me plan every day." P06 had begun exploring AI only two months earlier, while P14 described the current school year as the first year of regular AI use. These responses demonstrated that teachers entered AI-supported curriculum integration with varying degrees of exposure and experience.

Despite these differences, readiness generally developed through actual use. Teachers who had become familiar with AI expressed greater confidence but did not necessarily regard themselves as completely prepared. P03 stated, "I feel fairly able to use AI in planning lessons. However, I still need to learn more about using it effectively and responsibly." Similarly, P11 described being somewhat ready but identified the need for further training in appropriate prompting and verification of AI-generated information. P13 likewise reported confidence in generating ideas and drafting Daily Lesson Logs but continued to double-check outputs for accuracy and alignment with the MELCs.

Taken as participant evidence, these accounts showed that readiness developed through practical exposure while remaining incomplete and open to further learning. The researchers interpreted this pattern as a technological dimension of readiness: familiarity and confidence mattered, but so did the ability to prompt effectively, verify outputs, and recognize one's own learning needs. Readiness was therefore developmental rather than absolute and could not be reduced to simple access to or use of AI applications.

Theme 2. AI as Pedagogical Support Across Curriculum Processes

A second major theme concerned the practical contribution of AI across curriculum planning, classroom instruction, and assessment. Participants described AI as a supportive tool that made several teaching processes faster, more varied, and more responsive to learners.

Curriculum Planning

In curriculum planning, teachers primarily used AI for lesson preparation, idea generation, instructional materials, examples, activities, and assessment tasks. P01 explained, "I feel moderately ready. AI helps me save time when planning lessons and materials, although I still carefully review all generated content." P12 similarly reported using Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, Gemini, and Grammarly to generate ideas and learning materials and improve work efficiency.

The findings indicated that AI supported planning primarily by reducing preparation demands and broadening teachers' access to possible instructional ideas. However, participants did not equate faster preparation with automatic curriculum appropriateness. Verification and alignment with curriculum competencies remained necessary.

Classroom Instruction

Participants also perceived AI as useful for making classroom instruction more understandable, engaging, and differentiated. They reported using AI to generate explanations, real-life examples, passages, interactive activities, worksheets, and materials suited to learners' abilities and interests. P01 stated, "I use AI to generate real-life examples, create different passages, and develop interactive learning activities during my classes." P03 explained that AI made lessons more interesting and easier for pupils to understand.

> "AI has helped me create differentiated activities faster. One memorable experience was using ChatGPT to generate story problems in Math that matched my students' interests, like basketball. Students responded positively because the examples felt more relatable. It made the lesson more engaging." (P13)

This response illustrated how teachers used AI not simply to generate content but to contextualize learning materials according to students' interests. Nevertheless, participants emphasized that teacher guidance remained necessary. AI was viewed as a supplementary instructional resource rather than an independent instructor, with teachers retaining responsibility for contextualizing, evaluating, and adapting generated materials.

Assessment

AI was similarly perceived as useful in developing quizzes, worksheets, questions, rubrics, performance tasks, and feedback. P12 reported using AI to create assessment tasks aligned with learning objectives and to generate timely feedback, while P05 described AI as useful for creating assessment materials more quickly.

However, efficiency was consistently accompanied by caution. P01 stated, "AI is very useful for generating practice tests and rubrics. Manual review is always necessary to ensure fair grading." P03 likewise emphasized that teachers should still check AI-generated materials and exercise their own judgment in evaluating pupils.

The participant evidence therefore positioned AI as an assessment-support tool rather than an autonomous assessment mechanism. The researchers interpreted this as a pedagogical dimension of readiness because teachers retained responsibility for alignment, accuracy, fairness, appropriateness, and professional judgment. The ability to generate assessment materials was meaningful only when accompanied by the capacity to evaluate and adapt those materials to learning objectives and learner needs.

Theme 3. Human Judgment and Institutional Conditions as Essential Components of Readiness

Participants repeatedly described AI readiness as extending beyond technological competence. Their responses identified knowledge, skills, confidence, critical evaluation, ethical judgment, infrastructure, training, and institutional guidance as interconnected conditions for meaningful AI integration.

P01 summarized this position by stating, "AI readiness is not just about technical skills. It requires a supportive school environment, continuous professional development, and strong ethical guidance." P11 similarly associated readiness with reliable technology, internet connectivity, training, willingness to learn, and previous technology experience.

The participant evidence indicated that readiness operated beyond individual technical capability. The researchers interpreted the concerns about verification, fairness, privacy, and responsible use as an ethical dimension, while references to reliable internet, devices, professional development, technical assistance, clear policies, and school support represented an institutional dimension. Together with the technological and pedagogical dimensions described above, these findings supported a four-factor understanding of AI readiness grounded in participants' accounts.

Objective 2. Emerging Themes Informing Recommendations for Effective AI-Supported Curriculum Integration

The second objective sought to identify emerging themes from teachers' perceptions that could inform recommendations for effective AI-supported curriculum integration. Analysis of participants' accounts concerning opportunities, challenges, needed support, and recommendations generated three interconnected themes: (1) Pedagogical Opportunities of AI, (2) Technological, Ethical, and Competency Challenges, and (3) Need for Systemic and Sustained Support.

Table 2. Emerging Themes Informing Effective AI-Supported Curriculum Integration

Overarching Theme	Categories	Indicative Codes
1. Pedagogical Opportunities of AI	Teaching efficiency; personalization and differentiation; engagement	faster preparation, resource generation, remediation, enrichment, learner-specific materials, interactive activities
2. Technological, Ethical, and Competency Challenges	Access barriers; reliability and ethics; overreliance	unstable internet, limited devices, paid tools, inaccurate information, privacy, plagiarism, bias, student misuse
3. Need for Systemic and Sustained Support	Professional development; infrastructure; policy and curriculum support	hands-on training, prompting, assessment training, technical support, AI guidelines, curriculum revision, AI literacy

Theme 1. Pedagogical Opportunities of AI

Participants identified efficiency, personalization, differentiation, and engagement as major opportunities for AI-supported curriculum integration. AI reduced the time required to develop lessons and instructional resources and enabled teachers to generate multiple examples, activities, worksheets, quizzes, and materials.

A representative account came from P13, who explained, "AI has helped me create differentiated activities faster. One memorable experience was using ChatGPT to generate story problems in Math that matched my students' interests, like basketball. Students responded positively because the examples felt more relatable. It made the lesson more engaging." This quotation illustrates the pedagogical opportunity participants associated with AI: greater efficiency in producing learner-responsive and differentiated materials. P03 similarly described AI as useful for personalized activities and varied explanations, while P05 emphasized engagement, personalization, and accessibility.

These accounts suggested that participants valued AI most when it responded to practical instructional demands. AI was perceived as creating opportunities not only for efficiency but also for differentiated and learner-responsive teaching.

Theme 2. Technological, Ethical, and Competency Challenges

Despite recognizing these opportunities, participants identified significant barriers to sustainable AI integration. These included unstable internet connectivity, limited devices, costs associated with AI tools, insufficient teacher competency, inaccurate AI-generated information, privacy concerns, plagiarism, bias, student misuse, and learner overdependence.

P13 described the problem directly: "The main challenges are unstable internet connectivity, limited devices for students, and teacher competency. There are also ethical issues, such as students misusing AI to do their homework, and concerns about data privacy." P06 additionally emphasized the lack of clear ethical policies, potential loss of critical-thinking skills through overreliance, privacy and safety concerns, and the need to verify AI-generated content.

These findings demonstrated that barriers to AI integration were not exclusively technical. They involved an interaction among infrastructure, teacher competence, information reliability, ethics, and learner behavior. The participants' concerns regarding critical thinking further indicated that successful AI integration could not be judged solely by the frequency of technology use.

Theme 3. Need for Systemic and Sustained Support

Participants' responses concerning support and recommendations converged around continuous professional

development, adequate infrastructure, clear institutional policies, technical assistance, collaboration, and curriculum guidance.

> "For us to be prepared for AI, the support we need is continuous professional development and hands-on training. The training should not only explain what AI is, but should also demonstrate how to use AI for lesson planning, instruction, assessment, and differentiated learning." (P11)

P03 similarly identified proper training, reliable internet, devices, clear guidelines, technical support, and sharing of best practices as necessary forms of support. P12 emphasized continuous professional development for developing teachers' knowledge, skills, and confidence, while identifying infrastructure as a critical requirement.

Participants consequently recommended that schools and educational leaders institutionalize AI-related professional development and develop clear policies for responsible use. The convergence of these responses indicated that effective AI-supported curriculum integration required a whole-school approach. Teacher readiness could not be developed solely through individual initiative; schools and educational authorities also needed to establish enabling conditions through professional learning, infrastructure, technical assistance, ethical safeguards, and curriculum guidance.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that teachers perceived AI readiness for curriculum integration as a developing and multidimensional process comprising four interrelated factors: technological, pedagogical, ethical, and institutional. Technological readiness involved AI knowledge, skills, confidence, access, and critical verification of outputs; pedagogical readiness involved purposeful use of AI in curriculum planning, instruction, assessment, alignment, and differentiation; ethical readiness involved accuracy, fairness, privacy, academic integrity, and responsible use; and institutional readiness involved infrastructure, professional development, technical assistance, policies, and leadership support. AI was viewed as a supportive tool for improving efficiency and enriching teaching and assessment, but effective integration depended on teachers' continued professional judgment and on enabling school conditions. Thus, AI readiness extended beyond technology acceptance or digital competence to teachers' perceived capacity to use AI critically, ethically, pedagogically, and responsibly in context.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, schools and educational leaders should provide continuous and practical AI training, adequate technological resources, reliable internet connectivity, technical assistance, and clear guidelines for the ethical and responsible use of AI. Teachers should continuously strengthen their AI competencies and carefully verify and contextualize AI-generated materials before using them in planning, instruction, and assessment. Schools should also promote collaboration and sharing of effective AI practices among teachers. Future researchers may examine AI readiness in other educational settings and further investigate areas such as AI-supported assessment, professional development, ethical AI use, and equitable access to technology.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2006, pp. 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
2. Dela Cerna, Maria Cristina S. "Language Message Patterns and Positive Behaviors of Academic Leaders towards Inclusive Education." *International Journal of Special Education*, vol. 41, no. 3s, 2026, pp. 269–287.
3. Guest, Greg, Arwen Bunce, and Laura Johnson. "How Many Interviews Are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability." *Field Methods*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2006, pp. 59–82. doi:10.1177/1525822X05279903.

4. Holmes, Wayne, et al. "Ethics of AI in Education: Towards a Community-Wide Framework." *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2022, pp. 504–526. doi:10.1007/s40593-021-00239-1.
5. Losdo, Mary Joy G., and Maria Cristina S. Dela Cerna. "Educational Technology Proficiency and Classroom Integration: A Profile-Based Analysis of Public School Teachers." *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, vol. 10, no. 26, 2026, pp. 3254–3265. doi:10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0256.
6. Merriam, Sharan B., and Elizabeth J. Tisdell. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. 4th ed., Jossey-Bass, 2016.
7. Mishra, Punya, and Matthew J. Koehler. "Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge." *Teachers College Record*, vol. 108, no. 6, 2006, pp. 1017–1054. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x.
8. Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. 4th ed., SAGE Publications, 2015.
9. UNESCO. *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. UNESCO, 2023.