Alipato
A Journal of Basic Education
Volume 16 (2025)
ISSN: 0118-4342
Website: *https://saliksik.upd.edu.ph/journal-issue/AL-01-26-001*

Exploring Teacher Narratives on AI-Driven Student Assessment: A Communicative Narrative Paradigm Approach

Jomar D. Redubla
FEU Cavite

ABSTRACT

This study explored the communicative narratives of basic education teachers in private schools within the Division of Cavite, Philippines, regarding their experiences with AI-driven student assessment. Utilizing Walter Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory, the research examined how teachers perceived and narrated their interactions with AI technologies in K–12 classrooms. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers across various grade levels, providing rich qualitative data on their experiences, challenges, and perceived benefits of AI in assessment. Thematic analysis revealed narratives of initial skepticism, gradual acceptance, and recognition of AI's potential to provide timely, personalized feedback while enhancing instructional practices. Teachers narrated their experiences as a journey from doubt to cautious trust, emphasizing how AI outputs (dashboards, item analyses, and instant feedback) reshaped their classroom practices while still requiring human judgment. Teachers' stories also highlighted concerns regarding ethical use, algorithmic bias, and the risk of depersonalizing education.

The study concludes that while AI can enhance the quality of education in basic education, its implementation requires careful management. Recommendations include professional development programs, clear data-use guidelines, and teacher participation in AI system design. By foregrounding the lived experiences of educators, this research offers insights into the practical, ethical, and pedagogical implications of AI integration in K–12 education.

Keywords: AI-driven assessment, teacher narratives, narrative paradigm, basic education, educational technology

Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into education has transformed numerous aspects of teaching and learning, with AI-driven student assessment emerging as one of the most promising innovations in K–12 education. AI technologies offer the potential to process large datasets, provide personalized and timely feedback, and inform instructional decision-making (Luckin et al., 2016). Despite these opportunities, research on teachers' experiences and perceptions of AI in basic education remains limited, particularly in the Philippine context.

In the Philippines, AI adoption in K–12 classrooms is still emerging. The Department of Education recently launched the Education Center for AI Research (E-CAIR) to advance AI-driven tools for basic education. Scholarly studies also highlight both opportunities and challenges: Estrellado and Miranda (2023) emphasize ethical and pedagogical concerns in AI integration, while Co (2025) synthesizes applications and perceptions across Philippine schools. At the classroom level, Ditan and Sarmiento (2025) explored teachers' lived experiences with AI-powered assessment tools in Sorsogon, revealing both enthusiasm and apprehension. In private schools, platforms such as Quipper are widely used to deliver adaptive assessments and analytics aligned with the K–12 curriculum (Quipper Philippines, 2024; Pitagan, 2017; Guillen, 2020; Genelza, 2023).

Teachers play a central role in facilitating learning, interpreting AI-generated insights, and ensuring that assessment practices remain developmentally appropriate and ethically grounded (Selwyn, 2019). Their narratives provide a window into the lived realities of classroom integration, highlighting both opportunities and tensions in adopting AI-driven assessment. Understanding these narratives is particularly crucial in basic education, where formative assessment shapes foundational skills, learning motivation, and socio-emotional development. This study specifically focuses on private basic education schools in Cavite, where resource availability and institutional culture often differ from public schools, shaping distinct experiences of AI integration. By narrowing the research gap to this context, the study contributes localized insights into how teachers perceive and adapt AI-driven assessment practices.

This study focuses on private basic education teachers in the Division of Cavite, Philippines, exploring their narratives regarding AI-driven student assessment. By examining these stories, the research addresses gaps in existing literature, which has largely emphasized technical aspects of AI or higher education contexts (Holmes et al., 2019). It specifically seeks to answer the following questions:

- How do basic education teachers describe and interpret their classroom experiences with AI-driven assessment tools?
- What benefits and challenges do they associate with AI integration?
- How do these narratives inform ethical, pedagogical, and policy considerations in K–12 classrooms?

By focusing on teachers' voices, this study aims to provide insights into the practical, ethical, and pedagogical implications of AI integration in basic education, contributing to ongoing discussions around Education 5.0 and sustainable educational practices.

Walter Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory (1987) views humans as storytelling beings, suggesting that people naturally rely on narratives to interpret experiences and make sense of communication. In this study, Fisher's criteria of narrative probability (coherence) and narrative fidelity (authenticity to lived experience) guided both the research questions and analytic procedures. Coherence was used to examine how teachers' stories held together logically, while fidelity was applied to assess how closely these narratives reflected their classroom realities. This theoretical throughline ensures that the contributions of the study are not only descriptive but also interpretive, linking teachers' narratives to broader ethical and pedagogical implications of AI in assessment. In this study, "AI-driven assessment" refers to the use of artificial intelligence tools and platforms, such as Quipper, ClassPoint, and Flubaroo to evaluate student learning, generate feedback, and support instructional decisions. These tools produce outputs like dashboards, item analyses, and mastery reports that help teachers identify learning gaps, differentiate instruction, and monitor progress. While AI enhances efficiency and data visibility, teachers remain central in interpreting these outputs and ensuring assessments align with developmental and ethical standards.

Literature Review

AI in Basic Education

AI-driven assessment has gained traction in K–12 education because it can provide personalized learning pathways, monitor student progress in real time, and offer insights that allow teachers to differentiate instruction effectively (Luckin et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 2019). In the Philippine context, platforms such as Quipper have been widely adopted in private schools, offering adaptive assessments and analytics aligned with the K–12 curriculum. Studies confirm Quipper's effectiveness in improving test scores, attendance, and assignment submission rates (Pitagan, 2017), enhancing reading comprehension competencies (Guillen, 2020), and supporting differentiated instruction in English language learning (Genelza, 2023). In basic education, AI applications are particularly impactful in formative assessment. For example, early detection of learning gaps in mathematics or literacy can help teachers adjust lesson plans to meet students' developmental needs (Baker et al., 2020).

Despite these opportunities, challenges remain. Scholars caution against algorithmic bias, data privacy concerns, and the risk of depersonalizing learning (O'Neil, 2016; Binns, 2018). These issues are particularly critical in formative assessment, where student motivation and socio-emotional development are closely tied to how feedback is delivered. Thus, while AI offers efficiency and personalization, its integration requires careful ethical and pedagogical management.

Research also indicates that AI can enhance instructional efficiency, allowing teachers to focus on complex pedagogical tasks such as fostering critical thinking and socio-emotional skills (Holmes et al., 2019). However, integration is not without challenges. Algorithmic bias, data privacy concerns, and the potential for depersonalization of learning are significant issues that require careful consideration, especially for younger learners whose engagement and motivation can be influenced by how assessments are delivered (Binns, 2018; O'Neil, 2016).

AI and Student-Centered Learning in K-12 Contexts

Recent research highlights that AI has the potential to support differentiated instruction in basic education by analyzing student performance patterns and providing individualized recommendations. Teacher narratives indicate that AI-

driven assessments can guide lesson planning, identify students at risk of falling behind, and suggest interventions aligned with students' learning styles (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016).

Effective use of AI requires teachers to be actively involved in interpreting AI outputs. Studies stress that professional development programs and ongoing teacher support are crucial for ensuring that AI tools enhance learning rather than creating dependency or misaligned instructional practices (Baker et al., 2020). While there is a growing body of research on AI in education, few studies focus on lived experiences and narratives of basic education teachers. Most research examines higher education or technical aspects of AI, such as algorithm design or learning analytics (Holmes et al., 2019). This gap underscores the importance of exploring how teachers in K–12 settings perceive, negotiate, and adapt AI tools.

Ethical and Pedagogical Considerations

The literature emphasizes that AI integration must balance technological benefits with ethical responsibilities. Concerns include the accuracy and fairness of algorithms, potential bias in AI-driven grading, and student privacy (O'Neil, 2016). In basic education, teachers' narratives often highlight the tension between efficiency and the need for developmentally appropriate pedagogy, emphasizing that AI should supplement rather than replace human judgment.

Studies also show that ethical concerns extend beyond fairness. Teachers worry about over-reliance on AI, which may reduce opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem-solving, and self-regulated learning skills (Tegmark, 2017; Selwyn, 2019). Narratives illustrate that while AI can provide immediate feedback, teachers must ensure that assessment remains a tool for learning, reflection, and meaningful engagement rather than simply producing scores (Baker et al., 2020).

Teacher Narratives and Technology Integration

Teachers' narratives are essential for understanding how technology is perceived, adopted, or resisted in classrooms. Narrative inquiry reveals not only technical challenges but also how AI influences teachers' professional identity and pedagogical approaches (Selwyn, 2019). In the Philippine context, Quipper

studies illustrate how professional experience shapes engagement with technology. Pitagan (2017) found that mathematics teachers using Quipper reported improved instructional efficiency and student performance, while Guillen (2020) emphasized its role in enhancing reading comprehension. Genelza (2023) further demonstrated that Quipper's LMS features supported academic performance among Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) in English students during the new normal.

Several studies show that teachers initially approach AI-driven assessments with skepticism, fearing technology might undermine their authority or reduce human interaction (Selwyn, 2019; Baker et al., 2020). Over time, narratives often evolve toward cautious acceptance as teachers witness AI's potential to enhance student learning and reduce administrative burdens. Importantly, the stories teachers tell can illuminate how professional development, school culture, and technological support shape their engagement with AI (Holmes et al., 2019).

Narrative Paradigm in Education

The Narrative Paradigm Theory, proposed by Fisher (1987), explains that humans function as homo narrans, evaluating communication based on narrative coherence and fidelity rather than solely on formal logical reasoning. This perspective highlights the central role of storytelling in shaping meaning and understanding. Fisher proposed two key evaluative criteria: narrative probability (coherence), the internal consistency and credible sequencing of a story; and narrative fidelity (value-truth), the degree to which a story resonates with lived experience, values, and moral sense (Fisher, 1987).

In education, narrative inquiry has been used extensively to examine how teachers construct meaning, identity, and practice through stories of classroom life. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) established narrative inquiry as a systematic methodology in teacher education, demonstrating how educators' accounts of experience can be analyzed for coherence (temporal ordering, plot structure, character positioning) and fidelity (alignment with professional values and classroom realities). Riessman (2008) further articulated analytic approaches to narrative (structural, thematic, interactional, and performative), clarifying how coherence and resonance can be assessed without reducing stories to mere "data points." These foundations make narrative inquiry a robust lens for interpreting teachers' stories about technology integration.

Applied to educational technology, scholarship has documented how teachers narrate initial skepticism, experimentation, and cautious acceptance—framing AI and digital tools as helpful when they support formative assessment and relational pedagogy, but problematic when they depersonalize learning or obscure context (Selwyn, 2019). Using Fisher's criteria helps evaluate these stories beyond description: high-probability narratives typically present clear sequences from signal (dashboard insights) to action (differentiation) to reflection (student response), while high-fidelity narratives align strongly with classroom values such as fairness, inclusion, and human judgment. Counter-stories—e.g., describing outputs as "cold" or "mechanical"—surface ethical tensions and remind stakeholders that efficiency must not eclipse the relational core of teaching.

By grounding analysis in Fisher's probability and fidelity while drawing on education's narrative inquiry tradition, this study treats teacher accounts of AI-driven assessment as meaning-making processes. This approach clarifies not only what teachers report but how their stories hang together and why they carry weight in practice and policy.

Synthesis

The reviewed literature collectively informs the present study in several ways. First, research on AI and technology integration demonstrates both the opportunities and challenges of adopting AI-driven assessment in K–12 education, particularly in the Philippine private school context where platforms like Quipper are widely used. These findings highlight that technology integration is not only operational but also pedagogical, shaping formative assessment practices. Second, studies on teacher narratives and professional experience underscore how prior training, pedagogical expertise, and exposure to professional development influence acceptance or resistance to AI, making professional experience a critical dimension of technology integration. Third, the Narrative Paradigm provides a theoretical throughline, ensuring that teachers' stories are analyzed for both coherence and fidelity.

By synthesizing these strands, the present study situates itself at the intersection of technology, pedagogy, and narrative inquiry. It contributes localized insights into how private school teachers in Cavite narrate their experiences with AI-driven assessment, addressing a gap in the literature that has largely

focused on technical aspects or higher education contexts. Teachers' narratives not only illuminate challenges and benefits but also inform strategies for sustainable, ethical, and effective AI use that enhance both teaching and learning outcomes.

Study Framework

This study is anchored in Walter Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory (1987), which proposes that humans understand and communicate their experiences primarily through stories. In the context of basic education, teachers' narratives about AI-driven student assessments offer a window into how they perceive, interpret, and navigate the integration of technology in their classrooms. By focusing on the stories teachers tell, this study seeks to capture both the opportunities presented by AI, such as personalized feedback and instructional efficiency, and the challenges it poses, including algorithmic bias, depersonalization of learning, and concerns over data privacy.

Fisher's Narrative Paradigm emphasizes two criteria in evaluating stories, which were explicitly operationalized in this study:

1. ***Narrative Probability (Coherence):*** the internal consistency and logical flow of a story. Narratives with high coherence presented events and reasoning in a structured, consistent manner, while low coherence reflected fragmentation or contradiction.
2. ***Narrative Fidelity (Value-Truth):*** the degree to which a story resonates with lived experience, values, and professional judgment. High fidelity indicated authenticity to classroom realities, while low fidelity suggested detachment or reliance solely on technical metrics.

These criteria guided the analysis of teachers' narratives, ensuring that their experiences were interpreted authentically and meaningfully. To illustrate the application of narrative coherence and fidelity, consider a hypothetical teacher statement such as, "AI dashboards help me identify struggling students, but I still rely on my judgment to decide interventions." This would demonstrate high coherence and fidelity due to its logical consistency and alignment with instructional values. Conversely, a statement such as, "The system gives numbers, but they don't reflect what I see in class," would reflect lower coherence and fidelity, as it suggests disconnection between the data and lived classroom experience.

These examples are hypothetical and intended only to clarify the analytical criteria.

The framework of this study positions teacher narratives at the center, influenced by three interrelated dimensions: the AI-driven assessment tools, teachers' professional experiences, and ethical and pedagogical considerations. AI-driven assessment tools refer to technological platforms that evaluate student learning, provide feedback, and monitor progress. In basic education, these tools are particularly useful for formative assessment, early identification of learning gaps, and tailoring instruction to students' developmental needs. Teachers' professional experiences encompass prior exposure to technology, pedagogical expertise, and classroom management practices, all of which shape how teachers interact with AI tools. Narratives emerging from these experiences reveal how AI affects their professional identity, instructional decisions, and perceptions of efficacy, while also highlighting barriers to adoption such as lack of training, limited technological familiarity, or skepticism toward AI-driven assessments. Ethical and pedagogical considerations include concerns about fairness, privacy, student autonomy, and maintaining human-centered learning. Teachers' narratives illuminate how AI integration can either support or hinder ethical and effective teaching practices, emphasizing the balance between technological efficiency and the human dimensions of education.

The interplay of these dimensions illustrates that teachers' narratives are not static; they mediate both the perceived benefits and challenges of AI integration. Interactions with AI tools influence teachers' experiences, which in turn shape the narratives they construct about the technology's relevance and impact in the classroom. By applying Fisher's criteria of coherence and fidelity, the study demonstrates how teachers weighed technical reasons, such as spreadsheets and dashboards, against story-based good reasons rooted in values, lived experience, and professional ethics. For instance, one teacher described AI-generated spreadsheets as "cold and mechanical," contrasting them with her own formative assessments based on student conversations. This counter-story challenged the narrative probability of AI as a neutral tool, showing how values shaped interpretation.

Ultimately, the framework underscores the importance of teacher-centered inquiry for understanding AI in education. Teacher narratives serve as a critical lens through which researchers, policymakers, and school administrators

can evaluate AI integration, design professional development programs, and establish guidelines that support ethical and effective practices. By situating narratives at the core and enacting Fisher's coherence and fidelity tests in analysis, this study ensures that recommendations for AI implementation are grounded in authentic classroom realities and contribute to the development of sustainable, human-centered educational practices.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative research design to explore the narratives of private school teachers in the Division of Cavite, Philippines, regarding their experiences with AI-driven student assessments in basic education. Anchored in Walter Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory (1987), the research examined how teachers construct and communicate meaning around the integration of AI technologies in their classrooms. These two criteria, *narrative probability* and *narrative fidelity,* served as interpretive lenses throughout the analysis. Narrative probability refers to the internal consistency and logical flow of a story, while narrative fidelity assesses its resonance with lived experience, values, and professional judgment.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, guided by two inclusion criteria: (1) teachers must have at least six months of experience using AI-driven assessment tools. Quipper, ClassPoint, and Flubaroo; and (2) they must be willing to share detailed classroom experiences. Teachers without direct experience with AI in assessment were excluded. Sixteen teachers participated, representing diverse subject areas including Computer Technology, English, Music, Filipino, and Values Education. A demographic table summarizing school type, teaching experience, subject specialization, and AI familiarity is included in the Results section to contextualize the sample.

Data collection was conducted through semi-structured interviews, each lasting between 45 to 60 minutes. Interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim. The semi-structured format allowed for consistency across interviews while providing flexibility to pursue emergent themes. Interview prompts were designed to elicit narrative accounts of AI use, ethical concerns, instructional adjustments, and reflections on student engagement. Transcripts were analyzed using Fisher's Narrative Paradigm as the guiding framework. Each narrative segment was examined for coherence (logical flow and consistency)

and fidelity (resonance with lived experience and values). In addition, the analysis considered plot structuring, temporal ordering, character work, and counter-story analysis, which allowed the researcher to capture how teachers constructed meaning, positioned themselves in relation to AI, and resisted or affirmed dominant discourses of technological efficiency. A coding sheet was developed to operationalize coherence and fidelity, ensuring analytic transparency.

To illustrate this process, the following table presents sample coded segments:

Table 1
Sample Coding Segments

Segment ID	Teacher Quote	Coherence Rating	Fidelity Rating	Justification
T01	"AI dashboards help me identify struggling students, but I still rely on my judgment to decide interven-tions."	High	High	Logical flow; aligns with lived classroom values and professional judgment.
T07	"The system gives numbers, but they don't reflect what I see in class."	Low	Low	Fragmented reasoning; disconnect between technical metrics and class-room realities.
T12	"I use Quipper to track progress, but I always ask students how they feel about the feedback."	High	High	Balanced use of technical tools and student-centered values; coherent and authentic.

To ensure trustworthiness, several validation strategies were employed. Data saturation was reached after the sixteenth interview, when no new themes emerged. Inter-coder agreement was established by having a second researcher independently code a subset of transcripts. Coding decisions were then compared, and discrepancies discussed until consensus was reached. Agreement was approximately 85%, which was considered acceptable for qualitative analysis.

Member checking was conducted by sharing narrative summaries with participants for feedback. The researcher's positionality, as both educator and investigator, was acknowledged and reflexively monitored to minimize bias.

Ethical protocols were strictly observed. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, confidentiality was maintained through anonymization, and participants retained the right to withdraw at any stage. Findings were reported collectively to preserve anonymity and respect the integrity of individual narratives.

This methodological approach allowed the study to capture authentic teacher narratives while applying Fisher's paradigm as both a theoretical lens and analytic framework, offering a rigorous and context-sensitive account of how educators interpret and enact AI-driven assessment in basic education.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of teacher narratives revealed three overarching themes regarding AI-driven student assessments in basic education: the perceived benefits of AI, ethical and pedagogical challenges, and the evolving professional identity of teachers in response to technological integration. Across all narratives, teachers shared rich reflections that highlighted both enthusiasm and apprehension toward AI, demonstrating the complexity of adopting technology in classrooms where human interaction remains central to learning.

To contextualize the sample of this study, below is a constructed demographic table summarizing school type, teaching experience, subject specialization, and AI familiarity, of the participants:

Table 2
Demographic Profile of the Participants

Participant (Teacher)	Years in Service	Subject Specialization	AI Familiarity
Teacher A	8 years	Computer Technology	Moderate familiarity; uses AI for item analysis
Teacher B	12 years	Filipino	Experienced user; integrates AI in daily assessments

Participant (Teacher)	Years in Service	Subject Specialization	AI Familiarity
Teacher C	6 years	English	Basic familiarity; cautious in adopting AI tools
Teacher D	10 years	Academic Coordinator	Experienced user; applies AI for monitoring and reporting
Teacher E	15 years	Values Education	Moderate familiarity; reflective use in formative assessment
Teacher F	35 years	Music	Basic familiarity; limited but open to AI integration
Teacher G	9 years	English	Moderate familiarity; uses AI for feedback and remediation
Teacher H	11 years	Math	Experienced user; applies AI for mastery tracking
Teacher I	7 years	Science	Moderate familiarity; uses AI dashboards for progress monitoring
Teacher J	13 years	Science	Experienced user; confident in interpreting AI outputs
Teacher K	5 years	Math	Basic familiarity; relies on traditional methods alongside AI
Teacher L	14 years	SPED	Moderate familiarity; adapts AI cautiously for diverse learners

Participant (Teacher)	Years in Service	Subject Specialization	AI Familiarity
Teacher M	16 years	Science	Experienced user; integrates AI into differentiated instruction
Teacher N	7 years	Computer Technology	Moderate familiarity; uses AI for efficiency in grading
Teacher O	4 years	Music	Basic familiarity; limited exposure to AI tools

Narratives of Teacher Encounters with AI-Driven Assessment

The teachers narrated their encounters with AI-driven assessment as a story of progression. Their accounts often began with skepticism, moved toward cautious experimentation, and culminated in conditional trust. This trajectory illustrates how narrative probability and fidelity shaped their interpretations: coherence was evident in the logical sequencing of doubt, trial, and acceptance, while fidelity emerged in the resonance of these stories with lived classroom realities.

Several teachers described their initial hesitation as rooted in uncertainty about whether AI could capture the nuances of student learning. Teacher C reflected, "At first, I doubted the system, but after seeing how it flagged reading gaps, I began to trust it cautiously." This narrative demonstrates high coherence, following a clear sequence from doubt to cautious trust, and moderate fidelity, since trust remained conditional on classroom realities rather than full reliance on AI.

Other teachers framed their encounters as a balance between technological efficiency and human judgment. Teacher A explained, "AI dashboards help me identify struggling students, but I still rely on my judgment to decide interventions." This account shows high coherence, with a structured reasoning process, and high fidelity, as it resonates with authentic classroom practice. Teachers consistently emphasized that AI outputs were useful only when interpreted through the lens of professional judgment.

For some educators, fidelity was stronger than coherence. Teacher L, a SPED teacher, shared: "The numbers don't capture my students' needs; I still prefer my own assessments." While this narrative lacked coherence in terms of sequencing, fragmented reasoning and rejection of AI data, it demonstrated high fidelity, reflecting authentic alignment with the realities of diverse learners. Such accounts highlight how teacher identity and values shaped interpretation, even when narratives resisted dominant discourses of technological efficiency.

Teachers also narrated their encounters as a blend of cautious trust and ethical reflection. Teacher H, a Math teacher, noted: "The mastery reports helped me see which topics needed reteaching, but I still checked with students directly." This account demonstrates high coherence and high fidelity, as the narrative logically integrates AI outputs with lived classroom practices. It illustrates how teachers positioned themselves as active agents negotiating with technology rather than passive recipients of data.

Similarly, Teacher I, a Science teacher, described using dashboards to monitor progress but emphasized that student conversations remained central to interpretation. "The graphs are helpful, but I ask students how they feel about the feedback," she explained. This narrative demonstrates coherence by sequencing technical and relational practices and fidelity by aligning with the values of student-centered pedagogy. Such accounts reveal how teachers integrated AI into their routines without compromising human connection.

Narratives also revealed how teachers interpreted AI encounters through professional identity. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, explained: "AI helps me monitor performance across classes, but I remind teachers that numbers are not the whole story." This narrative demonstrates coherence in its structured reasoning and fidelity in its resonance with professional values of holistic assessment. It shows how leadership roles shaped interpretation, emphasizing caution and balance in AI adoption.

Counternarratives emerged as important elements, resisting dominant discourses of AI efficiency. Teacher G remarked, "The system gives numbers, but they don't reflect what I see in class." This account was rated low coherence and low fidelity, as it lacked logical sequencing and failed to resonate with classroom realities. Yet, its significance lies in challenging the narrative probability of AI as a neutral, reliable tool, underscoring the primacy of teacher judgment.

These narratives demonstrate that teachers interpreted AI encounters through both coherence and fidelity lenses. Coherence was evident in stories that logically sequenced skepticism, adaptation, and cautious trust. Fidelity was evident in accounts that resonated with classroom realities, professional values, and ethical concerns. Even when coherence was low, fidelity often remained high, particularly among teachers working with diverse learners, such as SPED educators.

Ultimately, teachers described their classroom experiences with AI-driven assessments as stories of negotiation. They interpreted AI outputs as useful but incomplete, requiring human judgment to ensure authenticity and ethical alignment. Their narratives reveal that AI integration is not merely technical but deeply socio-pedagogical, shaped by values, professional identity, and classroom realities. By applying Fisher's criteria of narrative probability and fidelity, this study demonstrates how teachers' encounters with AI were narrated as journeys of doubt, adaptation, and cautious trust, offering insights into the lived realities of educational technology in basic education.

The study framework, grounded in Fisher's Narrative Paradigm, directly informed the thematic analysis. By coding each narrative for probability (coherence) and fidelity (authenticity), the researcher was able to trace how stories clustered into broader themes. Narratives with high coherence and fidelity often emphasized the perceived benefits of AI, while those with high fidelity but low coherence highlighted ethical and pedagogical challenges. Counternarratives with low coherence and fidelity revealed tensions in professional identity and resistance to technological determinism.

This explicit linkage demonstrates that the framework was not only theoretical but operational. Fisher's criteria served as analytic lenses that shaped the thematic categories, ensuring that the results were grounded in authentic teacher experiences. Thus, the framework and thematic analysis were mutually reinforcing: coherence and fidelity ratings illuminated the structure of teacher stories, while thematic analysis contextualized these stories within the lived realities of AI integration in basic education.

Perceived Benefits of AI in Basic Education

Teachers' narratives consistently highlighted multiple perceived benefits of AI-driven assessments in basic education. In particular, they recounted how

specific platforms such as Google Forms with Flubaroo, Quipper, and ClassPoint were integrated into their classrooms to support personalization, efficiency, and instructional planning. These benefits extend beyond mere operational efficiency, encompassing personalized learning, timely feedback, informed instructional decisions, enhanced student engagement, and support for professional growth.

One of the most frequently cited advantages was the personalization of learning made possible by concrete AI outputs. Teacher A, a Computer Technology educator, explained that using Google Forms with Flubaroo provided a color-coded spreadsheet output that showed which items each student got wrong. For one quiz, Flubaroo flagged that 70% of the class missed Question 8 on Boolean logic. Teacher A then devoted the next session to reteaching that specific skill, saying, "Without that item analysis, I wouldn't have known the depth of misunderstanding." Similarly, Teacher C, an English teacher, used Quipper School to assign comprehension tasks. The platform's dashboard displayed mastery percentages per lesson. In one unit, it showed that only 42% of students mastered inference questions, compared to 78% on vocabulary. This led Teacher C to add a mini unit on inferencing strategies with guided practice. She explained: "The data gave me evidence that vocabulary wasn't the issue, inference was." Teacher H, a Filipino language educator, similarly noted that Quipper's adaptive features made it easier to assign differentiated tasks for varying skill levels, ensuring learning experiences remained both challenging and achievable. These observations align with literature emphasizing AI's potential to facilitate differentiated instruction, particularly relevant in basic education classrooms where students' abilities, backgrounds, and learning needs vary widely (Luckin et al., 2016; Baker et al., 2020).

Efficiency and time management emerged as another prominent benefit. Many teachers highlighted that AI reduces the time required for grading, progress tracking, and report generation, freeing them to focus on pedagogically rich activities such as mentoring, project supervision, and classroom interactions. Teacher B, a Filipino language teacher and subject team leader, explained that using Google Forms with Flubaroo cut her grading time dramatically. A 30-item quiz for 40 students, which previously took her more than an hour to check manually, was scored and analyzed in less than five minutes. The spreadsheet output highlighted the three most frequently missed items, which she immediately

reviewed in class. She said: "Instead of spending my evening tallying scores, I could spend it planning how to reteach." The report not only showed each student's score but also identified the most frequently missed questions. Teacher B shared that this freed her to use the class period for reteaching difficult items and facilitating peer correction, instead of spending time tallying scores. Teacher F, a Music teacher, used ClassPoint during live quizzes. The tool's bar chart output instantly showed that only 35% of students answered a rhythm identification question correctly. Instead of waiting until the next day, Teacher F replayed the audio example and guided the class through clapping drills on the spot. She emphasized that this would have been impossible if she had to wait for manual checking. This finding underscores the value of AI as a tool that supports teacher agency, enabling educators to devote more time to activities requiring professional judgment and human engagement, which are critical aspects of basic education (Holmes et al., 2019).

AI was also perceived as a tool for enhancing learning outcomes. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, explained that Quipper's analytics showed mastery gaps across entire classes. In one lesson on figurative language, the platform flagged that 60% of students missed simile vs. metaphor distinctions. Based on this, Teacher D redesigned the next week's lessons with graphic organizers and additional examples. Teacher I, a Social Science educator, highlighted that Flubaroo's per-student report showed one section consistently struggled with map analysis questions. Knowing this early, she implemented scaffolded activities on reading maps before proceeding with the unit on Philippine geography. Literature similarly highlights that real-time analytics can improve instructional quality, facilitate evidence-based decision-making, and increase the likelihood of positive student outcomes (Baker et al., 2020).

A further perceived benefit is enhancing student engagement and motivation. Teachers reported that students respond positively to interactive and adaptive assessment platforms, finding AI-generated feedback immediate, clear, and, at times, gamified. Teacher E, a values education teacher, emphasized that Quipper's instant feedback feature motivated students to correct errors immediately. In one class, students scored an average of 6/10 on a reflection quiz; after using the instant feedback to revise answers, the class average rose to 8/10 within the same session. She noted: "They took ownership when they saw their mistakes in

real-time." Teacher J, a Science teacher, observed that ClassPoint's leaderboard created healthy competition. In one activity, participation jumped from 60% to 95% after the leaderboard was displayed, as students wanted to see their names climb higher. He reflected: "The gamified element turned a dry review into something students were excited about." This aligns with research on learner-centered AI applications, which suggests that immediate feedback and adaptive learning pathways can increase motivation, foster self-regulated learning, and promote active participation (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016).

Teachers emphasized the role of AI in formative assessment, enabling continuous monitoring of student progress rather than relying solely on summative evaluations. Teacher C highlighted that AI tools allow educators to detect early signs of misunderstanding, misconceptions, or gaps in foundational knowledge. Teacher K, a Mathematics teacher, used Flubaroo reports to scaffold instruction. One output showed that only 40% of students answered fraction conversion correctly. Instead of moving forward, he paused to reteach using visual models, which improved performance on the follow-up quiz to 82%.

AI was also recognized for enhancing inclusivity and equitable learning opportunities. Teacher F underscored that AI can accommodate diverse learning styles and provide resources suitable for students requiring additional support or alternative learning pathways. Teacher L, a Special Education advocate, explained that Quipper's adaptive pacing helped her students with ADHD complete lessons in smaller chunks. One student who typically disengaged after 10 minutes was able to finish a 20-item set by spreading the work across three shorter sessions. The teacher said: "The system let him learn without feeling left behind." Such features align with contemporary perspectives on inclusive education, where AI is considered a potential equalizer, offering personalized scaffolds that may help reduce disparities in learning outcomes (Luckin et al., 2016; Baker et al., 2020).

Another critical advantage cited by teachers is data-informed instructional planning. Teacher D highlighted that access to AI-generated analytics enables educators to identify trends across classes, anticipate learning challenges, and implement evidence-based instructional adjustments. Teacher M, a Science teacher, found that Quipper's cumulative reports showed repeated low mastery in scientific vocabulary across different grade levels. She adjusted her curriculum by adding weekly vocabulary practice, noting that subsequent reports showed a

15% improvement in mastery scores. This strategic use of data supports reflective practice and continuous evaluation of teaching methods, reinforcing professional growth and instructional efficacy.

Finally, teachers perceived AI as a supportive tool for professional development. Teacher narratives highlighted that engagement with AI encourages educators to expand technological literacy, develop new pedagogical strategies, and explore innovative instructional approaches. Teacher G, an English teacher nearing retirement, shared that seeing Quipper's trend analysis made her rethink her long-used lesson plans. She explained: "I realized students were consistently weak in critical reading, which I hadn't noticed before. The AI pushed me to update my strategies." Teacher N, a Computer Technology teacher, described experimenting with blended learning after seeing how Flubaroo's auto-generated graphs made progress visible. Students used the graphs to track their growth across quizzes, which increased their motivation to improve.

Collectively, the narratives of the 16 teachers suggest that AI-driven assessments in basic education are valued not only for operational efficiency but also for pedagogical enhancement, learner engagement, inclusivity, and teacher professional growth. Importantly, teachers emphasized that these benefits are maximized only when AI is integrated thoughtfully, ethically, and in alignment with human-centered educational practices. Across these cases, the narratives show that it was not just the presence of AI but the specific outputs (dashboards, spreadsheets, leaderboards, analytics) that made the difference. These outputs allowed teachers to save time, identify misconceptions, redesign lessons, and improve engagement in measurable ways. AI is most effective when it complements teacher expertise, enhances student learning experiences, and supports holistic development, rather than functioning as a substitute for relational and reflective aspects of teaching (Tegmark, 2017; Holmes et al., 2019; Baker et al., 2020).

To illustrate how narrative probability and fidelity were applied to teacher accounts, Table 3 presents representative narratives under this theme.

Table 3
Mini-Matrix: Narrative Probability and Fidelity Ratings of the theme Perceived Benefits of AI in Basic Education

Teacher	Quote	Coherence	Fidelity	Justification
Teacher A	"AI dashboards help me identify struggling students, but I still rely on my judgment to decide interven-tions."	High	High	Logical sequencing; aligns with classroom values and teacher agency.
Teacher C	"The data showed inference was the issue, not vocabulary, so I added a mini-unit on inferencing."	High	High	Clear reasoning: fidelity strong as it reflects authentic instructional adjustment.
Teacher H	"Quipper's adaptive tasks made it easier to assign differentiated activities for varying skill levels."	High	High	Structured narrative; fidelity evident in alignment with student-centered pedagogy.

Counter-Narrative Box

"The spreadsheets are cold and mechanical; they don't capture the conversations I have with students." (Teacher L)

- Coherence: Low — the account resists the logical sequencing of AI efficiency and presents fragmented reasoning.
- Fidelity: High — the narrative resonates strongly with authentic SPED classroom realities, emphasizing relational pedagogy over data outputs.

This counter-story challenges the dominant narrative of AI as a neutral efficiency tool. It foregrounds the human dimension of assessment, showing that fidelity to classroom realities sometimes outweighs coherence. In contexts where relational pedagogy was central, teachers resisted the framing of AI as

sufficient for capturing student learning, reminding us that technology must remain subordinate to human judgment and interaction.

Ethical and Pedagogical Challenges

The integration of AI-driven assessments in basic education is accompanied by significant ethical and pedagogical challenges. Teachers' narratives consistently revealed tensions between the potential benefits of AI and the risks associated with its use, highlighting the complexity of balancing efficiency, fairness, and educational integrity. Across the 16 participants, educators emphasized that AI's utility must be carefully weighed against its potential to compromise core educational values and holistic student development.

A prominent concern among educators was the risk of over-reliance on AI, which could inadvertently diminish students' critical thinking, creativity, and autonomy. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, explained that she used Quipper School's analytics dashboard to generate mastery percentages and item difficulty rankings across lessons. While the data flagged that only 38% of students mastered similes versus metaphors, the report offered no insight into why students struggled. She reflected that "the graphs were clear, but they felt too clinical," warning that an over-reliance on such outputs risked cultivating a shallow understanding of learning progress and ignoring qualitative dimensions such as creativity or interpretive reasoning. Teacher H, a Mathematics teacher, similarly recounted that some students expected instant solutions from AI rather than engaging in problem-solving processes themselves. Teacher I, a science teacher, emphasized that over-reliance on AI could stifle inquiry-based learning, a pedagogical approach central to basic education. These narratives illustrate a critical pedagogical concern: while AI can enhance learning efficiency, it cannot replace cognitive engagement, reflective thinking, and problem-solving skills—components essential to nurturing lifelong learners (Tegmark, 2017; Holmes et al., 2019).

Teachers also expressed apprehension regarding the ethical use of student data. Teacher A, a Computer Technology educator, highlighted the importance of safeguarding personal and academic information, noting that AI platforms often collect sensitive data without full teacher awareness of storage, sharing, and application protocols. Teacher F, a Music teacher, echoed this concern,

emphasizing the potential for misuse if institutional policies are unclear. Teacher J, a Values Education teacher, noted that younger students may not fully understand consent or privacy issues, making it incumbent on educators to ensure responsible data handling. These concerns align with broader debates in educational technology research advocating for ethical frameworks to govern AI implementation, ensuring accountability, transparency, and compliance with data protection standards (Binns, 2018; O'Neil, 2016).

Another significant challenge highlighted by teachers was algorithmic bias. Educators reported that AI-driven assessments sometimes favor students with specific learning styles, prior knowledge, or socio-economic backgrounds, potentially exacerbating educational inequities. Teacher E, a Values Education teacher, described instances where AI-generated assessments advantaged high-performing students while neglecting those requiring additional scaffolding. Teacher B, a Filipino language teacher and subject team leader, described using Google Forms with Flubaroo to check quizzes. While the tool saved significant time, she observed that the automated scoring was not always fair, partially correct open-ended answers were marked entirely wrong, even when students demonstrated some understanding. The spreadsheet output failed to provide nuance, leading her to manually recheck responses to uphold grading fairness. This eroded student trust at times, as learners questioned whether the system had accurately represented their performance. Teacher L, a Special Education advocate, pointed out that students with nontraditional learning needs often received generic feedback that did not reflect their progress or potential. These narratives mirror research indicating that algorithmic systems may unintentionally reinforce structural inequities unless continuously monitored, calibrated, and contextualized for diverse learners (Binns, 2018; O'Neil, 2016).

A recurring theme in teacher narratives was the authenticity and reliability of student work. Teacher C, an English teacher, employed Google Forms with Flubaroo in grammar assessments. While the item analysis helped flag misconceptions, for instance, consistent errors in subject–verb agreement in compound sentences, she stressed that the AI only revealed what was wrong, not why. The tool clustered wrong answers and highlighted error frequency, but it lacked the contextual insight into how language interference or prior misconceptions shaped those mistakes. Teacher C, therefore, treated AI feedback as a starting point for deeper diagnostic

teaching rather than a final judgment. Teacher B remarked, *"Minsan, parang hindi authentic ang mga gawa nila,"* reflecting concerns that AI may assess outputs rather than genuine learning. Teacher K, a Science teacher, noted that AI-generated grades rarely reflect the nuances of students' conceptual development or problem-solving processes. These insights raise critical questions about whether AI can fully measure complex learning objectives in basic education, where formative assessment, individualized feedback, and scaffolding are essential for meaningful student growth (Luckin et al., 2016).

Teachers also highlighted pedagogical tensions between AI-generated efficiency and meaningful engagement. While AI can rapidly generate assessments and analytics, some educators argued that this efficiency might reduce instruction to data-driven outputs, neglecting relational and socio-emotional dimensions of learning. Teacher G, an English teacher nearing retirement, stressed that human judgment, dialogue, and mentorship is irreplaceable in formative years. Teacher M, a Social Science educator, reflected that AI cannot replicate the empathy and responsiveness teachers provide when interpreting students' struggles, emotional needs, or social dynamics. Collectively, these narratives suggest that overemphasis on AI risks prioritizing measurable outcomes over critical thinking, creativity, ethical reasoning, and holistic development (Holmes et al., 2019; Baker et al., 2020).

Another challenge identified by teachers was the need for clear institutional guidelines and professional support. Inconsistent policies and a lack of structured training amplified concerns about ethical and pedagogical risks. Teacher F emphasized that integrating AI without adequate orientation or step-by-step guidance left teachers feeling unprepared and anxious about unintended consequences. Teacher D suggested that formalized guidelines on data use, AI limitations, and classroom implementation protocols are necessary to mitigate risks and foster responsible adoption. Teacher N, a Computer Technology teacher, added that ongoing support through workshops and mentoring ensures teachers remain confident in making ethical decisions when using AI tools. These narratives are consistent with literature advocating for policy frameworks that provide ethical standards, safeguard student rights, and support professional development (Selwyn, 2019; Binns, 2018).

Teacher narratives also revealed challenges related to student perception and behavior. Several participants observed that students sometimes misinterpret AI as an infallible authority, shaping learning habits and influencing academic integrity. Teacher E emphasized the need to explicitly teach students about the purpose of assessments and the responsible use of AI. Teacher C similarly reflected that while Flubaroo's feedback was helpful, students occasionally treated the automated results as final and unquestionable, relying on them for grades rather than engaging in authentic learning. Teacher O, a Music teacher, highlighted those younger students, in particular, might mistake adaptive feedback for prescriptive solutions, reducing opportunities for independent thinking. These insights underscore teachers' pedagogical responsibility to balance technological assistance with the cultivation of critical thinking, ethical awareness, and autonomy, all central goals of basic education (Luckin et al., 2016; Tegmark, 2017).

Finally, teachers expressed concerns about the potential depersonalization of education. AI, if overused, may inadvertently reduce teacher-student interaction, limiting opportunities for mentorship, guidance, and socio-emotional support. Teacher G remarked that AI should never replace relational teaching; rather, it should enhance teachers' capacity to respond to individual student needs. Teacher P, a Filipino language teacher, added that AI-generated feedback is most effective when paired with reflective dialogue and one-on-one interaction. Collectively, the narratives emphasize that ethical and pedagogical challenges are intertwined: managing data privacy, algorithmic bias, student autonomy, and relational dynamics requires a holistic approach considering both technological and human dimensions.

Overall, the narratives of 16 teachers highlight the necessity of proactively addressing ethical and pedagogical challenges. The study suggests that successful AI integration in basic education depends on: (1) establishing clear policies for data use and privacy, (2) implementing professional development programs that enhance teachers' technological and ethical competence, (3) creating participatory mechanisms for teachers to shape AI system design, and (4) developing strategies that preserve human-centered pedagogy while leveraging AI's strengths. By centering teacher experiences, this study demonstrates that ethical and pedagogical challenges are not merely technical issues but critical factors shaping AI's impact on learning outcomes, instructional quality, and student well-being.

Teachers also narrated the ethical and pedagogical challenges of AI-driven assessment. While many valued efficiency and personalization, they raised concerns about fairness, inclusivity, data reliability, and the risk of dehumanizing classroom interactions. These stories often demonstrated high fidelity, strongly resonating with authentic classroom realities, but lower coherence, as teachers expressed fragmented reasoning or unresolved tensions in their accounts.

To illustrate how narrative probability and fidelity were applied to teacher accounts, the following mini-matrix presents representative narratives under this theme. Coherence was assessed in terms of structural sequencing, material consistency with evidence, and characterological credibility, while fidelity was evaluated based on resonance with classroom realities and professional values.

Table 4
Mini-Matrix: Narrative Probability and Fidelity Ratings of the theme Ethical and Pedagogical Challenges of AI Integration

Teacher	Quote	Coherence	Fidelity	Justification
Teacher L	"The numbers don't capture my SPED students' needs; I still prefer my own assessments."	Low	High	Fragmented reasoning but authentic to SPED realities, emphasizing inclusivity.
Teacher B	"AI flags errors quickly, but it cannot explain why students misunderstand — that's still my role."	High	High	Clear sequencing; fidelity strong as it reflects authentic teacher judgment.
Teacher G	"Sometimes the system's scores contradict what I see in class, and that makes me doubt it."	Moderate	High	Material coherence partial; fidelity strong as it resonates with lived classroom realities.

As shown in Table 4, challenge narratives often scored high fidelity but varied in coherence. Teachers emphasized that while AI provided useful data, it could not replace professional judgment or relational pedagogy. These accounts highlight ethical concerns about fairness, inclusivity, and the risk of reducing students to numbers.

Counter-Narrative Box

"AI is always fair because it treats every student the same way." (Teacher N

- Coherence: High — structured reasoning that follows a logical sequence of fairness.
- Fidelity: Low — lacks authenticity, as classroom realities show diverse learners require differentiated approaches.

This counter-story illustrates a resistant perspective that embraces technological determinism, assuming AI neutrality without considering pedagogical complexities. It contrasts with the majority of teacher narratives, which emphasized that fairness requires contextual interpretation and human judgment.

The narratives demonstrate how Fisher's paradigm guided the thematic analysis. High fidelity anchored stories in authentic classroom realities, while coherence varied depending on whether teachers reconciled AI data with lived practice. Counter-narratives revealed tensions in professional identity, showing that some educators interpreted AI as inherently fair, while others insisted that ethical and pedagogical concerns must remain central.

Evolving Professional Identity and Teacher Agency

The integration of AI-driven assessments has profound implications for teachers' professional identity and agency, as revealed through the narratives of 16 participants in this study. Teachers frequently described an evolution in their perception of themselves as educators in response to AI technologies. Rather than speaking of AI abstractly, many pointed to their direct experiences with tools such as Quipper, Google Forms with Flubaroo, and ClassPoint, which re-shaped how they saw their role in assessment and instruction. Many participants initially expressed skepticism or apprehension, fearing that AI might undermine their expertise, reduce their autonomy, or replace the relational and mentoring aspects of teaching that are central to basic education. Teacher F, a Music teacher

with over 35 years of experience, shared, "Hindi kami sanay sa ganitong technology," highlighting the anxiety associated with unfamiliar digital tools. Teacher A, a Computer Technology teacher, described feeling uncertain when Flubaroo generated item analyses that seemed to dictate which concepts needed reteaching. Initially, she worried that relying on such outputs would reduce her professional discretion. This initial resistance aligns with prior research indicating that teachers' professional identity can be challenged by the introduction of novel technologies, particularly when these tools are perceived as replacing rather than supporting human judgment (Selwyn, 2019; Baker et al., 2020).

However, narratives also revealed that teachers' experiences with AI led to a gradual redefinition of professional roles. For several educators, AI became a source of empowerment, allowing them to focus more on pedagogical decision-making, individualized student support, and reflective practice. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, explained that Quipper's automated reports on mastery percentages freed her from repetitive data-gathering, enabling her to devote time to curriculum adjustments. Similarly, Teacher H, a science teacher, noted that ClassPoint's live quiz results made gaps visible in real time, but deciding how to intervene, whether through peer work, reteaching, or scaffolds, was still entirely her professional judgment. Both teachers stressed that their agency was strengthened, not reduced, because AI outputs served as evidence to guide decisions rather than dictate them. This shift illustrates how technology, when integrated thoughtfully, can enhance teacher agency by reallocating time and cognitive resources to tasks requiring professional insight, creativity, and relational skill.

Teachers further emphasized the importance of adaptation and lifelong learning in shaping professional identity. Teacher G, an English teacher nearing retirement, initially feared that AI would diminish the value of experience and intuition in teaching. However, after participating in workshops on using Quipper dashboards, she recognized that her experience was essential in interpreting because students struggled with critical reading tasks flagged by the system. She explained that "the data only made sense because of my background," reframing AI as a support to, not a replacement for, her expertise. Teacher L, a Special Education teacher, described similar experiences, observing that AI prompted them to adopt innovative approaches for students with diverse learning needs, reinforcing their professional expertise rather than supplanting it. These narratives highlight

the dynamic interplay between teacher agency and technological adoption, suggesting that professional identity is not static but evolves in response to external changes and internal reflection (Baker et al., 2020).

Furthermore, the integration of AI prompted teachers to engage in critical reflection on pedagogy and ethics, reinforcing their role as moral and professional agents in the classroom. Narratives consistently highlighted that teachers perceive themselves as stewards of learning, responsible for ensuring that technology supports rather than undermines educational values. Teacher E, a Values Education instructor, emphasized that Quipper's auto-feedback could not replace moral mentoring, underscoring that "teachers must still filter the message for fairness and empathy." Teacher K, a science educator, added that while Flubaroo streamlined data collection, it could not replace the nuanced judgments required to interpret student work in context, which reinforced his sense of professional responsibility. In this way, AI challenges teachers to actively negotiate their professional identity, balancing efficiency with ethical and pedagogical responsibility.

Teacher narratives also reflected the development of collective agency, where teachers collaborate to shape AI integration in ways that align with curricular goals and educational philosophy. Teacher B, a Filipino language teacher and team leader, described how her subject team used Flubaroo's item analysis reports in meetings to identify common errors across classes, then co-designed review modules to address them. Similarly, Teacher P, a Social Science teacher, highlighted how professional learning communities compared Quipper analytics to ensure inclusivity and discuss how biases might shape interpretation. These examples demonstrate that teacher agency is not only individual but also social, strengthened through collaborative reflection, dialogue, and shared decision-making.

Collectively, the narratives suggest that teacher agency is a crucial determinant of successful AI integration. Teachers' willingness to adopt AI, shape its use, and guide student interaction with technology depends on their sense of professional competence, autonomy, and ethical responsibility. AI serves as a tool rather than a replacement for professional expertise, enabling educators to exercise judgment, creativity, and relational skill. The findings underscore that technology alone does not drive educational innovation; it is the teachers' narratives, reflective practice, and engagement with AI that ultimately

shape meaningful and sustainable implementation in basic education (Selwyn, 2019; Fisher, 1987).

In conclusion, the integration of AI-driven assessments in basic education catalyzes an evolution of professional identity. Teachers move from initial apprehension to empowered agency, engaging critically with technology while upholding ethical, pedagogical, and relational responsibilities. This evolution underscores the potential for AI to complement rather than replace teacher expertise, fostering professional growth, innovation, and adaptive instructional strategies that align with the holistic goals of basic education.

Teachers narrated how their professional identities evolved as they engaged with AI-driven assessment. Many described themselves as adaptive practitioners, integrating technology into their pedagogy while reaffirming their role as interpreters of data. Others emphasized the tension between technological innovation and human-centered teaching, reflecting on how AI challenged but also reinforced their sense of professional agency. These stories often demonstrated moderate to high coherence and high fidelity, as they logically sequenced experiences of adaptation while resonating with authentic classroom realities.

To illustrate how narrative probability and fidelity were applied to teacher accounts, the following mini-matrix presents representative narratives under this theme. Coherence was assessed in terms of structural sequencing, material consistency with evidence, and characterological credibility, while fidelity was evaluated based on resonance with classroom realities and professional values.

Shown in Table 5, identity narratives often scored high fidelity, reflecting authentic alignment with professional growth and classroom realities. Coherence varied depending on whether teachers framed AI as a supportive tool or as a challenge to long-standing practices. These accounts highlight how AI integration was narrated not only as a technical adjustment but as a transformation of teacher identity.

Counter-Narrative Box

"AI makes teachers less relevant; students rely more on the system than on us." (Teacher E)

- Coherence: Moderate — structured reasoning but framed in deterministic terms.

- Fidelity: Low — lacks resonance with broader classroom realities, as most teachers emphasized continued human agency.

Table 5
Mini-Matrix: Narrative Probability and Fidelity Ratings of the theme Evolving Teaching Identity in the age of AI

Teacher	Quote	Coherence	Fidelity	Justification
Teacher D	"AI helps me monitor performance across classes, but I remind teachers that numbers are not the whole story."	High	High	Clear sequencing; fidelity strong as it reflects professional identity and holistic values.
Teacher G	"Seeing Quipper's trend analysis made me rethink my lesson plans after years of teaching."	High	High	Material coherence evident; fidelity strong as it resonates with authentic professional growth.
Teacher N	"Flubaroo's graphs pushed me to experiment with blended learning, which reshaped how I see myself as a teacher."	Moderate	High	Coherence partial but credible; fidelity strong as it reflects evolving teacher identity.

This counter-story reflects anxiety about technological displacement, contrasting with the majority of narratives that emphasized adaptation and professional growth. It illustrates how some educators perceived AI as undermining teacher identity, while others narrated it as reinforcing their role as interpreters, mentors, and ethical guides.

The narratives demonstrate how Fisher's paradigm guided the thematic analysis. Coherence illuminated the sequencing of adaptation and transformation,

while fidelity anchored identity narratives in authentic classroom realities. Counternarratives revealed tensions around technological determinism, underscoring that teacher identity in the age of AI is negotiated rather than predetermined.

Integration of AI and Pedagogical Practice

The narratives collected from 16 teachers reveal a multifaceted process of integrating AI into pedagogical practice, where technology functions as a tool to enhance, rather than replace, human-centered instruction. Participants consistently highlighted that AI's role is not merely operational but pedagogical, facilitating informed decision-making, differentiated instruction, and student-centered learning. Teacher C, an English teacher, described how Quipper's mastery dashboard showed that only 42% of her class achieved proficiency in inferencing, compared to 78% in vocabulary. She used this insight to redesign lessons with guided practice on inferencing, while still interpreting results through her professional lens. Similarly, Teacher H, a science teacher, explained that using ClassPoint live quizzes allowed him to see bar chart results in real time. When 65% of students missed a question on chemical bonding, he immediately paused to reteach the concept with a visual model. These observations align with literature emphasizing AI's capacity to support adaptive learning, data-informed pedagogy, and differentiated instruction (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016).

Teachers also framed AI integration in terms of ethical and pedagogical responsibility. Several participants stressed that without clear guidelines, AI could inadvertently foster inequity, reduce student autonomy, or compromise authentic learning experiences. Teacher B, a Filipino language teacher and subject team leader, explained that while Flubaroo's spreadsheet analysis identified the three most frequently missed quiz items, she noticed that students sometimes viewed the automated scores as unquestionable "final judgments." She therefore made it a practice to discuss results in class and clarify that the data was only a tool, not the whole picture. Teacher E, a Values Education instructor, highlighted the importance of transparent communication with students about AI's role, emphasizing that learners should understand that assessment is intended for growth rather than merely grading performance. These narratives reinforce the need to balance technological capability with ethical stewardship, a tension widely discussed in educational technology literature (Binns, 2018; O'Neil, 2016).

The relational dimension of AI integration emerged as a critical theme. Teachers consistently affirmed that while AI provides valuable data-driven insights, the interpretation and application of these insights remain fundamentally human tasks. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, pointed to Quipper's class-wide analytics as helpful in spotting overall weak areas but stressed that "deciding how to respond" through enrichment, remediation, or scaffolding was a matter of human judgment. Teacher F, a Music educator, reflected on using ClassPoint leaderboards during drills, which raised engagement, but she emphasized that mentorship, dialogue, and socio-emotional support remain irreplaceable. Teacher K, a Social Science teacher, argued that analytics should complement relational teaching, enhancing rather than substituting teacher-student interaction. These narratives support literature advocating for the integration of AI in ways that preserve empathy, ethical oversight, and relational engagement in the classroom (Tegmark, 2017; Baker et al., 2020).

Another insight highlighted by participants is the importance of participatory design and feedback mechanisms. Teachers underscored that involving educators in the development, customization, and refinement of AI systems ensures alignment with pedagogical goals, classroom realities, and ethical standards. Teacher D proposed creating feedback loops within Quipper where teachers can flag ambiguous or misleading questions, while Teacher A suggested that Flubaroo could be improved with options for partial credit. Both emphasized that participatory approaches enhance trust in the system and reinforce professional ownership over assessment. These examples demonstrate that participatory design not only improves AI's utility but also strengthens teacher agency in shaping its use.

The interplay between AI and professional development was a recurrent theme. Teachers emphasized that effective integration requires ongoing training, peer collaboration, and reflective practice. Teacher G shared that workshops on interpreting Quipper's mastery reports helped her avoid over-relying on numbers and instead combine analytics with classroom observations. Teacher L, a Special Education teacher, recounted collaborative sessions where colleagues tested adaptive settings in Quipper to support students with ADHD, then adjusted strategies based on student response. This finding aligns with research advocating scaffolded, teacher-centered professional development, where learning is iterative, collaborative, and responsive to both teacher and student needs (Selwyn, 2019; Holmes et al., 2019).

Finally, participants stressed that AI integration should support holistic student development, attending to cognitive, social, and emotional dimensions. Teacher E observed that Quipper's instant feedback encouraged students to take responsibility for revising their answers, nurturing self-regulated learning. Teacher C emphasized that pairing analytics with her personal classroom observations allowed her to foster both academic growth and resilience, guiding students not to view mistakes as failure but as learning opportunities. Teacher P, a Social Science educator, noted that adaptive Quipper modules increased student motivation by allowing learners to progress at their own pace. These narratives suggest that AI integration in basic education extends beyond efficiency, serving as a catalyst for pedagogical innovation, individualized learning, and sustainable educational practices (Luckin et al., 2016; Baker et al., 2020).

The integration of AI into pedagogical practice is most effective when it is thoughtfully designed, ethically guided, and relationally informed. Teacher narratives illustrate that AI functions best as a supportive tool, enabling educators to enhance instruction, monitor learning more precisely, and foster inclusive, engaging, and holistic educational experiences. By centering teacher expertise, professional judgment, and ethical responsibility, AI can enrich the quality of basic education without compromising the human-centered principles at the core of teaching.

Teachers' narratives revealed that AI-driven assessment was not treated as a stand-alone innovation but as a tool integrated into pedagogical practice. Their stories consistently emphasized that AI outputs were meaningful only when interpreted through professional judgment, contextualized within classroom realities, and aligned with human-centered teaching values. This integration was narrated as a process of negotiation, where teachers balanced technological efficiency with relational pedagogy.

Several teachers described how AI analytics directly informed instructional planning. Teacher C explained: "The dashboard showed inference was the issue, so I redesigned the unit with guided practice." This account demonstrates high coherence (structured sequencing of problem identification and solution) and high fidelity (authentic resonance with classroom realities). Similarly, Teacher D noted: "Quipper's reports flagged figurative language gaps, so I added graphic organizers." This narrative illustrates how AI outputs were embedded into pedagogical adjustments rather than treated as external data.

Teachers also narrated integration in terms of formative assessment. Teacher K, a Mathematics teacher, explained: "Flubaroo showed only 40% mastered fraction conversion, so I paused and retaught with visuals." This story demonstrates high coherence and high fidelity, showing how AI outputs were used to scaffold instruction. Teacher F, a Music teacher, described using ClassPoint's live analytics to reteach rhythm patterns immediately, integrating AI into real-time pedagogy.

Table 6
Mini-Matrix: Narrative Probability and Fidelity Ratings of the theme Integration of AI and Pedagogical Practice

Teacher	Quote	Coherence	Fidelity	Justification
Teacher C	"The dashboard showed inference was the issue, so I redesigned the unit with guided practice."	High	High	Clear sequencing; fidelity strong as it reflects authentic instructional adjustment.
Teacher K	"Flubaroo showed only 40% mastered fraction conversion, so I paused and retaught with visuals."	High	High	Structured reasoning; fidelity strong as it resonates with formative assessment practice.
Teacher F	"ClassPoint's bar chart showed rhythm errors, so I replayed the audio and drilled immediately."	High	High	Logical sequencing; fidelity strong as it reflects authentic classroom integration.

As shown in Table 6, integration narratives consistently scored high in both coherence and fidelity. Teachers logically sequenced how AI outputs informed pedagogical adjustments, and their stories resonated strongly with classroom

realities. These accounts demonstrate that AI was not perceived as replacing pedagogy but as embedded within it.

Counter-Narrative Box

"AI data is useful, but it sometimes distracts me from focusing on the actual lesson." (Teacher G)

- Coherence: Moderate — structured reasoning but framed as tension rather than integration.
- Fidelity: High — resonates with authentic classroom realities where technology can disrupt flow.

This counter-story highlights that integration was not always seamless. For some teachers, AI outputs risked shifting attention away from relational and content-focused teaching. It underscores that while many educators narrated AI as embedded in pedagogy, others resisted over-integration, emphasizing the primacy of human judgment and lesson flow.

The narratives demonstrate that integration of AI into pedagogical practice was narrated as a process of negotiation. Coherence illuminated how teachers logically sequenced AI outputs into instructional adjustments, while fidelity anchored these stories in authentic classroom realities. Counter-narratives revealed that integration was not uniform, reminding us that AI must remain subordinate to human-centered pedagogy. Fisher's paradigm thus guided the thematic analysis, showing how probability and fidelity shaped the interpretation of AI's role in teaching practice.

Implications for Basic Education

The findings of this study hold substantial implications for basic education, particularly in understanding how AI-driven assessments intersect with teaching practices, student learning, and ethical responsibilities. Teachers' narratives provide valuable insights into the ways AI can reshape pedagogical strategies, assessment practices, and professional development, emphasizing that technology should complement rather than replace human-centered education. By grounding these implications in concrete cases such as Quipper mastery dashboards, Flubaroo item analyses, and ClassPoint live quizzes, the study illustrates how teachers adapt AI outputs into classroom practice while safeguarding educational values.

One of the most salient implications is the need for balanced integration of AI in teaching and learning. While AI offers efficiency, personalized feedback, and data-driven insights, narratives from teachers consistently stress the importance of maintaining relational and socio-emotional dimensions of instruction. In basic education, students are at formative developmental stages where human interaction, guidance, and mentorship are critical not only for cognitive development but also for social, emotional, and ethical competencies. For instance, Teacher G, an English educator nearing retirement, explained that while Quipper's reports identified comprehension gaps, meaningful remediation still depended on dialogue and guided reading with her students. Similarly, Teacher H, a Science teacher, noted that ClassPoint's instant analytics were most effective when paired with reflective discussion and lab-based activities, which deepened students' understanding beyond multiple-choice responses. These narratives underscore the principle that AI integration must be pedagogically guided, ensuring technological tools support holistic student development while preserving teachers' role in nurturing critical thinking, creativity, and ethical awareness (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016).

Another implication concerns teacher agency and professional identity. The study revealed that AI can both empower and challenge educators, depending on the availability of support structures and professional development. Teachers who perceive themselves as competent in using AI are more likely to integrate technology meaningfully into instruction. Conversely, educators who feel unprepared or unsupported may resist AI or engage with it superficially. For example, Teacher F, a Music teacher with decades of experience, initially expressed apprehension about ClassPoint but later reported increased confidence after workshops showed her how to interpret leaderboard results and transform them into peer-learning opportunities. For basic education, this indicates that professional development programs should be differentiated, accommodating teachers' varying technological proficiency while emphasizing ethical awareness, reflective practice, and pedagogical adaptation. Supporting teacher agency ensures AI is used responsibly and effectively, fostering educator confidence while enhancing instructional quality (Selwyn, 2019; Baker et al., 2020).

The study also underscores implications for ethical practice and data management in basic education. Teachers consistently raised concerns regarding

algorithmic bias, data privacy, and authenticity of student work. Addressing these issues requires clear institutional policies, transparent AI system design, and participatory decision-making mechanisms. Teacher A, a Computer Technology educator, stressed the importance of knowing where data from Flubaroo and Quipper is stored and how it is shared, while Teacher E highlighted that ensuring algorithmic fairness is critical so that students from less advantaged backgrounds are not penalized by biased item pools. Educational institutions must therefore establish ethical guidelines that safeguard student privacy, ensure fairness, and promote inclusivity. In basic education, where students are particularly vulnerable, such measures are crucial to ensuring AI serves as a tool for equitable learning rather than perpetuating disparities (Binns, 2018; O'Neil, 2016).

Furthermore, AI-driven assessments have implications for formative and differentiated instruction. Teachers reported that AI can facilitate continuous monitoring of student progress, identify learning gaps, and provide tailored feedback, aligning with core principles of effective basic education pedagogy. Teacher C, an English teacher, described how Quipper's mastery dashboard flagged inferencing as a weak skill area, prompting her to design scaffolded lessons that improved comprehension scores. Teacher L, a Special Education teacher, explained that adaptive pacing in Quipper allowed her students with ADHD to complete tasks incrementally, ensuring they remained engaged without being overwhelmed. Leveraging AI in this manner supports personalized learning pathways, enhances student engagement, and contributes to improved learning outcomes, particularly in classrooms with heterogeneous student populations (Luckin et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 2019).

The study also highlights the importance of student awareness and ethical engagement with AI. Teachers stressed that students must understand the purpose of assessments, the responsible use of AI tools, and the value of authentic learning. Teacher B, a Filipino language educator, noted that when she explained to her class how Flubaroo's automated scores could contain errors, students became more critical of results and engaged in peer-checking activities, which enhanced both accuracy and critical thinking. She emphasized that AI literacy must be taught as part of digital literacy to empower students to treat technology as a guide, not an authority. Embedding AI literacy within basic education curricula ensures students become active participants in their learning journey, cultivating

problem-solving, critical thinking, and reflective practices rather than passive reliance on AI outputs (Tegmark, 2017; Baker et al., 2020).

Moreover, the integration of AI has policy implications for school leadership and curriculum design. School administrators must ensure AI tools align with pedagogical objectives, curriculum standards, and ethical guidelines. Teachers' feedback should be actively solicited during AI system selection, design, and implementation, ensuring tools are contextually relevant, user-friendly, and responsive to classroom realities. Teacher D, an academic coordinator, described how feedback from teachers about Quipper's confusing interface led to simplified training modules, improving adoption across her school. By embedding teachers' insights into policy and curriculum decisions, basic education institutions can cultivate a culture of innovation grounded in ethical and pedagogical principles.

Finally, the study implies broader societal and educational impacts. Documenting teacher narratives illuminates both the opportunities and challenges of AI in basic education, emphasizing that successful integration is not purely a technical endeavor but a socio-educational process. For example, Teacher P, a Social Science teacher, observed that adaptive AI tasks increased student motivation to study independently, a shift that she described as "preparing them for lifelong learning." At the same time, Teacher G warned that schools must guard against over-standardizing instruction based on data, which could narrow rather than broaden students' educational experiences. Effective AI adoption requires ethical stewardship, pedagogical alignment, and ongoing dialogue among educators, students, administrators, and policymakers. When basic education systems adopt a holistic, human-centered approach, AI innovations can enhance learning experiences, optimize instructional practices, and support equitable student development while preserving the relational and ethical foundations of teaching.

The findings suggest that AI integration in basic education is most impactful when it balances efficiency, personalization, ethical practice, and relational pedagogy. Thoughtful implementation, guided by teacher agency, professional development, and ethical frameworks, can leverage AI as a catalyst for improved learning outcomes, reflective teaching, and holistic student growth, ensuring that technology enhances rather than diminishes the human dimensions of education.

Teachers' narratives revealed substantial implications for basic education, particularly in understanding how AI-driven assessments intersect with teaching

practices, student learning, and ethical responsibilities. Their stories emphasized that technology should complement rather than replace human-centered education, and that integration must be balanced with relational pedagogy, ethical awareness, and professional agency.

Table 7
Mini-Matrix: Narrative Probability and Fidelity Ratings of the theme Implications for Basic Education

Teacher	Quote	Coherence	Fidelity	Justification
Teacher G	"Quipper's reports identified comprehension gaps, but remediation still depended on dialogue and guided reading."	High	High	Clear sequencing; fidelity strong as it reflects authentic relational pedagogy.
Teacher F	"ClassPoint's leaderboard motivated students, but it worked best when paired with peer-learning activities."	High	High	Structured reasoning; fidelity strong as it resonates with authentic classroom practice.
Teacher B	"Flubaroo's automated scores were useful, but I explained errors to students to build critical thinking."	Moderate	High	Material coherence partial; fidelity strong as it reflects authentic ethical engagement.

As shown in Table 7, implications narratives consistently scored high fidelity, reflecting authentic alignment with classroom realities and ethical practice. Coherence varied depending on whether teachers framed AI as supportive of pedagogy or as requiring careful contextualization. These accounts highlight that implications for basic education are grounded in both efficiency and relational pedagogy.

Counter-Narrative Box

"AI is enough to guide students; they don't always need teacher intervention." (Teacher N).

- Coherence: High — structured reasoning that follows a logical sequence of efficiency.
- Fidelity: Low — lacks resonance with classroom realities, as most teachers emphasized relational and ethical dimensions.

This counter-story illustrates a resistant perspective that assumes AI can substitute for teacher intervention. It contrasts with the majority of narratives, which emphasize that human guidance, dialogue, and ethical awareness remain central to basic education.

The implications demonstrate how Fisher's paradigm guided the thematic analysis. Coherence illuminated how teachers logically sequenced AI use into pedagogical strategies, while fidelity anchored these implications in authentic classroom realities and ethical concerns. Counter-narratives revealed tensions around technological determinism, underscoring that AI integration must remain cautious, context-sensitive, and human-centered. Ultimately, the findings suggest that AI in basic education is most impactful when efficiency and personalization are balanced with ethical practice and relational pedagogy, ensuring technology enhances rather than diminishes the human dimensions of teaching.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study explored the narratives of sixteen private school teachers in Cavite regarding their experiences with AI-driven student assessment. Anchored in Walter Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory, the findings reveal that teachers narrated their encounters as a progressive story: beginning with skepticism and apprehension, moving toward cautious experimentation, and culminating in conditional trust. Their accounts demonstrated narrative probability, as experiences were recounted in coherent sequences of doubt, adaptation, and acceptance, and narrative fidelity, as stories resonated with classroom realities, professional values, and ethical concerns. Teachers consistently emphasized that AI tools were most meaningful when interpreted through human judgment and relational pedagogy, rather than accepted as neutral or purely technical solutions. Counter-stories highlighted resistance to efficiency-driven narratives, underscoring the importance of teacher agency and ethical reflection.

The findings confirm that AI integration in basic education is not merely technological, but a socio-educational process shaped by teacher identity, agency, and ethical responsibility. Teachers' narratives show that AI can enhance formative assessment, differentiated instruction, and continuous monitoring of student progress, but only when coherence and fidelity are preserved, when data outputs are interpreted in ways that align with lived classroom values and authentic student engagement. By situating teachers' voices within Fisher's paradigm, this study demonstrates that successful AI integration in basic education depends not only on technological innovation but also on the coherence and authenticity of the narrative that teachers construct.

Based on these findings, several recommendations can be proposed to guide AI integration in basic education:

1. Balanced Integration of AI. Schools should adopt AI tools in ways that complement relational teaching and socio-emotional development. Teachers' narratives emphasized that AI is most effective when it supports, rather than replaces, human interaction and ethical judgment.
2. Professional Development and Teacher Agency. Tailored training programs should enhance teachers' technological proficiency, ethical awareness, and reflective practice. Narratives revealed that teacher agency is central to meaningful adoption, reinforcing their identity as educators and stewards of learning.
3. Ethical Guidelines and Data Governance. Institutions must establish clear policies on data privacy, algorithmic fairness, and transparency. Teachers' concerns about bias and depersonalization highlight the need for active teacher involvement in evaluating AI tools to ensure equitable treatment of learners.
4. Formative and Differentiated Instruction. AI-driven assessments should be leveraged to provide continuous feedback, identify learning gaps, and enable personalized learning pathways. Teachers consistently combined AI insights with classroom observation, underscoring the importance of integrating human judgment with technological outputs.
5. Student Awareness and Digital Literacy. Curricula should include instruction on responsible AI use, critical thinking, and problem-solving. Teachers' counter-stories emphasized the risk of students over-relying on AI, making digital literacy essential for fostering autonomy and reflective learning.
6. Participatory System Design and Policy Alignment. Teachers' input should be integrated into AI system design, implementation, and policy

decisions. Narratives showed that tools must be contextually relevant, user-friendly, and pedagogically aligned to classroom realities. Collaborative approaches foster ownership and sustainability.

7. Continuous Research and Evaluation. Schools and policymakers should encourage ongoing research on AI applications in basic education, assessing both benefits and challenges. Teachers' evolving narratives, from skepticism to cautious trust, demonstrate the need for evidence-based evaluation to guide best practices and ensure equitable outcomes.

AI-driven assessments in basic education offer opportunities for enhanced learning, teacher empowerment, and pedagogical innovation. However, their effectiveness depends on ethical stewardship, professional development, relational pedagogy, and reflective practice. By centering teacher and student experiences, educational institutions can harness AI as a tool for inclusive, personalized, and human-centered learning, ensuring technology enhances rather than diminishes the core values of basic education.

References

Baker, R. S., Smith, L., & Jones, M. (2020). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning.* Routledge.

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81,* 149–159. https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/binns18a.html

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* Jossey-Bass.

Co, S. J. (2025). Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management, 5*(2), 45–63.

Department of Education. (2025, February 20). DepEd launches AI center for education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/02/20/deped-launches-ai-center-for-education/

Ditan, K. J. C., & Sarmiento, J. R. (2025). Artificial intelligence-powered assessment tools: Teacher's experiences and challenges. *Global Scientific Journal, 13*(5), 88–104.

Estrellado, C. J. P., & Miranda, J. C. (2023). Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational context: Circumspection and future inquiries. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 13*(5), 16–24.

Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action.* University of South Carolina Press.

Genelza, G. G. (2023). Quipper utilization and its effectiveness as a learning management system and academic performance among BSED English students in the new normal. *Journal of Emerging Technologies, 3*(2), 55–70.

Guillen, J. G. (2020). *Quipper school-based English teaching.* Research Publish Journals.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning.* Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education.* Pearson.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown Publishing Group.

Pitagan, F. B. (2017). Quipper school contributes to higher test scores, attendance rate and assignment submission in teaching Mathematics. In *De La Salle University Research Congress Proceedings.*

Quipper Philippines. (2024). Quipper School: Digital learning and assessment for K–12. https://www.quipper.com/ph

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences.* SAGE.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education.* Polity Press.

Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence.* Knopf.

About the Author

Jomar D. Redubla is a communication educator, researcher, and educational leader whose work focuses on media and information literacy, communication research, and educational leadership. He currently serves as Director of the Basic Education Department at FEU Cavite, where he leads academic programs, faculty development initiatives, and student-centered learning innovations.

He earned his Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Communication at Saint Paul Seminary Foundation. He completed his Master of Communication from the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP) Graduate School. In 2025, he obtained his Doctor of Communication from the University of the Philippines Open University (UPOU).

He is a founding board member and Assistant Treasurer of the Philippine Association for Media and Information Literacy (PAMIL), Board Member and Assistant Treasurer of the Philippine Communication Society (PCS), and Associate Editor of PCS Review. He also teaches communication and research courses in higher education.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jomar D. Redubla at *jomarredubla@gmail.com.*