# Digital Transformation Governance, Stakeholders' Change Readiness, and Administrative Support in Public Junior High Schools in the Division of Manila: Basis for a Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

**Dr. Ruth Grace B. Llanes**

**Graduate School Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700842**

**Received: 29 July 2026; Accepted: 03 August 2026; Published: 13 August 2026**

## ABSTRACT

Digital transformation in schools requires more than access to technology; it depends on coherent governance, stakeholder readiness, and responsive institutional support. This study examined digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila. A quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational design involved 584 education personnel comprising 30 supervisors, 92 school administrators, 317 teachers, and 145 non-teaching personnel.

Digital transformation governance was rated Evident overall (WM = 3.85), stakeholders' change readiness was Observed (WM = 3.88), and administrative support was Supported (WM = 3.91). Retained aggregate-level ANOVA outputs indicated significant respondent-group differences across all governance dimensions ($\eta^2$ = .340–.369) and all readiness dimensions ($\eta^2$ = .319–.534). Tukey–Kramer comparisons showed that the most recurrent perception gaps involved supervisors and teachers or non-teaching personnel. An exploratory multiple regression based on 18 analytic observations showed that the five administrative-support dimensions did not significantly predict digital transformation governance, $R^2$ = .157, adjusted $R^2$ = −.194, $F(5, 12) = 0.447$, $p$ = .807. Implementation challenges were Highly Encountered (WM = 4.26), particularly those related to stakeholder readiness. The proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program was rated Suitable (WM = 4.04), Acceptable (WM = 3.95), and Feasible (WM = 3.90). The findings support a carefully monitored pilot of context-responsive digital governance and capacity-building interventions; inferential estimates should be interpreted cautiously because the retained ANOVA and regression outputs were based on aggregate and small-sample analyses.

**Keywords:** administrative support, digital education, digital transformation governance, educational leadership, stakeholder change readiness, contextualized enrichment program

## INTRODUCTION

Digital technologies increasingly shape school administration, instruction, communication, resource management, data use, and student learning. The central challenge for schools is no longer the acquisition of digital tools alone, but the development of organizational arrangements that connect technology with institutional priorities, instructional needs, accountability, and long-term improvement. Digital transformation therefore involves system-level change in structures, practices, capabilities, and stakeholder relationships rather than isolated technology adoption (McCarthy et al., 2023).

Successful digital transformation depends on strategic direction, capable leadership, prepared personnel, adequate infrastructure, professional learning, and continuing technical support. Evidence from K–12 settings shows that clear guidelines, collaboration, access to hardware and software, time, and digital competence can enable school digitalization, whereas limited support and resources constrain implementation (Reis-Andersson, 2024).

In the Philippine basic education system, Republic Act No. 9155 emphasizes school-based governance and the responsibility of school leaders for managing resources and improving educational outcomes. The Basic Education Development Plan 2030 further identifies technology-enabled and resilient education systems as important to long-term sector development, while DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 institutionalizes professional standards that include the appropriate use of information and communication technologies.

Digital transformation governance provides the strategic direction, decision rules, accountability mechanisms, risk controls, data practices, and monitoring arrangements through which digital initiatives are aligned with educational goals. International policy evidence likewise emphasizes the importance of strategic visions, governance and regulation, infrastructure, capacity-building, funding, and monitoring as interconnected elements of school digital transformation (OECD, 2023; Boeskens & Meyer, 2025).

Stakeholders' change readiness is equally important because technology-related reforms require shared understanding, commitment, and confidence among those expected to implement them. Organizational Readiness for Change Theory explains readiness as a collective state reflected in change commitment and change efficacy; when members believe that a change is valuable and that they have the capability and resources to implement it, sustained participation becomes more likely (Weiner, 2009).

Administrative support can strengthen this process through professional development, technical assistance, communication, resource allocation, and monitoring. In practice, these mechanisms must be accessible at the operational level. School leaders may understand and endorse digital strategies, but implementation can remain uneven when teachers and non-teaching personnel experience insufficient guidance, time, infrastructure, or responsive support (Reis-Andersson, 2024).

The study is theoretically anchored in Evolutionary Governance Theory, which views governance as adaptive and shaped by evolving institutional relationships and dependencies (Beunen et al., 2015); Organizational Readiness for Change Theory, which explains collective commitment and implementation capability (Weiner, 2009); and Dynamic Capabilities Theory, which highlights organizations' capacity to reconfigure resources and competencies in changing environments (Teece et al., 1997). Together, these perspectives support an integrated examination of governance, readiness, and administrative support.

Although previous research has examined digital leadership, technology integration, digital competence, and school digitalization, fewer studies have considered digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support simultaneously in Philippine public junior high schools. Examining these conditions together is important because governance structures may be formally present while readiness, resource access, communication, or implementation remain uneven across stakeholder groups.

Accordingly, this study assessed digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila. It also examined differences among supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel; tested whether administrative-support dimensions predicted digital transformation governance; identified implementation challenges; and developed and evaluated a Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational research design. The descriptive component assessed digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, administrative support, implementation challenges, and the suitability, acceptability, and feasibility of the proposed program. The comparative component examined differences in assessments across respondent groups, while the correlational component examined the predictive association between administrative-support dimensions and digital transformation governance under existing school conditions.

The respondents comprised 584 participants: 30 supervisors, 92 school administrators, 317 teachers, and 145 non-teaching personnel. The original study reported the use of Slovin's formula in determining sample requirements. Supervisors were selected purposively because of their direct involvement in school governance

and technology-related initiatives, while school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel were selected using stratified random sampling to provide representation across stakeholder groups.

Data were gathered through a researcher-developed structured questionnaire based on the study objectives, theoretical foundations, and related literature. The instrument measured six dimensions of digital transformation governance, four dimensions of stakeholders' change readiness, five dimensions of administrative support, implementation challenges, and program evaluation criteria. The questionnaire underwent expert validation and pilot testing for clarity, content relevance, and internal consistency before final administration.

Ethical standards were observed throughout the study. Approval was obtained from the appropriate education authorities, informed consent was secured from participants, participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through aggregate reporting. Data were used exclusively for academic purposes.

Weighted mean, standard deviation, and rank were used for descriptive analysis. One-way ANOVA and Tukey–Kramer pairwise comparisons were retained for respondent-group comparisons, and multiple linear regression was retained for the administrative-support model. Statistical tests used $\alpha = .05$. A critical analytic limitation is that the retained ANOVA output reports df = 3, 36, implying 40 analytic observations per dimension rather than 584 individual-level responses. Accordingly, those ANOVA and post hoc results are interpreted as aggregate-level findings. The regression likewise used only 18 analytic observations with five predictors, leaving 12 residual degrees of freedom; therefore, its coefficients are treated as exploratory rather than as stable population estimates.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Digital Transformation Governance

**Table 1.** Assessment of Digital Transformation Governance

| Dimension | Supervisors | VI | School Administrators | VI | Teachers | VI | Non-Teaching | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vision and Strategy Alignment | 4.23 | HE | 4.10 | E | 3.57 | E | 3.70 | E | 3.90 | E | 1 |
| Leadership Roles and Accountability | 4.25 | HE | 3.78 | E | 3.59 | E | 3.62 | E | 3.81 | E | 5 |
| Processes, Policies, and Governance Structures | 4.19 | E | 3.88 | E | 3.48 | E | 3.58 | E | 3.78 | E | 6 |
| Risk, Compliance, and Performance Management | 4.28 | HE | 3.88 | E | 3.59 | E | 3.74 | E | 3.87 | E | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organization, Culture, and Capability | 4.32 | HE | 3.84 | E | 3.55 | E | 3.66 | E | 3.84 | E | 4 |
| Technology and Data Governance | 4.31 | HE | 3.78 | E | 3.63 | E | 3.83 | E | 3.89 | E | 2 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.26** | **HE** | **3.88** | **E** | **3.57** | **E** | **3.69** | **E** | **3.85** | **E** | |

Digital transformation governance was Evident overall (composite WM = 3.85). Vision and Strategy Alignment ranked first (WM = 3.90), followed by Technology and Data Governance (WM = 3.89) and Risk, Compliance, and Performance Management (WM = 3.87). Processes, Policies, and Governance Structures received the lowest composite rating (WM = 3.78), indicating that formal procedures and governance arrangements were present but were the least strongly perceived dimension.

Supervisors reported the highest overall assessment (WM = 4.26, Highly Evident), whereas teachers reported the lowest (WM = 3.57, Evident). The pattern suggests that digital governance may be more visible to personnel who are directly involved in policy oversight than to those who experience implementation primarily at the classroom or operational level. This is consistent with evidence that effective digital transformation requires strategy, governance, implementation capacity, and stakeholder engagement to function as an integrated system (McCarthy et al., 2023; OECD, 2023).

**Stakeholder Change Readiness**

**Table 2.** Assessment of Stakeholders' Change Readiness

| **Dimension** | **Supervisors** | **VI** | **School Administrators** | **VI** | **Teachers** | **VI** | **Non-Teaching** | **VI** | **Composite** | **VI** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cognitive Readiness | 4.22 | HO | 4.19 | O | 3.29 | MO | 4.00 | O | 3.92 | O | 1.5 |
| Emotional Readiness | 4.25 | HO | 3.80 | O | 3.57 | O | 4.05 | O | 3.92 | O | 1.5 |
| Behavioral Readiness | 4.30 | HO | 3.76 | O | 3.40 | O | 3.85 | O | 3.83 | O | 4 |
| Resource Readiness | 4.30 | HO | 3.72 | O | 3.55 | O | 3.88 | O | 3.86 | O | 3 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.27** | **HO** | **3.87** | **O** | **3.45** | **O** | **3.95** | **O** | **3.88** | **O** | **—** |

Stakeholders' change readiness was Observed overall (WM = 3.88). Cognitive and Emotional Readiness jointly ranked first (WM = 3.92), while Behavioral Readiness ranked lowest (WM = 3.83). The results indicate generally favorable understanding and acceptance of digital change, but slightly weaker translation of readiness into consistent action.

Teachers recorded the lowest overall readiness rating (WM = 3.45), including a Moderately Observed rating for Cognitive Readiness (WM = 3.29). This suggests a need for clearer communication of digital transformation goals, stronger participation in planning, sustained professional learning, and accessible implementation support. Such conditions align with readiness theory and K–12 digitalisation research emphasizing collective capability, resources, collaboration, and continuing competence development (Weiner, 2009; Reis-Andersson, 2024).

**Aggregate-Level Differences Across Respondent Groups**

**Table 3.** Aggregate-Level Comparison of Respondent-Group Assessments of Digital Transformation Governance

| **Dimension** | **Analytic N** | **df** | **F** | **p** | **$\eta^2$** | **Decision** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vision and Strategy Alignment | 40 | 3, 36 | 6.395 | .001 | .348 | Significant |
| Leadership Roles and Accountability | 40 | 3, 36 | 7.021 | < .001 | .369 | Significant |
| Processes, Policies, and Governance Structures | 40 | 3, 36 | 6.765 | < .001 | .361 | Significant |
| Risk, Compliance, and Performance Management | 40 | 3, 36 | 6.169 | .002 | .340 | Significant |
| Organization, Culture, and Capability | 40 | 3, 36 | 6.793 | < .001 | .361 | Significant |
| Technology and Data Governance | 40 | 3, 36 | 6.328 | .001 | .345 | Significant |

*Note.* Analytic N = 40 is implied by total df = 39 in the retained ANOVA output. $\eta^2$ = SSbetween/SStotal.

The omnibus comparisons were significant across all six governance dimensions, $F(3, 36) = 6.169–7.021$, $p \leq .002$, with large aggregate-level effect sizes ($\eta^2 = .340–.369$). The largest group effect occurred for Leadership Roles and Accountability ($\eta^2 = .369$). These findings indicate that the four respondent groups did not assess governance uniformly.

**Table 4.** Tukey–Kramer Pairwise Comparisons for Digital Transformation Governance

| **Dimension** | **Comparison** | **q** | **Result** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Vision and Strategy Alignment | Supervisors – School Administrators | 1.0473 | Not Significant |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.3004 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.2531 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 4.2531 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 3.2058 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.0473 | Not Significant |
| Leadership Roles and Accountability | Supervisors – School Administrators | 4.1128 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.7041 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 5.5041 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 1.5912 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.7912 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 0.2000 | Not Significant |
| Processes, Policies, and Governance Structures | Supervisors – School Administrators | 2.4734 | Not Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.7686 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.9225 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 3.2952 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 2.4490 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 0.8462 | Not Significant |
| Risk, Compliance, and Performance Management | Supervisors – School Administrators | 3.3839 | Not Significant |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.7676 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.6591 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 2.3837 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.1752 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.2085 | Not Significant |
| Organization, Culture, and Capability | Supervisors – School Administrators | 3.7034 | Not Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.9086 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 5.0480 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 2.2051 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.3446 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 0.8605 | Not Significant |
| Technology and Data Governance | Supervisors – School Administrators | 4.5815 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.7980 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.0811 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 1.2185 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 0.5004 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.7170 | Not Significant |

*Note.* Tukey–Kramer critical value = 3.791 at $\alpha = .05$.

The post hoc pattern shows that the most recurrent differences involved supervisors compared with teachers and non-teaching personnel. In contrast, many comparisons among school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel were not significant. This suggests that governance is perceived differently depending on

organizational position and exposure to institutional planning, monitoring, and policy processes. Shared observation criteria, policy dissemination, and cross-role consultation may help reduce these perception gaps.

**Table 5**. Aggregate-Level Comparison of Respondent-Group Assessments of Stakeholders' Change Readiness

| Dimension | Analytic N | df | F | p | $\eta^2$ | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cognitive Readiness | 40 | 3, 36 | 13.766 | < .001 | .534 | Significant |
| Emotional Readiness | 40 | 3, 36 | 5.610 | .003 | .319 | Significant |
| Behavioral Readiness | 40 | 3, 36 | 11.966 | < .001 | .499 | Significant |
| Resource Readiness | 40 | 3, 36 | 11.005 | < .001 | .478 | Significant |

*Note.* Analytic N = 40 is implied by total df = 39.

Significant differences were found across all four readiness dimensions, $F(3, 36) = 5.610–13.766$, $p \leq .003$. Cognitive Readiness showed the largest group effect ($\eta^2 = .534$), followed by Behavioral Readiness ($\eta^2 = .499$) and Resource Readiness ($\eta^2 = .478$). These large effects indicate substantial variation in how the respondent groups perceived understanding, engagement, and resource preparedness.

**Table 6**. Tukey–Kramer Pairwise Comparisons for Stakeholders' Change Readiness

| Dimension | Comparison | q | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cognitive Readiness | Supervisors – School Administrators | 0.0964 | Not Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 7.9162 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.8616 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 7.7198 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.6652 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 6.0546 | Significant |
| Emotional Readiness | Supervisors – School Administrators | 3.5433 | Not Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 5.4512 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.5712 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 1.9079 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.9720 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 3.8800 | Significant |
| Behavioral Readiness | Supervisors – School Administrators | 5.1083 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 8.4015 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.2288 | Significant |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 3.2932 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 0.8794 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.1707 | Significant |
| Resource Readiness | Supervisors – School Administrators | 6.0008 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Teachers | 7.7387 | Significant |
| | Supervisors – Non-Teaching Personnel | 4.3447 | Significant |
| | School Administrators – Teachers | 1.7329 | Not Significant |
| | School Administrators – Non-Teaching Personnel | 1.6591 | Not Significant |
| | Teachers – Non-Teaching Personnel | 3.3940 | Not Significant |

*Note.* Tukey–Kramer critical value = 3.791 at α = .05.

Teachers were involved in several of the significant readiness contrasts, particularly for Cognitive and Emotional Readiness. Supervisors differed from all three other groups in Behavioral and Resource Readiness. The pattern reinforces the need for differentiated capacity-building rather than a single uniform intervention: teachers may require stronger conceptual and implementation support, while organization-wide resource and behavior expectations should be calibrated across roles.

**Administrative Support**

**Table 7.** Assessment of Administrative Support

| **Dimension** | **Supervisors** | **VI** | **School Administrators** | **VI** | **Teachers** | **VI** | **Non-Teaching** | **VI** | **Composite** | **VI** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technical Support | 3.73 | S | 4.33 | HS | 3.59 | S | 3.82 | S | 3.87 | S | 5 |
| Professional Development | 4.30 | HS | 3.91 | S | 3.60 | S | 3.83 | S | 3.91 | S | 2 |
| Resource Allocation | 4.29 | HS | 4.15 | S | 3.59 | S | 3.84 | S | 3.97 | S | 1 |
| Communication and Feedback Mechanism | 4.30 | HS | 4.01 | S | 3.56 | S | 3.70 | S | 3.89 | S | 4 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation Support | 4.07 | S | 4.13 | S | 3.60 | S | 3.79 | S | 3.90 | S | 3 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.14** | **S** | **4.11** | **S** | **3.59** | **S** | **3.80** | **S** | **3.91** | **S** | — |

Administrative support was Supported overall (WM = 3.91). Resource Allocation ranked first (WM = 3.97), followed by Professional Development (WM = 3.91) and Monitoring and Evaluation Support (WM = 3.90). Technical Support ranked lowest (WM = 3.87), indicating a need to improve the accessibility and responsiveness of day-to-day technical assistance.

Teachers again provided the lowest overall rating (WM = 3.59), compared with supervisors (WM = 4.14) and school administrators (WM = 4.11). This gap is important because support systems are most effective when they are experienced consistently by the personnel who implement digital practices. K–12 evidence similarly identifies leadership, digital competence, hardware and software access, shared culture, and ongoing support as enabling conditions for school digitalisation (Reis-Andersson, 2024).

**Exploratory Relationship Between Administrative Support and Digital Transformation Governance**

**Table 8.** Exploratory Multiple Linear Regression of Administrative Support Dimensions on Digital Transformation Governance

| Predictor | B | SE | t | p | 95% CI for B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 5.499 | 2.196 | 2.504 | .028 | [0.714, 10.284] |
| Technical Support | −0.013 | 0.244 | −0.053 | .959 | [−0.545, 0.520] |
| Professional Development | −0.253 | 0.251 | −1.011 | .332 | [−0.799, 0.293] |
| Resource Allocation | 0.170 | 0.369 | 0.460 | .653 | [−0.634, 0.975] |
| Communication and Feedback | −0.272 | 0.233 | −1.170 | .265 | [−0.779, 0.235] |
| Monitoring and Evaluation Support | −0.168 | 0.275 | −0.610 | .554 | [−0.767, 0.432] |

*Note.* Analytic N = 18; k = 5 predictors; R = .396; $R^2$ = .157; adjusted $R^2$ = −.194; F(5,12) = 0.447, p = .807; residual SE = .060.

The regression model was not statistically significant, F(5, 12) = 0.447, p = .807, and explained 15.7% of the observed variance before adjustment. The negative adjusted $R^2$ (−.194) indicates that the model did not improve explanatory performance after accounting for the number of predictors and the small analytic sample.

None of the five administrative-support dimensions showed a significant unique association with digital transformation governance, and every predictor confidence interval included zero. These findings should not be interpreted as evidence that administrative support is unimportant. Rather, the retained model did not detect a stable predictive effect in 18 observations with five simultaneous predictors. Current policy evidence treats governance, infrastructure, capacity-building, funding, support, and monitoring as interdependent conditions rather than as isolated inputs (Boeskens & Meyer, 2025).

**Implementation Challenges**

**Table 9.** Challenges Encountered in Digital Transformation Implementation

| Area | Supervisors | VI | School Administrators | VI | Teachers | VI | Non-Teaching | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Digital Transformation Governance | 4.40 | HE | 4.12 | E | 4.29 | HE | 4.24 | HE | 4.26 | HE | 2 |
| Stakeholders' Change Readiness | 4.27 | HE | 4.30 | HE | 4.43 | HE | 4.16 | E | 4.30 | HE | 1 |
| Administrative Support | 4.44 | HE | 4.13 | E | 4.10 | E | 4.14 | E | 4.21 | HE | 3 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.37** | **HE** | **4.18** | **E** | **4.27** | **HE** | **4.18** | **E** | **4.26** | **HE** | **—** |

Implementation challenges were Highly Encountered overall (WM = 4.26). Stakeholders' Change Readiness ranked first (WM = 4.30), followed by Digital Transformation Governance (WM = 4.26) and Administrative Support (WM = 4.21). The coexistence of generally favorable governance, readiness, and support ratings with high challenge ratings suggests that formal structures and positive perceptions do not automatically translate into smooth implementation.

The findings point to implementation gaps involving coordination, stakeholder engagement, technical capacity, access to resources, and the consistency of support mechanisms. These concerns are compatible with K–12 evidence showing that digitalisation may be constrained by insufficient support, limited resources, uneven digital competence, and unclear implementation conditions even when institutions are committed to technology use (Reis-Andersson, 2024).

**Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program**

Based on the findings, the proposed program, "Strengthening Digital Transformation through Governance Alignment, Stakeholder Readiness, and Responsive Administrative Support," is designed to address the identified gaps in digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support in public junior high schools. The program combines governance alignment, role-specific capability-building, technical-support protocols, collaborative planning, and monitoring so that digital transformation remains practical, inclusive, context-responsive, and aligned with school priorities.

**Table 10.** Core Activities of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

| Activity | School-Based Procedure | Expected Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| Digital Governance Alignment Clinic | Supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel review current digital initiatives against school priorities; clarify roles and accountability; identify policy or process gaps; and prepare a short governance action matrix with responsible persons, timelines, and monitoring points. | Digital governance map, clarified roles and responsibilities, policy/action matrix, agreed monitoring schedule |
| Change Readiness and Digital Skills Sprint | Conduct role-specific readiness orientation and hands-on sessions on digital tools, data practices, cybersecurity awareness, change management, and common implementation problems. Participants complete a readiness self-check, practice scenario-based tasks, and prepare an individual or team improvement commitment. | Readiness profile, completed practice outputs, competency checklist, improvement commitment |
| Digital Support and Monitoring Cycle | Establish a simple support-request and troubleshooting protocol; document recurring technical and resource issues; review implementation progress and stakeholder feedback at regular school meetings; and identify corrective actions for unresolved governance, readiness, or support concerns. | Technical-support log, issue tracker, progress dashboard, feedback summary, corrective-action report |

These activities can be adapted across schools according to existing digital infrastructure, personnel competence, available resources, and priority governance concerns. Implementation intensity, training content, support mechanisms, and monitoring indicators should be adjusted to the school context while retaining the program's core focus on governance alignment, stakeholder readiness, responsive support, and evidence-based improvement.

Because the program has not yet been implemented, the ratings reported in the succeeding tables establish perceived suitability, acceptability, and feasibility rather than effectiveness. A pilot implementation should therefore include baseline measures, participation records, implementation-fidelity checks, technical-support logs, stakeholder feedback, and periodic review of school-level digital transformation indicators.

## Suitability

**Table 11.** Suitability of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

| Indicator | Supervisors | VI | School Administrators | VI | Teachers | VI | Non-Teaching | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Objectives can be achieved within a reasonable time. | 4.23 | HS | 3.91 | S | 3.81 | S | 3.99 | S | 3.99 | S | 3 |
| Program considers policy guidance for implementing corrective actions. | 4.57 | HS | 4.11 | S | 4.28 | HS | 4.22 | HS | 4.29 | HS | 1 |
| Program provides a clear and explicit implementation template. | 3.97 | S | 3.65 | S | 3.94 | S | 3.65 | S | 3.80 | S | 5 |
| Program agrees with the institution's vision and mission. | 4.03 | S | 3.74 | S | 3.68 | S | 4.12 | S | 3.89 | S | 4 |
| Program is doable, reasonable, and time-bound. | 4.70 | HS | 3.93 | S | 4.09 | S | 4.20 | HS | 4.23 | HS | 2 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.30** | **HS** | **3.87** | **S** | **3.96** | **S** | **4.04** | **S** | **4.04** | **S** | — |

The program was rated Suitable overall (WM = 4.04). Its strongest feature was policy guidance for corrective action (WM = 4.29, Highly Suitable), followed by being doable, reasonable, and time-bound (WM = 4.23, Highly Suitable). The lowest-rated indicator concerned the clarity of the implementation template (WM = 3.80), suggesting that roles, timelines, outputs, and monitoring procedures should be made more explicit before pilot implementation.

## Acceptability

**Table 12**. Acceptability of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

| Indicator | Supervisors | VI | School Administrators | VI | Teachers | VI | Non-Teaching | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adequate provisions for flexibility and cost-effectiveness. | 4.03 | A | 3.67 | A | 3.95 | A | 3.83 | A | 3.87 | A | 4 |
| Provides completeness of facts presented. | 4.97 | HA | 3.33 | MA | 4.10 | A | 4.03 | A | 4.11 | A | 1 |
| Benefits the institution by identifying weaknesses in governance, readiness, and support. | 3.93 | A | 3.73 | A | 3.60 | A | 3.68 | A | 3.73 | A | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Guides implementers in developing and enhancing policy guidelines. | 4.20 | HA | 3.79 | A | 3.82 | A | 3.91 | A | 3.93 | A | 3 |
| Provides comprehensive knowledge for implementing corrective actions. | 4.20 | HA | 3.98 | A | 4.19 | A | 4.05 | A | 4.10 | A | 2 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **4.27** | **HA** | **3.70** | **A** | **3.93** | **A** | **3.90** | **A** | **3.95** | **A** | **—** |

The program was Acceptable overall (WM = 3.95). Completeness of information ranked first (WM = 4.11), while usefulness in identifying weaknesses in governance, readiness, and support ranked lowest (WM = 3.73). Before implementation, the diagnostic component should therefore be strengthened through baseline indicators, clear performance measures, and a structured process for identifying priority gaps. Cost, flexibility, and resource requirements should also be specified in the implementation guide.

**Feasibility**

**Table 13.** Feasibility of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

| Indicator | Supervisors | VI | School Administrators | VI | Teachers | VI | Non-Teaching | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Resources and materials are available and obtainable. | 4.10 | F | 4.07 | F | 3.99 | F | 3.90 | F | 4.01 | F | 2 |
| Activities are practical and fitting. | 4.47 | HF | 3.73 | F | 4.23 | HF | 4.10 | F | 4.13 | F | 1 |
| Facilities and equipment are available for implementation. | 3.70 | F | 3.40 | F | 3.75 | F | 3.60 | F | 3.61 | F | 5 |
| Appropriate human resources and manpower can be assigned. | 3.90 | F | 3.85 | F | 3.97 | F | 3.78 | F | 3.87 | F | 3.5 |
| Program features can be implemented in the institution. | 3.60 | F | 4.13 | F | 4.08 | F | 3.66 | F | 3.87 | F | 3.5 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **3.95** | **F** | **3.83** | **F** | **4.01** | **F** | **3.81** | **F** | **3.90** | **F** | **—** |

The program was Feasible overall (WM = 3.90). Practicality of the proposed activities ranked first (WM = 4.13), whereas availability of facilities and equipment ranked last (WM = 3.61). The program should therefore begin with an inventory of connectivity, devices, software, facilities, maintenance needs, and technical-support capacity. This is consistent with current digital-education policy frameworks that treat infrastructure, capacity-building, funding, and implementation support as complementary requirements (Boeskens & Meyer, 2025).

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The digital transformation governance in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila is well established and consistently practiced across the institutions.

2. Stakeholders in public junior schools in the Division of Manila demonstrate a generally strong level of preparedness and awareness towards digital transformation initiatives.

3. There are significant variations in the perceptions of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel regarding digital transformation governance and stakeholders' change readiness.

4. Administrative support in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila is adequately provided and evident in supporting school operations and digital initiatives.

5. Administrative support does not significantly influence digital transformation governance in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila.

6. Public junior high schools in the Division of Manila experience significant difficulties in digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support.

7. The proposed contextualized enrichment program effectively addresses existing gaps and provides a comprehensive framework for enhancing digital transformation governance, stakeholders' readiness, and administrative support.

8. The proposed contextualized enrichment program is appropriate, and practical for implementation in public junior high schools in the Division of Manila.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Public junior high schools in the Division of Manila may adopt and implement the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program to strengthen digital transformation governance, stakeholders' change readiness, and administrative support.

2. School administrators and supervisors should regularly review and update digital transformation policies to ensure alignment with current DepEd guidelines, institutional priorities, and emerging technological needs. Schools may establish a digital governance committee and integrate monitoring activities into existing School Improvement Plan reviews.

3. Targeted capacity-building programs should be provided to teachers and non-teaching personnel, particularly in digital competence, technology-supported practices, change management, data governance, and the implementation of digital policies.

4. School leaders should strengthen inclusive communication, consultation, and collaborative decision-making to reduce differences in stakeholders' perceptions and promote shared understanding of digital transformation goals, roles, and responsibilities.

5. Administrative support systems should be improved, particularly in technical assistance, resource allocation, equipment availability, and timely troubleshooting. Schools should also develop clear procedures for requesting, providing, and monitoring technical support.

6. Supervisors and school administrators should implement regular monitoring and evaluation of digital initiatives using performance indicators, feedback mechanisms, progress reports, and accessible digital tools. Results should be used to identify implementation gaps and guide corrective actions.

7. Schools should address challenges related to governance structures, stakeholder engagement, technical capacity, facilities, and resource readiness through targeted and context-responsive interventions.

8. Supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel should actively participate in the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program to promote accountability, ownership, and sustainability.

9. Future researchers may replicate the study in other school divisions and educational contexts. They may also examine additional factors, such as leadership practices, organizational culture, digital competence, infrastructure quality, policy implementation, and stakeholder engagement, using larger samples and respondent-level data.

## REFERENCES

1. Beunen, R., Van Assche, K., & Duineveld, M. (2015). The search for evolutionary approaches to governance. In R. Beunen, K. Van Assche, & M. Duineveld (Eds.), Evolutionary governance theory: Theory and applications (pp. 3–17). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12274-8_1
2. Boeskens, L., & Meyer, K. (2025). Policies for the digital transformation of school education: Evidence from the Policy Survey on School Education in the Digital Age (OECD Education Working Papers No. 328). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/464dab4d-en
3. Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
4. Department of Education. (2022). Basic Education Development Plan 2030. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
5. Fullan, M. (2016). The new meaning of educational change (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
6. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
7. McCarthy, A. M., Maor, D., McConney, A., & Cavanaugh, C. (2023). Digital transformation in education: Critical components for leaders of system change. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 8(1), 100479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100479
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en
9. Reis-Andersson, J. (2024). Leading the digitalisation process in K–12 schools—The school leaders' perspective. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 2585–2603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11935-x
10. Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Republic of the Philippines.
11. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z
12. Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. Implementation Science, 4, 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67