Int. J. Sci. R. Tech., 2026 3(7)
A Multidisciplinary peer-reviewed Journal
www.ijsrtjournal.com [ISSN: 2394-7063]

Original Article

Comparing Organizational Resistance To Digital Change In Academia: A Cross-Institutional Analysis Of Barriers, Triggers, And Mitigation Strategies In Schools Vs. Higher Education Institutions"

Varsha S. Guru*

Maharaja Agrasen International College, Raipur (C.G.)

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation has become imperative for educational institutions in the era of artificial intelligence, yet organizational resistance remains a critical barrier to successful implementation. This study examines and compares the nature, causes, and manifestations of organizational resistance to digital change across two distinct academic sectors: K-12 schools and higher education institutions. Through a systematic literature review and comparative analysis, this research identifies three primary dimensions of resistance: individual-level factors (including emotional reactions, fear of job displacement, and lack of digital literacy), systemic barriers (such as budget constraints, staff shortages, and inadequate infrastructure), and organizational-cultural factors (including entrenched status quo preferences, lack of clear strategic direction, and faculty autonomy concerns). The study reveals that while schools face predominately resource-driven challenges, universities encounter more complex resistance rooted in academic culture and faculty governance. Eighty percent of students report lacking structured AI support despite employers accelerating toward AI-mandatory job descriptions, highlighting the urgency of addressing these barriers. This research proposes a comprehensive framework for overcoming resistance, encompassing strategic planning, targeted faculty development programs, ethical AI policy establishment, competency framework adoption, and human-centric change management approaches. The findings offer practical implications for educational leaders, policymakers, and administrators seeking to navigate digital transformation successfully while maintaining educational quality and institutional values.

Keywords: Digital transformation, organizational resistance, artificial intelligence in education, higher education institutions, K-12 education, change management, faculty development, barriers to adoption, academic culture, AI integration, educational technology, strategic implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence and digital technologies has fundamentally transformed every sector of modern society, with education standing as both a beneficiary and a critical frontier for technological integration. As AI systems increasingly capture classrooms and educational platforms evolve into sophisticated digital ecosystems, educational institutions worldwide face an unprecedented imperative to embrace digital transformation. However, despite the clear benefits and growing necessity of AI-driven digital transformation, a significant portion of educational institutions continue to resist or struggle with implementation. This resistance manifests differently across educational levels, creating distinct challenges that require nuanced understanding and targeted interventions.

In India, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has emphasized the integration of technology and digital literacy across all levels of education, placing particular importance on preparing students for an increasingly digitized workforce. The policy recognizes that digital transformation is not merely an option but a necessity for maintaining educational quality and relevance in the twenty-first century. However, the implementation of this vision has encountered substantial obstacles, particularly in states like Chhattisgarh, where resource constraints, infrastructure gaps, and organizational resistance

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

have slowed the pace of digital adoption. The situation becomes even more complex when examining the differential challenges faced by K-12 schools versus higher education institutions, each operating within distinct organizational cultures, resource frameworks, and stakeholder expectations.

Chhattisgarh, a state in central India established in 2000, presents a particularly compelling case for examining digital transformation challenges in education. The state has made significant efforts to improve educational outcomes through initiatives like the Chhattisgarh State Education Board's digital initiatives, the integration of computer education in schools, and partnerships with technology providers. However, despite these efforts, a substantial gap remains between policy aspirations and practical implementation. Rural schools in Chhattisgarh, which constitute a significant portion of the state's educational infrastructure, continue to face challenges related to electricity access, internet connectivity, and teacher training in digital tools. Urban schools, while better positioned in terms of infrastructure, still encounter resistance from teachers and administrators who are accustomed to traditional pedagogical methods.

The higher education sector in Chhattisgarh, and various state universities, face different yet equally formidable challenges. While higher education institutions generally possess better infrastructure and resources compared to schools, they encounter resistance rooted in academic culture, faculty autonomy, and concerns about the impact of AI on traditional scholarly practices. University faculty members, who often hold advanced degrees and have established pedagogical methods, may view AI-driven digital transformation as a threat to their professional expertise and autonomy. This resistance is compounded by the decentralized nature of university governance, where faculty committees and academic councils must approve changes, creating multiple layers of decision-making that can delay or prevent digital transformation initiatives

The comparative analysis of organizational resistance between schools and higher education institutions reveals important patterns that inform our understanding of digital transformation challenges. Schools, particularly in developing contexts like Chhattisgarh, face resistance that is predominantly driven by resource constraints, inadequate infrastructure, and lack of teacher training. Teachers in schools often lack basic digital literacy skills and may feel overwhelmed by the prospect of integrating complex AI tools into their daily teaching practices. Additionally, school administrators may resist digital transformation due to concerns about costs, the need for ongoing maintenance, and the potential disruption to established routines [2][6].

In contrast, higher education institutions encounter resistance that is more deeply rooted in organizational culture and academic traditions. University faculty members may resist AI integration due to concerns about the quality of AI-generated content, the potential for student dependency on AI tools, and the impact on traditional assessment methods. The autonomous nature of university departments and the importance of faculty governance create additional barriers to centralized digital transformation initiatives. Furthermore, higher education institutions often serve diverse student populations with varying levels of digital readiness, making it challenging to implement uniform AI-driven solutions

This research addresses several critical questions that remain underexplored in existing literature. First, what are the specific forms and manifestations of organizational resistance to AI-driven digital transformation in K-12 schools versus higher education institutions? Second, how do individual, systemic, and cultural factors contribute to resistance differently across these educational levels? Third, what contextual factors, particularly in the Chhattisgarh region, influence the nature and intensity of resistance to digital change? Fourth, what strategies and frameworks can effectively overcome organizational resistance and facilitate successful digital transformation in educational institutions?

The significance of this research extends beyond academic inquiry to practical implications for educational policy and practice. By understanding the differential nature of resistance across educational levels, policymakers can develop more targeted and effective interventions that address the specific barriers faced by schools and universities. Educational administrators can use these findings to design change management strategies that are

sensitive to the unique organizational cultures of their institutions. Teachers and faculty members can benefit from understanding the roots of their own resistance to digital change and develop strategies for overcoming these barriers.

This study contributes to the growing literature on digital transformation in education by providing a comparative analysis that highlights the differential challenges faced by schools and higher education institutions. While existing research has examined digital transformation challenges in isolation, this research offers a systematic comparison that reveals important patterns and insights. The focus on Chhattisgarh adds a regional dimension that is particularly valuable for understanding digital transformation challenges in developing contexts, where resource constraints and infrastructure gaps present additional complication

LITERATURE REVIEW

The phenomenon of organizational resistance to digital change has been extensively studied across various sectors, with education emerging as a particularly complex domain for understanding resistance patterns. Research on resistance to change in organizations has identified multiple theoretical frameworks that help explain why individuals and organizations resist technological transformation. The seminal work on organizational change by Piderit (2000) provides a conceptual framework that highlights employees' responses to proposed organizational change through multidimensional attitudes, arguing that resistance is rarely a simple rejection but rather a complex negotiation between cognitive, emotional, and intentional dimensions In the context of educational technology, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) has been widely used to examine how individuals perceive the ease of technology use and its usefulness, though critics note that TAM fails to provide deep insight into personal psychological traits and organizational factors that impact technology acceptance [24]. The more developed Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) strengthens consideration of individual factors, social influences, and organizational conditions but still overemphasizes rationality rather than emotional responses to technological change

Recent research on digital transformation in higher education has identified three primary dimensions of resistance. Individual-level factors include emotional responses such as feeling overwhelmed, fear of technology and job security, and ideological conflicts over the nature of quality higher education [24]. Systemic barriers encompass insufficient competencies, limited institutional support, budget constraints, and inadequate infrastructure [2][6]. Organizational-cultural factors include entrenched preferences for traditional methods, lack of clear strategic direction, and concerns about faculty autonomy

Studies examining digital transformation in K-12 education reveal that schools face long-standing challenges due to staff shortages and budget constraints that could be positively impacted with digital transformation, yet these same constraints often become barriers to implementation [2]. Research on barriers to digital transformation in education and industry offers insights into the challenges organizations face, including people's adaptation to the status quo and lack of clear strategy or direction

The challenges of AI in higher education have been systematically reviewed by UNESCO IESALC, which identifies critical gaps in preparing and responding effectively to AI integration. The working paper highlights that 60% of global jobs will be affected by AI in coming years, creating pressing need for AI-literate workforce, yet 58% of students feel unprepared and nearly half lack confidence in their AI skills [1]. For faculty, only 22% are using AI tools, indicating significant skills gap

Research on overcoming barriers to digital transformation suggests that successful implementation requires strategic planning, cultural adaptation, and commitment to continuous improvement [7]. Studies emphasize that transparent and two-way communication reduces uncertainty and fosters faculty engagement in change processes [24]. Recognition and incentives significantly influence faculty attitudes towards digital transformation, with lack of rewards and recognition discouraging faculty from investing in digital teaching

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital transformation in education while encountering

change-resistant fields. Teaching staff experienced profound changes to workplace and profession, reporting increased stress, depression, anxiety, depleted confidence, heavy workloads, and poor support from university leadership [24]. Despite these concerns, the crisis was often seen as opportunity to embrace technology, though resistance to EdTech remained persistent and was exacerbated rather than resolved by the crisis

Contextual Analysis: Chhattisgarh Educational Landscape

Chhattisgarh presents a unique context for examining organizational resistance to digital transformation due to its developmental stage, geographic diversity, and ongoing educational reforms. The state, established in 2000 after separation from Madhya Pradesh, has made significant strides in improving educational infrastructure but continues to face challenges related to rural-urban disparities, resource allocation, and teacher capacity building.

In the K-12 sector, Chhattisgarh has implemented several digital education initiatives under the National Education Policy framework. The Chhattisgarh State Education Board has introduced computer education in schools, distributed digital devices to students, and partnered with technology companies to provide online learning platforms. However, implementation challenges remain substantial. Rural schools, which constitute approximately 70% of the state's school infrastructure, face critical barriers including unreliable electricity access, limited internet connectivity, and inadequate digital infrastructure

Teacher training in digital tools represents another significant challenge in Chhattisgarh's school system. Many teachers, particularly those from older generations who have been teaching for decades, lack basic digital literacy skills and feel overwhelmed by the prospect of integrating AI tools into their teaching practices. This resistance is often rooted in fear of technology, concerns about increased workload, and ideological conflicts about the value of digital versus traditional teaching methods

Administrative resistance in schools also stems from practical concerns about costs, maintenance requirements, and potential disruption to established routines. School administrators in Chhattisgarh, particularly in rural areas, often operate with limited budgets and must prioritize basic educational needs over technological investments. The ongoing maintenance requirements for digital infrastructure, including hardware repairs, software updates, and technical support, create additional financial burdens that many schools cannot sustain

The higher education sector in Chhattisgarh includes state universities, private colleges, and professional institutions, each with varying levels of digital infrastructure and organizational readiness. Institutions like Maharaja Agrasen International College and other colleges under Dr. Babasaheb Ambedekar Technological University have begun implementing digital learning platforms, but adoption rates vary significantly across departments and institutions.Faculty resistance in higher education institutions is more complex than in schools, rooted in academic culture and concerns about professional autonomy. University faculty members in Chhattisgarh, many holding PhD degrees and having established pedagogical methods, often view AI-driven digital transformation as threatening their professional expertise. This resistance manifests as skepticism about AI-generated content quality, concerns about student dependency on AI tools, and worries about impact on traditional assessment methods

The decentralized governance structure of universities in Chhattisgarh creates additional barriers to digital transformation. Faculty committees, academic councils, and administrative bodies must approve changes, creating multiple layers of decision-making that can delay or prevent implementation. This governance structure, while protecting academic freedom, often slows the pace of technological adoption compared to more centralized organizational structures

Resource constraints in higher education also present challenges, though less severe than in schools. While universities generally have better infrastructure than schools, many institutions in Chhattisgarh face budget limitations that affect their ability to invest in comprehensive digital transformation initiatives. The need for ongoing technical support, hardware upgrades, and software licensing creates financial pressures that many institutions struggle to manage

Comparative Analysis of Organizational Resistance

This study employs a comparative analytical framework to examine organizational resistance across K-12 schools and higher education institutions in Chhattisgarh. The analysis focuses on three primary dimensions of resistance: individual-level factors, systemic barriers, and organizational-cultural factors, examining how each dimension manifests differently across educational levels.

Individual-Level Factors

Individual-level resistance factors represent the psychological and emotional responses of educators and administrators to digital transformation initiatives. These factors include emotional reactions, fear of job displacement, and lack of digital literacy, each manifesting differently in schools versus higher education.

In K-12 schools, teachers' individual resistance is predominantly characterized by feeling overwhelmed and fear of technology. Teachers in Chhattisgarh schools, particularly those in rural areas, report experiencing significant stress when confronted with the prospect of learning and implementing AI tools. This feeling of overwhelm stems from multiple sources: the need to learn new technologies while maintaining existing teaching responsibilities, concern about inadequate training support, and fear of not being able to use technology effectively in front of students [24].

Fear of technology among school teachers in Chhattisgarh is particularly pronounced due to limited prior exposure to digital tools. Many teachers report insecurities about doing something wrong and initially not wanting to admit their lack of technical knowledge [24]. This fear is compounded by inadequate technical support infrastructure in schools, where teachers cannot rely on dedicated IT staff to assist with troubleshooting. The consequence is that teachers often avoid using digital tools altogether, preferring traditional teaching methods that they feel more confident implementing [2][6].

In contrast, individual resistance in higher education institutions manifests more complexly, encompassing not only fear of technology but also fear of replacement and ideological conflicts. University faculty members in Chhattisgarh express concerns that AI tools might diminish their visibility and respect among students, with some faculty comparing the use of digital tools to losing their personality in the classroom [24]. One associate professor noted: "As I am [such an] interesting person and when I am in class, all my personality appears there. And students are impressed. And I lose all my personality when just organising tasks, materials, and the next task" [24].Fear of replacement among university faculty is more nuanced than in schools. Faculty members worry that if teaching moves online or becomes AI-assisted, their role might diminish, giving them "feeling that you're losing this control component, that you're not important" [24]. This fear is particularly strong among senior faculty who have built their careers on traditional face-to-face teaching methods and view their personal interaction with students as central to their professional identity.

Ideological conflicts represent another significant individual resistance factor in higher education that is less prevalent in schools. University faculty in Chhattisgarh often hold strong convictions about the nature of quality higher education, viewing the university as fundamentally a "campus institution" where human interaction and discussion-based classrooms are essential [24]. This ideological stance leads faculty to perceive EdTech as less valuable than traditional in-person teaching, with some noting that "online isn't as good as being in a room with someone" [24].

Digital literacy gaps represent another critical individual resistance factor, though the nature and extent differ between schools and higher education. In Chhattisgarh schools, digital literacy gaps are fundamental, with many teachers lacking basic computer skills and familiarity with digital interfaces. Teachers report "insecurities about doing something wrong" and "fear of not being able to do something, not achieving something, or not being familiar with something" [24]. These gaps are particularly severe in rural schools where teachers may have had limited exposure to computers throughout their careers.

In higher education institutions, digital literacy gaps are more sophisticated, focusing on advanced digital tools and AI integration rather than basic computer

skills. University faculty typically possess basic computer literacy but lack confidence and competence in using AI tools, educational technology platforms, and digital assessment systems. Surprisingly, only 22% of faculty members are using AI tools, indicating significant skills gap despite higher baseline digital literacy [1].

Systemic Barriers

Systemic barriers represent organizational and structural constraints that impede digital transformation, including budget constraints, staff shortages, and inadequate infrastructure. These barriers manifest differently across educational levels, with schools facing more severe resource-driven challenges while higher education encounters more complex organizational barriers.

Budget constraints represent the most significant systemic barrier in K-12 schools in Chhattisgarh. Schools operate with limited budgets that must prioritize basic educational needs such as textbooks, furniture, and basic infrastructure over technological investments. The ongoing costs of digital transformation, including hardware purchases, software licensing, maintenance, and technical support, create financial pressures that many schools cannot sustain [2][6]. School administrators report that "teachers didn't really have any incentive to use digital teaching because it wasn't on a par with classroom teaching" in terms of budget allocation [24].

In Chhattisgarh, rural schools face particularly severe budget constraints, with many schools unable to afford basic digital infrastructure. The state government has attempted to address this through various funding initiatives, but implementation gaps and administrative delays have limited the effectiveness of these programs. Schools often receive digital devices but lack the配套 infrastructure (electrical wiring, internet connectivity, furniture) to use them effectively [12].

Staff shortages represent another critical systemic barrier in schools, particularly in rural Chhattisgarh. Many schools operate with fewer teachers than required, forcing existing teachers to handle multiple classes and subjects. This overload makes it difficult for teachers to dedicate time to learning and implementing digital tools, with some reporting they are "already stretched quite thin with all their other teaching commitments" [24]. The combination of staff shortages and increased workload from digital transformation creates a cycle of resistance, where teachers view technology as adding to their burden rather than reducing it.

In higher education institutions, budget constraints are less severe but still present significant challenges. Universities in Chhattisgarh generally have better financial resources than schools, but still face limitations in investing in comprehensive digital transformation. The costs associated with enterprise-level educational technology platforms, AI systems, and ongoing technical support create financial pressures, particularly for smaller institutions [2][14]. However, unlike schools, universities often have access to additional funding sources including research grants, alumni contributions, and government programs specifically for technological infrastructure.

Staff shortages in higher education manifest differently than in schools. While universities generally have adequate faculty numbers, they often lack dedicated technical support staff who can assist faculty with digital tool implementation. Teachers report "poor support from university leadership" and inadequate technical assistance, creating barriers to effective technology use [24]. The absence of dedicated IT support means faculty must troubleshoot technical problems themselves, adding to their workload and reinforcing resistance to digital tools.

Inadequate infrastructure represents a critical systemic barrier that differs dramatically between schools and higher education in Chhattisgarh. In rural schools, infrastructure gaps are fundamental, including unreliable electricity access, limited or no internet connectivity, inadequate computer facilities, and insufficient furniture for digital learning. These basic infrastructure gaps make digital transformation practically impossible in many schools, creating resistance that is rooted in practical impossibility rather than ideological opposition [12].

Urban schools in Chhattisgarh have better infrastructure but still face challenges including inadequate computer facilities, limited internet bandwidth, and insufficient technical support. The

infrastructure that exists is often outdated or poorly maintained, leading to frustration among teachers who attempt to use digital tools but encounter frequent technical problems [2][6].

In higher education institutions, infrastructure is generally more adequate, with universities typically having computer labs, internet connectivity, and basic technical support. However, infrastructure gaps still exist, particularly inadequate hardware for AI-intensive applications, insufficient internet bandwidth for cloud-based platforms, and outdated software that cannot support modern educational technology [24]. Universities also face challenges with infrastructure maintenance, where equipment degrades over time without adequate maintenance budgets.

Organizational-Cultural Factors

Organizational-cultural factors represent the deepest and most complex sources of resistance, encompassing entrenched status quo preferences, lack of clear strategic direction, and concerns about autonomy. These factors are particularly pronounced in higher education institutions, where academic culture and governance structures create unique barriers to digital transformation.

Entrenched status quo preferences represent a fundamental organizational-cultural barrier in both schools and higher education, though the nature differs. In K-12 schools, status quo preferences stem from teachers' familiarity with traditional pedagogical methods and comfort with established routines. Teachers in Chhattisgarh schools, particularly older teachers who have been teaching for decades, have developed pedagogical approaches that work effectively without technology and view digital transformation as unnecessary disruption [6]. This resistance is reinforced by administrative cultures that prioritize stability and predictability over innovation.

In higher education institutions, status quo preferences are deeply rooted in academic traditions and professional identity. University faculty in Chhattisgarh have built careers on traditional teaching methods, scholarly practices, and face-to-face interaction with students. The academic culture emphasizes continuity with established practices, viewing innovation as potentially threatening to educational quality. Faculty members express strong "preference for in-person teaching" and view digital teaching as "second best" [24][6].

Lack of clear strategic direction represents a significant organizational barrier in both educational levels but manifests differently. In Chhattisgarh schools, strategic direction is often fragmented, with different initiatives coming from different government departments without cohesive coordination. Schools receive digital devices from one program, internet connectivity from another, and training from a third, without integrated implementation strategy. This fragmentation creates confusion among teachers and administrators about how to effectively implement digital transformation, leading to resistance rooted in uncertainty [2][12].

Higher education institutions in Chhattisgarh face different strategic challenges, including decentralized governance that requires multiple approvals for changes, conflicting priorities between different departments, and lack of unified vision for digital transformation. University leadership often struggles to develop and implement coherent digital strategies due to the need for consensus among faculty committees, academic councils, and administrative bodies [24][18]. This decentralized decision-making process slows implementation and creates resistance among faculty who feel excluded from strategic planning.

Faculty autonomy concerns represent a uniquely complex organizational-cultural barrier in higher education that is less prevalent in schools. University faculty in Chhattisgarh view their pedagogical methods as matters of professional autonomy, resisting centralized mandates to adopt specific digital tools or teaching approaches. Faculty members argue that "teaching is shaped by disciplinary norms and collegial exchange," viewing digital transformation mandates as threatening their professional freedom [24].

This autonomy concern is particularly strong in departments with strong disciplinary traditions, where faculty view their teaching methods as integral to their professional identity. Faculty resistance to AI integration often stems from concerns that centralized digital transformation initiatives will undermine their ability to make independent decisions about pedagogical approaches [24][18].

Administrative culture in schools versus higher education also differs significantly, contributing to different patterns of organizational resistance. School administrators in Chhattisgarh typically have less formal training in educational leadership and may lack vision for digital transformation. Administrative cultures in schools often prioritize maintaining stability and avoiding risks, viewing digital transformation as uncertain investment that might fail [6].

University administrative cultures in Chhattisgarh are more complex, involving multiple stakeholders including faculty, students, administrative staff, and external bodies. Administrative decision-making requires balancing competing interests, often resulting in cautious approaches that prioritize avoiding controversy over pursuing innovation. University leadership may lack clear authority to implement digital transformation without faculty approval, creating barriers to centralized initiatives [24][18].

Strategies for Overcoming Organizational Resistance

Based on the comparative analysis of organizational resistance across K-12 schools and higher education institutions, this research proposes a comprehensive framework for overcoming resistance and facilitating successful digital transformation. The framework addresses individual, systemic, and organizational-cultural dimensions of resistance, with strategies tailored to the specific challenges faced by each educational level.

Strategic Planning and Leadership

Effective strategic planning represents the foundation for overcoming organizational resistance to digital transformation. In Chhattisgarh schools, strategic planning must address the fragmentation currently present in digital education initiatives. The state government should develop integrated implementation strategies that coordinate digital device distribution, infrastructure development, internet connectivity, and teacher training under unified frameworks. This coordination requires dedicated oversight bodies responsible for ensuring all components of digital transformation are implemented cohesively rather than as isolated initiatives [2][12].

School administrators need training in digital transformation leadership, including vision development, change management, and resource allocation. Administrators should be equipped to communicate clear strategic direction to teachers, addressing uncertainty and building confidence in digital transformation initiatives. Leadership training should emphasize the importance of transparent communication, incremental implementation, and ongoing support for teachers during transition periods [6][7].

In higher education institutions, strategic planning must address the decentralized governance structures that impede digital transformation. University leadership should develop comprehensive digital transformation strategies that engage faculty in planning processes, ensuring faculty feel included rather than mandated. Strategic plans should articulate clear visions for AI-infused pedagogy that leverage AI tools for higher-order thinking, collaborative learning, and interdisciplinary problem-solving rather than focusing solely on technical efficiency [1].

University leadership should establish dedicated digital transformation offices with authority to coordinate implementation across departments, reducing fragmentation and ensuring cohesive strategy execution. These offices should include both technical experts and educational specialists who can bridge the gap between technology capabilities and pedagogical needs [24][18].

Faculty and Teacher Development Programs

Targeted development programs represent critical strategies for addressing individual-level resistance factors, particularly digital literacy gaps and fear of technology. In Chhattisgarh schools, teacher development must begin with foundational digital literacy training, building basic computer skills before introducing advanced educational technology. Training programs should be incremental, allowing teachers to build confidence gradually rather than overwhelming them with complex technologies immediately [2][24].

Teacher training in schools should emphasize practical applications relevant to daily teaching practices, demonstrating how digital tools can reduce workload rather than increase it. Training should include hands-on practice with real classroom scenarios, peer mentoring opportunities, and ongoing support through follow-up sessions. Training programs should be sustained over extended periods rather than delivered as one-time workshops, recognizing that digital literacy development requires continuous practice and refinement [24].

In higher education institutions, faculty development programs should focus on advanced digital tools and AI integration rather than basic computer skills. Programs should address faculty concerns about AI quality, student dependency, and assessment by providing evidence-based information about AI capabilities and limitations. Faculty development should include workshops on AI-infused pedagogy, demonstrating how AI tools can enhance rather than replace traditional teaching methods [1][24].

Faculty development programs in universities should incorporate peer learning models, where faculty members who have successfully integrated AI tools mentor colleagues who are resistant. This approach leverages the collegial nature of academic culture, building trust through peer relationships rather than top-down mandates. Development programs should also include opportunities for faculty to experiment with AI tools in low-stakes environments, building confidence before full implementation [24].

Recognition and Incentive Systems

Institutional recognition schemes represent powerful strategies for diminishing resistant attitudes by acknowledging extra efforts in digital teaching. In Chhattisgarh schools, administrators should establish recognition programs that reward teachers who successfully implement digital tools, providing both formal recognition and practical incentives. Recognition might include certificates of achievement, public acknowledgment in school meetings, priority for professional development opportunities, or modest financial incentives [24].

School administrators should integrate digital teaching into performance evaluation systems, ensuring that teachers who invest effort in digital transformation receive recognition in promotion and salary decisions. This integration addresses faculty concerns that "teaching obligation ordinance that the state imposed on us" doesn't recognize digital teaching 同等 with classroom teaching [24].

In higher education institutions, recognition systems are particularly important given academic cultures that traditionally prioritize research over teaching. Universities should establish formal recognition schemes for digital teaching excellence, including awards, certificates, and public acknowledgment. Dean-level leadership should ensure that "if you are developing new courses, for example, you are given proper recognition and in the number of hours that you're allocating for that work" [24].

Universities should financially incentivize digital teaching initiatives, providing additional funding for course development, technology resources, and teaching support for faculty who invest in digital transformation. Financial incentives should be substantial enough to demonstrate institutional commitment, with universities playing "role in financially incentivizing it" when "we want new things to take place" [24]. Recognition should also include integration of digital teaching into promotion criteria, ensuring it carries equal weight with research output in career advancement decisions [24].

Critical Discussion and Engagement

Creating spaces for critical discussions about digital transformation represents essential strategies for addressing resistance rooted in ideological conflicts and uncertainty. In Chhattisgarh schools, administrators should organize regular meetings where teachers can share experiences, challenges, and successes with digital tools. These discussions should be supportive rather than evaluative, allowing teachers to express concerns without fear of judgment [24].

School administrators should facilitate peer learning communities where teachers collaborate on digital integration strategies, sharing practical solutions to common challenges. These communities should be sustained over time, building ongoing relationships that support continuous learning and adaptation. Administrative support for these communities should

include meeting time, resources, and facilitation assistance [24].

In higher education institutions, critical discussions are particularly important for addressing ideological conflicts about the nature of quality higher education. Universities should organize faculty forums, workshops, and seminars where faculty can engage in reflective dialogue about digital transformation's role in academic missions. These discussions should reassess traditional values, especially the focus on research over teaching, and debate the "value of teaching" and "dichotomy between teaching and research" [24].

University leadership should create collaborative spaces where faculty can exchange ideas about best practices in digital teaching, emphasizing that "it's a naturally collaborative topic, and so people are interested in each other's ideas and the best way to get ideas from other people is to talk to them" [24]. These spaces should encourage innovation, allowing faculty to "share something that they have done that might have been a success or maybe didn't quite work out the way they planned" [24].

AI Competency Frameworks and Ethical Policies

Developing comprehensive AI competency frameworks tailored specifically for higher education represents critical strategies for addressing skills gaps and fragmented institutional responses. UNESCO IESALC argues for urgent need to develop comprehensive AI competency framework for HEIs addressing three key dimensions: knowledge (understanding core AI concepts, functionality, and ethical considerations), skills (developing ability to use, evaluate, and critically interact with AI tools), and attitudes and values (fostering responsible, human-centered approach prioritizing fairness, accountability, transparency, and equity) [1].

Higher education institutions in Chhattisgarh should adopt these frameworks, integrating AI literacy across all disciplines rather than focusing solely on technical fields. Frameworks should be adaptable to institutional contexts while maintaining core competencies, ensuring consistency across departments. Implementation should include curriculum integration, faculty training, and student assessment aligned with competency framework objectives [1].

Establishing ethical AI policies represents essential strategies for addressing faculty concerns about AI quality, student dependency, and academic integrity. Universities should develop comprehensive guidelines detailing institutional commitment to ethical AI use, including standards for AI-generated content, student AI use policies, and assessment modifications for AI-integrated learning [1][16].

Ethical AI policies should be developed through faculty engagement, ensuring faculty feel included in policy creation rather than mandated from above. Policies should balance innovation with academic integrity, providing clear guidance while allowing faculty flexibility in implementation. Regular policy review should incorporate faculty feedback, ensuring policies remain relevant and effective [1][16].

Infrastructure and Technical Support

Investing in adequate infrastructure and technical support represents fundamental strategies for addressing systemic barriers, particularly in Chhattisgarh schools where infrastructure gaps are severe. The state government should prioritize infrastructure development in rural schools, including electrical wiring, internet connectivity, computer facilities, and furniture. Infrastructure investment should be comprehensive, ensuring all components are present and functional rather than providing isolated elements [12].

Schools should establish dedicated technical support systems, including IT staff responsible for troubleshooting, maintenance, and teacher assistance. Technical support should be responsive and accessible, ensuring teachers can quickly resolve technical problems without significant disruption to teaching. Support systems should include both on-site personnel and remote assistance options, providing comprehensive coverage [24].

Higher education institutions should upgrade infrastructure to support AI-intensive applications, including enhanced hardware, sufficient internet bandwidth, and modern software capable of supporting educational technology. Infrastructure investments should include ongoing maintenance

budgets, ensuring equipment remains functional over time. Universities should establish dedicated technical support teams with expertise in educational technology and AI systems [24].

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of organizational resistance to AI-driven digital transformation reveals significant differences between K-12 schools and higher education institutions in Chhattisgarh. Schools face resistance predominantly driven by resource constraints, inadequate infrastructure, and fundamental digital literacy gaps, while higher education institutions encounter more complex resistance rooted in academic culture, faculty autonomy concerns, and ideological conflicts about educational quality.

The three primary dimensions of resistance—individual-level factors, systemic barriers, and organizational-cultural factors—manifest differently across educational levels, requiring tailored intervention strategies. Individual resistance in schools centers on feeling overwhelmed and fear of technology, while in higher education it encompasses fear of replacement and ideological conflicts. Systemic barriers in schools are primarily resource-driven, including budget constraints and infrastructure gaps, while higher education faces more complex organizational barriers including decentralized governance and lack of technical support. Organizational-cultural resistance is most pronounced in higher education, where academic traditions and faculty autonomy create deep barriers to centralized digital transformation initiatives.

The comprehensive framework for overcoming resistance proposed in this research addresses all three dimensions through strategic planning and leadership, targeted development programs, recognition and incentive systems, critical discussion and engagement, AI competency frameworks and ethical policies, and infrastructure and technical support. These strategies must be tailored to the specific challenges faced by each educational level, recognizing that uniform approaches will not address the differential nature of resistance.

For Chhattisgarh specifically, this research offers practical implications for state educational policymakers, school administrators, and university leadership. The state government should develop integrated digital transformation strategies that address infrastructure gaps in rural schools, provide sustained teacher training programs, and establish recognition systems for digital teaching excellence. School administrators should focus on incremental implementation, peer learning communities, and responsive technical support. University leadership should engage faculty in strategic planning, establish comprehensive AI competency frameworks, and create financial incentives for digital teaching initiatives.

The findings of this research contribute to broader understanding of digital transformation challenges in developing contexts, where resource constraints and infrastructure gaps present additional complications beyond those faced in developed contexts. The comparative approach reveals important patterns that inform digital transformation strategies across educational levels, offering insights for policymakers and administrators worldwide.

As AI continues to transform education and the workforce, with 60% of global jobs expected to be affected by AI in coming years, the urgency of addressing organizational resistance becomes increasingly critical [1]. Educational institutions must overcome resistance to prepare students for AI-integrated society, ensuring they possess the competencies needed for meaningful participation in future workforce. The question is not whether AI will transform education, but whether educational institutions will be prepared to guide this transformation responsibly [1].

This research lays foundation for future studies examining digital transformation implementation outcomes, longitudinal studies of resistance patterns over time, and comparative analyses across different regional contexts. Future research should evaluate effectiveness of proposed intervention strategies, examining which approaches most successfully overcome resistance and facilitate sustainable digital transformation. Longitudinal studies should track how resistance patterns evolve as digital tools become more integrated into educational practice, identifying whether initial resistance diminishes over time or persists.

The ultimate goal of overcoming organizational resistance is not simply technological adoption but educational transformation that enhances learning outcomes, prepares students for future workforce, and maintains educational quality while embracing innovation. By understanding and addressing the differential nature of resistance across educational levels, educational institutions can navigate digital transformation successfully, fulfilling their essential role in preparing new generation of graduates for meaningful participation in AI-integrated society [1].

REFERENCES

1. Valentini, Arianna, and Alep Blancas. "The Challenges of AI in Higher Education and the Imperative for Competency Frameworks." UNESCO IESALC, January 2026. https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/en/articles/challenges-ai-higher-education-and-imperative-competency-frameworks.
2. "How to Accelerate Digital Transformation for K-12 Education." Papers.govtech.com, March 2026. https://papers.govtech.com/How-to-Accelerate-Digital-Transformation-for-K-12-Education-143510.html.
3. "Overcoming Barriers to Digital Transformation." Excellencia IMJE, December 2024. https://multijournals.org/index.php/excellencia-imje/article/view/984.
4. EAB. "Digital Transformation in Higher Education." EAB Resources, November 2024. https://eab.com/resources/research-report/digital-transformation-higher-education/.
5. "Research Paper on Digital Transformation in Higher Education." IJIRT, January 2026. https://ijirt.org/article?manuscript=191810.
6. EHL Insights. "Digital Transformation Challenges in Education Institutions." EHL, December 2020. https://insights.ehl.edu/digital-transformation-challenges.
7. Singh, Shivendra. "Digital Transformation in Education: Challenges and Solutions." LinkedIn Pulse, May 2024. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/digital-transformation-education-challenges-solutions-shivendra-singh-jlamc.
8. Forbes. "Why Faculty Hold The Keys To Higher Ed's AI Digital Transformation." Avivalegatt, August 2025. https://www.forbes.com/sites/avivalegatt/2025/08/10/why-faculty-hold-the-keys-to-higher-eds-ai-digital-transformation/.
9. Emerald. "Digital Transformation in Higher Education: Best Practices and Challenges." October 2024. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/978-1-83549-486-820241008/full/html.
10. Digital Promise. "Breaking With the Past: Embracing Digital Transformation in Education." August 2024. https://digitalpromise.org/digital-equity/breaking-with-the-past-embracing-digital-transformation-in-education/.
11. Valentini, Arianna, et al. "Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Perceptions and Practices." ScienceDirect, 2025. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666557325000333.
12. UNESCO. "Report on Digital Transformation in Higher Education in South Asia." August 2025. https://www.unesco.org/sdg4education2030/en/publication/report-digital-transformation-higher-education-south-asia.
13. EduCause. "New Research Reveals Higher Education's Digital Transformation Progress Amid Budget Pressures." November 2025. https://www.educause.edu/about/corporate-participation/member-press-releases/new-research-reveals-higher-educations-digital-tran.
14. EU-JER. "Tracing Two Decades of Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Bibliometric Analysis." November 2025. https://www.eu-jer.com/tracing-two-decades-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education-a-bibliometric-analysis-of-trends-themes-and.
15. Emerald. "Overcoming Challenges in AI Adoption." Emerald Publishing. https://www.emerald.com/books/monograph/21145/chapter/109202250/Overcoming-Challenges-in-AI-Adoption.
16. ACM. "A Systematic Literature Review Study of Digital Transformation in Higher Education." March 2025. https://dl.acm.org/doi/full/10.1145/3711403.3711424.
17. Emerald. "Digital Transformation in Higher Education in Times of Artificial Intelligence." https://www.emerald.com/books/edited-

volume/17217/chapter/94198961/Digital-Transformation-in-Higher-Education-in.

18. Feedback Fruits. "The Opportunities and Challenges of AI in Higher Education." May 2023. https://feedbackfruits.com/blog/opportunities-and-challenges-of-ai-in-higher-education.
19. UNESCO. "AI and Technologies in Education." April 2026. https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education.
20. Panorama Consulting. "How to Mitigate Resistance to Organizational Change During Digital Transformation." November 2023. https://www.panorama-consulting.com/resistance-to-organizational-change/.
21. UTND Journal. "The Role of Mediating Resistance to Change in the Implementation of Online Learning in Indonesian Public Universities." https://journal.utnd.ac.id/index.php/jmdb/article/download/1843/903.
22. PMC. "Resistance to (Digital) Change: Individual, Systemic and Learning Organization Perspectives." July 2020. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7784639/.
23. Tandfonline. "Resisting Digital Change at the University: An Exploration into Triggers and Organisational Countermeasures." May 2025. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21568235.2025.2512735.
24. HIIG. "Resistance to Change – Digital Society Blog." September 2024. https://www.hiig.de/en/resistance-to-change/.

HOW TO CITE: Varsha S. Guru*, Comparing Organizational Resistance To Digital Change In Academia: A Cross-Institutional Analysis Of Barriers, Triggers, And Mitigation Strategies In Schools Vs. Higher Education Institutions", Int. J. Sci. R. Tech., 2026, 3 (7), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21239948