AD EDUXIAN JOURNAL
A Quarterly Multidisciplinary Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Online International Journal
Google Scholar Indexing *Impact Factor: 5.0*
Vol (3), Issue (4), October-December 2026 *ISSN: 3048-7951*

Artificial Intelligence in Teacher Education: Opportunities, Challenges and Future Perspectives

Dr. Kadarla Laxmi Prasad[1]

DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24614921

Review: 01/10/2026 **Acceptance: 08/10/2026** **Publication: 28/11/2026**

Abstract:

Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI, is reshaping the preparation, practice and continuing professional development of teachers. This conceptual review examines the opportunities, challenges and future perspectives of AI integration in teacher education, with particular attention to Indian B.Ed. and M.Ed. programmes. Drawing on policy documents and selected scholarly literature, the paper adopts a thematic narrative-review approach rather than reporting primary empirical data. The analysis identifies opportunities for differentiated instructional design, formative feedback, simulation, accessibility, research support and professional learning. It also highlights concerns involving inaccurate or fabricated outputs, algorithmic bias, privacy, academic integrity, unequal access, pedagogical deskilling and weak institutional governance. Building on UNESCO's human- centred, AI competency framework, the paper proposes a phased model for responsible implementation encompassing AI literacy, pedagogical integration, ethical safeguards, supervised practicum and ongoing evaluation. The paper argues that AI should augment rather than replace professional judgement, relational teaching and context-sensitive decision-making. Its principal contribution is an actionable framework for teacher-education institutions to align technological innovation with equity, accountability and educational values.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; teacher education; generative AI; pre-service teachers; digital pedagogy; professional development; AI ethics.

1. Introduction

Teacher education has traditionally combined disciplinary knowledge, educational psychology, pedagogy, assessment, school experience and professional ethics. Artificial intelligence introduces new possibilities into each of these domains. Generative systems can draft lesson plans, propose examples, translate text and simulate dialogue; analytic systems can organize educational information and identify patterns. Yet producing plausible instructional material is not equivalent to understanding learners or making defensible pedagogical decisions. Teacher educators must therefore examine not simply whether AI can perform a task, but when its use advances learning, who remains accountable and what evidence establishes its effectiveness (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

In India, the National Education Policy 2020 emphasizes multidisciplinary teacher preparation, technology integration and improved professional standards (Ministry of Education, 2020). These priorities make AI literacy relevant to teacher education, while differences in connectivity, language, institutional capacity and school contexts require careful adaptation. This paper treats AI as a sociotechnical educational resource whose value depends on curricular purpose, teacher agency, governance and equitable implementation.

[1] **Principal, L.B. College of Education, Warangal, Telangana, India**

2. Statement of the Problem

AI tools are becoming readily accessible to student teachers and teacher educators, often before programmes have established consistent rules for acceptable use, disclosure, data handling and assessment. Uncritical adoption may encourage superficial lesson planning or dependence on generated explanations, whereas blanket prohibition may deny useful opportunities for experimentation and professional preparation. The central problem is how teacher-education institutions can develop pedagogically meaningful, equitable and ethically responsible AI competence without weakening teachers' independent judgement.

3. Objectives of the Paper

a. To examine major educational opportunities of AI for pre-service and in-service teacher development.
b. To identify pedagogical, ethical, institutional and equity-related challenges associated with AI use.
c. To interpret relevant policy and research perspectives for the Indian teacher-education context.
d. To propose practical institutional strategies and a future-oriented framework for responsible integration.

4. Research Questions

a. What educational functions can AI appropriately support in teacher preparation and professional learning?
b. What risks arise when AI systems are used for lesson design, assessment, research and practicum?
c. Which competencies and governance mechanisms are needed for responsible AI integration?

5. Methodology and Scope

This paper uses a conceptual, thematic narrative-review design. Its evidence base comprises selected international guidance, Indian education policy and established scholarly publications concerning AI in education, teacher competence and generative AI. Materials were interpreted under four themes: pedagogical opportunities, risks and constraints, institutional readiness, and future directions. No survey, interviews, experiment, systematic database search or meta-analysis was conducted; consequently, the paper makes no claims about measured prevalence, causal impact or statistical significance. The synthesis is interpretive and intended to inform policy, curriculum planning and future empirical research.

6. Review of Related Literature

Holmes, Bialik and Fadel (2019) describe AI applications in education and emphasize that their implications extend beyond automation to questions of pedagogy and ethics. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019), in a systematic review focused on higher education, identified applications such as profiling, prediction, assessment and adaptive systems, while highlighting limited attention to educators' perspectives. These observations support the need to position teachers as active designers and evaluators of AI-supported learning rather than passive end users.

Kasneci et al. (2023) examine the educational promise and limitations of large language models, including opportunities for personalized support alongside risks of erroneous content and overreliance. UNESCO guidance on generative AI calls for human-centred design, protection of personal information and institutional oversight (Miao & Holmes, 2023). UNESCO's AI competency framework for teachers identifies five domains—human-centred mindset, ethics, AI foundations and applications, AI pedagogy, and AI for professional learning—and three progression levels: acquire, deepen and create (Miao & Cukurova, 2024). Together these sources indicate that technical familiarity alone is insufficient; teachers also require evaluative, ethical and pedagogical competence.

7. Opportunities of AI in Teacher Education

7.1. Lesson planning and instructional design: AI can help prospective teachers generate alternative lesson openings, learning outcomes, differentiated examples, discussion prompts and classroom activities. Such drafts may reduce routine preparation time and broaden the range of approaches considered. However, trainees should map every suggestion to curriculum objectives, learners' prior knowledge, local context and assessment criteria. The professionally valuable task is not copying an AI-produced plan, but justifying revisions and explaining why a selected activity supports learning.

7.2. Differentiated and inclusive teaching: AI-supported tools may help adapt reading levels, create multilingual explanations, produce alternative examples and prepare accessible formats. These functions may support learners with varied linguistic backgrounds and learning needs. Nonetheless, translation quality, cultural appropriateness and accessibility should be verified, particularly for regional languages and specialized terminology. Inclusive education also requires human relationships and appropriate accommodations that automated output cannot guarantee.

7.3. Formative assessment and feedback: Teacher trainees can use AI to propose rubrics, generate low-stakes practice questions and draft feedback comments. Comparing generated questions against learning objectives can itself develop assessment literacy. AI-generated feedback should not be treated as an authoritative judgement of a student's ability: the teacher must inspect accuracy, fairness and the evidence supporting each comment. High-stakes grading and consequential decisions require stronger safeguards and accountable human review.

7.4. Microteaching and simulated practice: Conversational simulations can allow trainees to rehearse questioning, explanations, parent communication and responses to classroom scenarios. Repeated practice may provide a low-risk setting for reflection before school placement. Simulations should complement rather than replace supervised teaching practice because real classrooms involve relationships, unpredictable behaviour, contextual constraints and ethical responsibilities.

7.5. Research literacy and professional development: AI can assist with brainstorming research questions, organizing notes, comparing methodological options and improving language clarity. It can also support self-paced professional learning. However, fabricated references and inaccurate summaries make verification essential. Student teachers should consult original sources, document their own analytical contribution and disclose AI assistance in accordance with institutional and publisher policies.

7.6. Administrative efficiency: AI may support preparation of schedules, notices, resource inventories and routine communication. Time saved can potentially be redirected toward mentoring and classroom observation, provided institutions do not use automation to intensify workload or compromise confidentiality.

8. Challenges and Ethical Concerns

8.1. Accuracy, hallucinations and misinformation: Generative systems can produce fluent but incorrect facts, quotations, citations and explanations. In teacher education, such errors can propagate into instructional materials and student misconceptions. Verification against authoritative textbooks, primary documents and credible research must be an explicit professional habit (Kasneci et al., 2023).

8.2. Bias, language and cultural representation: AI outputs may reflect unequal representation in training data, including stereotypes or insufficient coverage of local histories, minority perspectives and Indian languages. Trainees should learn to interrogate whose experiences are represented, compare alternative perspectives and adapt material to constitutional values and inclusive pedagogy.

8.3. Privacy, consent and data governance: Uploading identifiable student records, assessment scripts, disability information or classroom observations to unapproved services can create privacy and confidentiality risks. Institutions need clear rules on permitted platforms, data minimization, consent, retention and human oversight. Sensitive school data should not be entered into public tools without appropriate authorization and safeguards (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

8.4. Academic integrity and dependency: Unacknowledged AI-generated assignments may obscure student teachers' actual understanding. Excessive dependence can weaken independent planning, critical reading and reflective writing. Assessment should therefore include oral defence, annotated lesson-plan revisions, supervised demonstrations and reflective logs that reveal the trainee's reasoning. Institutional policy should distinguish permitted assistance from misrepresentation of authorship.

8.5. Digital divide and institutional capacity: Unequal access to devices, reliable connectivity, accessible interfaces, training and paid tools may widen disparities across institutions and learners. AI adoption should not assume uniform resources. Offline alternatives, shared infrastructure, open educational resources and equitable procurement are necessary for meaningful participation.

8.6. Teacher agency, accountability and environmental costs: Automated recommendations can appear authoritative even when their underlying logic is opaque. Teachers must retain the power to reject suggestions and explain their decisions. Institutions should also consider procurement costs, dependence on vendors, sustainability and the environmental footprint of computational services (Miao & Cukurova, 2024).

9. Indian Policy Context and Institutional Implications:

NEP 2020 places importance on teacher quality, multidisciplinary education and technology-enabled learning (Ministry of Education, 2020). For B.Ed. and M.Ed. programmes, these aspirations can be translated into AI literacy modules embedded in educational technology, pedagogy, assessment, research methodology and school internship. However, AI use must be aligned with applicable institutional policies, school permissions, child protection obligations and relevant privacy requirements. Policy aspirations should not be mistaken for evidence that particular AI interventions are already effective.

10. Proposed Framework for Responsible AI Integration

Stage 1: Foundational AI literacy: Introduce basic AI concepts, limitations, prompting, source verification and the distinction between prediction and understanding. Assess competence through error-detection exercises rather than only tool demonstrations.

Stage 2: Pedagogical design and critique: Require trainees to produce an initial independent lesson plan, compare it with an AI-assisted alternative, revise both and submit a written rationale explaining curricular alignment, inclusion and assessment choices.

Stage 3: Ethics and governance: Provide explicit rules for disclosure, personal data, copyright, consent, bias checking and prohibited uses. Create a faculty-reviewed approval process for new platforms and classroom pilots.

Stage 4: Supervised practicum: Pilot limited AI-supported activities during microteaching or internship with mentor supervision. Record practical benefits, errors, workload, and learner response and accessibility concerns without exposing identifiable student data.

Stage 5: Evaluation and continuous improvement: Evaluate outcomes using clearly defined measures such as lesson quality, pedagogical reasoning, teacher confidence, time use and equitable access. Combine quantitative and qualitative evidence, compare with suitable alternatives and revise practice based on findings.

11. Future Perspectives

Future teacher education is likely to require AI competence as part of wider professional judgement rather than as an isolated technical skill. Promising directions include multilingual and locally relevant tools, teacher-controlled adaptive resources, accessible simulations, evidence-informed professional learning and transparent institutional evaluation. Research should examine whether AI improves actual teaching quality and student learning, not simply whether users find it convenient.

Longitudinal and comparative studies are needed to determine how AI affects trainees' subject understanding, classroom interaction, reflective capacity and independent decision-making. Research in rural and resource-constrained teacher-education institutions is particularly important. Future studies should also examine accessibility, language equity, cost-effectiveness, gender-related differences in access and the sustainability of adoption.

12. Recommendations

- **a.** Embed AI literacy and critical verification across B.Ed. and M.Ed. curricula instead of limiting instruction to isolated software workshops.
- **b.** Use authentic assessment requiring student teachers to explain, critique and defend AI-assisted educational decisions.
- **c.** Develop written institutional policies for disclosure, privacy, consent, data security and human accountability.
- **d.** Train teacher educators and school mentors before scaling AI-supported practicum activities.
- **e.** Provide equitable access and low-bandwidth alternatives, including regional-language support where feasible.
- **f.** Evaluate tools through small, ethically reviewed pilots before institution-wide procurement or implementation.
- **g.** Promote independent empirical research on learning outcomes, workload, inclusion and professional agency.

13. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence presents meaningful opportunities for teacher preparation, including instrucional design support, accessible resources, formative assessment, simulation and professional learning. Its educational value, however, is conditional. Accuracy problems, bias, privacy risks, academic misconduct, unequal access and potential erosion of teacher agency demand deliberate safeguards. A responsible approach treats AI as an assistive resource under informed human control. Teacher-education institutions should combine foundational AI literacy with pedagogical critique, supervised practice, ethical governance and rigorous evaluation. The future of AI in

teacher education should be measured by better professional judgement, more equitable learning and stronger educational relationships—not by the volume of automated content produced.

References

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). AI competency framework for teachers. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

Ministry of Education. (2020). National education policy 2020. Government of India. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0