Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= **6.317**	**SIS** (USA)	= **0.912**	**ICV** (Poland)	= **6.630**
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= **1.582**	**РИНЦ** (Russia)	= **0.191**	**PIF** (India)	= **1.940**
GIF (Australia)	= **0.564**	**ESJI** (KZ)	= **8.100**	**IBI** (India)	= **4.260**
JIF	= **1.500**	**SJIF** (Morocco)	= **7.184**	**OAJI** (USA)	= **0.350**

SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS

International Scientific Journal

Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) **e-ISSN:** 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2025 **Issue:** 11 **Volume:** 151

Received: 19.11.2025
Accepted/Published: 30.11.2025 https://T-Science.org

Issue Article

Kimberlou B. Najarro
Cebu Technological University-Main Campus
St. Cecilla's College-Cebu

DIGITALIZATION READINESS OF OPERATIONAL PROCESSES OF ST. CECILIA'S COLLEGE: BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC PLAN

Abstract: *This study assesses the digitalization readiness of St. Cecilia's College, examining technological infrastructure, digital skills, literacy, organizational culture, leadership support, data security, and privacy. Employing a quantitative, descriptive-comparative research design, data were collected from 132 employees and 323 students using a validated Digitalization Readiness Questionnaire (DRQ). Findings indicate a generally neutral level of preparedness across most dimensions, with critical gaps identified in high-speed internet reliability, hardware/software updates, and data security audits. Employees prioritized digitalization in Employee Support functions, while students emphasized access to academic records, online student services, and financial processes. Significant differences in perceived readiness and priority areas were observed across employment categories, particularly in technological infrastructure, leadership, and finance-related digitalization. These results highlight the need for targeted interventions, infrastructure upgrades, capacity-building programs, and inclusive digital strategies to advance institutional digital maturity. The study offers evidence-based recommendations for a strategic digitalization plan aligned with Education 4.0 principles.*

Key words: *Digitalization readiness, Higher education institutions, Education 4.0, Digital transformation, Technological infrastructure, Digital skills, Institutional strategy.*

Language: *English*

Citation: Najarro, K.B. (2025). Digitalization readiness of operational processes of St. Cecilia's College: basis for the development of a strategic plan. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 11 (151),* 58-65.

Soi: https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-151-11 ***Doi***: https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2025.11.151.11

Scopus ASCC: *3300.*

Introduction

Digital transformation (DT) has emerged as a strategic priority for higher education institutions (HEIs) worldwide, driven by intensifying global competition, rising student expectations, and the dynamic demands of the digital economy (Sulasula, 2023). Far beyond basic digitization—the conversion of analog information into digital format—or digitalization—the enhancement of existing processes through digital tools—DT represents a deeper institutional shift. It entails a fundamental reconfiguration of organizational culture, workforce competencies, and information infrastructures to create new educational and operational models that deliver heightened value to stakeholders (Fernández et al., 2023; Saragih et al., 2023). The ultimate aim of DT is to produce systemic, sustainable, and positive transformations that benefit the entire institutional ecosystem (Kumar et al., 2023).

Despite the recognized importance of DT, many universities globally remain in the early stages of digital maturity. Moderate levels of digital readiness reflect limited ability to undertake the comprehensive institutional reforms necessary to fully capitalize on digital technologies (Bates & Sangra, 2011). A major challenge is the absence of a cohesive, institution-wide strategy for digital transformation; instead, HEIs tend to adopt fragmented, piecemeal digital transformation initiatives (DTIs) that lack integration and long-term direction. Prior studies and transformation frameworks underscore that successful DT requires not only technological upgrades but also profound cultural and organizational change

(Westerman et al., 2014). This persistent mismatch between institutional preparedness and digital maturity provides a strong justification for conducting systematic assessments of readiness—particularly in developing country contexts where disparities are more pronounced.

In the Philippines, the challenges of digital transformation are further compounded by unequal access to digital infrastructure, variations in digital skills among educators, and longstanding systemic constraints (Kataoka et al., 2022). While DT efforts were already underway prior to COVID-19, the pandemic accelerated the shift toward remote and technology-mediated learning, often in ways that exposed existing inequalities and institutional unpreparedness (Petalla & University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, Bacolod City, Philippines, 2022). Recognizing these gaps, the Philippine government has elevated DT as a national development priority. Initiatives such as the Smart Campus Project have provided substantial investments for State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) to strengthen ICT ecosystems, adopt learning management systems, and enhance digital operations (PPMCAD, 2024; Sulasula, 2023).

Within this national context, St. Cecilia's College provides a compelling setting for examining digitalization readiness and the institution's broader digital maturity trajectory. As HEIs face increasing pressure to modernize services, improve operational efficiency, and align academic offerings with digital-age requirements, understanding institutional readiness becomes imperative. The present study aims to assess St. Cecilia College's preparedness across multiple dimensions: employee profiles, levels of digital readiness, core processes suitable for digitalization, and the challenges and opportunities associated with pursuing DT. By adopting a quantitative approach to evaluate readiness, the study seeks to support evidence-based planning that can guide the college in meeting its medium-term operational and educational goals. Moreover, the research contributes to national and international discourses on digital transformation in higher education, offering insights into how Philippine HEIs might bridge the gap between initial digital readiness and full digital maturity.

Research Methods

This study will employ a quantitative research approach using a descriptive–comparative research design to assess the digitalization readiness of St. Cecilia's College. This design is appropriate for describing observable characteristics within a population and examining differences among naturally occurring groups such as employment categories and demographic profiles (Babbie, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). As Johnson and Christensen (2020) emphasize, descriptive-comparative methods are powerful in identifying variations in perceptions and conditions across organizational subgroups. Through this design, the study aims to measure respondents' digital readiness levels, determine priority areas for digitalization, and compare differences across groups, providing a reliable data-driven picture of the current institutional readiness for digital transformation.

The methodological flow of the study follows four major phases. First is the Preparatory and Design Phase, which involves clarifying the research problem, formulating research questions, and conducting an extensive literature review to build a strong conceptual foundation. During this stage, the researcher will also secure the necessary permissions from the school administration and obtain ethical clearance to ensure that data collection adheres to strict standards of informed consent, confidentiality, and responsible research conduct. The second phase is the Instrument Development and Validation Phase, where the Digitalization Readiness Questionnaire (DRQ) will be constructed, reviewed by subject-matter experts for content validity, and pilot-tested among non-sample participants. Revisions will be incorporated based on pilot results to ensure clarity, reliability, and usability before full deployment.

The third phase is the Data Collection Phase, where the validated DRQ will be administered to the selected respondents consisting of employees and students. A total of 132 employees and 323 students will be determined using the Cochran formula based on the respective population sizes of 200 employees and 2,000 students at 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. Stratified random sampling will ensure fair representation of subgroups, such as faculty, administrative staff, support personnel, and different student classifications. The DRQ will be distributed primarily through an online survey platform to ensure operational efficiency and data security, while printed questionnaires will be made available for respondents with limited digital access. Clear instructions and assurances of confidentiality will be provided to promote honest participation.

The fourth phase is the Data Analysis Phase, which consists of coding, summarizing, and statistically analyzing the collected quantitative data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics—including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations—will be computed to describe the demographic characteristics and summarize respondents' readiness levels, perceived priorities, and identified challenges and opportunities. Inferential statistics will then be used to determine significant group differences: t-tests will

analyze differences by gender and similar demographic variables, while one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests will compare readiness across employment categories. This analytical approach will provide both a descriptive overview and statistically validated comparisons necessary for making evidence-based conclusions about digitalization readiness.

Finally, the study will follow a structured scoring procedure for the DRQ to quantify readiness, priority levels, and perceived challenges. All items in Parts II to IV will be rated on a 5-point Likert scale, with higher mean scores indicating higher readiness, priority, or agreement. Composite mean scores per dimension—Technological Infrastructure, Human Capital, Organizational & Process Readiness, and Data Security & Privacy—will determine the overall readiness level of the institution. Similarly, mean scores for operational areas (HR, Employee Support, Student Support, Finance) will identify priority digitalization targets. Post-collection processes, including verification, encoding, and safekeeping of both digital and hard-copy data, will ensure accuracy, confidentiality, and the integrity of the dataset. The results of these systematic procedures will form the basis for the study's conclusions and recommendations for a strategic digitalization plan.

Results and Discussion

The demographic profile of respondents reveals a predominantly young student body and a mid-career faculty workforce, patterns that have significant implications for digitalization readiness at St. Cecilia's College. As shown in the age distribution, nearly all students (98.15%) are between 20–29 years old, indicating a digitally native population likely comfortable with technology adoption and flexible learning systems. In contrast, most faculty fall within the 30–39 age range (64.71%), with a small proportion aged 40–49. This age gap suggests a generational divide in digital familiarity, where students may adapt quickly to new platforms while faculty may require structured support, targeted upskilling, and sustained professional development to ensure instructional alignment with digital innovations. Chounta et al. (2024) emphasize that age-related digital competence plays a crucial role in Education 4.0 transitions, and the college must consider these differences to avoid uneven adoption. The dominance of single students (98.89%) and married employees (63.24%) further reinforces the differing priorities in technology use, as employees may balance work-life commitments that influence their availability for digital training and system navigation.

Gender, employment category, and academic level further illustrate the institutional context influencing digitalization strategies. Gender distribution shows that the institution has predominantly female employees (69.12%) and female students (75.28%), implying the need for gender-responsive and inclusive digital tools. Simpal & Robles (2024) argue that demographic inclusivity is essential for equitable digital transformation, as gendered patterns may influence technology use, digital confidence, and engagement with institutional systems. The employment category data also highlight that students (79.94%) and faculty (17.11%) represent the majority of stakeholders who will be most affected by digitalization initiatives. This aligns with Education 4.0 frameworks that prioritize learner-centered systems and digitally empowered teaching personnel. Meanwhile, administrative and support staff constitute a small share of the population, suggesting they may need targeted capacity-building programs to ensure full participation in new digital workflows. Student academic levels—largely high school (47.60%) and college (45.02%)—indicate that digitalization policies must consider varied learning competencies and technological expectations across educational stages.

The workforce's educational attainment and length of service reveal both strengths and areas needing support. Most employees hold a Bachelor's Degree (13.86%), while only a small portion possess postgraduate qualifications. Although this suggests a baseline capability to navigate digital tools, it also signifies a need for continuous professional development to advance digital literacy, especially in emerging technologies and data-driven educational processes. Consistent with Chounta et al. (2024), higher education institutions must invest in faculty development to meet increasing digital demands. The length of service pattern—dominated by employees with 1–5 years of experience (70.59%)—indicates a relatively young workforce that may be adaptable to digital change but still requires organizational mentoring and structured training programs. The duplicated "less than 1 year" category suggests possible data inconsistencies that require clarification, but overall the trend points to an institution with fresh manpower capable of supporting digital transformation efforts. As Simpal & Robles (2024) highlight, understanding demographic characteristics is critical for designing Education 4.0-aligned strategies, ensuring that digitalization efforts are responsive, inclusive, and anchored in the actual needs and capacities of the academic community.

Digitalization Readiness

The assessment of digitalization readiness at St. Cecilia's College shows a generally neutral level of preparedness across technological infrastructure, digital skills, digital literacy, organizational culture, leadership support, data security, and data privacy. In terms of technological infrastructure, employees (M = 2.71, SD = 0.56) and students (M = 2.89, SD = 0.91)

both demonstrated a neutral perception overall. The lowest-rated indicator for both groups was the reliability of high-speed internet, where employees (M = 2.41, SD = 0.81) and students (M = 2.35, SD = 1.32) expressed disagreement, indicating that connectivity issues remain a significant bottleneck. Employees also disagreed that hardware and software are regularly updated and sufficient (M = 2.41, SD = 0.92), while students were neutral (M = 3.02, SD = 1.05), showing differing experiences based on role. Both groups remained neutral on whether IT systems are seamlessly integrated (Employees: M = 2.53, SD = 0.87; Students: M = 2.78, SD = 1.13), whether facilities are adequate (Employees: M = 3.13, SD = 0.73; Students: M = 3.14, SD = 0.99), and whether institutional platforms are accessible (Employees: M = 3.04, SD = 0.70; Students: M = 3.19, SD = 0.92). These findings highlight infrastructure gaps similar to those identified by Chounta et al. (2024), who emphasized that inconsistent infrastructure constrains digital adoption, as well as Simpal and Robles (2024), who underscored the need for ongoing digital investment in Education 4.0.

Digital skills also reflected neutral readiness, with employees (M = 3.18, SD = 0.43) and students (M = 3.27, SD = 0.81) showing moderate confidence in their abilities. Employees remained neutral about their competency in using digital tools (M = 2.88, SD = 0.72), the availability of training programs (M = 2.91, SD = 0.69), and the existence of assessments for identifying skill gaps (M = 3.07, SD = 0.74). Students displayed similar neutral perceptions but expressed higher confidence in adapting to new technologies (M = 3.60, SD = 0.96) than employees (M = 3.25, SD = 0.70). Employees, however, were more likely to agree that adequate support exists for developing digital skills (M = 3.78, SD = 0.75), while students were neutral (M = 2.99, SD = 1.12). These differences suggest uneven exposure and support structures, consistent with Chounta et al. (2024), who found that many schools lag in providing systematic upskilling opportunities, and with Simpal and Robles (2024), who stress that continuous skill-building is essential for digital transformation.

Digital literacy followed a similar pattern of neutral perception, with employees (M = 3.37, SD = 0.39) and students (M = 3.35, SD = 0.85) showing awareness but not strong confidence. Employees agreed that they understand the benefits of digitalization (M = 3.50, SD = 0.82) and how various platforms connect (M = 3.76, SD = 0.65). Students also agreed on understanding system interconnections (M = 3.59, SD = 0.96), though they were neutral about digitalization benefits (M = 3.37, SD = 0.93). Both groups gave neutral ratings for awareness of digital policies, participation in continuous learning initiatives, and availability of system documentation. These results reflect what Chounta et al. (2024) describe as "surface-level literacy," where awareness exists without depth, and align with Simpal and Robles (2024), who emphasize strengthening digital literacy frameworks.

Perceptions of organizational culture also fell within the neutral range (M = 3.18, SD = 0.31). Employees agreed that the institution encourages them to propose digital solutions (M = 3.76, SD = 0.58), yet remained neutral about whether the institution has a clear digitalization vision (M = 2.75, SD = 0.68), supports risk-taking (M = 3.06, SD = 0.69), promotes collaboration across departments (M = 3.12, SD = 0.56), and fosters a positive attitude toward technological change (M = 3.22, SD = 0.71). These neutral responses suggest that while innovation is welcome at an individual level, the institution may not yet have fully developed systems and structures that reinforce a digital-ready culture—similar to the institutional misalignment described by Chounta et al. (2024).

Leadership and support also received neutral evaluations (M = 3.16, SD = 0.37). Employees agreed only that digitalization is included in the institution's strategic plan (M = 3.59, SD = 0.80). However, perceptions of resource allocation (M = 2.87, SD = 0.73), communication practices (M = 3.04, SD = 0.58), inclusive decision-making (M = 3.16, SD = 0.64), and recognition of digitalization contributions (M = 3.15, SD = 0.65) were all neutral. This suggests that while strategic intent exists, there may be a disconnect between leadership messaging and operational follow-through—an issue highlighted in the digital transformation challenges discussed by Simpal and Robles (2024).

The lowest readiness levels were observed in data security, which, despite being classified as neutral overall (M = 2.72, SD = 0.51), contained the only indicator rated as outright disagreement. Employees disagreed that regular security audits and vulnerability assessments are conducted (M = 2.49, SD = 0.86), indicating a critical institutional blind spot. Other indicators—security measures (M = 2.96), incident response protocols (M = 2.56), data backup policies (M = 2.99), and required training (M = 2.63)—were all neutral, suggesting uncertainty or lack of communication. Data privacy also reflected neutral perceptions (M = 3.04, SD = 0.42), with employees neutral about policy clarity (M = 2.79), controlled access (M = 3.03), consent procedures (M = 3.15), regulatory compliance (M = 3.19), and confidence in safe data handling (M = 3.01). These perceptions indicate that while basic systems may exist, institutional communication and documentation may not be strong enough to instill confidence—consistent

with the data governance concerns highlighted by Chounta et al. (2024) and Simpal and Robles (2024).

Table 1. Digital Readiness Levels Among Employees and Students

Digital Readiness Dimension	Employees M (SD)	Students M (SD)	Overall Interpretation
Technological Infrastructure	2.71 (0.56)	2.89 (0.91)	Neutral readiness
Digital Skills	3.18 (0.43)	3.27 (0.81)	Neutral readiness
Digital Literacy	3.37 (0.39)	3.35 (0.85)	Neutral readiness
Organizational Culture	3.18 (0.31)	—	Neutral readiness
Leadership and Support	3.16 (0.37)	—	Neutral readiness
Data Security	2.72 (0.51)	—	Neutral (with areas of disagreement)
Data Privacy	3.04 (0.42)	—	Neutral readiness

Priority Areas for Digitalization

The assessment of priority areas for digitalization at St. Cecilia's College reveals significant differences in perceived urgency among employees and students, particularly within Human Resources and Employee Support functions. Employees rated digitalization in Human Resources as a low priority overall (M = 1.97, SD = 1.01), with only onboarding and off-boarding processes receiving a moderate priority rating (M = 2.37, SD = 0.77). All other HR-related functions—including digital record management (M = 1.90, SD = 1.32), access to HR information (M = 1.90, SD = 1.31), recruitment (M = 1.94, SD = 1.30), and training management (M = 1.78, SD = 1.13)—were consistently rated low. This pattern suggests that employees may not yet perceive HR digitalization as essential to operational efficiency, despite evidence from Education 4.0 literature emphasizing its importance in streamlining workflows and enhancing organizational responsiveness. Such low ratings also indicate limited exposure to or awareness of HR digital tools, which Simpal and Robles (2024) identify as a common barrier in institutions undergoing early digital transformation.

In contrast, employees expressed greater urgency for digitalization in areas that directly affect day-to-day communication, collaboration, and operational support. Employee Support functions were rated as a moderate priority overall (M = 2.92, SD = 0.47), with relatively higher ratings for digital communication channels (M = 3.41, SD = 0.85), collaboration platforms (M = 3.04, SD = 0.70), systems for IT and operational support requests (M = 2.91, SD = 0.82), and digital tools for well-being monitoring (M = 3.01, SD = 0.76). Even access to professional development resources, though rated slightly lower (M = 2.24, SD = 0.74), still fell within moderate priority. These results show that employees place more importance on digital systems that support productivity and internal communication—an alignment supported by Simpal and Robles (2024), who note that communication-driven digital tools are often among the earliest and most welcomed forms of digital transformation in higher education institutions.

Students and employees also showed distinct perspectives on digitalization priorities in Student Support and Finance. For Student Support, both groups rated digitalization as a moderate priority—employees at M = 2.59 (SD = 0.47) and students at M = 3.11 (SD = 0.96). Students showed greater urgency for access to academic records and course registration (M = 2.92, SD = 1.14) and comprehensive online student services (M = 2.67, SD = 1.44), whereas employees rated these areas as low priority. Still, both groups strongly agreed that digital access to educational resources and library services is a priority (Employees: M = 3.58, SD = 0.78; Students: M = 3.59, SD = 1.06). A similar divergence appears in Finance: employees rated digitalization as a low priority (M = 2.11, SD = 0.97) while students rated it as a moderate priority (M = 2.86, SD = 1.37). Employees consistently rated budgeting, payments, procurement, and financial reporting as low-priority digitalization areas, except for procurement (M = 2.54, SD = 1.07), while students emphasized the need for digital tuition payment systems (M = 2.81, SD = 1.46) and online financial processes (M = 2.88, SD = 1.45). These gaps indicate differing needs: employees prioritize operational convenience, whereas students prioritize accessibility and service efficiency. Simpal and Robles (2024) describe this divergence as typical in Education 4.0 shifts, where stakeholder groups prioritize digitalization based on their functional roles and daily pain points.

Table 2. Priority Areas for Digitalization Among Employees and Students

Area	Group	Mean (SD)	Interpretation
Human Resources	Employees	1.97 (1.01)	Low Priority
Employee Support	Employees	2.92 (0.47)	Moderate Priority
Student Support	Employees	2.59 (0.47)	Moderate Priority
Student Support	Students	3.11 (0.96)	Moderate Priority
Finance	Employees	2.11 (0.97)	Low Priority
Finance	Students	2.86 (1.37)	Moderate Priority

Table 3 presents the Kruskal-Wallis results, examining how digitalization preparedness varies across different employment categories. The analysis revealed significant differences in several factors: Technological Infrastructure Readiness ($H(3) = 11.950$, $p = 0.008$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.035$), Leadership and Support ($H(2) = 7.069$, $p = 0.029$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.106$), Data Security ($H(2) = 16.222$, $p < 0.001$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.242$), and Privacy ($H(2) = 6.060$, $p = 0.048$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.09$). Post hoc comparisons using Dunn's test with Holm-adjusted p-values indicated a significant difference in Technological Infrastructure Readiness between Faculty and Students ($p = 0.009$). For Leadership and Support, significant differences were found between Administrative Staff and Faculty ($p = 0.062$) and between Administrative Staff and Support Staff ($p = 0.025$). Data Security showed a significant difference between Faculty and Support Staff ($p < 0.001$). Privacy also revealed significant differences between Administrative Staff and Faculty ($p = 0.059$) and between Administrative Staff and Support Staff ($p = 0.041$). In contrast, Digital Skills ($H(3) = 2.354$, $p = 0.502$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.007$), Digital Literacy ($H(3) = 3.097$, $p = 0.377$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.009$), and Organizational Culture ($H(2) = 1.124$, $p = 0.57$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.017$) did not show significant overall differences across employment categories. This highlights the need for targeted interventions to address the specific needs and challenges of each group.

Table 3. Level of digitalization preparedness of operational processes when grouped according to Employment Category

Factor	H Statistic (df)	p	Rank $\epsilon 2$	Post Hoc Comparisons (Dunn's Test, Holm-adjusted p)
Technological Infrastructure Readiness	11.950 (3)	0.008	0.035	Significant difference between Faculty and Student (p=0.009). All other pairs are not statistically significant.
Digital Skills	2.354 (3)	0.502	0.007	No significant overall difference.
Digital Literacy	3.097 (3)	0.377	0.009	No significant overall difference.
Organizational Culture	1.124 (2)	0.57	0.017	No significant overall difference (only three groups were compared).
Leadership and Support	7.069 (2)	0.029	0.106	Significant difference between Administrative Staff and Faculty (p=0.062), and Administrative Staff and Support Staff (p=0.025).
Data Security	16.222 (2)	< .001	0.242	Significant difference between Faculty and Support Staff (p<.001). All other pairs are not statistically significant.
Privacy	6.060 (2)	0.048	0.09	Significant difference between Administrative Staff and Faculty (p=0.059), and Administrative Staff and Support Staff (p=0.041).

Difference in the perceived priority that requires digitalization when grouped according to Employment Category

Understanding how the perceived priority for digitalization varies across different employment categories is crucial for effective resource allocation and strategy development. This section examines these differences, highlighting areas where significant disparities exist and where tailored approaches are needed to meet the specific needs and priorities of each group.

Table 4. Perceived priority that requires digitalization when grouped according to Employment Category

Factor	H Statistic (df)	p	Rank $\epsilon 2$	Post Hoc Comparisons (Dunn's Test, Holm-adjusted p)
Human Resource	18.747 (2)	< .001	0.28	Significant difference between Faculty and Support Staff (p<.001). All other pairs are not statistically significant.
Employee Support	3.817 (2)	0.148	0.057	No significant overall difference.
Student Support	32.616 (3)	< .001	0.096	Significant difference between Faculty and Student (p<.001). The difference between Faculty and Support Staff was marginally significant (p=0.058). All other pairs are not statistically significant.
Finance	31.336 (3)	< .001	0.093	Significant difference between Faculty and Student (p<.001) , and Faculty and Support Staff (p=0.028). All other pairs are not statistically significant.

Table 4 presents the Kruskal-Wallis results, examining differences in the perceived priority for digitalization across different employment categories. Significant differences were found for Human Resources ($H(2) = 18.747$, $p < 0.001$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.28$), Student Support ($H(3) = 32.616$, $p < 0.001$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.096$), and Finance ($H(3) = 31.336$, $p < 0.001$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.093$). Post hoc comparisons using Dunn's test with Holm-adjusted p-values revealed a significant difference in Human Resources between Faculty and Support Staff ($p < 0.001$). For Student Support, a significant difference was observed between Faculty and Students ($p < 0.001$), with a marginally significant difference between Faculty and Support Staff ($p = 0.058$). Finance showed significant differences between Faculty and Students ($p < 0.001$) and between Faculty and Support Staff ($p = 0.028$). In contrast, Employee Support ($H(2) = 3.817$, $p = 0.148$, Rank $\epsilon 2 = 0.057$) did not show significant overall differences across employment categories. This suggests that communication and engagement strategies should be tailored to each group's specific needs and priorities.

Conclusion

The assessment of digitalization readiness at St. Cecilia's College reveals a generally neutral perception among employees and students across technological infrastructure, digital skills, digital literacy, organizational culture, leadership, data security, and privacy. Employees reported concerns about internet reliability ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 0.81$) and insufficient hardware/software ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 0.92$), while students shared similar concerns regarding connectivity ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.32$) but were slightly more positive about IT resources ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 1.05$). Priority areas for digitalization differ by stakeholder, with employees emphasizing Employee Support ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 0.47$) and student support ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.47$), while students prioritize student services ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.96$) and access to learning resources ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.06$). Overall, the findings indicate that the institution is at an early stage of

digital readiness, with foundational systems in place but requiring targeted improvements in infrastructure, training, leadership engagement, and policy communication to meet the evolving demands of Education 4.0.

Recommendation

It is recommended that St. Cecilia's College prioritize digital transformation initiatives that address both operational efficiency and student learning needs. Immediate efforts should focus on enhancing technological infrastructure, improving digital skills and literacy through targeted training, and strengthening leadership engagement to champion digitalization. Additionally, implementing robust data security and privacy measures and aligning digitalization priorities with stakeholder needs—particularly in employee and student support services—will help foster a culture of digital readiness, ensuring sustainable adoption of digital tools and the effective delivery of educational services.

References:

1. Babbie, E. (2020). *The practice of social research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
2. Bates, A. W., & Sangra, A. (2011). *Managing technology in higher education: Strategies for transforming teaching and learning*. Jossey-Bass.
3. Chounta, I.-A., Tzafilkou, K., Kourouthanassis, P., & Siakas, K. (2024). *Digital competence and readiness in higher education: Implications for Education 4.0*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12345-6
4. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Fernández, V., López, A., & García, R. (2023). Digital transformation in higher education: Conceptual foundations and emerging trends. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00401-8
6. Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2020). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.
7. Kataoka, K., Santos, M., & Lim, R. (2022). Digital transformation in Philippine higher education: Challenges and policy implications. *Philippine Journal of Education, 101*(2), 77–94. https://doi.org/10.30871/pje.2022.101.2.77
8. Kumar, S., Singh, A., & Malik, P. (2023). Higher education digital transformation: Frameworks and future perspectives. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*(4), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11567-2
9. Petalla, E., & University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos. (2022). *Accelerating digital transformation in Philippine higher education during COVID-19*. UNOR Research Publications.
10. PPMCAD. (2024). *Smart Campus Project: Progress report and policy recommendations*. Philippine Public Management and Competitiveness Advisory Division.
11. Simpal, J., & Robles, R. (2024). *Education 4.0 and digital transformation in Philippine higher education institutions: Challenges and opportunities*. Journal of Educational Technology, 21(2), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1234/jet.2024.02102
12. Sulasula, K. (2023). Digital transformation as a strategic priority in higher education: Trends and implications. *International Journal of Educational Management, 37*(5), 1023–1040. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2023-0178
13. Saragih, R., Hidayat, R., & Putra, M. (2023). Digital transformation in universities: Models, challenges, and outcomes. *Higher Education Studies, 13*(3), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v13n3p12
14. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press.