International Journal of Humanities and Education Research

ISSN Print: 2664-9799
ISSN Online: 2664-9802
Impact Factor (RJIF): 8.97
IJHER 2025; 7(2): 280-288
www.humanitiesjournal.net
Received: 18-07-2025
Accepted: 19-08-2025

Gretchen T Cabunita
Department of Technical and Technology Education, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

Sarah O Namoco
Department of Technical and Technology Education, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

Corresponding Author:
Gretchen T Cabunita
Department of Technical and Technology Education, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

Navigating the new frontier: A case study of drivers and barriers to generative AI adoption among educators in public higher education institution in Southern Mindanao

Gretchen T Cabunita and Sarah O Namoco

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26649799.2025.v7.i2d.269

Abstract
The rapid expansion of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools like ChatGPT and Gemini presents both unprecedented opportunities and significant challenges for higher education. While academic discourse on AI's impact is widespread, there is a need for in-depth, qualitative exploration of the factors shaping faculty members' decisions to adopt or resist these technologies. The study employs a case study research design to investigate the reasons for the utilization or rejection of generative AI in their teaching and research functions. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 16 educators from diverse disciplines at a public university. Moreover, four direct observations were also conducted, and documents were reviewed to further provide in-depth information about the case. Using thematic analysis, the drivers to acceptance include [1] Effectiveness and efficiency in performing academic functions, [2] Quality of experience in using Generative AI, [3] Administrative support for the faculty, [4] Alignment to the core values of the institution, and [5] Responsible use of Generative AI. On the other hand, the barriers are [1] Associated risks on the use of generative AI, [2] Issues related to AI policy, [3] Threats to academic integrity, [4] Overdependence to Generative AI, and [5] Waste of time to learn and check the output of AI. This study recommends approved policy on the use of Generative AI in the university and to provide training for the educators about different types of these tools and its responsible use. These would help address the barriers encountered and strengthen the adoption of Generative AI for instruction and research.

Keywords: Drivers and barriers of adoption, generative artificial intelligence, higher education, instruction and research

Introduction
Generative Artificial Intelligence is revolutionizing multiple disciplines, including education, by transforming how knowledge is created, processed, and shared. As a subset of artificial intelligence, GenAI utilizes deep learning algorithms to generate content text, images, videos, and even software code based on input data and learned patterns [1, 2]. Since November 2022, Generative Artificial Intelligence such as Bing, Gemini, and ChatGPT has become a global phenomenon [3]. These generative AI are now making an impact including in the fields of education.

The integration of Generative AI into academia has sparked extensive debates regarding ethical and pedagogical implications. Critics contend that its use may raise ethical issues like plagiarism, intellectual property infringement, academic integrity, data privacy violations, and potential biases in AI-generated content [4, 5], while supporters point out its potential to automate administrative tasks, prepare assessments and student feedback, personalize learning, and support research [6, 7]. These issues call for a more thorough analysis of its adoption in educational settings, especially among educators at public universities where regulations pertaining to AI use are still in their infancy.

The integration of AI within the Philippine educational landscape presents significant opportunities to transform the learning experience, fostering innovation and adaptability in higher education [8]. However, the risks and challenges associated with AI in higher education demand a critical reassessment of how Philippine institutions position themselves in an AI-driven world [9].

Moreover, many institutions face infrastructural challenges, including inadequate digital resources and limited training opportunities, which hinder the seamless adoption of GenAI. Understanding the need to adopt emerging technologies such as generative AI and the realities on the ground such as availability of ICT and training can be better grasped through an in-depth exploration of the lived experiences of the faculty.

Existing research on Generative AI in education primarily focused on the student perspective, creating a significant gap in understanding educator's experience. While studies like [10] have shed light on how Filipino Gen Z students perceive the ethical threats of AI, and others have explored student acceptance of tools like ChatGPT [11] the voices of educators have largely been underrepresented. The same holds true for research by [12], which focused on the impact of ChatGPT on student skills and the need for policy changes. More research is needed to create a balanced body of literature that truly reflects the unique perspectives, challenges, and teaching experiences of educators in this new technological era.

The current body of literature on Generative AI in education, while growing, has some noticeable gaps. Literature often relies heavily on large-scale quantitative surveys, which are great for identifying broad trends but can miss the deeper, more personal stories behind the data. For instance, a systematic review by [13] found that quantitative studies were far more common than qualitative approaches that could provide a more nuanced understanding.

A significant geographical imbalance also exists that Western perspectives dominate the discussion with little contributions from Southeast Asian. Reviews by [14] and [15] confirm this, showing minimal research from countries like the Philippines. This limited representation is a concern, as it raises questions about whether findings from other parts of the world are even relevant in a country with its own unique educational systems, cultural values, and resource challenges.

Therefore, this qualitative case study directly responds to the identified gaps in the literature. As [16] noted that the case study research investigates contemporary phenomenon within their real-life context, making the case study well suited for examining the nuanced interplay of personal, institutional, and cultural factors influencing Generative AI adoption in higher education. It explored the underlying drivers that encourage adoption and the barriers that create hesitation, offering insights that quantitative data alone cannot fully capture. Furthermore, the study used the theoretical lens of Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), Diffusion of Innovation Theory, and Innovation Resistance theory to help understand these drivers and barriers to Generative AI adoption. This study seeks to answer a critical question that remains underexplored: What are the lived experiences of educators in their acceptance (the drivers) and resistance (the barriers) to the use of generative AI in their teaching and research practices?

Materials and Methods

Research Design

In exploring the factors influencing educators' acceptance and resistance to Generative AI, this study adopted a case study approach as its qualitative research design. It involves the study of a case within real-life, contemporary context or setting [17, 18]. This study offered a rich and detailed description of the lived experiences of educators as they navigate both acceptance and resistance to generative AI in their teaching and research practices.

Participants of the study

The participants of the study were educators from a State University in Southern Mindanao, Philippines. There were 16 participants that satisfied [19]. These educators are from different disciplines with an academic rank from Instructor to Professor Level. Some top management officials were included as participants because they have provided additional insights, especially into the organizational context. Furthermore, the study employed purposive sampling as [20] said that selecting participants is based on specific characteristics, particularly, they were selected because they are professionally independent in the application of skills vital to the teaching and learning process [21]. These participants were both users and non-users of Generative AI so they could share their experiences about what drives them to use these tools and what keeps them from using them.

Data collection tool

In this study, data were collected using an interview and observation protocol [22], consisting of carefully designed interview questions aimed at capturing the lived experiences of educators. Moreover, the semi-structured interview questions were validated by experts to comply with [22] that ensured that the questions effectively aligned with the research objectives. There were three Experts who have validated the instruments, one is an expert in the field of Electronics Engineering who is knowledgeable about emerging trends and technologies such as AI. Another is an expert in doing Qualitative research, and lastly, an expert in language also checked the clarity of the semi-structured interview questions. Their comments were integrated into the final instrument.

Data collection

Out of the six recommended information according to [16], three were used such as interviews, direct observations, and document review. Using semi-structured interviews, 16 participants were able to share their experiences about generative AI. The semi-structured in-person interview runs for about 45 minutes to 1 hour. The interview was conducted across the three campuses of the university.

The researcher conducted also a direct observation among the four participants. All the data were recorded in the field notes of the researcher alongside the observation protocol. Lastly, a document review was done by the researcher. Documents such as memorandum, sample learning material, and approved activity designs were examined to see any information that is substantial in the case study. The direct observation and document review were used to triangulate [22, 16] the information gathered in the interview. By utilizing diverse data sources, this study ensures a more holistic understanding of participants' lived experiences in accepting or resisting Generative AI, enhancing the reliability and depth of the findings.

Data analysis

In analyzing the data, the researcher employed a thematic analysis approach consistent with the recommendations of

[18, 23] for in-depth case study research. The interview transcripts, observation field notes, and documentary evidence were uploaded into N Vivo software, which was used to assist in organizing, coding, and managing the data [24, 25] including the demographic profiles of participants.

Following [23] suggesting for iterative coding, the researcher examined the interview statements line-by-line, developed initial codes directly from the data, and systematically grouped these into broader categories until themes emerged that captured the essence of participants' lived experiences in using generative AI. Though the researcher has used theories as [16] has pointed out, at the ideation stage of the study, the raw data from the different sources have driven the formation of codes and themes. The resulting themes were derived inductively, reflecting the authentic voices of the participants, and offered a detailed and holistic portrayal of their experiences with generative AI in higher education.

Trustworthiness of the study

To ensure the credibility of this research, member checking was done. Member checking is part of trustworthiness strategies in qualitative research, particularly for ensuring credibility [26]. During the interview, the researcher occasionally asks the participant if the interpretation and the understanding of the researcher to what they share is correct. Before ending the interview, the researcher reiterated the salient points shared by the participants and allowed them to verify if it was correctly taken by the researcher. Moreover, the participants were given interview transcripts for them to verify and validate the accuracy of the transcripts and to make sure that the meaning of their lived experiences is clear and not distorted by the interpretation of the researcher. Another approach the researcher has made to ensure trustworthiness was through data triangulation with observation and document review, to increase the construct validity of the case [16].

Ethical considerations

This study has strictly adhered to the ethical standards to ensure the integrity, credibility, and welfare of all the participants. This study has secured necessary approval from the University President for the conduct of this study. The Data Privacy Act of 2012 was carefully observed specifically in the data collection. Also, each participant was given informed consent form, and the purpose of the interview was explained to them. The researcher made sure that the interview process was friendly enough by allowing the participants to elaborate their thoughts and they were not coerced to share information that they were not willing to discuss. Also, the work of other researchers included in this study was properly cited and acknowledged.

Results and Discussion

The participants were from the different campuses of the university, representing a broad range of academic disciplines like Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), Administration, Business, and Management (ABM); Social Sciences; Education; and Law. Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. A significant proportion (43.75%) fell within the age range of 46 to 55 years. Male participants comprised the majority at 68.75%, while females accounted for 31.25%. In terms of teaching experience, half of the participants (50%) had been in the service for at least 21 years. Regarding academic rank, most held the position of Associate Professor (56%), followed by Professors (25%). All participants reported familiarity with generative AI tools, indicating they use them for instructional and research purposes. Interestingly, despite this widespread usage, 75% of the participants reported not subscribing to any premium version of these tools. During the interview of the participants, it was found out that ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini, PerplexityAI, and Scispace were commonly used Generative AI tools.

Table 1: Demographic profile

Profile	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25 years old and below	0	0%
	26-35	3	18.75%
	36-45	3	18.75%
	46-55	7	43.75%
	56-65	2	12.50%
	66 years old and above	1	6.25%
Sex	Male	11	68.75%
	Female	5	31.25%
Number of years in the service	less than 5 years	3	18.75%
	6-10 years	1	6.25%
	11-15 years	2	12.50%
	16-20 years	2	12.50%
	21-25 years	5	31.25%
	more than 26 years	3	18.75%
Academic rank	Instructor	2	12.50%
	Assistant Professor	1	6.25%
	Associate Professor	9	56.25%
	Professor	4	25%
Familiarity to AI	Yes	16	100%
	No	0	
Use of Generative AI in Instruction	Yes	13	81.25%
	No	3	18.75%
Use of Generative AI in Research	Yes	11	68.75%
	No	5	31.25%
Subscription to premium account	Yes	4	25%
	No	12	75%

Themes that emerged on the drivers of adoption of Generative AI

Through the conducted interview, direct observation, and document review, there are five themes that emerged relating to drivers to accept Generative AI in their teaching and research. These themes are [1] Effectiveness and Efficiency in performing academic functions [2] Quality of Experience in using Generative AI [3] Administrative support for the faculty [4] Alignment to the core values of the institution and [5] Responsible use of Generative AI.

Theme 1 Effectiveness and efficiency in performing academic function

Most of the participants have used Generative AI to perform their core academic functions in instruction and research. The reasons why they use include: working faster because they can finish their work earlier than usual, generative AI can help them develop instructional materials, they can easily revise the periodic enhancement of syllabus; create assessment with rubrics and produce Table of Specifications (TOS); develop and package research proposals faster, etc. They believe that with generative AI they are more productive.

"To make my work more efficient considering that we have several functions aside from teaching and research, we have accreditation, audit, etc. The purpose of using AI is to make it faster for me to work, produce results and output." – P10

"I use generative AI for revising syllabus and making rubrics. Since it lessens my time in the preparation of syllabus, rubrics and TOS, and I got more time in assessing the students' performance." – P15

"I use AI to test the novelty of technology in patent search using ChatGPT premium, I give context to the AI. It can give suggestions on search strings. I also use AI to write substantive and formality reports. AI also helped in validation as per my experience in patent drafting and in responding to these reports. Though I use AI as a guide or can give hints, my personal background and experience in patent is very helpful at the end of the process." – P16

Generative AI and other AI technologies have been recognized as powerful tools for enhancing both the effectiveness and efficiency of academic functions, enabling educators to save significant time and effort in their professional tasks [27]. These technologies streamline various aspects of teaching, from efficiently uploading, assigning, and distributing learning materials to automating classroom management processes [28, 29] making the educators free to do other equally important activities. Moreover, AI systems that recommend academic activities for students have demonstrated their capacity to further boost teacher productivity and optimize instructional planning [30].These findings imply that, when integrated thoughtfully and ethically, AI can serve as a transformative assistant in academia, enabling educators to channel their saved time and energy toward more meaningful teaching, research, and student engagement.

Theme 2 Quality of Experience in using Generative AI

The participants have expressed that based on their experience they were generally satisfied with the quality of output generated by these AI tools. It can carry out the instructions given by them. Whenever the participants provide specific prompt or detailed information, the output is also detailed, and the quality of information is almost perfect. Moreover, their interaction with these generative AI tools is easier due to their user-friendly interface.

"I use ChatGPT in making my multiple-choice quizzes/ exam for my undergraduate students. Based on my experience AI will generate multiple-choice exam questions with answers and rationale based on my given prompt". – P3

"I have tried using several generative AI in my subject language translation. There are tools available for translation. For me, giving correct prompts also determines the quality of output of translation of texts by AI". – P8

"I used AI in developing my examination with TOS by giving prompt to AI including the specific learning outcomes. Specific details in the prompts include the level in the taxonomy like analyses or application level. The output generated by AI to me is acceptable because it followed the specific instructions that I gave that is aligned to the learning outcomes with specific taxonomy". – P13

For educators, being proficient in the use of prompt is considered as important for interacting with Generative AI effectively because it increases productivity and generates the most relevant information needed for their academic functions [31]. Whenever educators get accurate responses from Generative AI it would increase their likelihood to use it. According to [32], trust (referring to perceptions of believability, credibility, reliability, and trustworthiness) of educators to Generative AI can lead to more positive attitudes and stronger intentions to adopt it. Moreover, individuals' attitudes, comfort levels [33], and hedonic motivation or pleasure in using AI [34] can greatly influence acceptance and integration into various aspects of the education system.

Theme 3 Administrative support for the faculty

The theme reflects the different support provided by the administration for the participants. The availability of support like training for the educators, and technical support for them help in their utilization. Though their experience was not uniform in a sense that there are colleges who have initiated training while other colleges do not have. But for the subscription of software that has embedded AI tools such as Grammarly and Turnitin, they all agreed that the university has provided a premium subscription for each instructor.

"The College had a 1-day session about the use Artificial Intelligence. It contains the information about different types of AI, how to use it. After the 1-day session, I think almost everyone become interested." – P2

May the University provide equipment, data infrastructure and other technical support for the faculty and students so AI can be maximized. Provide subscription of AI for Filipino to be used in translation. Also, it is helpful to conduct AI literacy for faculty so we know the ethical use of it and avoid the improper use of these generative AI tools." – P12

"There is subscription provided for the faculty in Grammarly and Turnitin." – P13

The literature underscores the critical role of administrative support to drive faculty adoption of generative AI. A primary concern is the lack of adequate training, which, as noted by [27], can lead to misunderstandings about academic integrity and a sense that universities are too slow to respond to the phenomenon. This aligns with findings from [29], who highlight that teachers often lack a sufficient understanding of AI technologies and their pedagogical implications, which can subsequently generate negative attitudes and weak self-efficacy [35]. Therefore, proactive administrative measures, including training for university teachers for them to understand the implications of AI technologies for their teaching [36] and the need for resource allocation to maximize the benefits of Generative AI in higher education.

Theme 4 Alignment to core values of the institution

The participants have described their beliefs that using Generative AI aligns to the core values of the university. They believe that the university should be adaptive to emerging trends in technology such as the use of AI to stay competitive and relevant. However, they also shared that the accountability aspect of the core values should be considered carefully, and responsible use of AI will help the people accountable.

> *"I think it is aligned to our core values because if we do not use technology such as AI, we will be left behind. The industries are now using advanced technologies so if we will not use new technologies, we might have difficulty in marketing our graduates." – P11*
> *"Though it is not 100% aligned to our core values, it is helpful to us in general. Since AI will help us in many ways to hit our university targets, the output should be excellent because the time is reduced with the use of AI so the quality of output is high." – P14*
> *"There is also a negative effect on resilience part of our core values because of too much dependence on AI we may not be able to function normally. If we cannot access AI due to some reasons, then we may get paralyzed by not being able to proceed as expected." – P16*

The integration of generative AI is not just a technological trend, but a matter of alignment with the core values of the institution. As highlighted by [37] that AI is seen as an inevitable change and the response of university authorities such as teachers are crucial. Furthermore, universities should use artificial intelligence and systems to achieve equitable outcomes [36], such as updating the curriculum is necessary because traditional assessment and methodologies may no longer be applicable [38]. Moreover, universities have obligation to serve students by preparing them for work [27]. Ultimately, by proactively engaging with and adopting AI, institutions achieve their mission to deliver a relevant, ethical, and forward-looking education that prepares students for the complexities of a technology-driven world.

Theme 5 Responsible Use of Generative AI

This theme talked about how they emphasized that Generative AI are just tools to help or assist but should not be left unchecked. They maintained that they should be responsible in using these tools and to also impart to their students to be responsible also in accessing and in using generative AI for their academics. The participants are fully aware of disadvantages of irresponsible use of generative AI and that they describe it being a shared responsibility with the students.

> *"In relation to doing research, I allow my students to use AI for them to know the state of the art of this subject when writing their review of related literature. But I instructed them to double check the output and see if it is correct, if the references are correct. AI is just an aid for them, but their output should not be entirely done by AI." – P6*
> *"I know there are faculty who are hesitant to use AI or who do not want to use AI, but we need to learn these new technologies, so we can also guide our students. In the research aspect we can use AI in enhancing or sentences, grammar but not to the extent that everything is done and generated by the AI." – P8*
> *"I do not copy and paste everything that ChatGPT provided, it is just a tool for the structuring of paragraphs. With the paragraphs given by ChatGPT, I am the one who will synthesize it and write my own statements." – P13*

The literature emphasizes that a responsible use of generative AI in academia requires a dual approach from educators and institutions. The findings of this study echoes the result of [39] that says universities must pay attention to social, environmental, and ethical responsibilities in the application of Generative AI. Moreover, [40] highlight that higher education institutions have a duty to prioritize teaching students about the responsible and ethical use of tools like ChatGPT. Therefore, a successful integration of generative AI hinges on a systemic approach that combines pedagogical innovation with a strong focus on educating the academic community on ethical principles and practices.

Themes that emerged on the barriers of adoption of Generative AI

Through conducted interviews, direct observation, and document review, there were five themes that emerged relating to the barriers to adoption of Generative AI in their teaching and research. These issues may have caused the participants to be reluctant, hesitant, or at the very least cautious when using generative AI. These themes are [1] Associated risks on the use of generative AI, [2] Issues related to AI policy, [3] Threats to academic integrity, [4] Overdependence to Generative AI, and [5] Waste of time to learn and check the output of AI.

Theme 1 Associated risks on the use of Generative AI

The participants described their experiences that there are possible risks in using AI. Giving unverified information to the students or allowing the students to submit academic output with inaccurate data poses risks on the educational quality of the institution. Breaches on data privacy and security may pose a threat to the personal identifications of users. Along with other risks and ethical issues, the participants discussed the reality of these scenarios and expressed caution on their part and have contributed that some of them are reluctant in using these tools.

"Being in an academic institution, teachers are obliged to give correct information to the students. If teachers just rely on AI and do not verify, and if it affects the knowledge of the students, then that is a gross negligence on the part of the teachers. The faculty should give quality and verified information to the students. Though we are not prevented from using AI in teaching, teachers must be responsible in using these technologies by verifying their content." – P4

> *"I have personally encountered risks of data privacy and security because ChatGPT can access my personal information through other means such as in my posting in social media platform." – P5*
> *"I do not use AI, and I have heard from my colleagues that there are references generated by these AI that do not exist. So for me, if a teacher just relied on the output of AI without verification of its authenticity and accuracy then it may give a negative impact to the learning of the students." – P6*

The hesitation of teachers to adopt generative AI is directly tied to the associated risks in using AI, which act as significant barriers to adoption. Associated risk such as hallucination where models generate plausible information but factually inaccurate [41], is said to be at 91%, emphasizing careful human oversight [42]. This issue of accuracy and the potential for spreading false information [43] makes educators fearful and sceptic about AI in higher education. Furthermore, teachers are deeply concerned about ethical issues, including plagiarism, bias, and breaches of privacy [27]. These apprehensions not only highlight the associated risks of AI use but also form substantial barriers to adoption, indicating that without stronger safeguards, transparency, and user understanding, many educators will remain reluctant to embrace these tools in their professional practice.

Theme 2 Issues related to AI policy

All participants have shared that currently the university does not yet have an approved guidelines or policy on the use of Generative AI. They believe that having an approved AI policy will provide a clear direction on the extent of use and to avoid irresponsible ways of utilizing the tools. Some participants were aware that there is a plan in creating a policy, while others especially the participants who are part of the administration have said that consultation with stakeholders is needed in the crafting of policy and many SUCs do not have also their own guideline and added the reality that our country do not have it yet.

> *"As of now, as an institution, we do not yet have a policy on the use of AI. Though we do not have the institutional policy yet there are existing laws that may address these issues like intellectual property rights law, trademark and patent laws the principles of which can be applied in the institution." – P4*
>
> *"For me, in my own opinion, by any means we need to adapt to the new technologies, otherwise, we will be left behind. The absence of a policy may hinder the full adoption of these technologies. As of the moment, the University has no AI policy, even the Philippines has no specific policy regarding the use of AI. – P7*
>
> *"We do not yet have a guideline on the use of AI because even other HEIs do not have guidelines yet they are still talking about it. What we have is the similarity index embedded in the graduate school program." – P8*

Policy gaps surrounding AI use in higher education present significant challenges that can delay its adoption. As highlighted by [37], universities need to establish strong policies that address ethical concerns, but the slow pace of university educators to adapt to new technologies because of resistance [36] can make these policies difficult to implement in a timely manner [27]. While the use of Generative AI may have good and bad effects, universities can effectively face these concerns head-on by having a proactive and ethical approach to the use of these tools [44]. Without comprehensive and timely policy frameworks, institutions risk inconsistent practices, disputes over intellectual property, and erosion of trust in academic outputs, all of which serve as barriers to the responsible and sustainable integration of AI in higher education.

Theme 3 Threats to academic integrity

There are several participants who have described that Generative AI may compromise the quality of education and challenge the academic integrity of the university. Those participants who do not use AI said that this is one of their reasons why they opted not to and because to them using generative AI is academic dishonesty. They would prefer to use their personal work or use other means for student assessment to guard themselves against possible cheating.

> *"I do not use AI for my case-based examination because students tend to copy and paste the AI generated output." – P3*
>
> *"Using the output of Generative AI is a form of cheating and academic dishonesty. I do not use Generative AI because I am confident and can guarantee accuracy with my personal work." – P6*
>
> *"Excessive use of Generative AI compromises our academic integrity. Lack of control measures is dangerous for the quality of learning of students." – P14*

The use of generative AI presents a significant threat to academic integrity, which is a primary reason for teacher hesitation and a major barrier to adoption. The absence of effective tools to verify content integrity, creating an unfair advantage for students who rely on AI over those who complete their own work [45]. Furthermore, the academic integrity policies of any given HEI, which must be updated to consider how academic misconduct may be defined when using these AI tools in future educational environments [46].

Theme 4 Overdependence to Generative AI

This theme described the experiences of the participants on the possibility of being overdependent on these Generative AI. They may have the tendency to not critically think in some aspect because they know that they can ask the AI and it can give answers or do the work for them.

> *"Based on my assessment and observation, if the person will depend too much on AI may have an effect to our thinking skills. For example, using calculators, we may tend to depend on it even in simple calculations, we do not want to think anymore, how much more with AI because they can give answers very fast. Our critical thinking may deteriorate because of too much dependence." – P1*
>
> *"There was once that I asked them to write a lesson plan then one student asked permission to use the cell phone because the AI application is useful in the activity for which to me is not good because there is too much dependence on it." – P5*
>
> *"We may lose our originality and critical thinking ability because we depend on AI to almost everything. By just a click of the command we can generate answers without thinking much." – P15*

The experiences and observations of the participants are congruent to what the extant literature said on the negative effect of being over dependent on Generative AI. Since AI such as ChatGPT can streamline decision-making and boost productivity, over-reliance can reduce users' critical thinking skills and contribute to compulsive usage patterns [47]. Furthermore, [48] said that overdependence could impair critical thinking skills and degrade the quality of instruction and learning outcomes, and it can reduce their thinking

ability and lead to a dependence on the tool for even minor tasks.

Theme 5 Waste of time to learn and check the output of AI

Learning how to use Generative AI and integrating it into their academic work may be challenging to some participants, especially to the older ones who were near their retirement. Others chose not to use it because they have observed that it is time consuming to do verification of the output generated by AI.

> *"For me it takes time to learn generative AI like ChatGPT with my age. I am about to retire so I usually prefer my own way of doing things." – P1*
> *"For me it is a hassle and time-consuming to use AI and then double check its results. I would rather make the exam on my own." – P3*
> *"It takes more time for me to double check if it is correct or not, it is not saving me time at all. If I am the one doing it, then I know and certain that what I am doing is correct." – P6*
> *"I personally do not use AI even though my colleagues tried to help me explore AI, because it takes time to learn and understand how it works. Based on my observation, the output of AI in terms of Translation in Filipino is not accurate and it would take my time to review and recheck its output." – P12*

For many educators, a significant barrier to adopting generative AI lies in the perceived time burden required to learn, adapt, and effectively integrate it into teaching and research. The process of understanding AI tools, exploring their capabilities, and ensuring their outputs are accurate and appropriate can be both time-consuming and mentally demanding [36]. As a result, some educators view AI integration as an inefficient investment of time, especially when weighed against competing academic responsibilities.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this case study, it can be concluded that majority of the educators have started to use Generative AI in their teaching and research. On the other hand, there were few educators who have little exposure to it like they have tried it out of curiosity but did not continue while others have decided not to use it entirely. This confirmed the theory of UTAUT and Innovation Diffusion that there are factors that drive users to adopt or utilize new technologies such as generative AI because they find it beneficial, effective, and make their work easier. With the thorough examination of data from the interview, observation, and document review, there were five themes that can help explain what drives the educators to use generative AI, these include [1] Effectiveness and Efficiency in performing academic functions [2] Quality of Experience in using Generative AI [3] Administrative support for the faculty [4] Alignment to the core values of the institution and [5] Responsible use of Generative AI.

Though there are several advantages of using generative AI, some of the educators perceived that there are many things that need careful consideration that made them hesitant or reluctant to use it in their teaching and research. In the process of adoption of technology, it is expected that not everyone will right away adopt, because of the introduction of new technologies there are barriers that needed to be overcome as what the Innovation Resistance Theory was emphasizing. Indeed, the participants have described their experiences, and through thematic analysis, these themes were identified as the barriers: [1] Associated risks on the use of generative AI, [2] Issues related to AI policy, [3] Threats to academic integrity, [4] Overdependence to Generative AI, and [5] Waste of time to learn and check the output of AI.

Recommendations

There are several areas for recommendations that this study would like to make based on the findings and conclusions. It is recommended that the overarching concern of the participants is for the university to have an approved policy on the use of Generative AI. Having an approved policy would encourage every educator, including those who are resistant to use or adopt generative AI into their teaching and research practices. The approved policy will serve as a guide on the ethical and responsible use of AI, and it would address issues relating to privacy, overdependence, and declaration of its use not just in their research but also in their syllabus and other learning materials that were developed with assistance of these tools. Another recommendation is to strengthen the training and AI literacy among educators. The university may provide series of training for all the educators to help clarify the use of AI, what it is, what it can do for the institution, including the legal and ethical aspect of it to address the risks, threats to academic integrity, over dependent to it, and other barriers that can be overcome by proper literary. Aside from training, other support such as availability of data infrastructure and possible subscription to premium accounts may be considered by the administration.

Limitations of the study

This study was conducted in one of the big universities in Southern Mindanao, its unique context and culture may not represent the experiences of educators in other public higher education institutions. The study was focused on describing the experiences of educators on the use of generative AI and was limited to understanding that there are drivers and barriers in their adoption. The students may have a different description of their lived experiences in using generative AI. Furthermore, other stakeholders such as parents, and industry partners may be interviewed next time to also capture their perspective on the prevalence of generative AI affecting not just the educators but other significant people in the community. Lastly, the study was a snapshot of a particular time where the educators have experienced using generative AI, it did not have a time series study to see any changes in their behaviour or perspectives.

References

1. Jovanovic M, Campbell M. Generative artificial intelligence: Trends and prospects. Computer; 2022;55:107-12.
2. Farrelly T, Baker N. Generative artificial intelligence: Implications and considerations for higher education practice. Educ Sci. 2023;13[11].
3. Wong WK. The sudden disruptive rise of generative artificial intelligence? An evaluation of their impact on higher education and the global workplace. J Open Innov Technol Mark Complex; 2024.
4. Swiecki Z, Khosravi H, Chen G, Martinez-Maldonado R, Lodge J, Milligan S, *et al*. Assessment in the age of artificial intelligence. Comput Educ Artif Intell; 2022, p. 3.

5. Chan CK, Hu W. Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. Int J Educ Technol High Educ; 2023.
6. Luckin R, Cukurova M, Kent C, Boulay B. Empowering educators to be AI-ready. Comput Educ Artif Intell; 2022.
7. Sullivan M, Kelly A, McLaughlan P. ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. J Appl Learn Teach; 2023;6[1].
8. Estrellado CJ, Miranda J. Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational context: Circumspection and future inquiries. Int J Sci Res Publ. 2023;13[5]:16-22.
9. Giray L, De Silos P, Adornado A, Buelo R, Galas E, Reyes-Chua E, *et al*. Use and impact of artificial intelligence in Philippine higher education: Reflections from instructors and administrators. Internet Ref Serv Q. 2024;28[3]:315-338.
10. Jabar M, Javier CE, Sherer PP. Qualitative ethical technology assessment of artificial intelligence (AI) and the Internet of Things (IoT) among Filipino Gen Z members: Implications for ethics education in higher learning institutions. Asia Pac J Educ; 2024.
11. Almogren AS, Al-Rahmi W, Dahri N. Exploring factors influencing the acceptance of ChatGPT in higher education: A smart education perspective. Heliyon; 2024.
12. Rudolph J. ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? J Appl Learn Teach; 2023;6[1]:342-63.
13. Wu F, Dang Y, Li M. A systematic review of responses, attitudes, and utilization behaviors on generative AI for teaching and learning in higher education. Behav Sci. 2025;15[4].
14. Batista J, Mesquita A, Carnaz G. Generative AI and higher education: Trends, challenges, and future directions from a systematic literature review. Information; 2024.
15. Li B, Tan Y, Wang C, Lowell V. Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. Comput Educ Artif Intell; 2025;9.
16. Yin RK. Case study research and applications: Designs and methods. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2018.
17. Stake RE. The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications, Inc.; 1995.
18. Merriam SB. Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco (CA): Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1998.
19. Marshall B, Cardon P, Poddar A, Fontenot R. Does sample size matter in qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. J Comput Inf Syst; 2015.
20. Patton MQ. Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE; 2014.
21. Teacher Education Council. Philippine professional standards for teachers [Internet]. DepEd; 2017 [cited 2025 Jul]. Available from: https://tec.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Philippine-Professional-Standards-for-Teachers.pdf
22. Creswell JW. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications; 2009.
23. Creswell JW, Poth C. Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2018.
24. Auerbach CF, Silverstein L. Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis. New York (NY): New York Univ Press; 2003.
25. Saldaña J. The coding manual for qualitative researchers. 3rd ed. London: SAGE; 2016.
26. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. New Dir Eval. 1986:73-84.
27. Lee D, Arnold M, Srivastava A, Plastow K, Strelan P, Ploeckl F, *et al*. The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. J Appl Learn Teach; 2024, p. 6.
28. Gupta KP, Bhaskar P. Inhibiting and motivating factors influencing teachers' adoption of AI-based teaching and learning solutions: Prioritization using analytic hierarchy process. J Inf Technol Educ Res; 2020, p. 693-723.
29. Chiu TK, Xia Q, Zhou X, Chai C, Cheng M. Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. Comput Educ Artif Intell; 2022.
30. Villegas-Ch W, Sánchez-Viteri S, Román-Cañizares M. Academic activities recommendation system for sustainable education in the age of COVID-19. Informatics; 2021;8[2].
31. Park J, Choo S. Generative AI prompt engineering for educators: Practical strategies. J Spec Educ Technol; 2024;40[3].
32. Shata A, Hartley K. Artificial intelligence and communication technologies in academia: Faculty perceptions and the adoption of generative AI. Int J Educ Technol High Educ; 2025.
33. Bower M, Torrington J, Lai JWM, Petocz P, Alfano M. How should we change teaching and assessment in response to increasingly powerful generative artificial intelligence? Outcomes of the ChatGPT teacher survey. Educ Inf Technol; 2024.
34. Venkatesh V, Thong JIL, Xu X. Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. MIS Q; 2012;36[1]:157-178.
35. Wang S, Yu H, Hu X, Li J. Participant or spectator? Comprehending the willingness of faculty to use intelligent tutoring systems in the artificial intelligence era. Br J Educ Technol; 2020;51[5]:1657-1673.
36. McGrath C, Pargman T, Juth N, Palmgren P. University teachers' perceptions of responsibility and artificial intelligence in higher education: An experimental philosophical study. Comput Educ Artif Intell; 2023, p. 4.
37. Bearman M, Ryan J, Ajjawi R. Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. High Educ; 2023:369-385.
38. Thurzo A, Strunga M, Urban R, Surovková J, Afrashte K. Impact of artificial intelligence on dental education: A review and guide for curriculum update. Educ Sci; 2023;13[2].
39. Xing Y. The influence of responsible innovation on ideological education in universities under generative

artificial intelligence. IEEE Access; 2024;12:133008-17.
40. Rasul T, Nair S, Kalendra D, Robin M, Santini F, Ladeira W, *et al*. The role of ChatGPT in higher education: Benefits, challenges, and future research directions. J Appl Learn Teach; 2023;6[1].
41. Huang L, Yu W, Ma W, Zhong W, Feng Z, Wang H, *et al*. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. ACM Trans Inf Syst; 2025;43[2]:1-55.
42. Adel A, Alani N. Can generative AI reliably synthesise literature? Exploring hallucination issues in ChatGPT. AI Soc; 2025.
43. Murugesan S, Cherukuri A. The rise of generative artificial intelligence and its impact on education: The promises and perils. Computer; 2023;56[5]:116-121.
44. Cotton DR, Cotton P, Shipway J. Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innov Educ Teach Int; 2023;61[2]:228-239.
45. Chaudhry IS, Sarwary SM, El Refae GA, Chabchoub H. Time to revisit existing student's performance evaluation approach in higher education sector in a new era of ChatGPT: A case study. Cogent Educ; 2023.
46. Perkins M. Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. J Univ Teach Learn Pract; 2023;20[2].
47. Yankouskaya A, Liebherr M, Ali R. Can ChatGPT be addictive? A call to examine the shift from support to dependence in AI conversational large language models. Hum Cent Intell Syst; 2025;5:77-89.
48. Chan CKY, Lee KKW. The AI generation gap: Are Gen Z students more interested in adopting generative AI such as ChatGPT in teaching and learning than their Gen X and millennial generation teachers? Smart Learn Environ; 2023.