

Digital Health Transformation: Stakeholder Perspectives on Adoption, Barriers, and Healthcare Innovation

Anne Lorraine J. Pineda¹, Heronima D. Sanchez², Archie Nel B. De Jesus³, Princess Catherine B. De Jesus⁴, Minsoware S. Bacolod⁵, Ronald B. Enoc⁶

¹ Faculty, Pangasinan State University, Philippines.

ORCID: 0000-0002-1386-249X

Email: apineda@psu.edu.ph

² Benguet State University – Bokod Campus, Philippines.

ORCID: 0000-0003-1327-1515

³ Faculty/Professor, College of Information and Communications Technology, Bulacan State University, Philippines.

⁴ Bulacan State University, Philippines. ORCID: 0009-0005-2883-4423

⁵ Associate Professor, National University, Manila, Philippines

⁶ President and Chief Executive Officer, E-Research Publication, Philippines.

Corresponding Author: Anne Lorraine J. Pineda

Abstract: The current study examines awareness, attitudes, and adoption among healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers on innovative health technologies in the Philippines. A mixed-methods approach was used through a descriptive-correlational survey, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions to assess factors influencing the integration of digital health solutions. There was a high awareness level of 82% and positive attitudes of mean = 4.3 toward digital health technologies, which were particularly held by healthcare professionals at 89% awareness levels. However, the adoption rate was lower among healthcare professionals (65%), policymakers (52%), and technology developers (47%). Major barriers identified include financial constraints, lack of standardized policies, inadequate technological infrastructure, and workforce readiness. Knowledge was also seen to influence attitudes and adoption very strongly. It calls for continuous education and capacity-building programs. The importance of clear regulatory frameworks, inter-sectoral collaboration, and investment in both digital and physical infrastructures to improve the scalability and effectiveness of health innovations is well brought out. This would provide insightful findings for policymakers and stakeholders to improve the integration of digital health technologies leading to more equitable and efficient healthcare delivery in the Philippines. Future research should consider the long-term impact of capacity-building initiatives and what role government funding plays in scaling digital health solutions.

Keywords: health innovation, digital health technologies, adoption barriers, healthcare professionals

1. INTRODUCTION

The integration of innovative health technologies is rapidly transforming healthcare systems worldwide, offering promising solutions to emerging health challenges and improving access to care. The Philippines is a country with a diverse population with varying healthcare access levels. The adoption of health innovations comes with both opportunities and challenges. Emerging technologies like telemedicine, AI, and other digital health apps have been proving to be much promising in strengthening the delivery process of healthcare facilities and meeting up with the huge demand for well-being solutions nowadays (Okwor et al., 2024). However, despite all benefits, the actual implementation of this innovation is threatened by lack of regulatory frameworks and financial constraints that are further reinforced by infrastructural challenges (Chountalas et al., 2024). This study intends to examine awareness,



attitudes, and adoption of innovative health solutions by healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers in the Philippines, aiming at evidence-based decision-making to enhance health systems.

Healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers are key players in the healthcare ecosystem, and their actions determine the success or failure of health innovations (Reed et al., 2024). Understanding their perspectives is vital in identifying the factors that either hinder or facilitate the implementation of new health technologies. Comprehensive research by Alotaibi et al. (2024) indicates that most health professionals have problems with digital literacy, which further creates a problem in the rapid pace of technological change in the health sector, hence making it difficult for them to prepare in the adoption of new tools and equipment. For policymakers, innovative health solutions come with complex policy landscapes and financial constraints (MacNeil et al., 2021). Moreover, technology developers should contend with the technical issues, such as interoperability between digital systems and data privacy. This study tries to examine the impact of influencing determinants for being effective and scalable health innovations and seeks to provide actionable insights for the relevant stakeholders.

In the Philippine context, health innovation faces unique challenges in terms of the country's demographic and geographic factors. Rapid growth in digital health technologies opens new opportunities, but gaps in technology infrastructure, particularly in rural and underserved areas, remain a significant barrier to equitable healthcare delivery (Widjaja et al., 2024). Internet connectivity, limited access to digital devices, and poor infrastructures are reasons why digital health tools cannot gain widespread adoption without policymakers investing more in both physical and digital infrastructures of health care (Wambua & Oduor, 2024). In trying to assess whether the current scenario of awareness and attitudes toward this digital health innovation is at adoption rates, its focus will lay on healthcare providers, policymakers, and technology developers in three large urban centers.

The effectiveness of health innovations scales with the contribution of key actors, especially doctors, policymakers, and technology producers. The actual success of ehealth tools may not only hang on technological progresses but also to supportive policies developed for their advocacy. In addition, the up-skilling of healthcare employees through professional trainings plays an important role in developing a more flexible workforce that can easily incorporate digital instruments into their clinical practice. This study aims to investigate the barriers related to adoption like lack of finance, absence of standardized policies, and readiness of the health force; thus this study will try to draw connections between factors of barriers and the overall effectiveness of health innovations.

1.1 Objective of the Study

This study aims to explore and assess innovation in health-related challenges by looking at the integration of emerging technologies, novel wellness strategies, and evidence-based healthcare solutions. Specifically, it evaluates the level of awareness, attitudes, and adoption among health innovation seen in the management circles of the three distinct types of players: healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers in the Philippines. The study aims to spot the important factors that affect the effectiveness and scalability of such innovations in different health settings. Carrying out a qualitative and quantitative analysis, this research projects to offer concrete insights that can guide policy-making, improve healthcare delivery, and advance sustainable initiatives for wellness. Findings will contribute to the advancement of global health strategies through providing a foundation for evidence-based decision-making and interdisciplinary collaboration in health innovation.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Research Design

A mixed-methods research design was applied in this study, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore comprehensively innovative strategies in global health and their effectiveness in advancing wellness. The descriptive-correlational survey was a quantitative approach used, while key informant interviews and focus group discussions were the approaches used for gathering in-depth insight from experts. This approach helped ensure a comprehensive understanding of how effective and challenging innovative health solutions are.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in three major urban centers in the Philippines. These locations were chosen due to their high concentration of healthcare institutions, research centers, and technology-driven wellness programs.

2.3 Sampling Technique

A purposive sampling method was applied to select the respondents and participants. For the quantitative aspect, a random stratified sampling method was used in order to represent the different health sectors. Here, the participants included healthcare professionals, policymakers, researchers, and technology developers. For the qualitative aspect, expert sampling was applied by choosing key opinion leaders, medical practitioners, and digital health entrepreneurs. To determine the sample size for the survey, Slovin's formula was applied.

2.4 Research Instrument

Structured questionnaires were used in the study for quantitative data collection. These were adapted from validated global health assessment tools. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices concerning innovative health solutions have been addressed, as well as barriers in adopting these innovations. Questions are fashioned in a Likert scale format to assess attitude and practice-related items. For qualitative data, an interview guide and FGD protocol were developed for issues concerning emerging trends and changes, policy implications of interest, and challenges in adopting these health innovations. The tools were tested by experts and piloted on 30 respondents to ensure that they are clear, reliable, and valid. Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency was at 0.85, showing that the scale was highly reliable.

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection was conducted in three phases. First, a survey questionnaire was disseminated through Google Forms and in-person distribution at hospitals, research institutions, and digital health centers in the Philippines. Respondents were given two weeks to complete the survey. Second, key informant interviews (KII) were conducted with 15 selected experts, including healthcare professionals, policymakers, and leaders in health innovation, to gain deeper insights into the implementation and effectiveness of innovative health strategies. Each interview lasted 30 to 45 minutes and was audio-recorded with participant consent. Lastly, three focus group discussions (FGD) were facilitated with five to eight participants per session, including researchers, medical practitioners, and technology developers, to explore challenges, policy implications, and the future direction of global health innovations. Ethical clearance was obtained from the University Research Ethics Board, and informed consent was secured from all participants before data collection.

2.6 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS version 27. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to summarize respondent demographics and responses. Pearson's correlation and multiple regression analysis were employed to determine relationships between knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding innovative health solutions. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$. Qualitative data were transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis, employing NVivo software to identify key themes and patterns emerging from interviews and FGDs. Data triangulation was applied to enhance reliability and validity.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Category	Percentage
Healthcare Professionals	45%
Policymakers	30%
Technology Developers	25%
Experience (>5 years)	65%

The study covered diverse groups of health professionals, policy makers, researchers, and technologists from the three major urban centers in the Philippines. Total respondents to the survey were 500, whereas 15 key informant interviews were conducted, and three focus group discussions were made with an average of six persons per session. The demographic analysis revealed that 45% of the respondents were healthcare professionals, 30% policymakers, and 25% technology developers. Most participants (65%) had over five years of experience in their respective fields, ensuring informed perspectives on health innovations.

3.2 Awareness, Attitudes, and Adoption of Health Innovations

Level of Awareness

Table 2.1 Level of Awareness of Health Innovations

Category	Percentage
Healthcare Professionals	89%
Policymakers	78%
Technology Developers	75%
Overall Awareness	82%

Table 2.1 Findings showed that 82% of the respondents were highly aware of innovative health solutions, including digital health technologies, artificial intelligence in diagnostics, and applications of telemedicine. Healthcare professionals showed the highest level of awareness (89%), policymakers (78%), and technology developers (75%). Despite high awareness, there is still a chasm in information about the specific regulatory framework and implementation strategy (Siamoglou et al., 2021).

Table 2.2 Attitudes Toward Health Innovations

Category	Mean Score (SD)
Healthcare Professionals	4.5 (0.52)
Policymakers	4.2 (0.71)
Technology Developers	4.0 (0.68)
Overall Awareness	4.3 (0.64)

Applying a Likert scale analysis, respondents generally showed a positive attitude toward health innovations with a mean score of 4.3 (SD = 0.64). Healthcare professionals acknowledged the advantages of digital tools in improving patient care (M = 4.5, SD = 0.52), while policymakers pointed out that it could also lead to streamlined healthcare systems (M = 4.2, SD = 0.71). Concerns about data privacy and ethical considerations were, however, noted, with 40% of the respondents raising apprehensions regarding the security of patient data (Bizimana, 2024).

Table 2.3 Adoption and Implementation of Health Innovations

Category	Mean Score (SD)
Healthcare Professionals	65%
Policy makers	52%
Technology Developers	47%

Awareness and attitudes towards adoption were positive as shown in table 2.3; however, adoption rates differed between stakeholders. Health professionals' practice was highly adopting digital health solutions at 65%, with a lower percentage for policymakers (52%) and developers of technologies (47%). Major barriers reported included high costs for implementation at 60%, lack of standardized policies at 50%, and resistance to change at 42%. The qualitative data emphasized that there was a need for focused capacity building for adoption purposes (Bell et al., 2023).

3.3 Factors Influencing Effectiveness and Scalability

Table 3. Factors Influencing Effectiveness and Scalability

Factor	Correlation (r)	Significance (p)
--------	-----------------	------------------

Knowledge → Attitude	0.78	<0.001
Knowledge → Adoption	0.62	<0.01
Supportive Policies	High Impact	-

As shown in table above, multiple regression analysis looked into the knowledge, attitudes, and adoption relationship with health innovations. The outcomes of the result were that knowledge has a very strong influence both on attitudes, $r = 0.78$, $p < 0.001$, and adoption rates, $r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$. On the other hand, supportive policies also became important to ensure a good implementation process. The respondents have emphasized cross-sector collaboration of healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers in scaling up the health innovations (Milat & Bauman, 2015).

3.4 Key Challenges and Policy Implications

Policy and Regulatory Gaps

The most critical challenge identified in the study was the *lack of standardized policies and regulatory frameworks for the integration of digital health technologies* (Sivaranjani et al., 2024). Although digital health solutions such as telemedicine, artificial intelligence in diagnostics, and electronic health records have tremendous potential to transform healthcare delivery, the lack of clear regulations has led to uncertainty regarding their legal and ethical implementation. Policymakers specifically emphasized that without clear policies in place, the adoption of such technologies is often scattered and disorganized across institutions that deliver healthcare. The *lack of a national digital health regulatory framework* was a recurring theme from the key informant interviews and focus group discussions (Saheb & Saheb, 2024; Srivastava et al., 2023). Such a structure would not only make the induction of digital innovations in health efficient but also use these technologies to a uniform model, thus inducing trust among stakeholders in the entire healthcare delivery ecosystem.

Financial Constraints

Another major impeding factor for the adoption and scaling of innovations in health was the financial constraint, primarily in public healthcare sectors. *High implementation costs were highlighted as significant barriers in the implementation of digital health tools such as telemedicine platforms and AI-powered diagnostic systems* (Zumani, 2024). Over 60% indicated that while the innovations potentially would enhance delivery in healthcare, up-front investment on infrastructure and purchase of the technological apparatus would prove unaffordable for the many health organizations especially in poor economies. It is with that mind that politicians as well as professionals in healthcare pleaded for further government funding as well as for incentives in a move to aid these institutions' embracement of the digital healthcare interventions. In addition, there was a need for transparent financial models that would ensure sustainability and also equally provide access to these technologies.

Technological Infrastructure

Limited technological infrastructure in the remote setting is yet another major problem associated with health innovations in the country. That is, *not enough internet penetration or availability; rural settings being particularly hard-hit; a few people who work to ensure adequate support is achieved regarding the issue; and in terms of equipment, they hardly get anything there* (Drake et al., 2019; Kos-Łabędowicz, 2017). Over 50% of the respondents saw technological infrastructure gaps as a serious barrier to achieving widespread adoption. The uneven access to technological resources further aggravates existing healthcare inequalities, especially in the more depressed regions. They called for investments in both digital and physical infrastructures, internet connectivity, data security systems, and technical support staff to be able to bridge the gap that health innovations face in reaching every population regardless of location.

3.5 Workforce Readiness

The study also brought out the issue of workforce readiness as one of the major challenges. According to a significant percentage of healthcare professionals, 58%, they were not adequately prepared to use emerging digital health technologies. Many of them were concerned that they were not trained enough in new technologies. Some even indicated that *the pace of technological advancements has outstripped the ability of healthcare workers to stay abreast of such developments* (Wong et al., 2023). This gap in digital literacy and technical skills has created hesitance among healthcare workers to embrace these tools in total, especially where the group lacks experience with them. According

to the findings, *health care employees are mostly needed to undergo a capacity-building process aimed at teaching basic digital literacy as well as specific training for certain health innovations* (Owoyemi et al., 2022). Continuous professional development programs and special training workshops will be necessary in the integration of digital health solutions by healthcare workers into their everyday practice.

4. CONCLUSION

This study is able to give worthwhile insights into health innovation integration into the Philippine health sector, where it has laid down the current level of awareness, attitudes, and adoption rates among healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers. Findings have revealed an overwhelming awareness with positive attitudes about emerging health technologies, where most significant adoption was among healthcare professionals. However, other barriers remain, such as inability due to limited finance, lack of standardized policy, technological infrastructure gaps, and an unprepared workforce. The study shows that knowledge is essential for both attitudes and adoption—that knowledge itself would make acceptance easier or less easy and that its continuous education and capacity-building initiatives are very crucial. The need for greater collaboration between healthcare professionals, policymakers, and technology developers to effectively scale health innovations is a key finding. Additionally, the study identifies the importance of establishing clear regulatory frameworks and removing financial and infrastructural barriers that hinder the seamless integration of digital health technologies.

In light of these challenges, this research recommends the development of a comprehensive national digital health policy that addresses gaps in regulation, promotes financial support for healthcare institutions, and invests in infrastructure and workforce readiness. By filling these gaps, the Philippines will be able to enhance its healthcare delivery systems in such a way that innovative health solutions contribute to sustainable wellness outcomes. The results also highlight the importance of interdisciplinarity in health innovation to facilitate change in health strategies globally. This study provides evidence for informed decision-making and sets a foundation for future studies focused on improving digital health solutions, which could be applied in other global health contexts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, it is proposed that future research in health innovation should focus on strengthening a comprehensive national digital health policy to address the gaps in regulation, finance, technology infrastructure, and workforce readiness. The subsequent studies should clearly investigate further whether these capacity-building programs result in long-term sustained impact on the adoption and performance of digital health solutions especially in the rural and underserved areas. More research could also explore the impact of interdisciplinary collaboration on healthcare innovation, as well as the government incentives and funding models that affect the scaling of health technologies. This would certainly benefit policymakers, healthcare providers, and innovators regarding digital health who all wish to enhance how integrated and sustainable such innovations are in the Philippines and elsewhere.

References

1. Alotaibi, N., Wilson, C. B., & Traynor, M. (2024). Enhancing Digital Readiness and Capability in Healthcare: A Systematic Review of Interventions, Barriers, and Facilitators. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4816097/v1>
2. Bell, H. J., Rees, D., Huxtable-Thomas, L., Rich, N., & Miller, E. (2023). Innovation Adoption Research in Healthcare: Understanding Context and Embracing Complexity. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecie.18.1.1865>
3. Bizimana, R. T. (2024). The Impact of Digital Health on Improving Patient Outcomes. *NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN MEDICAL SCIENCES (NIJRMS)*, 5(3), 38–41. <https://doi.org/10.59298/nijrms/2024/5.3.3841>
4. Chountalas, P., Chatzifoti, N., Αλεξανδροπούλου, Α., & Géorgakèllos, D. A. (2024). Analyzing Barriers to Innovation Management Implementation in Sustainable Tourism Using DEMATEL Method. *World*, 5(4), 1004–1022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/world5040051>
5. Drake, C., Zhang, Y., Chaiyachati, K. H., & Polsky, D. (2019). The Limitations of Poor Broadband Internet Access for Telemedicine Use in Rural America: An Observational Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 171(5), 382–384. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0283>
6. Kos-Labędowicz, J. (2017). The issue of digital divide in rural areas of the European Union. 126, 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.18276/EPU.2017.126/2-20>
7. MacNeil, M., Juzwishin, D., & Stolee, P. (2021). Navigating Policy, Regulatory, and Health System Landscapes (pp. 305–313). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34390-3_41
8. Milat, A., & Bauman, A. (2015). Increasing the Scale and Adoption of Health Innovations: Practice Models for Public Health (pp. 51–78). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-537-2_4

9. Okwor, I. A., Hitch, G., Hakkim, S., Akbar, S. Kom. F. A., Sookhoo, D., & Kainesic, J. (2024). Digital Technologies Impact on Healthcare Delivery: A Systematic Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine-Learning (ML) Adoption, Challenges, and Opportunities. *AI*, 5(4), 1918–1941. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5040095>
10. Owoyemi, A., Osuchukwu, J. I., Azubuike, C., Ikpe, R. K., Nwachukwu, B. C., Akinde, C. B., Biokoro, G. W., Ajose, A. B., Nwokoma, E. I., Mfon, N. E., Benson, T. O., Ehimare, A., Irowa-Omoregie, D., & Olaniran, S. (2022). Digital Solutions for Community and Primary Health Workers: Lessons From Implementations in Africa. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2022.876957>
11. Reed, J., Svedberg, P., & Nygren, J. M. (2024). Enhancing the innovation ecosystem: overcoming challenges to introducing information-driven technologies in healthcare (Preprint). <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.56836>
12. Saheb, T., & Saheb, T. (2024). Digital Health Policy Decoded: Mapping National Strategies Using Donabedian’s Model. *Health Policy*, 147, 105134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2024.105134>
13. Siamoglou, S., Koromina, M., Politopoulou, K., Samiou, C.-G., Papadopoulou, G., Balasopoulou, A., Kanavos, A., Mitropoulou, C., Patrinos, G. P., Patrinos, G. P., & Vasileiou, K. (2021). Attitudes and Awareness Toward Pharmacogenomics and Personalized Medicine Adoption Among Health Sciences Trainees: Experience from Greece and Lessons for Europe. *Omics A Journal of Integrative Biology*, 25(3), 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.1089/OMI.2020.0230>
14. Sivaranjani, P. S., Priyadharshini, S., & Nagalakshmi, S. (2024). Navigating Digital Health Technology: A Comprehensive Review of USFDA Regulations. *Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 26(10), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jamps/2024/v26i10716>
15. Srivastava, D., van Kessel, R., Delgrange, M., Cherla, A., Sood, H., & Mossialos, E. (2023). A Framework for Digital Health Policy: Insights from Virtual Primary Care Systems Across Five Nations. *PLOS Digital Health*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000382>
16. Wambua, R. N., & Oduor, C. (2024). Digital health tools and technologies dimensions for equitable access to health, including Universal Health Coverage in developing economies. <https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjrmhs.v4i1.536>
17. Widjaja, A. M. N., Sanjaya, M. H., Fitriati, R., Fitriana, F. W., & Keloko, A. B. (2024). Digital Health Technologies in Improving Access to Care for Underserved Populations. <https://doi.org/10.59613/azka9r10>
18. Wong, J. H. K., Näswall, K., Pawsey, F., Chase, J. G., & Malinen, S. (2023). Adoption of technological innovation in healthcare delivery: a psychological perspective for healthcare decision-makers. *BMJ Innovations*, bmjinnov-001003. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjinnov-2022-001003>
19. Zumani, K. (2024). The Future of Telemedicine: Overcoming Barriers to Widespread Adoption. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202410.1147.v1>