The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on Decision-Making Styles of Administrative Staff in Public Schools

Sancho Jr. P. Cagampang

Department of Education-District of Candijay, Bohol, Philippines

Bohol Island State University-Candijay, Bohol, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of the study was to assess the perceived impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools on decision-making styles of administrative staff in Public Schools. It employed descriptive- documentary and survey methods with aid of standardized questionnaires. There were composed of forty-seven (47) administrative staff and twenty-eight (28) school heads, using cluster sampling technique. The study found that position or designation, years of experience, and decision-making style showed significant relationships with work efficiency. Despite differences in professional experience, administrative staff demonstrated generally uniform perceptions of AI tools, suggesting that both novice and experienced personnel similarly recognize their usefulness, ease of use, and benefits. The findings conclude that the effective integration of Artificial Intelligence tools significantly enhances decision-making practices by improving self-efficacy, technological readiness, and positive work attitudes, which contribute to better task and contextual performance. Professional roles and accumulated experience further strengthen efficiency, while the consistently positive perception of AI tools across varying experience levels highlights their value as supportive administrative resources.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence Tools, Decision-Making Styles, Administrative Staff

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a potent catalyst in the age of swift digital change, transforming organizational operations in a number of domains, most especially in the education sector. The potential of AI to expedite administrative procedures, and facilitate data-driven decision-making is among its most exciting uses. In school, administrative tasks like monthly reports have been made easy with the help of AI tools like ChatGPT, copilot, and Grammarly.

According to a news article by Marcelo (2024), the Philippine Department of Education is presently researching the creation of a policy standard on the moral application of artificial intelligence (AI) in classrooms. Education Secretary claims that DepEd recognizes the benefits of AI for educators and learners alike, as it might streamline research and education delivery. DepEd is now investigating artificial intelligence's possibilities. It has significant benefits for both teachers and pupils. Teachers can save a lot of time by using AI. Students can also start studying lessons in advance with AI's help.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term artificial intelligence (AI) describes a class of algorithms or computer programs that mimic human decision-making processes. AI that is highly scalable and equipped with real-time data and ever-increasing processing capacity can improve leaders' decision-making accuracy and efficiency. However, stakeholders in education may be at risk if AI is misused. Current AI has a lot of hidden biases that could be exacerbated. More concerning, utilizing AI to make data-informed decisions may conflict with the moral principles we cherish, such as justice, equity, honesty, and doing no damage (Wang, 2021).

However, Rand also discovered that only 18% of principals reported that their school or district provided any kind of direction on the use of AI, despite the fact that many of them were use it. Principals stated that low-poverty schools were nearly twice as likely as high-poverty schools to receive AI guidance, with a 25% versus 13% chance, respectively.

Additionally, leadership methods have changed as a result of the introduction of new Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology. Educational leaders use their viewpoints and knowledge of AI ethics to their administrative responsibilities, including making decisions. Attitudes about the ethics of artificial intelligence (AT-EAI) are among the factors that may have an impact on educational managers' decision-making styles (DMS), which indicate the reaction pattern displayed by a management in a decision-making circumstance. But the question of whether diversity management skills (DMS) and sustainable leadership behaviors (SLB) can buffer this link emerges (Aldighrir, 2024).

One of the main elements of digital government reforms is automated, administrative decision-making (Roehl & Hansen, 2024). It challenges the principles of public administration while also expressing a desire for a better and more effective administration. The broad review highlights the main similarities, compromises, and boundaries between AADM and good governance in relation to nine values: accountability, efficiency, equality, fairness, resilience, responsiveness, right-to-privacy, rule-of-law, and transparency. This acknowledges the inherent conflicts between public administration values. Synergies are "low-hanging fruit," but boundaries and trade-offs are "hard cases" that pose obstacles to sound governance. In order to increase the desired societal effects of using AADM, practitioners and scholars should try to nurture the "fruits" and reduce the tensions of the "hard-cases" while taking into consideration the particular decision-making context.

Artificial intelligence's quick development (AI) has brought about a new period of potentialities, accompanying instruction. AI is described as Computer systems' capacity to execute activities that normally call for human intelligence, which includes a variety of technology like machine learning, natural language processing, deep learning, as well as computer vision. This technology is becoming more and more utilized in educational environments to address numerous difficulties and improve the efficiency of the management of education. AI's revolutionary potential in the ability to assimilate information is what propels education. Enormous volumes of data, spot trends, and produce insights that were previously unavailable for human examination. AI is able to examine data on student performance and learning patterns and the use of resources to determine places for development and forecast possible obstacles, and maximize educational results (Ashraf, 2024).

This has been studied as a potent instrument to improve decision-making in educational institutions. This study offers a thorough examination of the opportunities, difficulties, and applications associated with using AI to enhance decision-making in educational settings. The study examines the various uses of AI in education by drawing on current research and trends. Predictive analytics, administrative optimization, and personalized learning are a few examples of this. Algorithmic bias, data privacy, transparency, and other ethical issues related to the deployment of AI were emphasized. Despite these obstacles, the study finds many ways that educational stakeholders might use AI's revolutionary potential to enhance administrative, instructional, and learning procedures (Okokoyo et.al., 2024).

However, per Dai et. al. (2021), the disruption caused by technology has always caused changes in education. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming education and administration as schools move toward a post-digital paradigm where digital technology is accepted as a regular part of daily life. Finding solutions to cohabit with AI is essential if we are to work toward a future that is focused on people. AI performs informative tasks within the framework, including gathering and analyzing data using its data analytic capabilities. On the other hand, educational leaders are responsible for setting the direction, communicating, resolving disputes, finding new opportunities, negotiating, and giving stakeholders the power to make decisions. Additionally, educational authorities must to support and oversee the use of AI in classrooms.

Organizations are promoting human-AI collaboration as the use of artificial intelligence (AI)-based decision-making grows. This cooperation can take many different forms, including the division of work, parallel or sequential variances in the nature of interdependence, and the existence or absence of specialization. The purpose of this study is to investigate how comfortable people are with various human–AI collaboration approaches.

With AI as a colleague, certain configurations help to increase trust and clarify roles. There is no situation were having AI as a coworker result in less trust than having humans. However, human mistrust of AI may have less to do with humans' vs AI and more to do with the way humans and AI collaborate (Jain et.al., 2023).

The increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational institutions is transforming school leadership. AI can help school administrators manage their stress, automate administrative tasks, and enhance data-driven decision-making. However, there are challenges and moral dilemmas associated with its incorporation that need to be properly explored. Algorithmic prejudice, employee resistance, and the need for ethical norms are some of the challenges that come with integrating AI. While using AI in an open and ethical manner, school administrators must strike a balance between its efficacy and human judgment. Through improving adherence, monitoring student development, and allocating resources as effectively as feasible, artificial intelligence has immense potential to transform educational governance. However, putting it into practice necessitates managing ethical concerns like algorithmic bias, data privacy, and transparency with care (Osegbue et.al., 2025).

In the public and private sectors' work environments and government business practices are rapidly evolving due to the technological revolution. AI technology has been used recently to tackle the problems of public management and governance. The application of AI in public administration and governance is not without its limitations, though. Competent personnel with extensive knowledge of AI applications are needed to integrate AI into government operations. Additionally, more research should be done and experts and professionals who are interested in integrating AI into more functional areas of public management and governance should receive more support due to the high returns on investment that AI offers (Agba et.al,. 2023).

The application of artificial intelligence (AI) is a game-changer in the rapidly changing field of education, with the potential to completely alter conventional methods of decision-making. We enable educators and administrators to evaluate instructional strategies, identify complex trends in student performance data, and allocate resources as efficiently as possible by utilizing AI algorithms. In addition to addressing the expanding significance of data in education, this approach supports the larger trend toward intelligent, flexible educational systems. By applying our model to several educational datasets, the results section demonstrates observable gains in student outcomes and institutional efficiency. In summary, our study highlights how AI-driven decision-making can spur significant educational progress, signaling a turning point in the continuous pursuit of data-driven educational excellence (Degni, 2025).

The findings indicate that the use of AI in education will bring both new goods and advantages to educators as well as disadvantages. The results highlight several recommendations for applying AI and averting potential issues. Although most participants appear to view AI favorably, there are certain disadvantages, particularly those mentioned by academics and teachers, with reference to the future of education.

In order to create ethical standards and guarantee the fair dissemination of AI-enhanced educational materials, the evaluation emphasizes the necessity of cooperation between educators, legislators, and developers. These requires important components from administrative support, choice in planning, and patience and persistence in working (Torreon & Sumayang, 2021).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is anchored on Decision Making Theory by Herbert Simon (1948), the idea forecasts the significance of a choice and how to convey it. According to Simon, there may be a number of courses of action that would be most appropriate given the circumstances, since the individual making the decision may always be missing some knowledge. Put otherwise, it might be argued that, given the facts at hand, there is always a better method to make decisions. AI makes it easier to obtain timely and pertinent data, which promotes logical decision-making. According to this theory, administrators can make well-informed, rational, and successful decisions by using scenario modeling and predictive analytics.

The pattern and rate at which novel concepts, methods, or goods proliferate throughout a population are described by the diffusion of innovations theory by Everett Rogers (2003). Generally speaking, early adopters and innovators are willing to take on the potential risks associated with experimenting with new ideas, technology,

or inventions. This hypothesis helps us comprehend the adoption of AI tools at various administrative levels. While some leaders are averse to change, others could be early adopters. The rate and scope of AI adoption can have an impact on the organization's overall work effectiveness as well as the decision-making styles.

In Expectancy Theory by Victor H. Vroom (1964), expectation, instrumentality, and valence are three interrelated characteristics that affect how productively employees perform. Expectancy is the conviction that performance will increase with effort. The idea that successful performance will lead to desired results is known as instrumentality. The value that workers attach to those results is known as valence. When these three factors are satisfied, workers are more inclined to work hard, which boosts productivity. Efficiency, however, tends to decrease when any of these components is lacking, such as when performance is not clearly correlated with effort or when results are not valued.

In Candijay District, teachers are not the only ones who have been using AI tools in tasks, but also the schools and administrative staff. Recently, AI tools have been a trend to meet report deadlines. With this, AI's unquestionable importance has been under scrutiny on how it affects work efficiency and decision-making styles.

This study would be viable since it assesses the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools on the decision-making styles and work efficiency of administrative staff. Additionally, this is conducted because the rising use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in schools presents both benefits and risks for school heads and administrative staff. While AI applications enhance efficiency and decision-making, misuse or overreliance may cause errors, biased judgments, and workflow issues. To address these challenges, the study examines the impact of AI on work efficiency and decision-making styles, with results serving as the basis for an enhancement program that fosters digital literacy, responsible AI use, and improved professional practices. The findings of the study served as the basis for a proposed plan of action to enhance administrative performance and AI integration in public schools.

Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) tools on the decision-making styles of administrative staff in the Candijay District, Schools Division of Bohol. The findings of the study served as the basis for a proposed plan of action to enhance administrative performance and AI integration in public schools.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the administrative staff in public schools in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, position and years in the position?

2. How do the respondents perceive the impact of artificial intelligence tools in terms of self-efficacy, technological readiness, perception about usefulness, perception about ease of use, attitude and AI tools usage?

3. What is the respondents' perception on the decision-making styles of the administrative staff in public schools?

4. Is there a significant difference between the perceived impact of artificial intelligence tools when respondents are grouped according to the years of experience?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Design

This study employed a descriptive research design using survey and documentary methods to determine the impact of artificial intelligence tools on the decision-making styles and work efficiency of administrative staff in public schools. The descriptive approach was appropriate as it aimed to objectively describe existing conditions, perceptions, and practices related to AI use without manipulating variables. The survey method

enabled the systematic collection of standardized data from respondents, while the documentary method provided supporting evidence through the review of relevant records, policies, and reports, thereby strengthening the validity and context of the findings.

Instrument

This research utilized instruments to be used in gathering the data which are adapted from several related studies. The data for the impact of AI-driven tools was gathered through a standardized tool based on the Falebita and Kok (2025). A standardized questionnaire was used to know the work efficiency of the respondents by Koopmans et.al. (1984). To measure the level of decision making, a standardized questionnaire from French, et. al. (1993) is used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table 1, the highest mean was statement 1 in the Attitude indicator "Using AI tools is a good idea" with a weighted mean of 3.39, reflecting a strong positive attitude toward AI adoption. This suggests that respondents clearly recognize the value and potential benefits of AI tools even if they are not yet fully integrated into their daily routines. A high score in attitude is significant because it signals willingness, openness, and a favorable, mindset important qualities needed for successful implementation of technological innovations.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is seen in the indicator AI tools usage item # 1, "I rely on AI tools to help me complete a variety of tasks." with a weighted mean of 2.39. This shows that despite strong recognition of AI's usefulness, actual day-to-day utilization remains limited. The gap between positive perception and actual practice indicates that while respondents are willing, they may lack access, training, exposure, or structured opportunities to apply AI tools regularly. This highlights an area where professional development and policy support are needed to strengthen actual AI integration.

Table 1. Perception of the Respondents on the Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools

Indicators	WM	DI	Rank
2.1 Self-Efficacy	3.02	Moderately Impactful	5
2.2 Technological Readiness	3.22	Moderately Impactful	3
2.3 Perceptions about Usefulness	3.23	Moderately Impactful	2
2.4 Perceptions about Ease of Use	3.08	Moderately Impactful	4
2.5 Attitude	3.32	Moderately Impactful	1
2.6 AI Tools Usage	2.72	Moderately Impactful	6
Composite Mean	**3.10**	**Moderately Impactful**	

Legend:

Rating Scale	Descriptive Value	Interpretation
4	Strongly Agree	Extremely Impactful
3	Agree	Moderately Impactful
2	Disagree	Slightly Impactful
1	Strongly Disagree	Not Impactful

Respondents rated the impact of AI tools as generally Moderately Impactful (Overall Mean = 3.10) across self-efficacy, technological readiness, perceived usefulness, ease of use, attitude, and actual usage. Respondents expressed confidence in their ability to use AI tools, eagerness to learn new technologies, and recognition of AI's benefits in increasing productivity, accuracy, and work convenience. However, while attitudes and perceptions are positive, actual AI tool usage remains moderate, indicating that although respondents see AI's potential, full integration into daily routines has yet to occur.

The table illustrates that both school heads and administrative staff demonstrate a strong level of readiness for deeper AI adoption within their institutions. Their positive attitudes toward AI, coupled with a clear perception of its usefulness, indicate that stakeholders are open to integrating AI tools into everyday operations. This suggests that, with adequate professional development and sustained institutional support, the use of AI in administrative and managerial tasks could increase substantially. Enhanced training opportunities, clear implementation guidelines, and supportive leadership structures would likely further strengthen this trajectory.

In Table 3, the highest mean is recorded in the item #13, "plans well ahead" with a weighted mean of 3.26, showing that respondents value analytical thinking and logical processing. This highlights a preference for deliberate decision-making, which is an important skill in administrative work where decisions affect school operations and service delivery.

Conversely, the lowest mean is seen in the item #9, "makes decisions without considering all of the implications" with a weighted mean of 2.53. This suggests that respondents tend to avoid impulsive or intuition-based decisions, preferring to rely on concrete information, logic, and consultation. This lower score is positive, as it indicates that staff do not depend solely on instinct but instead use rational processes—an essential foundation for AI-supported decision-making environments.

The administrative staff display a generally Capable (Mean = 2.95) decision-making style. They tend to consult others, stay calm under pressure, plan ahead, and adopt logical approaches when facing decisions. While some tendencies such as relying on intuition or occasionally changing one's mind—appear, the overall pattern reveals structured and thoughtful decision-making behaviors appropriate for administrative work settings.

Table 2. Respondents' Decision-Making Styles of the Administrative Staff in Public Schools

Statements The admin staff …	School Heads		Administrative Staff		Overall		
	WM	DI	WM	DI	WM	DI	Rank
1. enjoys making decisions.	3.07	MC	2.89	MC	2.98	MC	10
2. relies on 'gut feelings' when making decisions.	2.39	SC	2.70	MC	2.55	MC	20
3. likes to consult with others.	3.29	MC	3.09	MC	3.19	MC	4
4. sticks by own decisions come what may.	2.46	SC	2.74	MC	2.60	MC	19
5. settles with one option left.	2.93	MC	2.85	MC	2.89	MC	15
6. remains calm when he/she must make decisions very quickly.	3.25	MC	3.02	MC	3.14	MC	6
7. feels in control of things.	3.11	MC	2.94	MC	3.03	MC	9
8. often has decision governed by ideals regardless of practical difficulties.	3.00	MC	2.91	MC	2.96	MC	11

9. makes decisions without considering all of the implications.	2.36	SC	2.70	MC	2.53	MC	21
10. changes his/her mind about things.	2.79	MC	2.94	MC	2.87	MC	16
11. takes the safe option if there is one.	3.36	HC	3.09	MC	3.23	MC	2
12. prefers to avoid making decisions if he/she can.	2.82	MC	2.89	MC	2.86	MC	17
13. plans well ahead.	3.36	HC	3.15	MC	3.26	HC	1
14. when making decisions, finds favouring first one option then another.	2.79	MC	3.00	MC	2.90	MC	14
15. carries on looking for something better even if he/she founds a course of action that is just about OK.	3.11	MC	2.98	MC	3.05	MC	8
16. finds it difficult to think clearly when deciding on something in a hurry.	2.86	MC	2.98	MC	2.92	MC	12.5
17. makes up own mind about things regardless of what others think.	2.79	MC	3.04	MC	2.92	MC	12.5
18. avoids taking advice over decisions.	2.57	MC	2.70	MC	2.64	MC	18
19. works out all the pros and cons before making a decision.	3.32	HC	3.04	MC	3.18	MC	5
20. in decision making, often give practicalities more importance than principles.	3.18	MC	2.94	MC	3.06	MC	7
21. thinks decision making a deliberate logical process.	3.39	HC	3.02	MC	3.21	MC	3
Average Weighted Mean	**2.96**	**MC**	**2.93**	**MC**	**2.95**	**MC (Moderately Capable)**	

Legend:

Rating Scale	Descriptive Value	Meaning
4	Strongly Agree	Highly Capable
3	Agree	Moderately Capable
2	Disagree	Slightly Capable
1	Strongly Disagree	Not Capable

The table reflects a workforce that can make informed and balanced decisions, an important trait in managing complex and time-sensitive administrative tasks. These decision-making strengths can be further enhanced through targeted training, especially in data-driven and AI-supported decision-making approaches.

Table 3. Test of Relationship Between the Level of Work Efficiency and Decision-Making Style of the Administrative Staff

Variables		r	df	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
Work Efficiency	Decision-Making Style	0.392	45	0.006	Significant	Reject H$_0$

Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 displays the test of the relationship between decision-making style and work efficiency. The results reveal a statistically significant relationship, *r(45)=0.392, p=0.006*, indicating that the decision-making styles displayed by administrative staff meaningfully relate to their work efficiency.

This finding suggests that staff members who demonstrate more effective or adaptive decision-making tendencies also tend to exhibit higher levels of efficiency in task performance and contextual responsibilities. The significant relationship highlights the importance of cultivating effective decision-making styles among administrative personnel.

Table 4. Test of Difference Between the Perceived Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools When Grouped According to the Years of Experience of Administrative Staff

Profile		Mean	SD	t	p-value	Interpretation
Years of Experience	1 years and below (n=25)	3.05	0.291	0.0193	0.985	Not Significant
	2 years and above (n=22)	3.36	0.342			

Difference is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 shows the independent samples t-test comparing the perceived impact of artificial intelligence tools between administrative staff with one year or less of experience (M = 3.05, SD = 0.291) and those with two or more years of experience (M = 3.36, SD = 0.342). The difference was not statistically significant, *t(45) = 0.0193, p = .985*, indicating that years of experience do not influence how administrative staff perceive the usefulness, ease of use, or benefits of AI tools. Both groups appear to view AI tools similarly regardless of their tenure.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that the use of Artificial Intelligence tools has becomes effective in decision-making of administrative staff. Impactful and well-accepted AI tools enhance self-efficacy, technological readiness, and positive work attitudes, which contribute to improved task and contextual performance. In addition, capable decision-making styles foster a work environment that supports efficiency and effective performance of administrative responsibilities. Overall, the integration of Artificial Intelligence tools and sound decision-making practices is essential in improving administrative efficiency and organizational performance.

REFERENCES

1. Agba, M. S., Agba, G. E. M., & Obeten, A. W. (2023). Artificial intelligence and public management and governance in developed and developing market economies. Journal of Public Administration, Policy and Governance Research, 1(2), 1-14. https://tinyurl.com/3y23m3ez
2. Aldighrir, W. M. (2024). Impact of AI ethics on school administrators' decision-making: the role of sustainable leadership behaviors and diversity management skills. Current Psychology, 43(41), 32451-32469. https://tinyurl.com/3kvza98j

3. Ashraf, S. R. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Enhancing Managerial Decision-Making in Education. International Journal of Advanced Social Sciences Research, 1(1), 10-20. https://shorturl.at/coKif

4. Dai, R., Thomas, M. K. E., & Rawolle, S. (2024). The roles of AI and educational leaders in AI-assisted administrative decision-making: a proposed framework for symbiotic collaboration. The Australian Educational Researcher, 1-17. https://shorturl.at/aVwj7

5. Degni, F. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Education: The Effectiveness of AI-Driven Educational Tools and Assessments. In Improving Student Assessment with Emerging AI Tools (pp. 55-94). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://shorturl.at/ZQaVD

6. Simon, Herbert (1948). Decision Making Theory. https://shorturl.at/G5LR3

7. Jain, R., Garg, N., & Khera, S. N. (2023). Effective human–AI work design for collaborative decision-making. Kybernetes, 52(11), 5017-5040. https://tinyurl.com/uayc3v86

8. Marcelo E. (2024). DepEd studying policy on use of AI in schools. https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2024/10/26/2395424/deped-studying-policy-use-ai-schools

9. Okokoyo, I. E., Nwaham, C. O., & Nwachukwu, O. G. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for enhanced administrators' decision making in educational institutions: A comprehensive exploration of applications, challenges, and opportunities. NIU Journal of Educational Research, 10(1), 63-72. https://tinyurl.com/648k3p2b

10. Osegbue, G. C., Ekwe, N. I., & Ogaga, S. A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of School Leadership. Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology, 8(1). https://tinyurl.com/56utvhmr

11. Roehl, U. B., & Hansen, M. B. (2024). Automated, administrative decision-making and good governance: Synergies, trade-offs, and limits. Public Administration Review, 84(6), 1184-1199. https://shorturl.at/rFm5N

12. Rogers, Everett (2003). Diffusion of Innovations Theory. https://shorturl.at/0Evx1

13. Torreon & Sumayang (2021). Multiple intelligence-based classroom activities and learners' academic achievement. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Development (AJMRD) Volume 3, Issue 02, PP 37-41

14. Vroom (1964). Expectancy Theory

15. Wang, Y. (2021). When artificial intelligence meets educational leaders' data-informed decision-making: A cautionary tale. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 69, 100872. https://shorturl.at/JyAmf