

Teachers' Workload Efficacy and Challenges Associated With Chatgpt Adoption among Public Elementary Teachers in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales

Blessilda Marie F. Madarang¹, *Santi A. Magtalas²

¹Graduate Student, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales

²Graduate School Lecturer, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500543>

Received: 08 May 2026; Accepted: 13 May 2026; Published: 06 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the teachers' workload efficacy and challenges associated with ChatGPT adoption among public elementary teachers in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, 163 public elementary teachers were selected through simple random sampling. Data were gathered using a validated researcher-designed questionnaire measuring ChatGPT use frequency, perceived opportunities, workload efficacy, and integration challenges. Findings revealed that teachers frequently used ChatGPT for instructional and administrative tasks, particularly for administrative work. They perceived ChatGPT as offering opportunities for professional growth, instructional innovation, learner engagement, and resource access. ChatGPT was rated as having a "Great Extent" of workload efficacy, though integration faced challenges, particularly ethical concerns. Significant differences in ChatGPT use were observed across demographic variables, and positive relationships were found among perceived opportunities, workload efficacy, and challenges. Based on these findings, a training program was developed to enhance teachers' effective and responsible use of ChatGPT. This study provides insights into how ChatGPT supports workload efficacy and offers a basis for designing training programs that strengthen responsible AI use in education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI Tools, ChatGPT, Teachers' Workload Efficacy, Adoption, Challenges, Public School Teachers

INTRODUCTION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in performing the works of teachers became a transformative force in global education, reshaping how instructional materials were prepared, lessons were delivered, and learning outcomes were assessed. According to Triberti et al. (2024), AI-based tools allowed teachers to automate repetitive tasks and focus on learner-centered instruction. Similarly, Siddiqui (2025) emphasized that AI served as a digital teaching assistant that enhanced teacher productivity and supported innovative pedagogical practices.

From a global perspective, the opportunities afforded by ChatGPT on teachers' workload efficacy were widely acknowledged. Zemljak (2023) reported that ChatGPT helped streamline lesson planning and content generation, saving time and effort. Ankitdhamija and Dhamija (2024) highlighted that the tool supported instructional quality despite increased administrative responsibilities. Harini (2023) explained that ChatGPT enabled personalized learning experiences and automated clerical tasks, improving efficiency. These studies indicated that ChatGPT contributed to reducing teacher burnout and enhancing teaching productivity. Supporting this claim, the study of Magtalas and Eduvala (2025) revealed that excessive teacher workload was significantly associated with burnout and reduced work performance, emphasizing the importance of interventions and support systems that could help teachers manage instructional and administrative responsibilities more effectively.

In the Philippine context, ChatGPT presented opportunities to address challenges faced by public school teachers, particularly those handling large classes and paperwork. Giray et al. (2024) found that Filipino teachers used AI tools like ChatGPT to simplify lesson design and assessment preparation. Magat and Sangalang (2024) emphasized that ChatGPT supported differentiated instruction to address diverse learner needs. David and Maroma (2025) asserted that ChatGPT served as a bridge for digital transformation in Philippine education, especially in resource-limited schools. These studies showed that ChatGPT could help alleviate workload burdens while promoting instructional efficiency.

Despite these benefits, research gaps remained regarding the actual use and perceived impact of ChatGPT on the workload efficacy of public elementary teachers in local contexts such as Zambales. Manaig, et al. (2025) pointed out that while AI adoption was growing, localized studies assessing its implications for teachers' daily routines were limited. Lopez (2023) added that literature focused primarily on higher education, leaving gaps in understanding its integration at the basic education level. These gaps highlighted the need to explore how ChatGPT was utilized in Philippine elementary schools.

Given the rising demand for efficiency among teachers, there was a need to conduct this study to address workload issues faced by public elementary teachers. The findings could provide insights into how ChatGPT could reduce stress, enhance time management, and improve instructional quality. Ultimately, this study aimed to inform policymakers, school leaders, and teachers in developing sustainable AI integration strategies within the Philippine basic education system.

METHODS

The study employed a descriptive-correlational design to determine the teachers' workload efficacy and challenges associated with ChatGPT adoption among public elementary teachers in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales. The 163 public elementary school teachers were identified using random sampling. Prior to participation, all respondents were provided with an informed consent form clearly stating the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks, benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participation was strictly voluntary. To ensure data confidentiality, all responses were treated with the utmost privacy, and data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researchers. Results were presented in aggregate form to prevent identification of individual participants.

To develop the survey questionnaire, the researchers reviewed relevant literature to identify appropriate items and indicators. The questionnaire consisted of three (3) parts: (1) respondents' profile including sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, years in service, length of ChatGPT usage (in months or years), and the number of trainings attended on AI integration in teaching; (2) the frequency in which teachers used ChatGPT for instructional planning, classroom activities, assessment tasks, and administrative tasks; (3) the opportunities perceived by teachers in using ChatGPT, highlighting instructional innovation and creativity, professional development, learner engagement and differentiated instruction, and access to teaching resources; (4) the extent of ChatGPT's contribution to teachers' workload efficacy, particularly in lesson preparation time, preparation of instructional materials, management of classroom records, and overall work-life balance; and (5) the challenges encountered by teachers when integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practices, including technical and technological constraints, digital literacy and user competence, curricular and pedagogical alignment, ethical and academic integrity concerns, policy and institutional support, and time and workload management.

The researcher-made questionnaire was developed through a thorough review of relevant literature, including journal articles, previous research studies, and other academic sources related to ChatGPT use and teacher workload like the works of Ahmed & Ahmed (2025); Crompton & Burke (2024); Govindarajan & Christuraj (2024); Kim & Ahn (2023); Rahman & Watanobe (2023); and Zhang & Tur (2023).

To ensure its validity and reliability, the instrument underwent expert validation and was pilot tested on a separate group of respondents not involved in the main study. The developed instrument was also subjected to Cronbach's Alpha analysis, and the results confirmed its reliability for administration to the target participants. Data collected from the respondents were tallied and analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage, weighted mean, ranking, ANOVA, Pearson-r, and Likert Scale.

DISCUSSION

Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers

Instructional Planning

Table 1 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the frequency of ChatGPT use by public elementary teachers in terms of instructional planning in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 1. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers in Terms of Instructional Planning

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I use ChatGPT for generating clear and coherent lesson plans.	2.47	Seldom	9
2. I use ChatGPT for simplifying complex concepts for learners.	2.66	Often	1
3. I use ChatGPT for aligning my lessons with curriculum standards.	2.51	Often	7
4. I use ChatGPT for developing differentiated instructional materials.	2.57	Often	4
5. I use ChatGPT for adapting lessons to diverse learning needs and styles.	2.56	Often	5
6. I use ChatGPT for improving the overall quality of my lesson preparation.	2.60	Often	3
7. I use ChatGPT for enhancing creativity in designing instructional materials.	2.61	Often	2
8. I use ChatGPT for preparing Daily Lesson Logs (DLL) and lesson exemplars.	2.42	Seldom	10
9. I use ChatGPT for creating engaging and level-appropriate learning activities.	2.53	Often	6
10. I use ChatGPT for ensuring the relevance and accuracy of instructional content.	2.49	Seldom	8
Weighted Mean	2.54	Often	

Several indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for simplifying complex concepts for learners” with $\bar{x} = 2.66$, ranked 1; “I use ChatGPT for enhancing creativity in designing instructional materials” with $\bar{x} = 2.61$, ranked 2; and “I use ChatGPT for improving the overall quality of my lesson preparation” with $\bar{x} = 2.60$, ranked 3. These findings meant that teachers frequently relied on ChatGPT to support clarity, creativity, and overall effectiveness in lesson planning. This finding denoted that ChatGPT had been primarily used as a tool to enhance instructional design rather than as a sole planning mechanism.

This was because teachers needed efficient tools to manage complex instructional tasks while ensuring that lessons remained engaging and understandable for learners. Macabenta, Manubag, Tabanag, Villegas, Villegas, and Cabanilla (2023) found that teachers tended to adopt instructional innovations that directly improved teaching efficiency and lesson quality. This suggested that teachers were more likely to embrace new practices when these clearly enhanced classroom performances and reduced instructional workload.

Several indicators were described as “Seldom” such as “I use ChatGPT for ensuring the relevance and accuracy of instructional content” with $\bar{x} = 2.49$, ranked 8; “I use ChatGPT for generating clear and coherent lesson plans” with $\bar{x} = 2.47$, ranked 9; and “I use ChatGPT for preparing Daily Lesson Logs (DLL) and lesson exemplars”

with $\bar{x} = 2.42$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers had limited dependence on ChatGPT for formal documentation and content validation.

This was because teachers tended to rely more on established curriculum guides, official templates, and their own professional judgment when preparing required instructional documents to ensure compliance and accuracy. Cacho (2024) found that teachers demonstrated selectivity in applying new tools to formal instructional requirements. This indicated cautious use of ChatGPT in areas that required official compliance and high accountability, where accuracy and adherence to guidelines were prioritized.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of the indicators was “Often,” with a weighted mean of 2.54, indicating frequent but not extensive use of ChatGPT in instructional planning. These results were affected by teachers’ familiarity with technology, perceived reliability of AI tools, and the formal demands of lesson documentation.

Teachers tended to use ChatGPT as a supportive tool rather than a primary source in instructional planning, balancing its benefits with professional judgment and existing curriculum requirements. Alonzo, Bejano, and Labad (2022) found that teachers’ utilization of innovations had been influenced by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This suggested that instructional decisions were shaped not only by immediate teaching demands but also by policies and standards set within the school system.

Classroom Activities

Table 2 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the frequency of ChatGPT use by public elementary teachers in terms of classroom activities in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for preparing enrichment and remedial learning tasks” with $\bar{x} = 2.64$, ranked 1; “I use ChatGPT for providing instant explanations to student questions,” “I use ChatGPT for organizing and structuring my instructional delivery,” and “I use ChatGPT for generating strategies that improve student engagement” with $\bar{x} = 2.60$, ranked 3. These findings meant that teachers frequently used ChatGPT to support immediate instructional needs and lesson flow inside the classroom. This finding denoted that ChatGPT had been valued as a practical tool for enhancing responsiveness and organization during classroom activities.

Teachers often prioritized immediate classroom needs such as delivering lessons, addressing learner questions, and managing instructional flow, where ChatGPT served as a quick and accessible support tool. Hatmanto and Rahmawati (2023) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that directly supported day-to-day instructional efficiency. This indicated that teachers were more likely to use tools and strategies that provided immediate and practical benefits in classroom instruction.

Table 2. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers in Terms of Classroom Activities

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I use ChatGPT for designing collaborative or group-based activities.	2.55	Often	9.5
2. I use ChatGPT for preparing enrichment and remedial learning tasks.	2.64	Often	1
3. I use ChatGPT for providing instant explanations to student questions.	2.60	Often	3
4. I use ChatGPT for preparing visual or textual materials for instruction.	2.58	Often	6.5
5. I use ChatGPT for creating varied and interactive classroom activities.	2.55	Often	9.5

6. I use ChatGPT for organizing and structuring my instructional delivery.	2.60	Often	3
7. I use ChatGPT for producing examples appropriate to my learners' level.	2.57	Often	8
8. I use ChatGPT for identifying motivational strategies to start my lessons.	2.58	Often	6.5
9. I use ChatGPT for developing discussion prompts and learning questions.	2.59	Often	5
10. I use ChatGPT for generating strategies that improve student engagement.	2.60	Often	3
Weighted Mean	2.59	Often	

Certain indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for producing examples appropriate to my learners’ level” with $\bar{x} = 2.57$, ranked 8; “I use ChatGPT for designing collaborative or group-based activities” with $\bar{x} = 2.55$, ranked 9.5; and “I use ChatGPT for creating varied and interactive classroom activities” with $\bar{x} = 2.55$, ranked 9.5. These findings meant that ChatGPT had been less frequently utilized for activity design and collaborative task development. This finding denoted that teachers still relied more on personal experience and existing strategies when planning interactive classroom activities.

Teachers tended to depend more on their established instructional experience, ready-made teaching materials, and familiarity with classroom strategies when designing interactive and collaborative activities, rather than relying on ChatGPT for activity development. Mastul, De Vera, and Jayme (2023) found that teachers demonstrated selectivity in applying new tools to areas requiring direct learner interaction. This indicated that teachers carefully chose when to use innovations, prioritizing methods they perceived as more effective for engaging learners face-to-face in classroom activities.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Often,” with a weighted mean of 2.59, indicating frequent use of ChatGPT in classroom activities. These results were affected by teachers’ immediate instructional demands, classroom management needs, and perceived usefulness of AI tools during teaching.

Teachers frequently used ChatGPT as a supportive tool to address immediate classroom demands, particularly in managing instruction, simplifying tasks, and responding to learner needs in real time. Lazo (2024) found that teachers’ utilization of innovations had been influenced by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers’ decisions to adopt new tools were shaped by their immediate instructional demands as well as the requirements and standards set by their schools.

Assessment Tasks

Table 3 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the frequency of ChatGPT use by public elementary teachers in terms of assessment tasks in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 3. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers in Terms of Assessment Tasks

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I use ChatGPT for preparing summative tests efficiently.	2.52	Often	9.5
2. I use ChatGPT for generating rubrics for performance tasks.	2.67	Often	1
3. I use ChatGPT for generating answer keys or scoring guides.	2.52	Often	9.5
4. I use ChatGPT for crafting comprehension and application questions.	2.58	Often	2.5

5. I use ChatGPT for drafting constructive feedback for student outputs.	2.54	Often	6.5
6. I use ChatGPT for designing higher-order-thinking assessment items.	2.58	Often	2.5
7. I use ChatGPT for checking the clarity and appropriateness of test items.	2.53	Often	8
8. I use ChatGPT for developing quick and effective formative assessments.	2.54	Often	6.5
9. I use ChatGPT for constructing valid and competency-aligned test questions.	2.56	Often	4
10. I use ChatGPT for improving the overall quality and consistency of assessments.	2.55	Often	5
Weighted Mean	2.56	Often	

Several indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for generating rubrics for performance tasks” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 1; “I use ChatGPT for crafting comprehension and application questions” with $\bar{x} = 2.58$, ranked 2.5; and “I use ChatGPT for designing higher-order-thinking assessment items” with $\bar{x} = 2.58$, ranked 2.5. These findings meant that teachers frequently relied on ChatGPT to create meaningful and effective assessment tools. This finding denoted that ChatGPT had been a valuable support for enhancing assessment quality and aligning tasks with learning objectives.

Teachers often faced time constraints and increasing workload demands in preparing assessments, which led them to use ChatGPT as a convenient tool for quickly generating structured, varied, and curriculum-aligned evaluation materials. Sibug, Vital, Miranda, Fernando, Gamboa, Hernandez, Bansil, Penecilla, and Gonzales (2024) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that directly improved instructional efficiency and assessment practices. This indicated that teachers were more likely to utilize tools that enhanced the speed, quality, and effectiveness of lesson delivery and assessment preparation.

Certain indicators were described as “Often” such as and “I use ChatGPT for checking the clarity and appropriateness of test items” with $\bar{x} = 2.53$, ranked 8; “I use ChatGPT for preparing summative tests efficiently” and “I use ChatGPT for generating answer keys or scoring guides” with $\bar{x} = 2.52$, ranked 9.5. These findings meant that teachers had been less frequent in using ChatGPT for formal documentation and test verification. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT was widely used for creating assessment content, teachers still exercised caution in its application for finalized evaluation tools.

Teachers tended to prioritize accuracy and accountability when dealing with formal assessment documents, leading them to rely more on their professional judgment and official curriculum references rather than fully depending on ChatGPT for test verification and finalized evaluation materials. Gonzales (2022) found that teachers were selective in applying new tools to formal assessment processes. This indicated that teachers exercised caution and relied more on established assessment standards and professional judgment when handling tasks that required accuracy and accountability.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Often,” with a weighted mean of 2.56, indicating that ChatGPT had been frequently used in assessment-related tasks. These results were influenced by teachers’ familiarity with AI tools, the need for efficient assessment preparation, and the perceived reliability of ChatGPT in generating valid materials.

This became the finding of the study because teachers frequently used ChatGPT as a practical support tool to streamline assessment preparation while balancing concerns on accuracy, reliability, and adherence to official testing standards. Velasco (2023) found that teachers’ use of innovations had been shaped by practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers’ decisions to adopt tools and strategies were guided both by immediate instructional demands and by compliance with school policies and standards.

Administrative Tasks

Table 4 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the frequency of ChatGPT use by public elementary teachers in terms of administrative tasks in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for preparing reports and required documentation” with $\bar{x} = 2.79$, ranked 1; “I use ChatGPT for writing narrative reports and minutes of meetings” and “I use ChatGPT for organizing information for administrative submissions” with $\bar{x} = 2.75$, ranked 2.5. These findings meant that teachers frequently relied on ChatGPT to enhance efficiency and accuracy in preparing administrative outputs. This finding denoted that ChatGPT had been a valuable tool in streamlining administrative tasks and reducing workload.

Table 4. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers in Terms of Administrative Tasks

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I use ChatGPT for rewriting and editing official documents.	2.67	Often	10
2. I use ChatGPT for preparing reports and required documentation.	2.79	Often	1
3. I use ChatGPT for preparing content for presentations and meetings.	2.71	Often	9
4. I use ChatGPT for writing narrative reports and minutes of meetings.	2.76	Often	2.5
5. I use ChatGPT for accomplishing administrative tasks more efficiently.	2.73	Often	6.5
6. I use ChatGPT for organizing information for administrative submissions.	2.75	Often	2.5
7. I use ChatGPT for preparing announcements, advisories, or public notices.	2.72	Often	8
8. I use ChatGPT for drafting official communication such as letters and memos.	2.73	Often	6.5
9. I use ChatGPT for improving the clarity and quality of administrative outputs.	2.75	Often	4
10. I use ChatGPT for completing content needed for school forms and compliance tasks.	2.75	Often	5
Weighted Mean	2.74	Often	

Teachers were burdened with multiple administrative requirements and time-consuming documentation tasks, which led them to use ChatGPT as a practical tool for organizing, drafting, and streamlining reports more efficiently while maintaining productivity. Zahurin, Mamat, Ali, and Abas (2024) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that directly improved work efficiency and task management. This indicated that teachers were more inclined to use tools and strategies that helped them accomplish administrative and instructional tasks faster and with greater organization.

Certain indicators were described as “Often” such as “I use ChatGPT for preparing announcements, advisories, or public notices” with $\bar{x} = 2.72$, ranked 8; “I use ChatGPT for preparing content for presentations and meetings” with $\bar{x} = 2.71$, ranked 9; and “I use ChatGPT for rewriting and editing official documents” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers had been less frequent in using ChatGPT for formal content preparation

and public-facing communications. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT was widely used in administrative work, teachers still exercised discretion in its use for formal or official outputs.

Teachers remained cautious in using ChatGPT for formal and public-facing documents, as they prioritized accuracy, accountability, and adherence to official communication standards, often preferring to personally review or refine outputs before final submission. Capili and Paglinawan (2025) found that teachers were selective in applying innovations to formal administrative responsibilities. This indicated that teachers carefully regulated the use of new tools in official tasks to ensure accuracy, compliance, and alignment with institutional standards.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Often,” with a weighted mean of 2.74, indicating frequent use of ChatGPT in administrative tasks. These results were affected by teachers’ familiarity with AI tools, the demand for efficient administrative processing, and perceived reliability of ChatGPT in generating accurate outputs.

Teachers frequently used ChatGPT as a practical support tool to cope with heavy administrative workloads, while still exercising judgment to ensure that outputs remained accurate, appropriate, and aligned with school requirements. Manegdeg and Paglinawan (2024) found that teachers’ use of innovations had been shaped by both practical workplace needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers’ adoption of new tools was guided by the demands of their daily tasks as well as the requirements and standards imposed by their institutions.

Summary of the Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers

Table 5 presents the summary of the weighted mean and descriptive equivalent of the frequency of ChatGPT use by public elementary teachers in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 5. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Frequency of ChatGPT Use by Public Elementary Teachers

Frequency of ChatGPT Use	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Instructional Planning	2.54	Often	4
2. Classroom Activities	2.59	Often	2
3. Assessment Tasks	2.56	Often	3
4. Administrative Tasks	2.74	Often	1
Overall Weighted Mean	2.61	Often	

The indicator “Administrative Tasks” had the highest $\bar{x} = 2.74$, interpreted as “Often.” This implied that teachers most frequently use ChatGPT to support administrative responsibilities compared to other areas of practice. This finding denotes that ChatGPT is mainly valued for reducing paperwork, organizing information, and improving efficiency in non-instructional tasks.

Teachers often faced heavy administrative workloads and time constraints, which led them to prioritize ChatGPT as a practical tool for reducing paperwork, organizing data, and improving efficiency in completing non-instructional responsibilities. Algar, Basaños, De La Luna, Jentelizo, Salbibia, and Trecho (2025) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that lessened administrative workload and allowed more time for instructional responsibilities. This indicated that teachers were more likely to embrace tools that improved efficiency in handling paperwork and streamlined non-instructional tasks within their daily routines.

The indicator “Instructional Planning” had the lowest $\bar{x} = 2.54$, interpreted as “Often.” This implied that while teachers use ChatGPT for lesson preparation, it is relatively less frequent compared to its use in other teaching

functions. This finding denotes that teachers may still rely on professional experience and existing teaching guides when planning instruction.

Teachers tended to rely more on established curriculum guides, their prior teaching experience, and ready-made instructional materials when planning lessons, using ChatGPT only as a supplementary tool rather than a primary resource for instructional planning. Ramos (2025) found that teachers were more selective in adopting new tools for core instructional planning where pedagogical judgment was considered essential. This indicated that teachers tended to prioritize their professional expertise and established instructional frameworks when designing lessons, especially for tasks requiring careful alignment with curriculum standards.

In summary, all areas were commonly interpreted as “Often,” suggesting consistent use of ChatGPT among public elementary teachers. These results indicate that teachers’ frequency of ChatGPT use is affected by task type, workload demands, and perceived usefulness of the tool.

Teachers tended to use ChatGPT regularly across various tasks but not uniformly, as their frequency of use was influenced by the nature of the task, the urgency of workload demands, and their perception of how helpful the tool was for specific instructional and administrative needs. Basileo and Lyons (2024) stated that the adoption of educational innovations is strongly influenced by practicality and relevance to teachers’ daily responsibilities, which explains the findings of this study. Basileo and Lyons (2024) found that the adoption of educational innovations was strongly influenced by practicality and relevance to teachers’ daily responsibilities. This indicated that teachers were more likely to embrace tools and strategies that directly supported their workload, improved efficiency, and aligned with their immediate instructional needs.

Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT

Instructional Innovation and Creativity

Table 6 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of perceived opportunities of public elementary teachers in using ChatGPT in terms of instructional innovation and creativity in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me innovate beyond traditional lecture-based methods” with $\bar{x} = 2.90$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me design interactive games or simulations for classroom use” with $\bar{x} = 2.89$, ranked 2; and “ChatGPT helps me integrate 21st-century skills into lesson activities” and “ChatGPT helps me explore and experiment with new teaching strategies” with $\bar{x} = 2.88$, ranked 3.5. These findings meant that teachers perceived ChatGPT as a useful tool for enhancing creativity and introducing innovative strategies in their lessons. This finding denoted that ChatGPT provided opportunities for teachers to expand beyond conventional instructional approaches.

Table 6. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT in Terms of Instructional Innovation and Creativity

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me design engaging lesson activities.	2.85	Agree	7.5
2. ChatGPT helps me adjust activities to suit diverse learner interests.	2.82	Agree	10
3. ChatGPT helps me innovate beyond traditional lecture-based methods.	2.90	Agree	1
4. ChatGPT helps me integrate 21st-century skills into lesson activities.	2.88	Agree	3.5
5. ChatGPT helps me generate unique ideas for integrating technology into lessons.	2.86	Agree	5

6. ChatGPT helps me create interdisciplinary or project-based learning tasks.	2.85	Agree	7.5
7. ChatGPT helps me develop creative approaches for teaching difficult topics.	2.85	Agree	7.5
8. ChatGPT helps me explore and experiment with new teaching strategies.	2.88	Agree	3.5
9. ChatGPT helps me design interactive games or simulations for classroom use.	2.89	Agree	2
10. ChatGPT helps me produce culturally relevant and locally contextualized content.	2.85	Agree	7.5
Weighted Mean	2.86	Agree	

Teachers were increasingly exposed to digital tools and evolving instructional demands, which encouraged them to view ChatGPT as a supportive resource for enhancing creativity, exploring new teaching strategies, and moving beyond traditional lecture-based instruction. Gamboa (2023) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that enhanced teaching creativity and instructional quality. This indicated that teachers were more likely to use tools and strategies that supported innovative lesson design and improved the overall effectiveness of classroom instruction.

Certain indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me design engaging lesson activities,” “ChatGPT helps me create interdisciplinary or project-based learning tasks,” “ChatGPT helps me develop creative approaches for teaching difficult topics,” and “ChatGPT helps me produce culturally relevant and locally contextualized content,” with $\bar{x} = 2.85$, ranked 7.5; and “ChatGPT helps me adjust activities to suit diverse learner interests” with $\bar{x} = 2.82$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers were moderately confident in using ChatGPT to cater to diverse learning needs and implement complex instructional designs. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT supported innovation, its use for certain adaptive or interdisciplinary tasks was still developing.

Teachers were still in the process of fully integrating ChatGPT into complex instructional design tasks, as their use of the tool was influenced by varying levels of digital competence, familiarity with adaptive teaching strategies, and the need to balance innovation with established classroom practices. Hortelano and Roleda (2024) found that teachers were selective in applying innovations to areas requiring careful planning and alignment with learner needs. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt new tools more cautiously when instructional tasks involved complex decision-making, differentiation, and curriculum alignment.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Agree,” with a weighted mean of 2.86, indicating a positive perception of ChatGPT as a tool for instructional innovation and creativity. These results were influenced by teachers’ openness to technology, familiarity with ChatGPT, and the perceived relevance of AI tools in lesson design.

Teachers generally showed openness to digital tools and recognized the usefulness of ChatGPT in enhancing lesson design, while their perceptions were shaped by prior experience with technology and the practical relevance of AI to their instructional tasks. Padohinog, Liwanag, and Balsicas (2024) found that teachers’ use of innovations had been shaped by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers’ adoption of new tools was influenced by the demands of daily instruction as well as the policies, guidelines, and expectations set by their schools.

Professional Development

Table 7 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of perceived opportunities of public elementary teachers in using ChatGPT in terms of professional development in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me build confidence in using emerging educational technologies” with $\bar{x} = 2.95$, ranked 1; and “ChatGPT helps me learn new instructional strategies,” “ChatGPT helps me prepare materials for seminars and presentations,” and “ChatGPT helps me strengthen my prompt-writing skills for various technologies” with $\bar{x} = 2.94$, ranked 3. These findings meant that teachers perceived ChatGPT as highly beneficial for strengthening their skills and confidence in applying new teaching methods. This finding denoted that ChatGPT provided meaningful opportunities for professional growth and enhanced instructional competency.

Table 7. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT in Terms of Professional Development

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me learn new instructional strategies.	2.94	Agree	3
2. ChatGPT helps me improve my digital literacy skills.	2.90	Agree	7
3. ChatGPT helps me clarify subject content when needed.	2.89	Agree	9
4. ChatGPT helps me reflect on and refine my teaching practices.	2.90	Agree	7
5. ChatGPT helps me stay updated with the latest teaching trends.	2.84	Agree	10
6. ChatGPT helps me draft research outlines or action research proposals.	2.93	Agree	5
7. ChatGPT helps me prepare materials for seminars and presentations.	2.94	Agree	3
8. ChatGPT helps me strengthen my prompt-writing skills for various technologies.	2.94	Agree	3
9. ChatGPT helps me build confidence in using emerging educational technologies.	2.95	Agree	1
10. ChatGPT helps me develop outputs for continuing professional development (CPD).	2.90	Agree	7
Weighted Mean	2.91	Agree	

Teachers used ChatGPT not only as an instructional tool but also as a means of professional development, as it helped them gain confidence, explore new teaching strategies, and improve their competence in integrating emerging technologies into their instructional practices. Pelingon, Contreras, Moreno, Dayrit, Mallari, Toledano, and Dominado (2024) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that supported professional development and teaching effectiveness. This indicated that teachers were more likely to embrace tools and strategies that enhanced their instructional skills, confidence, and overall classroom performance.

Certain indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me improve my digital literacy skills,” “ChatGPT helps me reflect on and refine my teaching practices,” and “ChatGPT helps me develop outputs for continuing professional development (CPD)” with $\bar{x} = 2.90$, ranked 7; “ChatGPT helps me clarify subject content when needed” with $\bar{x} = 2.89$, ranked 9; and “ChatGPT helps me stay updated with the latest teaching trends” with $\bar{x} = 2.84$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers moderately used ChatGPT to enhance specific knowledge areas or stay current with educational trends. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT was effective for professional development, its use in certain tasks was still evolving.

Teachers were gradually integrating ChatGPT into their professional development practices, but their usage remained moderate due to varying levels of digital literacy, limited sustained training, and the tendency to rely on traditional sources and established professional learning activities for updating content knowledge and instructional practices. Morales (2023) found that teachers were selective in applying innovations to support

continuous professional learning. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt new tools only when they clearly aligned with their immediate professional development needs and practical classroom applications.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Agree,” with a weighted mean of 2.91, indicating a positive perception of ChatGPT in supporting professional development. These results were influenced by teachers’ interest in upskilling, familiarity with technology, and the relevance of AI tools for professional growth.

This became the finding of the study because teachers generally recognized the value of ChatGPT as a support tool for professional development, particularly as they sought opportunities to enhance their digital skills, adapt to emerging technologies, and align their instructional practices with current educational trends, although their level of engagement was still influenced by familiarity and practical exposure to AI tools. Dayagbil and Alda (2024) found that teachers’ use of innovations had been shaped by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt educational tools that addressed immediate instructional demands while still complying with school policies and professional standards.

Learner Engagement and Differentiated Instruction

Table 8 presented the mean and descriptive equivalent of perceived opportunities of public elementary teachers in using ChatGPT in terms of learner engagement and differentiated instruction in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me produce story prompts and examples that interest young learners” with $\bar{x} = 2.92$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me create enrichment tasks for advanced learners,” and “ChatGPT helps me prepare remedial exercises for struggling learners” with $\bar{x} = 2.90$, ranked 2.5. These findings meant that teachers perceived ChatGPT as highly effective in supporting differentiated instruction and engaging learners at various levels. This finding denoted that ChatGPT provided opportunities for teachers to address learner diversity while sustaining interest and participation.

Teachers were working in classrooms with diverse learner abilities and learning needs, which required them to adapt instruction through enrichment and remediation; thus, they perceived ChatGPT as useful for generating varied instructional materials that could support differentiation and sustain learner engagement across different proficiency levels. Guisadio, Tordos, Pocdol, Taboada, Petin, Asentista, Sumampong, Catacutan, Catamco, Delatado, Lerio, Villanueva, and Cabello (2025) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that enhanced learner engagement and instructional effectiveness. This indicated that teachers were more likely to integrate tools and strategies that made lessons more interactive, responsive, and supportive of learners’ active participation in the learning process.

Table 8. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT in Terms of Learner Engagement and Differentiated Instruction

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me craft higher-order thinking questions.	2.83	Agree	10
2. ChatGPT helps me create enrichment tasks for advanced learners.	2.90	Agree	2.5
3. ChatGPT helps me design activity variations for multiple learning styles.	2.85	Agree	8
4. ChatGPT helps me prepare remedial exercises for struggling learners.	2.90	Agree	2.5
5. ChatGPT helps me adapt lessons for multilingual or multicultural classes.	2.85	Agree	8
6. ChatGPT helps me connect lesson content to real-life learner experiences.	2.85	Agree	8
7. ChatGPT helps me design formative assessments for different ability levels.	2.88	Agree	4

8. ChatGPT helps me create visuals or examples that increase student participation.	2.87	Agree	5
9. ChatGPT helps me sustain learner motivation through varied lesson formats.	2.86	Agree	6
10. ChatGPT helps me produce story prompts and examples that interest young learners	2.92	Agree	1
Weighted Mean	2.87	Agree	

Certain indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me design activity variations for multiple learning styles,” “ChatGPT helps me adapt lessons for multilingual or multicultural classes,” and “ChatGPT helps me connect lesson content to real-life learner experience,” with $\bar{x} = 2.85$, ranked 8; and “ChatGPT helps me craft higher-order thinking questions” with $\bar{x} = 2.83$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers moderately used ChatGPT to develop complex or culturally adaptive instructional tasks. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT supported engagement and differentiation, its use for higher-order or culturally responsive tasks was still developing.

Teachers were still developing confidence and competence in designing complex instructional tasks, particularly those requiring cultural responsiveness and higher-order thinking integration, as their use of ChatGPT was shaped by varying levels of pedagogical expertise, exposure to differentiated instruction strategies, and experience in applying AI tools to nuanced classroom contexts. Frianeza, Maravilla, Relox, Dagaraga, Cruz, Solomon, and Mohammad (2024) found that teachers were selective in applying innovations to address diverse learner needs. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt instructional tools more cautiously when these required adaptation to varied learning styles, cultural contexts, and levels of learner proficiency.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Agree,” with a weighted mean of 2.87, indicating positive perceptions of ChatGPT in enhancing learner engagement and differentiated instruction. These results were affected by teachers’ familiarity with AI tools, instructional planning strategies, and the perceived relevance of ChatGPT in supporting diverse learners.

Teachers generally viewed ChatGPT as a supportive tool for improving learner engagement and differentiation, but their level of perceived effectiveness was shaped by their familiarity with AI, their instructional planning practices, and how relevant they considered the tool in addressing diverse learner needs within their classrooms. Pecson and Sarmiento (2024) found that teachers’ use of innovations had been shaped by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt new instructional tools when they directly supported classroom efficiency while still aligning with school policies, standards, and expected teaching practices.

Access to Teaching Resources

Table 9 presented the mean and descriptive equivalent of perceived opportunities of public elementary teachers in using ChatGPT in terms of access to teaching resources in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 9. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT in Terms of Access to Teaching Resources

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me locate open educational resources (OER).	2.77	Agree	10
2. ChatGPT helps me create age-appropriate reading materials.	2.88	Agree	4
3. ChatGPT helps me generate worksheets and quizzes instantly.	2.81	Agree	8

4. ChatGPT helps me prepare sample rubrics and scoring guides.	2.91	Agree	1.5
5. ChatGPT helps me access updated facts and references quickly.	2.79	Agree	9
6. ChatGPT helps me identify credible online and offline resources.	2.83	Agree	7
7. ChatGPT helps me summarize lengthy documents for classroom use.	2.88	Agree	4
8. ChatGPT helps me translate learning materials into Filipino or local languages.	2.85	Agree	6
9. ChatGPT helps me produce templates for letters, reports, and other school documents	2.91	Agree	1.5
10. ChatGPT helps me reduce the need for purchasing costly commercial teaching aids.	2.88	Agree	4
Weighted Mean	2.85	Agree	

Several indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me prepare sample rubrics and scoring guides” and “ChatGPT helps me produce templates for letters, reports, and other school documents” with $\bar{x} = 2.91$, ranked 1.5; and “ChatGPT helps me create age-appropriate reading materials,” “ChatGPT helps me summarize lengthy documents for classroom use,” and “ChatGPT helps me reduce the need for purchasing costly commercial teaching aids,” with $\bar{x} = 2.88$, ranked 4. These findings meant that teachers perceived ChatGPT as highly effective in generating essential teaching materials quickly and accurately. This finding denoted that ChatGPT supported teachers in enhancing instructional planning and classroom efficiency.

Teachers were often managing heavy instructional and administrative workloads, which led them to value ChatGPT as a convenient tool for quickly generating teaching materials, organizing documents, and simplifying complex content while maintaining efficiency in lesson preparation and classroom tasks. De Lara and Santos (2024) found that teachers tended to adopt innovations that provided immediate and practical access to teaching resources. This indicated that teachers were more likely to use tools that simplified lesson preparation, improved resource availability, and supported efficient instructional planning.

Certain indicators were described as “Agree” such as “ChatGPT helps me generate worksheets and quizzes instantly” with $\bar{x} = 2.81$, ranked 8; “ChatGPT helps me access updated facts and references quickly” with $\bar{x} = 2.79$, ranked 9; and “ChatGPT helps me locate open educational resources (OER)” with $\bar{x} = 2.77$, ranked 10. These findings meant that teachers moderately used ChatGPT for accessing specific resources or factual information. This finding denoted that while ChatGPT facilitated resource access, teachers were still developing familiarity and confidence in using it for certain tasks.

Teachers were still in the process of fully integrating ChatGPT into resource searching and verification tasks, as their usage was influenced by varying levels of digital literacy, cautiousness in relying on AI-generated information, and continued preference for traditional or established sources of instructional materials. Alejandro, Sanchez, Sumalinog, Mananay, Goles, and Fernandez (2024) found that teachers were selective in adopting innovations for efficient access to instructional resources. This indicated that teachers tended to use digital tools when they clearly improved efficiency in locating, organizing, and utilizing teaching materials.

In summary, the most common descriptive mean of all indicators was “Agree,” with a weighted mean of 2.85, indicating positive perceptions of ChatGPT in supporting access to teaching resources. These results were influenced by teachers’ technological skills, the relevance of AI-generated materials, and the perceived usefulness of ChatGPT in lesson preparation.

Teachers generally perceived ChatGPT as a helpful tool for accessing and generating teaching resources, but their level of utilization was shaped by their technological competence, trust in AI-generated content, and the practical relevance of the materials produced for lesson preparation and classroom use. Balbin, Abenes-Balbin,

Yangco, and Oplencia (2025) found that teachers' use of innovations had been shaped by both practical classroom needs and institutional expectations. This indicated that teachers tended to adopt instructional tools that addressed immediate teaching demands while still complying with school policies, standards, and administrative requirements.

Summary of the Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT

Table 10 presents the summary of the weighted mean and descriptive equivalent of the perceived opportunities of public elementary teachers in using ChatGPT in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 10. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Perceived Opportunities of Public Elementary Teachers in Using ChatGPT

Frequency of ChatGPT Use	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Instructional Innovation and Creativity	2.86	Agree	3
2. Professional Development	2.91	Agree	1
3. Learner Engagement and Differentiated Instruction	2.87	Agree	2
4. Access to Teaching Resources	2.85	Agree	4
Overall Weighted Mean	2.87	Agree	

The indicator "Professional Development" had the highest $\bar{x} = 2.91$, interpreted as "Agree." This implied that teachers most strongly recognize ChatGPT as an effective tool for improving their professional skills, building confidence with educational technologies, and supporting continuous learning. This finding denotes that ChatGPT plays a key role in enhancing teachers' growth and readiness to integrate digital tools in instruction.

Teachers were increasingly exposed to digital learning tools and professional expectations that encouraged continuous upskilling, leading them to view ChatGPT as a practical support system for improving their technological competence, strengthening instructional confidence, and sustaining professional growth in line with evolving educational demands. Guhao and Sioting (2023) found that teachers were more receptive to innovations that strengthened their professional competence and self-efficacy. This indicated that teachers tended to embrace tools and strategies that enhanced their skills, confidence, and overall effectiveness in teaching.

The indicator "Access to Teaching Resources" had the lowest $\bar{x} = 2.85$, interpreted as "Agree." This implied that teachers perceive ChatGPT as useful for accessing and generating instructional resources, though slightly less strongly compared to professional development opportunities. This finding denotes that while ChatGPT supports resource preparation, teachers may still rely on additional judgment and verification to ensure relevance and quality.

Teachers tended to use ChatGPT primarily as a supplementary tool for gathering and generating instructional materials, but they still relied on their professional judgment, curriculum standards, and other verified sources to ensure that the resources used in teaching were accurate, appropriate, and aligned with learner needs. Garcia, Himang, Himang, Densing, Alit, Burgos, Bongo, and Ocampo (2023) found that teachers adopted technological tools selectively, especially when external resources required evaluation. This indicated that teachers tended to be cautious in using digital tools and preferred to verify the accuracy and appropriateness of resources before integrating them into instruction.

In summary, all areas were commonly interpreted as "Agree," suggesting that teachers consistently perceive opportunities for ChatGPT use across instructional innovation, professional growth, learner engagement, and resource access. These results indicate that teachers' acceptance of ChatGPT is influenced by its usefulness, efficiency, and alignment with professional and instructional needs.

Teachers generally recognized ChatGPT as a practical and supportive tool across multiple teaching functions, as their acceptance was shaped by its perceived usefulness in reducing workload, improving efficiency, and aligning with their instructional and professional development needs. Escanda (2025) found that teachers are more likely to adopt innovations that provide practical benefits, enhance professional competence, and support effective teaching. This indicated that teachers tended to embrace tools that directly improved their instructional efficiency, strengthened their skills, and aligned with their classroom needs.

Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use

Lesson Preparation Time

Table 11 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of workload efficacy of public elementary teachers through ChatGPT use in terms of lesson preparation time in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me reduce last-minute stress in lesson planning” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me produce examples and explanations faster” with $\bar{x} = 2.73$, ranked 2; and “ChatGPT helps me quickly create learning objectives and outcomes” with $\bar{x} = 2.71$, ranked 3. These findings meant that ChatGPT was most effective in easing planning pressure, accelerating content generation, and clarifying instructional goals. This finding denotes that the use of ChatGPT significantly enhances efficiency and organization during the early stages of lesson preparation among teachers.

Teachers experienced heavy lesson preparation demands and time constraints, which led them to rely on ChatGPT as a practical support tool for reducing planning stress, speeding up the creation of instructional materials, and improving the clarity and organization of lesson objectives during the early stages of instruction. De Santo Cristo De Burgos and Ilagan (2024) found that efficient instructional tools reduce teachers’ planning burden and improve task management. This indicated that teachers tended to benefit from technologies that streamlined lesson preparation, minimized workload pressures, and enhanced overall organizational efficiency in teaching tasks.

Table 11. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use in Terms of Lesson Preparation Time

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me have more time for classroom interaction.	2.65	Great Extent	9
2. ChatGPT helps me produce examples and explanations faster.	2.73	Great Extent	2
3. ChatGPT helps me spend less time researching lesson content.	2.67	Great Extent	6
4. ChatGPT helps me reduce last-minute stress in lesson planning.	2.74	Great Extent	1
5. ChatGPT helps me generate ready-to-use outlines for lesson plans.	2.69	Great Extent	4
6. ChatGPT helps me prepare substitute or emergency lessons easily.	2.66	Great Extent	7.5
7. ChatGPT helps me shorten the time I spend drafting daily lesson logs.	2.64	Great Extent	10
8. ChatGPT helps me quickly create learning objectives and outcomes.	2.71	Great Extent	3
9. ChatGPT helps me accelerate preparation of visual aids or slide content.	2.68	Great Extent	5
10. ChatGPT helps me adjust plans rapidly to accommodate schedule changes.	2.66	Great Extent	7.5
Weighted Mean	2.68	Great Extent	

Certain indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me prepare substitute or emergency lessons easily” and “ChatGPT helps me adjust plans rapidly to accommodate schedule changes,” with $\bar{x} = 2.66$, ranked 7.5; “ChatGPT helps me have more time for classroom interaction” with $\bar{x} = 2.65$, ranked 9; and “ChatGPT helps me shorten the time I spend drafting daily lesson logs” with $\bar{x} = 2.64$, ranked 10. These findings meant that although ChatGPT was helpful in these areas, they were perceived as less impactful compared with other lesson preparation functions. This finding denotes that time savings from ChatGPT are more pronounced in planning and content creation than in documentation and indirect classroom benefits.

Teachers prioritized using ChatGPT for direct instructional preparation tasks such as lesson planning and content creation, while its impact on indirect functions like documentation and schedule adjustments was less noticeable due to existing school procedures, established templates, and the limited frequency of unexpected scheduling changes in daily teaching practice. Turbanada, Alvarez, Chan, Adriatico, and Morales (2025) found that auxiliary teaching tasks benefit from technology support but to a relatively moderate extent. This indicated that while teachers appreciated digital tools for assisting non-core instructional tasks, their perceived impact remained limited compared to primary teaching and lesson preparation activities.

In summary, most indicators obtained mean scores ranging from 2.64 to 2.74, all interpreted as “Great Extent,” with a common mean description reflecting high workload efficacy. The weighted mean of 2.68 indicates that ChatGPT generally contributes positively to reducing lesson preparation time and effort of public elementary teachers.

Teachers were experiencing increasing demands in lesson preparation and workload management, which led them to perceive ChatGPT as an efficient support tool that streamlined planning tasks, reduced preparation time, and improved overall teaching productivity through quicker generation of instructional materials and lesson components. Prestoza (2024) found that teachers’ need for efficiency and instructional support was strongly linked to the use of supportive tools that enhanced teacher productivity and instructional effectiveness. This indicated that teachers tended to rely on such tools to streamline tasks, reduce workload, and improve the overall quality of instruction.

Preparation of Instructional Materials

Table 12 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of workload efficacy of public elementary teachers through ChatGPT use in terms of preparation of instructional materials in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 12. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use in Terms of Preparation of Instructional Materials

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me prepare differentiated reading materials.	2.75	Great Extent	2
2. ChatGPT helps me select multimedia resources for lessons.	2.74	Great Extent	3.5
3. ChatGPT helps me draft worksheets and activity sheets efficiently.	2.66	Great Extent	10
4. ChatGPT helps me create interactive PowerPoint or slide presentations.	2.67	Great Extent	9
5. ChatGPT helps me generate story problems or test questions quickly.	2.72	Great Extent	7
6. ChatGPT helps me obtain sample scripts for role-play or dramatization.	2.74	Great Extent	3.5
7. ChatGPT helps me design rubrics for performance tasks easily.	2.77	Great Extent	1
8. ChatGPT helps me create parent communication materials (letters, memos).	2.73	Great Extent	5

9. ChatGPT helps me prepare enrichment and remedial materials.	2.72	Great Extent	7
10. ChatGPT helps me reduce time spent on printing and material development.	2.72	Great Extent	7
Weighted Mean	2.72	Great Extent	

Several indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me design rubrics for performance tasks easily” with $\bar{x} = 2.77$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me prepare differentiated reading materials” with $\bar{x} = 2.75$, ranked 2; and “ChatGPT helps me select multimedia resources for lessons” and “ChatGPT helps me obtain sample scripts for role-play or dramatization,” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 3.5. These findings meant that ChatGPT was most effective in supporting assessment design, material differentiation, and the selection of engaging instructional resources. This finding denotes that ChatGPT significantly enhances teachers’ capacity to create quality instructional materials aligned with diverse learner needs.

Teachers were handling diverse learner needs and complex instructional requirements, which led them to rely on ChatGPT as a practical tool for efficiently designing assessments, differentiating materials, and selecting appropriate instructional resources that aligned with varied learning abilities and classroom engagement strategies. Gamit (2023) found that the use of supportive instructional tools improved teachers’ efficiency and creativity in material preparation. This indicated that teachers were more capable of producing diverse, well-structured, and engaging instructional materials when assisted by appropriate technological tools.

Certain indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me generate story problems or test questions quickly,” “ChatGPT helps me prepare enrichment and remedial materials,” and “ChatGPT helps me reduce time spent on printing and material development,” with $\bar{x} = 2.72$, ranked 7; “ChatGPT helps me create interactive PowerPoint or slide presentations,” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 9; and “ChatGPT helps me draft worksheets and activity sheets efficiently,” with $\bar{x} = 2.66$, ranked 10. These findings meant that ChatGPT was still beneficial in these areas, although its perceived impact was relatively lower compared with other instructional material tasks. This finding denotes that teachers prioritize content quality and instructional design over logistical and supplementary material concerns.

Teachers tended to prioritize instructional tasks that directly influenced learning outcomes, such as assessment design and lesson content development, while considering logistical and supplementary tasks like formatting, slide preparation, and printing as secondary responsibilities where ChatGPT was helpful but not maximally utilized. Kottmann, Schildkamp, and Der Meulen (2024) found that technological tools contributed to instructional efficiency, though their effects varied depending on task complexity and immediacy. This indicated that teachers tended to benefit more from digital tools in tasks that required quick outputs, while more complex instructional decisions still relied on professional judgment and experience.

In summary, the indicators revealed a common mean clustered around 2.72, all interpreted as “Great Extent.” The weighted mean of 2.72 indicates that ChatGPT has a strong and positive effect on reducing teachers’ workload in preparing instructional materials.

Teachers consistently experienced ChatGPT as a practical tool that streamlined the preparation of instructional materials, allowing them to work more efficiently by reducing time and effort spent on repetitive tasks while maintaining the quality of their teaching outputs. Didiquin, Mobo, and Cutillas (2023) found that teachers’ need for efficiency and instructional support was essential in enhancing teacher productivity and instructional effectiveness. This indicated that teachers were more likely to adopt tools and strategies that streamlined their work processes, reduced workload, and improved the quality of instruction.

Management of Classroom Records

Table 13 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of workload efficacy of public elementary teachers through ChatGPT use in terms of management of classroom records in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 13. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use in Terms of Management of Classroom Records

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me compose reflection logs and journals.	2.74	Great Extent	8.5
2. ChatGPT helps me simplify routine record-keeping tasks.	2.86	Great Extent	1
3. ChatGPT helps me summarize assessment data efficiently.	2.67	Great Extent	10
4. ChatGPT helps me suggest formats for class monitoring sheets.	2.77	Great Extent	6
5. ChatGPT helps me prepare documentation for school programs.	2.75	Great Extent	7
6. ChatGPT helps me create announcement drafts for school events.	2.80	Great Extent	3.5
7. ChatGPT helps me draft narrative reports (e.g., quarterly accomplishments).	2.81	Great Extent	2
8. ChatGPT helps me generate template letters for parents or stakeholders.	2.74	Great Extent	8.5
9. ChatGPT helps me produce sample forms for learner progress reports.	2.79	Great Extent	5
10. ChatGPT helps me reduce time spent writing certificates or citations.	2.80	Great Extent	3.5
Weighted Mean	2.77	Great Extent	

Several indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me simplify routine record-keeping tasks” with $\bar{x} = 2.86$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me draft narrative reports (e.g., quarterly accomplishments)” with $\bar{x} = 2.81$, ranked 2; and “ChatGPT helps me create announcement drafts for school events” and “ChatGPT helps me reduce time spent writing certificates or citations,” with $\bar{x} = 2.80$, ranked 3.5. These findings meant that ChatGPT was most effective in streamlining routine documentation, report writing, and formal communication tasks. This finding denotes that ChatGPT substantially enhances teachers’ efficiency and accuracy in managing essential classroom records.

Teachers were frequently burdened with repetitive documentation and administrative writing tasks, which led them to rely on ChatGPT as a practical support tool that helped streamline record-keeping, improve drafting efficiency, and reduce the time required to complete formal school documentation while maintaining acceptable quality and accuracy. Garcia (2023) found that supportive tools significantly reduced clerical workload and improved teachers’ administrative efficiency. This indicated that teachers benefited from technological assistance in managing routine paperwork, allowing them to allocate more time to instructional and learner-centered activities.

Certain indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me compose reflection logs and journals” and “ChatGPT helps me generate template letters for parents or stakeholders” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 8.5; and “ChatGPT helps me summarize assessment data efficiently” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 10. These findings meant that although ChatGPT was helpful in reflective writing, correspondence, and data summarization, these tasks were perceived as less impactful compared with routine documentation and reporting. This finding denotes that teachers prioritize tools that directly lessen repetitive and time-consuming administrative work.

This became the finding of the study because teachers tended to prioritize the use of ChatGPT for repetitive and time-consuming administrative tasks such as record-keeping and report preparation, while reflective writing, correspondence, and data summarization were less frequently emphasized since these tasks were either done less

often or still required greater professional judgment and personalization. Nieva (2023) found that technological assistance was more effective for structured administrative tasks than for analytical or reflective processes. This indicated that teachers benefited more from digital tools when completing routine, rule-based tasks, while more interpretive and reflective activities still required professional judgment and experience.

In summary, the indicators obtained mean scores clustered around the common mean of 2.77, all verbally interpreted as “Great Extent.” The weighted mean of 2.77 indicates that ChatGPT has a strong positive effect on easing the management of classroom records among public elementary teachers.

Teachers consistently experienced ChatGPT as an efficient support tool in managing classroom records, which reduced the time and effort required for documentation tasks while improving organization and allowing them to focus more on instructional responsibilities. Sanchez, Sumalinog, Mananay, Baguia, Goles, and Alejandro (2023) found that teachers’ need for efficiency and instructional support was essential in enhancing teacher productivity and administrative effectiveness. This indicated that teachers tended to rely on tools and strategies that streamlined their work processes, reduced workload, and improved the overall management of both instructional and administrative tasks.

Overall Work-Life Balance

Table 14 presents the equivalent of workload efficacy of public elementary teachers through ChatGPT use in terms of overall work-life balance in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 14. Equivalent of Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use in Terms of Management of Classroom Records

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT helps me experience less burnout.	2.79	Great Extent	5.5
2. ChatGPT helps me finish schoolwork earlier.	2.81	Great Extent	1
3. ChatGPT helps me improve time management.	2.77	Great Extent	8
4. ChatGPT helps me improve overall job satisfaction.	2.78	Great Extent	7
5. ChatGPT helps me achieve a healthier work–life balance.	2.74	Great Extent	10
6. ChatGPT helps me lower stress from paperwork demands.	2.79	Great Extent	5.5
7. ChatGPT helps me reduce overtime or weekend workload.	2.76	Great Extent	9
8. ChatGPT helps me focus on learners rather than routine tasks.	2.80	Great Extent	3
9. ChatGPT helps me have more personal or family time after school hours.	2.80	Great Extent	3
10. ChatGPT helps me pursue hobbies or personal interests due to saved time.	2.80	Great Extent	3
Weighted Mean	2.78	Great Extent	

Several indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me finish schoolwork earlier” with $\bar{x} = 2.81$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT helps me focus on learners rather than routine tasks,” “ChatGPT helps me have more personal or family time after school hours,” and “ChatGPT helps me pursue hobbies or personal interests due to saved time,” with $\bar{x} = 2.80$, ranked 3. These findings meant that ChatGPT was most effective in enabling teachers to complete tasks earlier, prioritize learner-centered activities, and allocate more time for personal life. This finding denotes that ChatGPT plays a significant role in improving teachers’ work efficiency and overall work–life balance.

Teachers experienced heavy workloads and time constraints in school, which led them to use ChatGPT as a practical support tool that helped them complete tasks faster, reduce time spent on routine work, and redirect their attention toward more meaningful instructional activities and personal well-being. Culajara (2023) found that supportive tools helped teachers manage workload demands and improve job-related well-being. This indicated that teachers tended to benefit from technologies that reduced work pressure, improved task efficiency, and supported a healthier balance between professional and personal responsibilities.

Certain indicators were described as “Great Extent” such as “ChatGPT helps me improve overall job satisfaction,” with $\bar{x} = 2.77$, ranked 8; “ChatGPT helps me reduce overtime or weekend workload” with $\bar{x} = 2.76$, ranked 9; and “ChatGPT helps me achieve a healthier work–life balance” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 10. These findings meant that although ChatGPT contributed to reducing burnout and overtime work, its impact on broader lifestyle outcomes was perceived as comparatively lower. This finding denotes that while ChatGPT eases workload pressures, achieving holistic work–life balance also depends on other personal and institutional factors.

Teachers perceived that while ChatGPT helps reduce workload and supports well-being, its influence on overall job satisfaction and work–life balance is less pronounced due to the impact of other personal and institutional factors. Duran, Pontillas, and Comon (2024) found that technological support alleviated work strain but did not solely determine overall work–life balance. This supported the findings of the present study, where ChatGPT reduced workload pressures but had a comparatively lower impact on broader lifestyle outcomes.

In summary, the indicators obtained mean scores clustered around the common mean of 2.78, all verbally interpreted as “Great Extent.” The weighted mean of 2.78 indicates that ChatGPT has a positive and substantial influence on the overall work–life balance of public elementary teachers.

Teachers generally perceived ChatGPT as having a positive and substantial influence on their overall work–life balance. Gudelos and Mabitad (2025) stated that teachers’ need for efficiency and reduced workload stress was essential in enhancing productivity and well-being. This influenced the findings of the present study, where ChatGPT was perceived to have a positive impact on teachers’ work–life balance.

Summary of the Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use

Table 15 presents the summary of the weighted mean and descriptive equivalent of the workload efficacy of public elementary teachers through ChatGPT use in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 15. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Workload Efficacy of Public Elementary Teachers Through ChatGPT Use

Frequency of ChatGPT Use	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Lesson Preparation Time	2.68	Great Extent	4
2. Preparation of Instructional Materials	2.72	Great Extent	3
3. Management of Classroom Records	2.77	Great Extent	2
4. Overall Work-Life Balance	2.78	Great Extent	1
Overall Weighted Mean	2.74	Great Extent	

The indicator “Overall Work-Life Balance” had the highest $\bar{x} = 2.78$, interpreted as “Great Extent.” This implied that teachers strongly believe that ChatGPT helps them manage their workload in a way that allows for more personal time, reduced stress, and improved job satisfaction. This finding denotes that ChatGPT contributes significantly to balancing professional responsibilities with personal life, enhancing overall teacher well-being.

Teachers perceived “Overall Work–Life Balance” as having the highest mean because they experienced that ChatGPT helped them manage workload more efficiently, which allowed more personal time, reduced stress, and improved job satisfaction. Gudelos and Mabitad (2025) stated that innovations that streamlined tasks and

saved time were strongly associated with improved work–life balance among teachers. This supported the findings of the present study, where efficiency-enhancing tools were linked to better balance between professional and personal responsibilities.

The indicator “Lesson Preparation Time” had the lowest $\bar{x} = 2.68$, interpreted as “Great Extent.” This implied that while ChatGPT assists in reducing lesson preparation time, teachers perceive this benefit slightly less strongly compared to other workload aspects. This finding denotes that although lesson preparation becomes more efficient with ChatGPT, the overall efficacy is influenced by the complexity of teaching tasks and the teacher’s familiarity with the tool.

Teachers perceived “Lesson Preparation Time” as the lowest mean because they experienced that, although ChatGPT reduced preparation time, its effectiveness was slightly less pronounced due to task complexity and varying familiarity with the tool. Fredeluces, Garcia, and Quines (2023) found that the effectiveness of technological tools in reducing workload depended on task-specific factors and user competence. This supported the findings of the present study, where the perceived efficiency of ChatGPT varied depending on the complexity of lesson preparation and teachers’ familiarity with the tool.

In summary, all indicators were interpreted as “Great Extent,” showing that ChatGPT is widely recognized for enhancing teachers’ workload management, from lesson preparation to work-life balance. These results indicate that integrating ChatGPT into teaching practices improves efficiency, reduces stress, and allows teachers to focus more on instructional quality and personal well-being.

Teachers perceived ChatGPT as highly beneficial in improving workload management, efficiency, reducing stress, and enhancing both instructional quality and personal well-being, as all indicators were rated “Great Extent.” Santiago, Embang, Acanto, Ambojia, Aperocho, Balilo, Cahapin, Conlu, Lausa, Laput, Malabag, Paderes, and Romasanta (2023) found that tools and innovations that increased productivity and reduced workload were more likely to be adopted and valued by teachers. This supported the findings of the present study, where ChatGPT was perceived to enhance efficiency and reduce workload among teachers.

Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice

Technical and Technological Constraints

Table 16 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of technical and technological constraints in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “ChatGPT use is challenging because data costs for mobile access are burdensome” with $\bar{x} = 2.63$, ranked 1; “ChatGPT use is challenging because system or server errors occur frequently” and “ChatGPT use is challenging because the school lacks enough computers or tablets” with $\bar{x} = 2.62$, ranked 2.5. These findings meant that financial constraints, system reliability, and limited school resources were the most prominent barriers to ChatGPT integration. This finding denotes that external infrastructural and economic factors significantly affect teachers’ ability to consistently utilize AI tools in instruction.

Table 16. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Technical and Technological Constraints

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. ChatGPT use is challenging because my personal devices are inadequate.	2.52	Challenging	8.5

2. ChatGPT use is challenging because system or server errors occur frequently.	2.62	Challenging	2.5
3. ChatGPT use is challenging because IT support is limited when issues arise	2.58	Challenging	5.5
4. ChatGPT use is challenging because internet connectivity in my school is unreliable.	2.58	Challenging	5.5
5. ChatGPT use is challenging because the school lacks enough computers or tablets.	2.62	Challenging	2.5
6. ChatGPT use is challenging because power interruptions hinder consistent AI use	2.56	Challenging	7
7. ChatGPT use is challenging because there is insufficient bandwidth for smooth operation.	2.60	Challenging	4
8. ChatGPT use is challenging because school budgets do not cover necessary hardware/software.	2.52	Challenging	8.5
9. ChatGPT use is challenging because data costs for mobile access are burdensome.	2.63	Challenging	1
10. ChatGPT use is challenging because I experience difficulty accessing the platform during peak hours.	2.50	Slightly Challenging	10
Weighted Mean	2.57	Challenging	

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because financial constraints, system errors, and limited access to devices hindered their consistent use of ChatGPT in instruction, which made these external infrastructural and economic factors the most prominent barriers to integration in all aspects. Kunjiapu, Sinnappan, Salim, and Kunasegaran (2025) found that inadequate technological support and resources posed major obstacles to the effective adoption of instructional innovations. This supported the findings of the present study, where limited devices, system errors, and data costs were identified as key barriers to ChatGPT integration in teaching.

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “ChatGPT use is challenging because my personal devices are inadequate” and “ChatGPT use is challenging because school budgets do not cover necessary hardware or software” with $\bar{x} = 2.52$, ranked 8.5; and “Slightly Challenging” such as “ChatGPT use is challenging because I experience difficulty accessing the platform during peak hours” with $\bar{x} = 2.50$, ranked 10. These findings meant that while these constraints were still present, they were perceived as less severe compared with connectivity and cost-related issues. This finding denotes that personal and access-related limitations are secondary concerns relative to broader systemic challenges.

Teachers perceived these indicators as less severe because personal device limitations and occasional access difficulties were experienced but were overshadowed by more critical issues such as connectivity and cost-related constraints, making them secondary concerns in the overall challenges of ChatGPT use. Galleto, Africa, De Leon, and Culaba (2023) found that individual-level limitations were often outweighed by institutional and technological constraints in implementing new tools. This supported the findings of the present study, where personal device issues and access difficulties were considered secondary to broader system and cost-related challenges.

In summary, the indicators yielded a common mean clustering around 2.57, mostly described as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.57 indicates that technical and technological constraints pose a notable challenge in integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because recurring technical and technological constraints consistently affected their use of ChatGPT that reflected a notable level of difficulty in integration into teaching practice. Celeste and Osias (2024) found that limitations in infrastructure, financial resources, and system reliability were critical factors influencing technology adoption in schools. This supported the findings of the present study, where such constraints contributed to the challenges in integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice.

Digital Literacy and User Competence

Table 17 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of digital literacy and user competence in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I face difficulty in evaluating the accuracy of AI-generated content” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 1; “I face difficulty in using advanced ChatGPT features due to lack of training” with $\bar{x} = 2.64$, ranked 2; and “I face difficulty in receiving peer or mentor support for AI integration” with $\bar{x} = 2.60$, ranked 3. These findings meant that teachers experienced the greatest challenges in content validation, advanced feature utilization, and collaborative support. This finding denotes that insufficient digital literacy training and professional guidance hinder effective and confident AI integration in teaching.

Teachers experienced the greatest challenges in evaluating AI-generated content, using advanced features, and accessing peer or mentor support because insufficient digital literacy training and professional guidance limited their confidence and competence in integrating ChatGPT effectively into teaching practice. Mariscal, Albarracin, Mobo, and Cutillas (2023) found that limited user competence and support significantly affected the successful adoption of technological innovations. This supported the findings of the present study, where insufficient training and lack of peer or mentor guidance hindered effective ChatGPT integration among teachers.

Table 17. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Digital Literacy and User Competence

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I face difficulty in integrating AI outputs into lessons.	2.50	Slightly Challenging	10
2. I face difficulty in using ChatGPT on different devices.	2.53	Challenging	7
3. I face difficulty in editing AI-generated text effectively	2.53	Challenging	7
4. I face difficulty in writing effective prompts for ChatGPT.	2.51	Challenging	9
5. I face difficulty in exploring new digital tools due to anxiety.	2.59	Challenging	4
6. I face difficulty in keeping up with frequent updates of AI tools.	2.56	Challenging	5
7. I face difficulty in evaluating the accuracy of AI-generated content.	2.67	Challenging	1
8. I face difficulty in using advanced ChatGPT features due to lack of training.	2.64	Challenging	2

9. I face difficulty in typing or computer skills slowing down my ChatGPT use.	2.53	Challenging	7
10. I face difficulty in receiving peer or mentor support for AI integration.	2.60	Challenging	3
Weighted Mean	2.57	Challenging	

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I face difficulty in using ChatGPT on different devices,” “I face difficulty in editing AI-generated text effectively,” and “I face difficulty in typing or computer skills slowing down my ChatGPT use,” with $\bar{x} = 2.53$, ranked 7; “I face difficulty in writing effective prompts for ChatGPT” with $\bar{x} = 2.51$, ranked 9; and “I face difficulty in integrating AI outputs into lessons” with $\bar{x} = 2.50$, ranked 10. These findings meant that while these challenges were present, they were perceived as less severe compared with issues related to evaluation skills and training gaps. This finding denotes that basic operational difficulties are secondary to higher-level digital competence concerns.

Teachers perceived these indicators as less severe because basic operational difficulties in using ChatGPT across devices, editing outputs, and typing skills were present but were overshadowed by more critical issues in evaluation skills and training gaps, making them secondary concerns in overall digital competence challenges. Gonzales and Gonzales (2024) found that foundational digital skills improved with exposure, while advanced competencies required structured training and support. This supported the findings of the present study, where basic operational difficulties were less pronounced compared to challenges in higher-level digital skills and AI integration tasks.

In summary, the indicators showed a common mean clustering around 2.57, generally described as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.57 indicates that digital literacy and user competence remain notable barriers to the effective integration of ChatGPT in teaching practice.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because recurring difficulties in digital literacy and user competence consistently affected their effective use of ChatGPT that reflected these barriers in teaching practice. Duterte (2024) identified limited training opportunities, anxiety toward new technologies, and insufficient professional support as critical factors in technology adoption. This supported the findings of the present study, where digital literacy gaps and lack of training hindered effective ChatGPT integration among teachers.

Curricular and Pedagogical Alignment

Table 18 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of curricular and pedagogical alignment in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I experience difficulty when ChatGPT produces language unsuitable for young learners” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 1; “I experience difficulty when AI examples conflict with DepEd-approved materials” with $\bar{x} = 2.67$, ranked 2; and “I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with the K–12 curriculum” with $\bar{x} = 2.66$, ranked 3. These findings meant that content appropriateness, curriculum compliance, and alignment with approved instructional materials were the most pressing concerns. This finding denotes that teachers remain cautious in using ChatGPT due to the need to ensure age-appropriate, accurate, and curriculum-aligned instruction.

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because they remained cautious in using ChatGPT to ensure that outputs were age-appropriate, aligned with DepEd-approved materials, and consistent with the K–12 curriculum, making content validity and curriculum compliance the most pressing concerns in their instructional practice. Quimsing and Cruz (2024) found that instructional innovations required careful alignment with curricular standards to be effectively implemented. This supported the findings of the present study, where teachers prioritized content appropriateness and curriculum alignment when using ChatGPT in instruction.

Table 18. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers' Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Curricular and Pedagogical Alignment

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with lesson objectives.	2.56	Challenging	10
2. I experience difficulty in fitting suggested activities into allotted class time.	2.64	Challenging	5
3. I experience difficulty in localizing content to the Filipino culture and context.	2.57	Challenging	9
4. I experience difficulty in integrating values into AI-generated lessons.	2.60	Challenging	8
5. I experience difficulty when the generated content is too advanced or too simple.	2.61	Challenging	7
6. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with the K–12 curriculum.	2.66	Challenging	3
7. I experience difficulty when AI examples conflict with DepEd-approved materials.	2.67	Challenging	2
8. I experience difficulty in cross-checking AI outputs against DepEd competencies.	2.64	Challenging	5
9. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with formative assessment standards.	2.64	Challenging	5
10. I experience difficulty when ChatGPT produces language unsuitable for young learners.	2.74	Challenging	1
Weighted Mean	2.63	Challenging	

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I experience difficulty in integrating values into AI-generated lessons” with $\bar{x} = 2.60$, ranked 8; “I experience difficulty in localizing content to the Filipino culture and context” with $\bar{x} = 2.57$, ranked 9; and “I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with lesson objectives” with $\bar{x} = 2.56$, ranked 10. These findings meant that contextualization, values integration, and objective alignment posed relatively lower yet notable challenges. This finding denotes that while AI-generated content is generally usable, it still requires teacher mediation to ensure relevance and alignment with instructional goals.

Teachers perceived these indicators as less severe challenges because, although they experienced difficulties in values integration, localization, and alignment with lesson objectives, these issues were secondary to more pressing concerns, indicating that AI-generated content remained usable but required teacher mediation to ensure instructional relevance. Tolentino, Campo, Licup, Lumba, and Lingat (2024) found that teachers played a critical role in contextualizing and adapting instructional resources for meaningful learning. This supported the findings of the present study, where teachers mediated AI-generated content to ensure relevance, values integration, and alignment with lesson objectives.

In summary, the indicators showed a common mean clustering around 2.63, all interpreted as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.63 indicates that curricular and pedagogical alignment remains a significant challenge in integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because recurring difficulties in aligning ChatGPT outputs with curricular and pedagogical requirements consistently affected their instructional use, resulting in a common mean of 2.63 that reflected ongoing challenges in integration. Capili and Paglinawan (2025) emphasized that strict curriculum standards and teachers’ responsibility to ensure appropriate content delivery were essential considerations in instructional innovation. This supported the findings of the present study, where curricular and pedagogical alignment remained a significant challenge in integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice.

Ethical and Academic Integrity Concerns

Table 19 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of ethical and academic integrity concerns in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 19. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Ethical and Academic Integrity Concerns

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with lesson objectives.	2.74	Challenging	10
2. I experience difficulty in fitting suggested activities into allotted class time.	2.81	Challenging	4
3. I experience difficulty in localizing content to the Filipino culture and context.	2.78	Challenging	5
4. I experience difficulty in integrating values into AI-generated lessons.	2.75	Challenging	9
5. I experience difficulty when the generated content is too advanced or too simple.	2.77	Challenging	7
6. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with the K–12 curriculum.	2.77	Challenging	7
7. I experience difficulty when AI examples conflict with DepEd-approved materials.	2.84	Challenging	3
8. I experience difficulty in cross-checking AI outputs against DepEd competencies.	2.87	Challenging	1
9. I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with formative assessment standards.	2.77	Challenging	7
10. I experience difficulty when ChatGPT produces language unsuitable for young learners.	2.85	Challenging	2
Weighted Mean	2.80	Challenging	

Several indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I experience difficulty in cross-checking AI outputs against DepEd competencies” with $\bar{x} = 2.87$, ranked 1; “I experience difficulty when ChatGPT produces language unsuitable for young learners” with $\bar{x} = 2.85$, ranked 2; and “I experience difficulty when AI examples conflict with DepEd-approved materials” with $\bar{x} = 2.84$, ranked 3. These findings meant that ensuring alignment with competencies, appropriate language, and approved materials are the most critical ethical and academic

integrity concerns. This finding denotes that teachers are vigilant in safeguarding instructional quality and ethical standards while integrating AI tools.

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because they remained vigilant in ensuring that ChatGPT outputs were aligned with DepEd competencies, used appropriate language for learners, and conformed to approved instructional materials, making ethical and academic integrity considerations the most critical concerns in AI integration. Ramos (2025) found that adherence to ethical and professional standards was essential when adopting technological innovations in education. This supported the findings of the present study, where teachers prioritized ensuring ethical use and instructional integrity when integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practices.

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I experience difficulty when the generated content is too advanced or too simple,” “I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with the K-12 curriculum,” and “I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with formative assessment standards,” with $\bar{x} = 2.77$, ranked 7; “I experience difficulty in integrating values into AI-generated lessons,” with $\bar{x} = 2.75$, ranked 9; and “I experience difficulty in aligning AI outputs with lesson objectives,” with $\bar{x} = 2.74$, ranked 10. These findings meant that while time management, cultural relevance, and content appropriateness were still challenging, they were perceived as slightly less critical than alignment and language issues.

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because they experienced ongoing difficulties in aligning ChatGPT outputs with curriculum standards, assessment requirements, and lesson objectives, while issues related to values integration, cultural relevance, and content appropriateness were considered comparatively less critical. Cardoso and Sison (2025) found that effective integration of new tools required both ethical vigilance and contextual adaptation. This supported the findings of the present study, where operational and contextual challenges were perceived as secondary to ethical and integrity considerations in using ChatGPT.

In summary, the indicators revealed a common mean clustering around 2.80, all interpreted as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.80 indicates that ethical and academic integrity concerns remain significant barriers to the effective use of ChatGPT in teaching practice.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because persistent concerns about ethical use, academic integrity, and content reliability consistently affected their use of ChatGPT that reflected these barriers in teaching practice. Hermogenes and Paglinawan (2025) identified teachers’ responsibility to uphold professional standards and ensure proper AI use as essential in promoting instructional quality and integrity. This supported the findings of the present study, where ethical and academic integrity concerns remained significant barriers to the effective use of ChatGPT in teaching practice.

Policy and Institutional Support

Table 20 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of policy and institutional support in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 20. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Policy and Institutional Support

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I am concerned about the privacy of uploaded data.	2.64	Challenging	9
2. I am concerned about ownership of AI-generated materials.	2.69	Challenging	3
3. I am concerned that proper citation of AI outputs is unclear.	2.67	Challenging	5.5

4. I am concerned that learners may plagiarize AI-generated text.	2.65	Challenging	8
5. I am concerned that ethical guidelines for AI use are not explicit.	2.67	Challenging	5.5
6. I am concerned that parents may object to AI-generated materials.	2.71	Challenging	1.5
7. I am concerned that overreliance on AI might reduce critical thinking.	2.67	Challenging	5.5
8. I am concerned that AI use may promote dependency among students.	2.63	Challenging	10
9. I am concerned that learners may access inappropriate content through AI.	2.67	Challenging	5.5
10. I am concerned that ChatGPT may provide biased or inaccurate information.	2.71	Challenging	1.5
Weighted Mean	2.67	Challenging	

Several indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I am concerned that parents may object to AI-generated materials” and “I am concerned that ChatGPT may provide biased or inaccurate information” with $\bar{x} = 2.71$, ranked 1.5; and “I am concerned about ownership of AI-generated materials” with $\bar{x} = 2.69$, ranked 3. These findings meant that parental acceptance, accuracy and bias of AI outputs, and intellectual property considerations are the most pressing institutional and policy-related concerns. This finding denotes that teachers require clear policies, ethical guidance, and institutional support to integrate ChatGPT responsibly.

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because they were concerned about parental acceptance, the accuracy and potential bias of AI-generated content, and issues of ownership, which collectively reflected the most pressing institutional and policy-related considerations in the use of ChatGPT. Estrellado and Miranda (2023) found that proper policy frameworks and institutional backing were essential for the successful adoption of technological tools in education. This supported the findings of the present study, where concerns on policy, parental acceptance, and ethical use required strong institutional guidance for effective ChatGPT integration.

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I am concerned that learners may plagiarize AI-generated text” with $\bar{x} = 2.65$, ranked 8; “I am concerned about the privacy of uploaded data” with $\bar{x} = 2.64$, ranked 9; and “I am concerned that AI use may promote dependency among students” with $\bar{x} = 2.63$, ranked 10. These findings meant that while these concerns were present, they were perceived as less critical compared with accuracy, parental objections, and ownership issues. This finding denotes that operational and ethical oversight challenges are secondary yet important considerations in AI integration.

Teachers perceived these indicators as less critical because concerns about plagiarism, data privacy, and learner dependency were present but were overshadowed by more pressing issues such as content accuracy, parental objections, and ownership, making them secondary yet still important considerations in AI integration. Martin (2026) found that institutional support and clear policy guidelines reduced challenges in implementing educational innovations. This supported the findings of the present study, where concerns on plagiarism, data privacy, and learner dependency were considered secondary to broader ethical and policy-related issues.

In summary, the indicators obtained a common mean around 2.67, verbally interpreted as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.67 indicates that policy and institutional support remain significant barriers to fully integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because ongoing concerns about policy clarity, institutional support, and governance issues consistently affected their confidence in using ChatGPT that reflected these barriers in teaching practice. Villarino (2025) identified the lack of explicit ethical guidelines, parental concerns, and uncertainty in AI content usage as critical factors influencing technology adoption in schools. This supported

the findings of the present study, where policy ambiguity and institutional limitations were perceived as significant barriers to ChatGPT integration in teaching practice.

Time and Workload Management

Table 21 presents the mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers' challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in terms of time and workload management in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Several indicators were described as "Challenging" such as "I face difficulty due to a lack of collaboration opportunities for AI integration" with $\bar{x} = 2.60$, ranked 1; "I face difficulty due to limited leadership support for AI initiatives" with $\bar{x} = 2.59$, ranked 2; and "I face difficulty due to the absence of clear data privacy protocols" and "I face difficulty due to the absence of reward systems for innovative AI use," with $\bar{x} = 2.58$, ranked 3.5. These findings meant that teachers considered insufficient collaboration, limited administrative support, and unclear privacy protocols as the most significant barriers in managing workload with ChatGPT. This finding denotes that effective time and workload management is strongly influenced by institutional support and clear operational guidelines.

Table 21. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers' Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice in Terms of Time and Workload Management

Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. I face difficulty due to unclear DepEd guidelines on AI use.	2.53	Challenging	9
2. I face difficulty due to the absence of clear data privacy protocols	2.58	Challenging	3.5
3. I face difficulty due to no official monitoring or evaluation of AI use.	2.55	Challenging	7
4. I face difficulty due to limited leadership support for AI initiatives.	2.59	Challenging	2
5. I face difficulty due to a lack of a written school policy on AI integration.	2.53	Challenging	9
6. I face difficulty because school heads rarely include AI topics in INSETs.	2.53	Challenging	9
7. I face difficulty due to the absence of reward systems for innovative AI use.	2.58	Challenging	3.5
8. I face difficulty due to no dedicated budget for AI-related training.	2.56	Challenging	5.5
9. I face difficulty due to a lack of collaboration opportunities for AI integration.	2.60	Challenging	1
10. I face difficulty due to an undefined school policy on learner use of ChatGPT.	2.56	Challenging	5.5
Weighted Mean	2.56	Challenging	

Teachers perceived these indicators as "Challenging" because insufficient collaboration opportunities, limited leadership support, and unclear data privacy protocols consistently hindered their effective use of ChatGPT for workload management, making institutional support and operational clarity the most significant factors affecting implementation. Fuentes (2025) found that structured support and clear policies were critical in minimizing teacher workload challenges when integrating new technologies. This supported the findings of the present study, where limited collaboration, weak leadership support, and unclear guidelines were identified as major barriers to effective workload management using ChatGPT.

Certain indicators were described as “Challenging” such as “I face difficulty due to unclear DepEd guidelines on AI use,” “I face difficulty due to a lack of a written school policy on AI integration,” and “I face difficulty because school heads rarely include AI topics in INSETs,” with $\bar{x} = 2.53$, ranked 9. These findings meant that while financial resources, policy clarity, and official guidance were concerns, they were less pressing than collaboration and leadership support. This finding denotes that operational constraints related to budgeting and policy clarity are secondary yet important factors in workload management.

Teachers perceived these indicators as “Challenging” because unclear DepEd guidelines, absence of school-level AI policies, and limited inclusion of AI in INSETs were present but were considered less pressing than collaboration and leadership support, making these operational constraints secondary yet still important factors in workload management. Awang, Zulkifli, and Hamzah (2025) found that the availability of resources and well-defined policies enhanced teachers’ efficiency in adopting educational innovations. This supported the findings of the present study, where unclear guidelines and limited policy support were perceived as secondary but relevant factors affecting ChatGPT-based workload management.

In summary, the indicators revealed a common mean around 2.56, verbally interpreted as “Challenging.” The weighted mean of 2.56 indicates that time and workload management remains a moderate challenge for teachers integrating ChatGPT into their teaching.

Teachers perceived the indicators as “Challenging” because time and workload management issues were consistently experienced but remained at a moderate level compared to other concerns that reflected a manageable yet persistent challenge in integrating ChatGPT into teaching practice. Caratiquit and Javier (2025) emphasized that limited leadership support, lack of collaborative opportunities, and unclear operational policies were key factors influencing teacher efficiency in technology adoption. This supported the findings of the present study, where time and workload management challenges were considered moderate but persistent issues in ChatGPT integration.

Summary of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice

Table 22 presents the summary of the weighted mean and descriptive equivalent of the public elementary teachers’ challenges or limitations in integrating ChatGPT into their teaching practice in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

The indicator “Ethical and Academic Integrity Concerns” was described as “Challenging” with highest $\bar{x} = 2.80$, ranked 1. These findings meant that teachers perceive ethical considerations, potential plagiarism, and the responsible use of AI-generated content as the most critical barriers in integrating ChatGPT. This finding denotes that addressing ethical guidance and academic integrity is essential for effective AI adoption.

Teachers perceived “Ethical and Academic Integrity Concerns” as the most critical barrier because issues related to plagiarism, responsible AI use, and ethical considerations consistently influenced their cautious integration of ChatGPT in teaching practice. Azman and Tumkaya (2025) found that proper ethical frameworks and accountability measures were vital in promoting responsible use of educational technologies. This supported the findings of the present study, where ethical and academic integrity concerns were identified as the most critical barriers in ChatGPT integration.

Table 22. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Public Elementary Teachers’ Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice

Frequency of ChatGPT Use	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Technical and Technological Constraints	2.57	Challenging	4.5
2. Digital Literacy and User Competence	2.57	Challenging	4.5

3. Curricular and Pedagogical Alignment	2.63	Challenging	3
4. Ethical and Academic Integrity Concerns	2.80	Challenging	1
5. Policy and Institutional Support	2.67	Challenging	2
6. Time and Workload Management	2.56	Challenging	6
Overall Weighted Mean	2.74	Challenging	

The indicator “Time and Workload Management” was described as “Challenging” with the lowest $\bar{x} = 2.56$, ranked 6. These findings meant that while workload and time management challenges exist, they are perceived as less critical compared to ethical concerns and institutional support. This finding denotes that teachers may manage time and workload more effectively if adequate policies, leadership support, and training are provided.

Teachers perceived “Time and Workload Management” as less critical because, although challenges in managing time and workload existed, these were overshadowed by more pressing concerns such as ethical issues and institutional support that reflected a manageable but secondary challenge in ChatGPT integration. Rodriguez (2024) found that structured guidance and institutional backing helped reduce operational difficulties in integrating new technologies. This supported the findings of the present study, where time and workload management challenges were perceived as secondary when adequate support systems were present.

In summary, the summary revealed an overall weighted mean of 2.74, verbally interpreted as “Challenging.” This indicates that the integration of ChatGPT in teaching is generally challenged by multiple factors, with ethical concerns being the most significant.

Teachers perceived the overall indicators as “Challenging” because multiple factors consistently affected the integration of ChatGPT in teaching, with ethical concerns emerging as the most significant issue. Malon and Paglinawan (2025) emphasized that teachers’ need for clear ethical guidelines, institutional support, and workload management was crucial in enhancing productivity and responsible technology adoption. This supported the findings of the present study, where multiple factors were perceived as challenges in the integration of ChatGPT in teaching practice.

5. Test of Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers’ Perceived Opportunities and Workload Efficacy in Using ChatGPT

Table 23 presents the Spearman Rho to test the significant relationship between the public elementary teachers’ perceived opportunities and workload efficacy in using ChatGPT in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 23. Spearman Rho to Test the Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers’ Perceived Opportunities and Workload Efficacy in Using ChatGPT

		Perceived Opportunities in Using ChatGPT	Interpretation
Workload Efficacy Through ChatGPT Use	Correlation Coefficient	.767**	High Relationship Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	163	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The computed Spearman Rho value ($r = 0.767$, $p = 0.000$) indicates a high and significant positive relationship between teachers’ perceived opportunities and their workload efficacy in using ChatGPT. Since the p-value is

less than 0.01, the relationship is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that the more opportunities teachers perceive in using ChatGPT, the higher their workload efficacy becomes. The present study was parallel with the findings of the previous study that teachers' recognition of instructional opportunities strongly influences their efficiency and productivity (Delgra, 2026).

A "high relationship and significant" result means that the correlation between the two variables is strong and statistically meaningful, indicating a substantial connection between perceived opportunities and workload efficacy. In this study, it implies that teachers who see more potential benefits in using ChatGPT tend to manage their workload more effectively. The present study was aligned with the findings of previous study that maximizing perceived opportunities in technology integration significantly enhances teacher performance and instructional effectiveness (Portugues, 2026).

6. Test of Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers' Perceived Opportunities and Challenges or Limitations in Using ChatGPT

Table 24 presents the Spearman Rho to test the significant relationship between the public elementary teachers' perceived opportunities and challenges or limitations in using ChatGPT in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

Table 24. Spearman Rho to Test the Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers' Perceived Opportunities and Challenges or Limitations in Using ChatGPT

		Perceived Opportunities in Using ChatGPT	Interpretation
Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice	Correlation Coefficient	.327**	Low Relationship Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	163	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The computed Spearman Rho value ($r = 0.327$, $p = 0.000$) indicates a low but significant positive relationship between teachers' perceived opportunities and the challenges they encounter in integrating ChatGPT. Since the p-value is less than 0.01, the relationship is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that while challenges exist, they slightly influence teachers' perception of opportunities in using ChatGPT. The present study was parallel with the findings of the previous study that teachers' perceived benefits of technology are affected by encountered limitations, even if the influence is modest (Aurangzeb, Kashan, & Rehman, 2024).

A "low relationship and significant" result means that the correlation between the variables is weak but statistically meaningful and not due to chance. In this study, it implies that challenges moderately affect the perception of opportunities in using ChatGPT. The present study was aligned with the findings of previous study that minor obstacles in technology integration can still significantly shape teachers' perceptions and use of instructional tools (Veridiano & Brondo, 2023).

7. Test of Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers' Perceived Workload Efficacy and Challenges or Limitations in Using ChatGPT

Table 25 presents the Spearman Rho to test the significant relationship between the public elementary teachers' perceived workload efficacy and challenges or limitations in using ChatGPT in Zone III, Schools Division of Zambales.

The computed Spearman Rho value ($r = 0.317$, $p = 0.000$) indicates a low but significant positive relationship between teachers' perceived workload efficacy and the challenges they face in integrating ChatGPT. Since the p-value is less than 0.01, the relationship is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that even though the challenges exist, they slightly influence teachers' perceived workload efficacy. The present study was parallel with the findings of the previous study that teacher perceptions of workload and instructional challenges have a measurable, though limited, impact on their productivity and technology adoption (Domingo, 2024).

Table 25. Spearman Rho to Test the Significant Relationship Between the Public Elementary Teachers' Perceived Workload Efficacy and Challenges or Limitations in Using ChatGPT

		Workload Through Use	Efficacy ChatGPT	Interpretation
Challenges or Limitations in Integrating ChatGPT into Their Teaching Practice	Correlation Coefficient	.317**		Low Relationship Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	163		
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

A "low relationship and significant" result means that while the correlation between the two variables is not strong, the association is statistically meaningful and unlikely due to chance. In the present study, this suggests that challenges in using ChatGPT do influence teachers' workload efficacy, but the effect is modest. The present study was aligned with the findings of previous study that even minor challenges in instructional technology can significantly affect teacher performance and efficiency (Barrot, Agdeppa, & Manzano, 2024).

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study revealed that public elementary teachers were predominantly female, generally in early to middle adulthood, and mostly held graduate-level educational qualifications. Most respondents occupied mid-level teaching positions, possessed moderate teaching experience, had recently adopted ChatGPT, and had limited formal training in artificial intelligence (AI) integration. Teachers frequently utilized ChatGPT in instructional planning, classroom activities, assessment, and administrative tasks, with the highest level of use observed in administrative functions and the lowest in instructional planning. The respondents generally perceived ChatGPT as beneficial, particularly in terms of professional development, instructional innovation, learner engagement, differentiated instruction, and access to teaching resources. Likewise, teachers assessed the workload efficacy of ChatGPT to a great extent, especially in lesson preparation, instructional material development, classroom record management, and improvement of work-life balance. Despite these opportunities and benefits, teachers also perceived the integration of ChatGPT as challenging, particularly with respect to ethical and academic integrity concerns, while time and workload management emerged as the least challenging aspect.

The study further showed that the frequency of ChatGPT use significantly differed according to sex, age, years in service, years of ChatGPT experience, and number of AI-related trainings attended, particularly in instructional and administrative functions. In contrast, teaching position did not significantly influence ChatGPT use, while educational attainment affected only administrative utilization. Teachers generally shared similar perceptions regarding the opportunities and workload efficacy of ChatGPT regardless of sex, age, educational attainment, teaching position, years in service, and years of use. However, participation in AI integration training significantly influenced perceptions related to learner engagement, differentiated instruction, and classroom record management. Moreover, respondents experienced generally similar challenges in integrating ChatGPT, although age, teaching experience, position, and training exposure significantly affected specific concerns

related to technical limitations, curricular alignment, ethical issues, and pedagogical integration. Correlation analysis further established a high and statistically significant positive relationship between perceived opportunities and workload efficacy, as well as low but statistically significant positive relationships between opportunities and challenges and between workload efficacy and challenges. Based on these findings, a training program was developed to maximize opportunities and enhance workload efficacy in the use of ChatGPT among public elementary teachers.

In light of the findings and conclusions, it is recommended that public elementary teachers be encouraged to expand the use of ChatGPT, particularly in instructional planning, to achieve a more balanced integration across teaching responsibilities. School heads and educational leaders may strengthen professional development initiatives by providing inclusive and targeted AI integration training programs tailored to teachers' varying profiles, including sex, age, teaching experience, and level of AI exposure. Such initiatives may further enhance teachers' instructional innovation, learner engagement, differentiated instruction, classroom record management, and overall workload efficiency.

Furthermore, school administrators may establish clear ethical guidelines, institutional policies, and support mechanisms to address concerns related to academic integrity, data privacy, and responsible AI use in education. Continuous technical and pedagogical support may also be provided to help teachers overcome challenges associated with technological limitations and curricular alignment. Finally, the proposed training program may be implemented and regularly enhanced, while future studies on ChatGPT and other AI tools in education may be conducted to examine their long-term effects on teacher performance, instructional innovation, and learner outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Triberti, S., Di Fuccio, R., Scuotto, C., Marsico, E., & Limone, P. (2024). "Better than my professor?" How to develop artificial intelligence tools for higher education. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1329605>
2. Siddiqui, N. M. T. (2025). AI-Enabled pedagogy: Advancing education through innovative teaching tools and the AI-TEACH model. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.52783/jier.v5i1.2261>
3. Zemljak, D. (2023). Advanced tools for education: ChatGPT-based learning preparations. *Gamtamokslinis Ugdyimas / Natural Science Education*, 20(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.48127/gunse/23.20.10>
4. Ankitdhamija, N., & Dhamija, D. (2024). Understanding Teachers' perspectives on CHATGPT-Generated Assignments in Higher Education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.32674/ptf9yd75>
5. Magtalas, S.A., & Eduvala, Joy C. (2024). Teacher's Workload in Relation to Burnout and Work Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 5(10). <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.10.24>
6. Taherdoost, H. (2022). Designing a questionnaire for a research paper: A comprehensive guide to design and develop an effective questionnaire. *Asian Journal of Managerial Science*, 11(1), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2022.11.1.3087>
7. Ahmed, S. K., & Ahmed, K. S. (2025). The impact of ChatGPT on Iraqi Kurdish EFL teachers' workload. *Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 510–518. <https://doi.org/10.14500/kujhss.v8n1y2025.pp510-518>
8. Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2024). The Educational Affordances and Challenges of CHATGPT: State of the Field. *TechTrends*, 68(2), 380–392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-00939-0>
9. Govindarajan, R., & Christuraj, G. (2024). Opportunities and challenges of using ChatGPT in the ELT scenario of Uta, Nizwa, Oman. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 593. <https://doi.org/10.22190/jtesap230529046g>
10. Kim, E., & Ahn, K. (2023). Exploring the potential of utilizing ChatGPT in elementary English lesson planning and English language teaching. *The Korea Association of Primary English Education*, 29(4), 59–87. <https://doi.org/10.25231/pee.2023.29.4.59>

11. Rahman, M. M., & Watanobe, Y. (2023). ChatGPT for Education and Research: Opportunities, Threats, and Strategies. *Applied Sciences*, 13(9), 5783. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13095783>
12. Zhang, P., & Tur, G. (2023). A systematic review of ChatGPT use in K-12 education. *European Journal of Education*, 59(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12599>
13. Department of Education. (2023). Digital rise program: Framework for ICT integration in Philippine education. DepEd.
14. International Society for Technology in Education. (2022). ISTE standards for educators. <https://www.iste.org/standards>
15. Mercado, C. V. (2022). Teachers' workload and the adoption of emerging technologies in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 9(4), 12–21.
16. Sparks, S., & Gago, M. (2024). Generative AI in K–12 education: Opportunities and challenges. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(1), 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10156-7>
17. Villanueva, E. M., & Santos, J. R. (2023). Readiness of Filipino teachers for artificial intelligence integration. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(2), 1–18.[17
18. Firaina, R., & Sulisworo, D. (2023). Exploring the Usage of ChATGPT in Higher Education: Frequency and Impact on Productivity. *Buletin Edukasi Indonesia*, 2(01), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.56741/bei.v2i01.310>
19. Kang, H. G., La Kim, E., Park, G. H., Song, E. A., & Kim, D. K. (2023). Field teachers' Perception of Utilizing ChatGPT in Education. *Korean Association for Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 23(19), 567–580. <https://doi.org/10.22251/jlcci.2023.23.19.567>
20. Lou, Y. (2023). Exploring the application of ChatGPT to English teaching in a Malaysia primary school. *Journal of Advanced Research in Education*, 2(4), 47–54. <https://doi.org/10.56397/jare.2023.07.08>
21. Pham, M. T., & Cao, T. X. T. (2025). The Practice of ChatGPT in English Teaching and Learning in Vietnam: A Systematic Review *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 5(1), 50–70. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.25513>
22. Klimova, B., Pikhart, M., & Al-Obaydi, L. H. (2024). Exploring the potential of ChatGPT for foreign language education at the university level. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1269319>
23. Ameur, F. Z. H., & Belkhir, F. Z. (2024). Embracing ChatGPT for Enhanced English as a Foreign Language Learning and Teaching: Teachers' Attitudes. *أطراس*, 5(3), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.70091/atras/ai.12>
24. Obenza, B. N., Salvahan, A., Rios, A. N., Solo, A., Alburo, R. A., & Gabila, R. J. (2024). University Students' perception and use of ChatGPT: Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher education. *International Journal of Human Computing Studies*, 6(3), 125–138. <https://doi.org/10.31149/ijhcs.v5i12.5033>
25. Giray, L., & Aquino, R. (2024). Use and impact of ChatGPT on undergraduate engineering students: A case from the Philippines. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 28(4), 453–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2384028>
26. Cabuquin, J. C., Acidre, M. A. S., Manabat, M. A. A., Aruta, M. G. H., Sangutan, J., & Yu, R. F. B. (2024). The role of ChatGPT on academic research: perspectives from filipino students across diverse educational levels. *Salud Ciencia Y Tecnología - Serie De Conferencias*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.56294/sctconf2024.1205>
27. Huallpa, J. J. (2023). Exploring the ethical considerations of using Chat GPT in university education. *Periodicals of Engineering and Natural Sciences (PEN)*, 11(4), 105. <https://doi.org/10.21533/pen.v11i4.3770>
28. Van Den Berg, G., & Du Plessis, E. (2023). ChatGPT and Generative AI: Possibilities for its contribution to lesson planning, critical thinking and openness in teacher education. *Education Sciences*, 13(10), 998. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13100998>
29. Gurl, T. J., Markinson, M. P., & Artzt, A. F. (2024). Using ChatGPT as a Lesson Planning Assistant with Preservice Secondary Mathematics Teachers. *Digital Experiences in Mathematics Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40751-024-00162-9>

30. Walter, A. (2024). Utilizing Language-Generating Artificial Intelligence (LGAI) in Educational Planning: A case study. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Teacher Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.46767/kfp.2016-0052>
31. Stognieva, O. N. (2024). Using ChatGPT in planning English language classes. *Informatics and Education*, 39(4), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.32517/0234-0453-2024-39-4-77-89>
32. Kehoe, F. (2023). Leveraging generative AI tools for enhanced lesson planning in initial teacher education at post primary. *Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 7(2), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.22554/ijtel.v7i2.124>
33. Albaloul, O., Marttinen, R., & Killian, C. (2024). Unlocking Educational Potential: How physical education teachers can thoughtfully benefit from using ChatGPT for planning, instruction, and assessment. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation & Dance*, 95(7), 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2024.2378776>
34. Spasic, A. J., & Jankovic, D. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT standard prompt engineering techniques in lesson preparation: role, instructions and Seed-Word prompts. 2022 57th International Scientific Conference on Information, Communication and Energy Systems and Technologies (ICEST), 47–50. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icest58410.2023.10187269>
35. Broutin, M. S. T. (2023). Exploring mathematics teacher candidates' instrumentation process of generative artificial intelligence for developing lesson plans. *Yuksekokretim Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.53478/yuksekokretim.1347061>
36. Durmus, C. (2024). From AI-Generated lesson plans to the Real-Life classes: explored by Pre-Service teachers. 8th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'22). <https://doi.org/10.4995/head24.2024.17060>
37. McCallum, L. (2023). New takes on developing intercultural communicative competence: using AI tools in telecollaboration task design and task completion. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 18(1/2), 153–172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jme-06-2023-0043>
38. Bonner, E., Lege, R., & Frazier, E. (2023). Large language model-based artificial intelligence in the language classroom: Practical ideas for teaching. *Teaching English With Technology*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.56297/bkam1691/wieo1749>
39. Manuel, D. B., & Bueno, F. J. (2024). Application of GPT Language Models for Innovation in activities in university Teaching. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2403.14694>
40. Huang, L., Holtham, C., & Rich, M. (2024). Applying generative AI to facilitate class orchestration with technology: ChatGPT and nearpod for seminar activities. *INTED Proceedings*, 1, 6807. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2024.1788>
41. Glahn, K. (2024). Using ChatGPT to teach English for academic purposes. *Journal of Education, Innovation, and Communication*, 5(2), 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.34097/jeicom-5-2-december-23-5>
42. Ghouali, K. (2025). Empowering EFL learning: leveraging ChatGPT for lesson planning and activity generation in the EFL classroom. *ONOMAZEIN*, 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.ne16.02>
43. Zulfikasari, S., Sulistio, B., & Aprilianasari, W. (2024). Utilization of Chat GPT Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Student's Learning Experience Gen-Z class. *Lectura Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 259–272. <https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v15i1.18840>
44. Rane, N. (2023). Enhancing the Quality of Teaching and Learning through ChatGPT and Similar Large Language Models: Challenges, Future Prospects, and Ethical Considerations in Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4599104>
45. Araujo, J. L., & Saude, I. (2024). Can ChatGPT enhance chemistry laboratory teaching using prompt engineering to enable AI in generating laboratory activities. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 101(5), 1858–1864. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.3c00745>
46. Popovici, M. (2023). ChatGPT in the Classroom. Exploring its potential and limitations in a functional programming course. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 40(22), 7743–7754. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2269006>
47. Meyasa, K. Y., Artini, N. L. P., & Marsakawati, N. N. P. E. (2024). EFL Teachers' Perspectives on the Integration of CHATGPT in Writing Assessment. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 12(1), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v12i1.78618>
48. Farazouli, A., Cerratto-Pargman, T., Bolander-Laksov, K., & McGrath, C. (2023). Hello GPT! Goodbye home examination? An exploratory study of AI chatbots impact on university teachers' assessment

- practices. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(3), 363–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2241676>
49. Kanik, M. (2024). The use of ChatGPT in assessment. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 11(3), 608–621. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1379647>
50. O’Cain, A., Fedoruk, B. D., Masri, Z., Frost, R., & Alahmar, A. (2023). A system for the improvement of educational assessment using intelligent conversational agents. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4393234>
51. Bucol, J. L., & Sangkawong, N. (2024). Exploring ChatGPT as a writing assessment tool. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2363901>
52. Le, T. T. H. (2024). Evaluating HUFLIT lecturers’ perspectives on CHATGPT’s capabilities in designing English testing and assessment. *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference*, 6, 157–181. <https://doi.org/10.54855/paic.24612>
53. Meniado, J. C. (2023). The impact of CHATGPT on English Language Teaching, Learning, and Assessment: A Rapid Review of literature. *Arab World English Journal*, 14(4), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no4.1>
54. Zaiarna, I., Zhyhadlo, O., & Dunaievska, O. (2024). ChatGPT in foreign language teaching and assessment: Exploring ELF instructors’ experience. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 102(4), 176–191. <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v102i4.5716>
55. Fergus, S., Botha, M., & Ostovar, M. (2023). Evaluating academic answers generated using ChatGPT. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 100(4), 1672–1675. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.3c00087>
56. De Jesus, F. S., Ibarra, L. M., Villanueva, W., & Leyesa, M. (2024). ChatGPT as an artificial intelligence learning tool for business administration students in Nueva Ecija, Philippines. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(6), 348–372. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.6.16>
57. Pawar, S. D. (2023). ChatGPT: Revolutionizing Education Administration-A Case Study Analysis. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(4), 4447–4454. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.51225>
58. Minz, A., & Behera, S. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in teaching and administrative tasks: Perspectives of DePED personnel. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(IV), 2394–2408. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90400180>
59. [Ahn, S. (2023). Significance and limitations of CHaTGPT utilization in the light of Descartes’ philosophy: focusing on educational questions and the role of teachers. *Korean Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(6), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.14333/kjte.2023.39.6.02>
60. Fatima, M. (2023). Revolutionizing interaction: Exploring the impact of ChatGPT in education. *Deleted Journal*, 01(02), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.60072/ijabmr.2023.v1i02.003>
61. Manik, E. (2024). The role of the teacher taken by ChatGPT. *International Journal of Advanced Technology and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijatss.v2i1.1147>
62. Fernandez, B. L., & Barazon, L. M. (2024). Streamlining Organization Tasks: A Grounded Theory on the Perspective and Coping Mechanism of School Administrators in Response to DepEd Order 002, s. 2024. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(5). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i05.22800>
63. Lea, L. B. (2023). A Computer Wrote this Paper: What ChatGPT Means for Education, Research, and Writing. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4338981>
64. Agarwal, K. (2023). AI in Education - Evaluating ChatGPT as a Virtual Teaching Assistant. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i04.4484>
65. Pachuashvili, N. (2024). Teaching in the Era of AI: Teachers’ perspectives of utilizing ChatGPT in Education. *European Conference on Education Official Conference Proceedings*, 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2188-1162.2024.29>
66. Samala, A. D., Zhai, X., Aoki, K., Bojic, L., & Zikic, S. (2024). An In-Depth review of ChatGPT’s pros and cons for learning and teaching in education. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, 18(02), 96–117. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i02.46509>
67. Hussain, Z. D. (2023). Incorporating ChatGPT in the ESL Composition Classroom: A Literature Review and Teacher Experimentation in a Sri Lankan context. *the æProceedings of Sliit International Conference on Advancements in Science and Humanities*, 103–108. <https://doi.org/10.54389/xaqa6267>

68. Hong, W. C. H. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on foreign language teaching and learning: opportunities in education and research. *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.61414/jeti.v5i1.103>
69. Mai, D. T. T., Van Da, C., & Van Hanh, N. (2024). The use of ChatGPT in teaching and learning: a systematic review through SWOT analysis approach. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1328769>
70. Ren, L. (2024). Use ChatGPT in Teaching and Learning: Opportunity and Challenge. *Advances in Social Behavior Research*, 11(1), 90–94. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7102/11/2024105>
71. Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., & Wals, A. (2023). A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(3), 460–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>
72. Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
73. Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
74. Macabenta, J. M., Manubag, C. V., Tabanag, J. C., Villegas, N. B., Villegas, T. M., & Cabanilla, A. J. (2023). Inclusive Education: Lived Experiences of 21st century Teachers in the Philippines. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(4), 454–462. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.48982>
75. Cacho, R. (2024). Integrating Generative AI in university Teaching and Learning: a model for balanced guidelines. *Online Learning*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i3.4508>
76. Adel, A., Ahsan, A., & Davison, C. (2024). ChatGPT Promises and Challenges in Education: Computational and Ethical Perspectives. *Education Sciences*, 14(8), 814. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080814>
77. Kostka, I., & Toncelli, R. (2023). Exploring Applications of ChatGPT to English Language teaching: Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language--TESL-EJ*, 27(3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27107int>
78. Djuwari, D., Pila, R. A., & Syaikhon, M. (2025). The implementation of ChatGPT in English language learning in the Philippines and Indonesia. *Deleted Journal*, 6(1), 225–240. <https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v6i1.1431>
79. Mastul, A. H., De Vera, C. T., & Jayme, C. B. (2023). Understanding the use of EduTech in Schools in the Philippines: Recommendations for Effectiveness. *Engineering Science Letter*, 2(02), 37–40. <https://doi.org/10.56741/esl.v2i02.307>
80. Lazo, K. P. M. (2024). The interaction between teachers' efficacy and students' attitudes toward effective learning in state universities and colleges of the Philippines. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 11(7), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.07.010>
81. Sibug, V. B., Vital, V. P., Miranda, J. P. P., Fernando, E. Q., Gamboa, A. B., Hernandez, H. E., Bansil, J. A., Penecilla, E. M., & Gonzales, D. D. (2024). Teachers' Perspectives on Integrating AI tools in Classrooms: Insights from the Philippines. *International Conference on Computers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.58459/icce.2024.4964>
82. Gonzales, R. D. (2022). From Face-to-Face to Virtual Student assessment: Changes in student assessment practices during COVID-19 among Filipino teachers. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4257986>
83. Velasco, Y. (2023). Students' perceptions towards the implementation of adult education as the nexus in continuing education in Philippine higher education institutions. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 28(1), 132–149. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol28no1.6>
84. Zahurin, K., Mamat, N., Ali, W. N. H. W., & Abas, H. (2024). The influence of robotic process automation on the administrative workload of teachers. *Open International Journal of Informatics*, 12(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.11113/oiji2024.12n1.296>
85. Capili, S. R., Maed, & Paglinawan, J. L. (2025). Narratives of Teachers on Educational Technology Adaptation. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 08(10), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.37502/ijsmr.2025.81013>

86. Manegdeg, J. F. T., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Collaboration opportunities and workload on professional development access of Public-School teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, IX(XII), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2024.912008>
87. Algar, G. J., Basañes, M. G., De La Luna, A. T. J., Jentelizo, J. A. A., Salbibia, M. G. A., & Trecho, R. C. (2025). Balancing Act: Exploring the impact of ancillary duties on Filipino teachers' professional lives. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(III), 846–855. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90300066>
88. Ramos, A. L. (2025). Technological Innovative Practices in English Language Teaching among Higher Education Institutions in Basilan, Philippines. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(5). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9289>
89. Basileo, L. D., & Lyons, M. E. (2024). An exploratory analysis of Early Adopters in education innovations. *Quality Education for All*, 1(1), 158–179. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qea-10-2023-0009>
90. Hong, J. C. (2023). Exploring the opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in foreign language teaching. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 34, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2023.34.01>
91. Mai, T., Nguyen, T. T. T., Phan, T. T. N., & Nguyen, M. T. (2024). Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) of ChatGPT: A comprehensive literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(14), e34820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e34820>
92. Ren, Z. (2024). Harnessing the potential of ChatGPT in language classrooms: A Dual-Perspective review and future research agenda. *SAGE Open*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241242786>
93. Al-Khreshah, M. H. (2024). Bridging technology and pedagogy from a global lens: Teachers' perspectives on integrating ChatGPT in English language teaching. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100218>
94. Adiguzel, T., Kaya, M. H., & Cansu, F. K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with AI: Exploring the transformative potential of ChatGPT. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(3), ep429. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13152>
95. Reichert, J., Ngo, L. K., Ruiz, C., & Striepe, M. (2024). Bridging Theory and Practice: Developing a Professional Development Course for High School Teachers Using ChatGPT. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22(5), 98–113. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.22.5.3394>
96. Huang, J. (2025). Harnessing AI for professional growth: ESL teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251318025>
97. Chang, Y., & Hwang, G. J. (2024). Potential of ChatGPT for improving self-worth and self-confidence of trainers in case-based teaching. *Computers & Education*, 210, 104969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104969>
98. Tran, T. Q., Nguyen, T. T. H., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). AI chatbots in language teaching: EFL teachers' perceptions of ChatGPT as a professional development tool. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241244629>
99. Zymovets, O., & Karpenko, O. (2025). ChatGPT for Professional Development of the Future Foreign Language Teachers: Attitudes, Benefits, and Challenges. *Arab World English Journal*, 16(1), 148–163. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no1.10>
100. Arefian, M. H., Ghasemi, H., & Rezaee, A. A. (2024). Collaborative reflective practice in EFL teacher professional development mediated by ChatGPT. *System*, 124, 103377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103377>
101. Cerero, J. F., Rueda, M. M., Graván, P. R., & Batanero, J. M. F. (2025). ChatGPT as a Digital Tool in the Transformation of Digital Teaching Competence: A Systematic review. *Technologies*, 13(5), 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies13050205>
102. Alrishan, A. (2023). Factors Affecting the Pre-service Teachers' Intention to Use ChatGPT in Oman. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(10), 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.10.20>
103. Bettayeb, A. M., Alkaabi, A., & Althbiti, A. (2024). Synergizing AI and Traditional Teaching: ChatGPT's impact on learner engagement, motivation and challenges. *Journal of Educators Online*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.9743/jeo.2024.21.2.5>
104. Anjarani, D., Nafiati, D. A., & Kurniati, D. (2024). The Use of ChatGPT in EFL Writing Class: Its Role in Promoting Student Engagement. *International Journal of Language Education*, 8(3), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v8i3.57600>

105. Gouia-Zarrad, R., & Gunn, C. (2024). Innovative teaching in mathematics: Leveraging ChatGPT to enhance student engagement and performance in differential equations. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(13), 16841–16855. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12500-y>
106. Bin-Hady, W. R. A., Al-Kadi, A., Hazaea, A., & Ali, J. K. M. (2023). Exploring the dimensions of ChatGPT in English language learning: A global perspective. *Library Hi Tech*, 42(3), 906–921. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-05-2023-0200>
107. Lin, C. (2023). Exploring ChatGPT as a Facilitator for Self-Directed Learning. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 10(6), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.106.14812>
108. Agustini, S. (2023). Exploring ChatGPT to Promote Learner Autonomy in EFL Context. *Journal of English and Education*, 9(2), 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol9.iss2.art5>
109. Solak, E. (2024). Promise and Challenge of ChatGPT for Language Teaching. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 24(1), 90–104.
110. Pachuashvili, N. (2024). Exploring teachers' attitudes toward the use of ChatGPT as a digital resource. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 9(2), 145–159. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeps.v9i2.330>
111. Nernere, S., & Kastuhandani, K. (2024). ChatGPT as a support tool for lesson preparation of Indonesian English teachers. *ELLITE Journal of English Language Literature and Teaching*, 9(2), 193–207. <https://doi.org/10.32528/ellite.v9i2.1041>
112. Hussain, Z. (2023). Integrating ChatGPT into the ESL writing classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.745>
113. Naweed-E-Sehar, S. (2024). Teachers' Attitudes and Ethical Awareness Towards ChatGPT: Implications for Responsible Use in Academic Research. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(2), 1078–1089. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.2.87>
114. Rane, N. (2023). Enhancing the Quality of Teaching and Learning through ChatGPT and Similar Large Language Models: Challenges, Future Prospects, and Ethical Considerations in Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4599104>
115. Guarin, G. R., Jugar, G. O., Gudelos, J. T., Boco, N. A. O., Cantal, M. P., Durano, M. A. J. P., Robel, E. M. P., Tundag, T. M. F., & Mabitad, B. D. (2025). Perspectives, Practices, and Challenges of ChatGPT Utilization at Eastern Visayas State University Teacher Education Department. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(I), 4164–4185. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.9010325>
116. Pecasion, S., Papelleras, S. J., Pedrozo, P., & Allawan, J. G. L. (2023). Silver Lining of ChatGPT Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tool: through the Lens of Department of Teachers Education in Panabo City, Philippines. *Journal of Learning and Educational Policy*, 41, 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.55529/jlep.41.19.29>
117. Mabuan, R. A. (2024). ChatGPT and ELT: Exploring Teachers' voices. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 7(1), 128–153. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.523>
118. Nguyen, T. H. B., & Tran, T. D. H. (2023). Exploring the efficacy of ChatGPT in language teaching. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 14(2), 156–167. <https://doi.org/10.54855/acoj.2314210>
119. Hashem, R., Ali, N., Zein, F. E., Fidalgo, P., & Khurma, O. A. (2023). AI to the rescue: Exploring the potential of ChatGPT as a teacher ally for workload relief and burnout prevention. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 19, 023. <https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19023>
120. Estrellado, C. J., & Millar, G. (2023). ChatGPT: Towards Educational Technology Micro-Level Framework. *International Journal of Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics*, 3(4), 101–127. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353035>
121. Goli-Cruz, M. J. (2024). Perceptions of higher education faculty regarding the use of Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT) in Education. *International Journal on Open and Distance e-Learning*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.58887/ijodel.v9i2.249>
122. Karaman, M. R., & Goksu, İ. (2024). Are lesson plans created by ChatGPT more effective? an experimental study. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 7(1), 107–127. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.607>
123. [125] Kalenda, P. J., Rath, L., Heidt, M. A., & Wright, A. (2024). Pre-service Teacher Perceptions of ChatGPT for Lesson Plan Generation. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395241301388>

124. Ulla, M. B., Perales, W. F., & Busbus, S. O. (2023). 'To generate or stop generating response': Exploring EFL teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT in English language teaching in Thailand. *Learning Research and Practice*, 9(2), 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2023.2257252>
125. De Santo Cristo De Burgos, C., & Ilagan, C. (2024). Factors affecting workload balance and workplace resiliency among teachers in the implementation of special needs education programs. *The Research Probe*, 4(2), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.53378/trp.1224.138>
126. Turbanada, M. Y., Alvarez, M. D., Chan, C. J., Adriatico, J. D., & Morales, R. A. (2025). Technology Integration among Public Secondary School Teachers in the Division of Northern Samar, Philippines. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 19(6), 446–460. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2025/v19i61072>
127. Prestoza, M. J. (2024). Assessing remote learning's feasibility: A comprehensive analysis of Philippine public-school teachers' use of learning management systems and blended learning approaches. *Journal of Research Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 14(1), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrppte.vol14.1.3.2024>
128. Hatmanto, E. D., Rahmawati, F., Pasandalan, S. N. B., & Sorohiti, M. (2024). Empowering Creative Education: Applying ChatGPT for enhancing personalized learning in Senior Teacher-Driven instructional Design in the Philippines. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 594, 05004. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202459405004>
129. Robledo, D. A. R., Zara, C. G., Montalbo, S. M., Gayeta, N. E., Gonzales, A. L., Escarez, M. G. A., & Maalihan, E. D. (2023). Development and Validation of a Survey Instrument on Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices (KAP) Regarding the Educational Use of ChatGPT among Preservice Teachers in the Philippines. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(10), 1582–1590. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2023.13.10.1965>
130. Madunic, J., & Sovulj, M. (2024). Application of ChatGPT in Information Literacy Instructional Design. *Publications*, 12(2), 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications12020011>
131. Javier, D. R. C., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2023). Developing secondary school English language learners' productive and critical use of ChatGPT. *TESOL Journal*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.755>
132. Yulia, P., Nasution, E. Y. P., Deswita, R., & Casanova, A. (2024). Increasing the motivation of prospective teachers: Exploration of the use of ChatGPT in developing mathematics teaching materials independent. *International Journal of Studies in Education and Science*, 5(4), 404–415. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijses.102>
133. Javaid, M., Haleem, A., Singh, R. P., Khan, S., & Khan, I. H. (2023). Unlocking the opportunities through ChatGPT Tool towards ameliorating the education system. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks Standards and Evaluations*, 3(2), 100115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100115>
134. Karakose, T., & Tulubaş, T. (2023). How can ChatGPT facilitate teaching and learning: Implications for Contemporary Education. *Educational Process International Journal*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2023.124.1>
135. Gamit, A. M. (2023). ICT integration in Elementary School for mathematics subject. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(2), 432–465. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.2.24>
136. Kottmann, A., Schildkamp, K., & Van Der Meulen, B. (2024). Determinants of the Innovation Behaviour of Teachers in Higher Education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 49(2), 397–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-023-09689-y>
137. Dicediquin, J. B., Mobo, F. D., & Cutillas, A. L. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of professional development programs for junior high school mathematics teachers in improving mathematics instruction in the K to 12 curriculum in the Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(4), 1143–1153. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.04.12>
138. Cabato, J. U. (2025). From Awareness to Practice: Exploring the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of secondary ESL teachers in the Philippines toward ChatGPT in Education. *LatIA*, 3, 360. <https://doi.org/10.62486/latia2025360>
139. Harini, H. (2023). The role of ChatGPT in improving the efficiency of education management processes. *Indo-MathEdu Intellectuals Journal*, 4(2), 255–267. <https://doi.org/10.54373/imeij.v4i2.199>
140. Hayat, A. (2025). Language Classroom Management: Underprivileges of ChatGPT. *Deleted Journal*, 2025(1), 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.53935/jomw.v2024i4.632>

141. Pan, Y., & Gu, J. (2023). Empowering Education: ChatGPT's role in teaching and learning statistics and data Analytics. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.37120/ijttl.2023.19.1.02>
142. Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4337484>
143. Chinonso, O. E., Theresa, A. M., & Aduke, T. C. (2023). ChatGPT for Teaching, Learning and Research: Prospects and Challenges. *Global Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(02), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.36348/gajhss.2023.v05i02.001>
144. Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, T. (2023). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 199, 123076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076>
145. Garcia, M. B. (2023). Factors affecting adoption intention of productivity software applications among teachers: A Structural equation modeling investigation. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 40(10), 2546–2559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2163565>
146. Nieva, A. (2023). Construct validation of the teacher attitude to inclusion scale for Filipino pre-service teachers. *Bedan Research Journal*, 8(1), 305–329. <https://doi.org/10.58870/berj.v8i1.56>
147. Kopuz, E. (2024). English Language Teachers' insights on the Influence of ChatGPT on Professional Well-Being. *Journal of Educational Studies and Multidisciplinary Approaches*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.51383/jesma.2024.107>
148. Lasaca, J. P., & Paceno, R. D. (2025). Between Chalk and Home: Work-Life Balance of Master Teachers I in Bayugan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Scientific Research Publications*, 15(5), 244–258. <https://doi.org/10.29322/ijsrp.15.05.2025.p16127>
149. Aquino, J. M., Culajara, C. J., & Culajara, J. P. M. (2023). Examining the Work-Life Balance of Teacher-Parents in one secondary school in the Philippines: a phenomenological study. *e-Jurnal Penyelidikan Dan Inovasi*, 10(2), 158–175. <https://doi.org/10.53840/ejpi.v10i2.118>
150. Delavin, E. A., & Pogoy, A. M. (2023). Work-Life balance of married female teachers during pandemic in the Philippines: A Qualitative metaphorical analysis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(3), 784–791. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.03.11>
151. Manalo, A. S., & Velasco, C. Q. (2024). Balancing Act: Investigating the Work-Life Equilibrium of Public Elementary School teachers. *International Journal of Social Science Humanity & Management Research*, 3(05). <https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshmr.2024.v3i5n09>
152. Sabuero, J. B. (2024). The work-life balance among private secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(7), 2611–2619. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.07.19>
153. Cusipag, M. N., Oluyinka, S., Bernabe, M. T. N., & Bognot, F. L. (2023). Perceptions toward achieving work-life balance and job satisfaction in online teaching. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 6(1), 2024012. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2024012>
154. Santiago, C. R. (2023). Sustaining Work-Life Balance of teachers during the new normal. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 2(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajiri.v2i2.1257>
155. Eden, J. J. (2025). Teachers' work and family life: impacts and the need for balance. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.102>
156. Bayucot, H. L., & Grana, L. B. (2024). A Generational Perspective of the Determinants of Work-Life Balance of Secondary School Teachers in Gingoog City Division. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 5(2), 677–687. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v5i2.1001>
157. Culajara, C. J. (2023). Improving teachers' professional development through School Learning Action Cell (SLAC). *Journal of Research Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 13(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrppte.vol13.1.6.2023>
158. [160] Duran, E. P., Pontillas, P. V., & Comon, J. D. (2024). Teachers' Work-Life Balance and Well-Being across Opol East District, Division of Misamis Oriental. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(4), 134–166. [https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8\(4\).2024.9](https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8(4).2024.9)

159. Gudelos, J. T., & Mabitad, B. D. (2025). Work-Related Stress, Workloads, and Performance: A case of senior high school teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(I), 1457–1471. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.9010121>
160. Fredeluces, S. M. A., Garcia, N. P., & Quines, L. A. (2023). Extent of utilization of paperless technology: Basis for a proposed intervention program. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(7). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i7.4903>
161. Santiago, C. S., Embang, S. I., Acanto, R. B., Ambojia, K. W. P., Aperocho, M. D. B., Balilo, B. B., Cahapin, E. L., Conlu, M. T. N., Lausa, S. M., Laput, E. Y., Malabag, B. A., Paderes, J. J., & Romasanta, J. K. N. (2023). Utilization of writing assistance tools in research in selected higher learning institutions in the Philippines: A text mining analysis. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(11), 259–284. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.11.14>
162. Baskara, F. R. (2023). Integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction: Benefits and challenges. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.31763/ijele.v5i1.858>
163. Kiryakova, G., & Angelova, N. (2023). ChatGPT—A challenging tool for the university professors in their teaching practice. *Education Sciences*, 13(10), 1056. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13101056>
164. Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(2), ep421. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036>
165. Kunjiapu, S., Sinnappan, P., Salim, F. A. A., & Kunasegaran, M. (2025). Challenges and Dilemmas of Digitalization in Philippine Education: a Grassroots perspective. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 14(2), 232. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v14i2.22325>
166. Galleto, F., Jr., Africa, A. D., De Leon, F., & Culaba, A. (2023). Fifth-generation networks: The adoption of technology in a developing country. *SciEnggJ*, 16(2), 310–320. <https://doi.org/10.54645/2023162mih-35>
167. Celeste, R. J., & Osias, N. (2024). Challenges and Implementation of Technology Integration: Basis for enhanced instructional program. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(2), 106–130. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i2.2656>
168. Abella, J. L., & Rosa, E. D. (2023). Digital Literacy and Digital competence of selected Filipino teachers: Basis for a Post-Pandemic Pedagogy. *IJORER International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 4(5), 548–569. <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v4i5.378>
169. Zhou, J., Shen, L., & Chen, W. (2024). How ChatGPT transformed teachers: the role of basic psychological needs in enhancing digital competence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1458551>
170. Nugroho, A., Putro, N. H. P. S., Syamsi, K., Mutiaraningrum, I., & Wulandari, F. D. (2024). Teacher's Experience Using ChatGPT in Language Teaching: An Exploratory study. *Computers in the Schools*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2024.2441161>
171. Allehyani, S. H., & Algamdi, M. A. (2023). Digital Competences: Early Childhood Teachers' Beliefs and perceptions of ChatGPT Application in Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL). *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(11), 343–363. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.11.18>
172. Slamet, J. (2024). Potential of ChatGPT as a digital language learning assistant: EFL teachers' and students' perceptions. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00143-2>
173. Mogavi, R. H., Deng, C., Kim, J. J., Zhou, P., Kwon, Y. D., Metwally, A. H. S., Tlili, A., Bassanelli, S., Bucchiarone, A., Gujar, S., Nacke, L. E., & Hui, P. (2023). ChatGPT in education: A blessing or a curse? A qualitative study exploring early adopters' utilization and perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior Artificial Humans*, 2(1), 100027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100027>
174. Tran, T. N., & Tran, H. P. (2023). Exploring the Role of ChatGPT in Developing critical digital literacies in Language Learning: A Qualitative study. *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference*, 4, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.54855/paic.2341>
175. Urazbayeva, G., Kussainova, R., Aibergen, A., Kaliyeva, A., & Kantayeva, G. (2024). Innovation Off the Bat: Bridging the ChatGPT Gap in Digital Competence among English as a Foreign Language Teachers. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), 946. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090946>

176. Mariscal, L. L., Albarracin, M. R., Mobo, F. D., & Cutillas, A. L. (2023). Pedagogical competence towards technology-driven instruction on basic education. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(5), 1567–1580. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.05.18>
177. Gonzales, A. G., & Gonzales, G. G. (2024). Exploring users' acceptance of electronic circuits simulation: Implications to teaching basic electronics. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100821>
178. Duterte, J. P. (2024). Technology-Enhanced Learning Environments: Improving engagement and learning. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(X), 1305–1314. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8100111>
179. Bateman, T. (2024). Teacher perspectives of ChatGPT as a pedagogical tool in the K-12 setting: a case study. *Quality Assurance in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-02-2024-0042>
180. Karatas, F., Ericok, B., & Tanrikulu, L. (2024). Reshaping curriculum adaptation in the age of artificial intelligence: Mapping teachers' AI-driven curriculum adaptation patterns. *British Educational Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4068>
181. Nikolopoulou, K. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Exploring Ways of Harnessing Pedagogical Practices with the Assistance of ChatGPT. *Deleted Journal*, 1(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewijce42022489>
182. Bektik, D., Ullmann, T. D., Edwards, C., Herodotou, C., & Whitelock, D. (2024). AI-Powered Curricula: Unpacking the potential and progress of generative technologies in education. *Ubiquity Proceedings*, 38. <https://doi.org/10.5334/uproc.160>
183. Japoshvili-Ghvinashvili, N. M., & Suleman, N. D. N. (2023). Assisting ELT Teachers: Designing activities for the use of ChatGPT in teaching and learning. *Pakistan Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovation*, 2(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.59075/pjmi.v2i1.219>
184. Trilaksana, H., Soelistiono, S., & Wahidin, N. (2024). Campus Learning Based on AI: Implementation of ChatGPT in AILS and its implications for curriculum development in Indonesia. *INFLUENCE International Journal of Science Review*, 6(1), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.54783/influencejournal.v6i1.211>
185. Pasaribu, A. N., Manik, S., Pasaribu, T. K., Sibagariang, R. O., & Saragih, Y. I. (2025). EFL students' perceptions of ethical concerns on using ChatGPT in academic writing. *English Review Journal of English Education*, 13(1), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v13i1.11322>
186. Chavez, N. J. V., Cuilan, N. J. T., Mannan, N. S. S., Ibrahim, N. N. U., Carolino, N. A. A., Radjuni, N. A., Albani, N. S. E., & Garil, N. B. A. (2024). Discourse Analysis on the Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, Science, and Language Instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
187. Stepanechko, O., & Kozub, L. (2023). English teachers' concerns about the ethical use of ChatGPT by university students. *ГРАЛБ НАУКИ*, 25, 297–302. <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.17.03.2023.051>
188. Obed, K., Anangisye, W. A., & Sanga, P. (2025). Academic integrity considerations of using ChatGPT in assessment activities among university student teachers. *Quality Assurance in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-06-2024-0100>
189. Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Sadallah, M., & Bouteraa, M. (2023). Use of ChatGPT in academia: Academic integrity hangs in the balance. *Technology in Society*, 75, 102370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102370>
190. Cong-Lem, N., Tran, T. N., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). Academic integrity in the age of Generative AI: Perceptions and responses of Vietnamese EFL teachers. *Teaching English With Technology*, 2024(1). <https://doi.org/10.56297/fsyb3031/mxnb7567>
191. Guleria, A., Krishan, K., Sharma, V., & Kanchan, T. (2023). ChatGPT: ethical concerns and challenges in academics and research. *The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries*, 17(09), 1292–1299. <https://doi.org/10.3855/jidc.18738>
192. Farhi, F., Jeljeli, R., Aburezeq, I., Dweikat, F. F., Al-Shami, S. A., & Slamene, R. (2023). Analyzing the students' views, concerns, and perceived ethics about chat GPT usage. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100180>
193. Alli, A., Alam, M. R., Moreira, T., & Chowdhury, F. (2025). Generative AI policy framework for higher education: a strategic approach to responsible integration. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13178-y>

194. Dempere, J., Modugu, K., Hesham, A., & Ramasamy, L. K. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1206936>
195. Mhlanga, D. (2023). Open AI in education, the responsible and ethical use of ChatGPT towards lifelong learning. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 690. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070690>
196. Goldman, S. R., et al. (2024). Exploring the use of AI tools to support special education teachers. *Journal of Special Education Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01626434241242590>
197. Baes, M. Q., Dinglasan, R. L. C., Patal, N. F. A., Rellama, C., Briones, J., & Verano, J. P. E. (2025). Work overload and its impact on staff retention among Non-Teaching personnel of public elementary schools in the Philippines. *People and Behavior Analysis*, 3(1), 39–65. <https://doi.org/10.31098/pba.v3i1.3030>
198. Rodriguez, J. M. (2024). The AI, Blockchain, Cloud and Data (ABCD) Technology Integration in the Philippines: A literature review. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(12). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0588>
199. Malon, S. M. J. A., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2025). The relationship of access in technology to the teachers productivity in the last mile schools. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(V), 3751–3756. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.905000285>
200. Delgra, M. J. (2026). Organizational support, teachers' instructional strategies and efficiency. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.71097/ijst.v17.i1.10065>
201. Portugues, T. M. (2026). Teachers' information and communication technology (ICT) skill, technology integration and learners' performance. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.71097/ijst.v17.i1.10066>
202. Aurangzeb, W., Kashan, S., & Rehman, Z. U. (2024). Investigating Technology perceptions among secondary school teachers A systematic literature review on perceived usefulness and ease of use. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review*, 4(2), 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.48112/aessr.v4i2.746>
203. Veridiano, M. A. C., & Brondo, J. M. (2023). Perceived technology integration of Filipino teachers teaching in the U.S.A. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 17(3), 471–479. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.3.0363>
204. Domingo, J. G. (2024). Attitudes, Practices and Challenges in Technology Integration within the Industrial Classroom: The Context of TVL Track in SHS. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences (PJLSS)*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.2.001016>
205. Barrot, J., Agdeppa, J., & Manzano, B. (2024). What It Takes to Teach in a Fully Online Learning Environment: Provisional Views from a Developing Country. *Online Learning*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i1.3921>