

Review

The Evolution of Teacher Roles in AI-Dominated English Classrooms: A Sociological Perspective

Yongcai Li^{1,*}

¹ Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

* Correspondence: Yongcai Li, Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

Abstract: The integration of artificial intelligence into English language classrooms has precipitated a fundamental reconfiguration of teacher identity, function, and social positioning. This review examines that transformation through a sociological lens, foregrounding structural shifts rather than technological affordances alone. It traces how pedagogical authority has migrated from human mediation toward algorithmically scaffolded interaction, altering the teacher's relationship to knowledge transmission, student assessment, and classroom governance. The analysis identifies two interlocking dimensions: first, the redefinition of instructional labor---where tasks once rooted in interpretive judgment (e.g., evaluating rhetorical nuance, diagnosing idiosyncratic linguistic development) are increasingly delegated to adaptive systems; second, the emergence of new professional identities centered on curatorial oversight, ethical arbitration, and socio-affective scaffolding---roles that resist automation yet demand novel forms of sociocultural competence. Drawing on institutional ethnography and role theory, the paper argues that teacher agency is neither erased nor preserved intact but redistributed across hybrid human--machine assemblages, with consequences for equity, accountability, and professional legitimacy. It further contends that prevailing models of teacher preparation remain misaligned with these emergent responsibilities, privileging content mastery over systemic literacy in AI-mediated learning ecologies. The review concludes by proposing a framework for reconceptualizing teacher roles not as replacements to be managed, but as evolving nodes within dynamic educational infrastructures---where pedagogical sovereignty is negotiated, not assigned.

Keywords: teacher roles; AI in education; sociology of education

1. Introduction

1.1. The Sociological Imperative

A sociological perspective is indispensable for analyzing the evolution of teacher roles in AI-integrated English classrooms because it foregrounds structural transformations rather than instrumental adaptations [1]. This lens reveals how automation reshapes occupational status hierarchies, redistributes institutional authority between human educators and algorithmic systems, and reconfigures intersubjective practices central to language learning---such as feedback reciprocity, identity negotiation, and discursive scaffolding [2, 3]. Teacher agency does not merely shift in method but undergoes recalibration within broader fields of educational power, professional legitimacy, and cultural capital. Without this framing, technological integration risks being misread as neutral tool adoption rather than a site of contested social ordering [4]. Consequently, understanding role evolution demands attention to embedded norms, symbolic boundaries, and collective meaning-making---not just pedagogical efficiency or interface design [5, 6].

1.2. Scope and Boundaries

This study confines its analytical scope to English language classrooms in which generative and adaptive AI systems constitute the operational infrastructure of

Received: 07 January 2026

Revised: 01 March 2026

Accepted: 13 March 2026

Published: 16 March 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

pedagogical practice---not supplementary tools, but constitutive agents shaping lesson design, real-time formative feedback, and summative assessment protocols. The inquiry excludes contexts where AI functions intermittently or peripherally, such as isolated grammar-checking tasks or optional vocabulary drills [7, 8]. It further omits non-English language instruction, vocational or technical English training, and settings lacking sustained, institutionally embedded AI integration [9, 10]. Temporal boundaries span contemporary implementations from 2021 onward, prioritizing post-pandemic digital acceleration. Geographically, the analysis centers on formal K--12 and tertiary institutions within high-infrastructure educational ecosystems. Conceptual boundaries deliberately exclude speculative or hypothetical AI architectures, focusing instead on empirically observable deployment patterns and their sociological ramifications for teacher identity, authority, and labor [4, 11].

1.3. Conceptual Anchors

This section anchors the analysis in three interlocking sociological constructs [12, 13]. Role strain captures the tension teachers experience when AI tools simultaneously expand instructional possibilities and erode traditional evaluative prerogatives [2, 14]. Occupational boundary work delineates how educators negotiate jurisdictional claims over linguistic meaning-making amid algorithmic mediation. Epistemic authority interrogates the shifting grounds of legitimacy---how teachers sustain credibility as arbiters of language competence when automated systems generate feedback, assess fluency, and model grammatical correctness. Together, these concepts frame adaptation not as technical upskilling but as contested reconfiguration of professional identity, pedagogical agency, and institutional legitimacy within evolving sociotechnical ecosystems. The analysis treats classroom AI not as neutral infrastructure but as a jurisdictional catalyst that reorders relations of knowledge, judgment, and control [6, 15].

2. Historical Overview: From Grammarian to Facilitator

2.1. The Didactic Era

The Didactic Era, centered in the mid-twentieth century, institutionalized the teacher as an unchallenged authority on linguistic correctness and literary legitimacy. Instructional practice emphasized rote memorization of prescriptive grammar rules, canonical texts, and standardized lexical hierarchies. Pedagogical authority derived exclusively from textual mastery and certification in normative language standards, reinforced through summative assessments that privileged conformity over interpretation. Classroom discourse was unidirectional: teachers transmitted fixed knowledge while students internalized sanctioned forms and meanings [16]. This model presupposed a stable, monolithic English whose boundaries were policed by educators acting as gatekeepers of linguistic orthodoxy [3]. Curriculum design reflected national educational mandates prioritizing uniformity, with minimal attention to sociolinguistic variation or learner agency [3, 8]. The teacher's role remained externally defined---anchored in institutional credentialing rather than responsive pedagogy---and persisted until structural shifts in language theory and educational philosophy began challenging its epistemological foundations.

2.2. The Communicative Turn

The Communicative Turn marked a decisive departure from transmission-oriented pedagogy, repositioning teachers as dynamic facilitators rather than authoritative grammarians [9]. This paradigm shift prioritized authentic interaction, pragmatic competence, and learner agency over formal accuracy alone [4]. Educators began orchestrating collaborative tasks, mediating discourse in real time, and responding flexibly to emergent linguistic performance [10, 14]. Their role evolved into one of scaffolding meaning-making processes, diagnosing communicative breakdowns, and co-constructing knowledge through dialogue. Assessment criteria broadened to encompass fluency, strategic competence, and sociopragmatic appropriateness. Teacher training

programs accordingly emphasized discourse analysis, interactional awareness, and adaptive classroom management [5]. The turn thus institutionalized a relational epistemology wherein language learning was reconceived as socially embedded practice rather than internalization of abstract rules. This foundational reorientation established the conceptual groundwork for subsequent technological integrations.

2.3. Digital Intermediation

Early digital tools initiated a subtle yet consequential redistribution of cognitive labor within English instruction. Learning management systems centralized administrative functions and content delivery, shifting teachers from curators of physical materials to coordinators of digital pathways [3]. Grammar checkers assumed responsibility for surface-level error detection, while corpus-based tools externalized lexical retrieval, enabling students to consult authentic language patterns independently. These technologies did not eliminate pedagogical judgment but rather insulated interpretive tasks—such as assessing rhetorical intent, negotiating cultural nuance, or scaffolding metacognitive awareness—from automation. Relational functions, including motivational support, ethical guidance, and adaptive feedback, remained irreducibly human. Thus, digital intermediation did not displace teachers but reconfigured their epistemic authority: expertise migrated from domain-specific knowledge transmission toward orchestration of distributed cognitive ecologies. This recalibration laid groundwork for subsequent AI-driven transformations [13].

3. Core Theme a: The Redistribution of Instructional Labor

3.1. Automatable Tasks and Their Consequences

The integration of artificial intelligence into English instruction has precipitated a systematic redistribution of instructional labor, fundamentally altering the epistemic terrain of pedagogical practice [9]. As detailed in Table 1, tasks once requiring sustained human attention—such as Grammatical Consistency Scoring, Discourse Coherence Assessment, and Stylistic Register Alignment—are now largely delegated to algorithmic agents [13]. For each category, the human role has shifted from direct execution to meta-cognitive oversight: teachers no longer annotate collocation errors manually but adjudicate contextual appropriateness; they no longer assign coherence scores subjectively but calibrate AI-generated metrics against rhetorical intent; they no longer correct register mismatches through intuition but interrogate stylistic recommendations for genre-specific legitimacy. This transition entails both deskilling—erosion of routine diagnostic fluency—and reskilling—heightened demand for interpretive precision, contextual triangulation, and normative judgment. The teacher's authority is no longer anchored in procedural accuracy but in hermeneutic discernment: distinguishing between grammatically valid yet pragmatically infelicitous constructions, identifying coherence failures masked by syntactic correctness, and evaluating stylistic alignment beyond lexical substitution. Consequently, instructional labor is increasingly concentrated in domains resistant to algorithmic formalization—interpersonal scaffolding, affective attunement, and ethical framing of linguistic choices. Such shifts reconfigure professional identity not as diminished expertise but as relocated epistemic responsibility, demanding new forms of pedagogical literacy grounded in critical AI literacy, discourse awareness, and sociolinguistic reflexivity [13].

Table 1. Comparative Mapping of Task Delegation in AI-dominant English Instruction

Task Category	Human Role Prior to AI	Current AI-Mediated Role	Resulting Teacher Shift
Grammatical Consistency Scoring	Manual annotation of collocation errors and syntactic violations	Algorithmic detection and scoring of grammatical deviations with	From error identifier to contextual appropriateness adjudicator

		probabilistic confidence intervals	
Discourse Coherence Assessment	Subjective coherence scoring based on rhetorical flow and logical progression	AI-generated coherence metrics derived from discourse graph centrality and referential density	From coherence evaluator to rhetorical-intent calibrator
Stylistic Register Alignment	Intuition-based correction of register mismatches across genres and audiences	Real-time stylistic recommendation engine optimizing lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic features per genre corpus	From stylistic corrector to genre-specific legitimacy interrogator

3.2. The Rise of Curatorial Practice

Contemporary English pedagogy increasingly positions teachers not as primary content producers but as curatorial agents mediating AI-generated instructional material [7]. This shift entails systematic evaluation of algorithmic output for cultural resonance, ideological coherence, and alignment with disciplinary norms—functions that demand heightened epistemic vigilance rather than technical authorship [16]. As detailed in Table 2, curatorial labor manifests across three interlocking dimensions. Prompt Engineering for Genre Fidelity requires operational precision in designing inputs that constrain AI behavior to match target discourse conventions, with social risk emerging when genre misalignment undermines rhetorical authenticity. Bias Auditing of Generated Dialogues necessitates cross-referencing AI-suggested utterances against sociolinguistic corpora to detect skewed representation or normative erasure, where legitimacy erosion occurs if outputs reinforce stereotyped speech patterns or exclude vernacular registers. Scaffolding Student Critique of AI Output involves designing metacognitive frameworks that equip learners to interrogate generative logic, source provenance, and framing assumptions—carrying risk of pedagogical authority dilution if students perceive teacher mediation as arbitrary rather than evidence-based [1]. Collectively, these functions reconfigure expertise: proficiency now resides less in textual production and more in diagnostic judgment, contextual calibration, and ethical arbitration. The teacher's labor becomes infrastructural—orchestrating trust, transparency, and critical uptake within AI-augmented learning ecologies. This redistribution does not diminish professional agency; rather, it relocates its locus from creation to curation, from generation to governance.

Table 2. Dimensions of Curatorial Labor in AI-mediated English Instruction

Curatorial Function	Operational Demand	Social Risk
Prompt Engineering for Genre Fidelity	Designing syntactically and pragmatically constrained inputs to enforce adherence to target discourse conventions (e.g., academic hedging, narrative sequencing, register-appropriate modality)	Rhetorical inauthenticity and loss of disciplinary credibility when AI output violates genre expectations despite prompt specification
Bias Auditing of Generated Dialogues	Systematic comparison of AI-generated utterances against sociolinguistically annotated corpora to identify underrepresentation, stereotyped constructions, or suppression of vernacular, intersectional, or non-dominant speech forms	Legitimacy erosion and epistemic harm when pedagogical materials normalize biased linguistic norms or erase marginalized communicative practices

Scaffolding Student Critique of AI Output	Developing metacognitive frameworks	Pedagogical authority
	that guide learners to interrogate generative logic, source provenance, framing assumptions, and contextual constraints of AI output	dilution if teacher mediation appears subjective or ungrounded, undermining students' trust in curatorial judgment as evidence-based practice

3.3. *Epistemic Tensions in Feedback Loops*

Epistemic tensions emerge when AI-generated feedback systematically diverges from teacher judgment—particularly in domains where interpretive nuance resists algorithmic codification [2]. Voice authenticity, rhetorical intentionality, and creative deviation constitute such domains: they rely on contextualized human inference rather than rule-based pattern matching. When automated systems flag stylistically unconventional phrasing as erroneous or penalize idiosyncratic syntactic choices that serve deliberate expressive aims, teachers confront a structural dilemma. Compliance with institutional mandates to integrate AI tools pressures them to endorse feedback that contradicts their pedagogical intuition. This generates role conflict rooted not in individual preference but in competing epistemic authorities—one grounded in statistical correlation, the other in situated professional judgment [1]. Teachers report recalibrating their instructional stance: some defer to algorithmic outputs to maintain procedural legitimacy; others selectively override them, risking accountability gaps or platform-imposed constraints on intervention points. Such friction reveals deeper asymmetries in how knowledge is validated within AI-mediated classrooms—where quantifiable metrics increasingly displace hermeneutic criteria for evaluating linguistic competence [5]. The resulting feedback loop becomes unstable: AI systems learn from aggregated student submissions filtered through teacher-approved corrections, yet those corrections themselves are increasingly shaped by prior AI suggestions. This recursive entanglement obscures the locus of epistemic agency, transforming assessment from a dialogic practice into a contested terrain of distributed authorship. Without explicit scaffolding for epistemic negotiation, such tensions risk eroding teacher autonomy while simultaneously undermining the very qualities—voice, intention, creativity—that define advanced English proficiency [15].

4. **Core Theme B: Reconstituting Professional Identity**

4.1. *From Authority to Arbitration*

The shift from pedagogical authority to epistemic arbitration marks a fundamental reconfiguration of teacher legitimacy in AI-dominant English classrooms [2]. Legitimacy no longer resides primarily in mastery of linguistic content but in the capacity to adjudicate tensions arising from algorithmic mediation [10]. Teachers must now navigate competing claims across multiple domains: between AI-generated output and student-authored expression, between efficiency-driven standardization and the recognition of sociolinguistic variation, and between normative grammatical expectations and context-sensitive pragmatic competence. As detailed in Table 3, three critical arbitration domains demand specialized competencies [2]. In textual originality judgment, teachers reconcile AI-detected similarity metrics with students' legitimate intertextual practices and rhetorical borrowing strategies, requiring deep genre awareness and historical literacy. For pragmatic appropriateness in multilingual contexts, they mediate between AI's monolingual calibration and students' strategic code-switching or translanguaging, necessitating sociolinguistic awareness of discourse norms across communities. Finally, ethical use of AI-generated model texts requires discernment between pedagogical scaffolding and epistemic displacement, demanding critical digital literacy and curriculum design fluency. These roles collectively redefine professionalism not as knowledge transmission but as situated judgment—grounded in ethical deliberation,

contextual responsiveness, and commitment to linguistic justice [7, 16]. The teacher thus functions less as an omniscient source and more as a reflexive arbiter whose credibility emerges from transparent, principled negotiation rather than unchallenged expertise. This reconstitution demands institutional support for ongoing professional learning centered on sociotechnical critique and pedagogical ethics.

Table 3. Arbitration Domains Requiring Teacher Intervention in AI-dominant Settings

Domain of Arbitration	Competing Claims	Required Teacher Competence
Textual Originality Judgment	AI-detected similarity metrics vs. students' legitimate intertextual practices and rhetorical borrowing strategies	Deep genre awareness and historical literacy
Pragmatic Appropriateness in Multilingual Contexts	AI's monolingual calibration vs. students' strategic code-switching or translanguaging	Sociolinguistic awareness of discourse norms across communities
Ethical Use of AI-Generated Model Texts	Pedagogical scaffolding vs. epistemic displacement	Critical digital literacy and curriculum design fluency

4.2. *Affective Infrastructure Work*

The integration of artificial intelligence into English language instruction has precipitated a marked intensification of affective infrastructure work, wherein teachers perform sustained emotional labor to stabilize pedagogical relationships under algorithmic pressure [11]. As detailed in Table 4, three distinct labor types now dominate daily practice: Cognitive Delegation Anxiety Management arises when students fear displacement by AI writing tools, triggering interventions that reframe automation as augmentative rather than substitutive; AI-Generated Peer Feedback Mediation occurs when algorithmically produced evaluations lack nuance or cultural grounding, requiring teachers to reinterpret, contextualize, and ethically recalibrate feedback for developmental appropriateness; Identity Affirmation Amid Algorithmic Standardization emerges as educators actively resist homogenizing assessment rubrics by foregrounding idiosyncratic voice, rhetorical experimentation, and sociolinguistic variation---practices routinely suppressed by AI scoring heuristics [11]. Each labor type corresponds to specific trigger conditions, such as student submissions rejected by AI plagiarism detectors despite original composition, or peer feedback generated from non-native corpora misrepresenting genre conventions [3, 8]. Critically, institutional support gaps persist across all domains: no protocol exists for human override of AI verdicts, no training addresses affective mediation strategies, and no curricular space legitimizes non-algorithmic modes of linguistic expression. This structural deficit transforms affective labor from supplementary to constitutive---redefining professional identity not through technical mastery alone, but through persistent, unremunerated stewardship of human meaning-making in increasingly quantified educational ecologies [3].

Table 4. Affective Labor Demands Amplified by AI Integration

Labor Type	Trigger Condition	Institutional Support Gap
Cognitive Delegation Anxiety Management	Students express fear of being displaced by AI writing tools, misinterpreting automation as substitution rather than augmentation	No training provided on affective mediation strategies to reframe AI as pedagogical augmenter
AI-Generated Peer Feedback Mediation	Peer feedback generated from non-native corpora misrepresents genre conventions or lacks cultural	No curricular space legitimizes non-algorithmic modes of linguistic expression

	grounding, leading to developmentally inappropriate evaluations	or ethical recalibration of AI feedback
Identity	Student submissions rejected by AI	No protocol exists for human
Affirmation Amid	plagiarism detectors despite original	override of AI verdicts or
Algorithmic	composition, due to suppression of	validation of rhetorical
Standardization	idiosyncratic voice and sociolinguistic variation	experimentation outside algorithmic rubrics

4.3. Boundary Work in Hybrid Classrooms

Boundary work in hybrid classrooms constitutes a deliberate, reflexive practice through which teachers enact sociocultural authority by demarcating domains of pedagogical labor that resist algorithmic substitution. This process is neither defensive nor reactive but emerges from sustained curricular design and discursive framing that foregrounds human capacities---particularly the interpretation of irony, negotiation of semantic ambiguity, and cultivation of writerly voice---as epistemically distinct and socially indispensable. Teachers orchestrate activities where meaning-making hinges on contextualized judgment rather than pattern recognition: scaffolded peer feedback loops, recursive drafting with metacognitive reflection prompts, and dialogic analysis of culturally embedded rhetorical choices. Such practices instantiate what might be termed relational epistemic labor, wherein knowledge is co-constructed through intersubjective attunement, ethical responsiveness, and affective scaffolding---dimensions fundamentally inaccessible to current AI architectures. Discursively, educators frame these acts not as supplementary to technological tools but as constitutive of literacy itself, repositioning their expertise as custodians of linguistic agency rather than mere facilitators of skill acquisition. This boundary work thus functions as professional reconstitution: it reaffirms teacher identity not through resistance to technology but through rigorous specification of irreplaceable human contributions to language development, thereby anchoring pedagogical legitimacy in sociocultural praxis rather than technical proficiency [8, 15]. The resulting classroom ecology sustains a dialectic between computational efficiency and human interpretability, ensuring that technological integration serves, rather than supplants, the developmental aims of English education [8].

5. Comparison & Challenges

5.1. Divergent Institutional Trajectories

Public, private, and international schools exhibit markedly divergent institutional trajectories in assigning AI oversight responsibilities within English instruction. Public institutions frequently centralize accountability through district-level AI governance committees, constraining teacher autonomy while offering minimal technical scaffolding. Private schools, by contrast, delegate substantial operational discretion to individual educators but couple it with stringent performance metrics tied to AI-integrated outcomes---intensifying workload without commensurate pedagogical support [16]. International schools adopt hybrid models, leveraging external vendor partnerships for infrastructure management yet retaining curricular sovereignty; however, this often fragments accountability across contractual, administrative, and instructional domains. These asymmetries reinforce preexisting stratifications: under-resourced public settings face heightened surveillance without capacity-building, elite private contexts prioritize efficiency over equity, and internationally accredited institutions privilege procedural compliance over critical AI literacy. Consequently, the distribution of technical authority, evaluative weight, and professional development access does not merely reflect organizational differences---it actively reproduces structural inequities in teacher agency, curriculum design, and student access to human-centered pedagogy. The absence of cross-sectoral standards further entrenches fragmentation, transforming AI integration from a pedagogical opportunity into an institutional stress test with uneven consequences.

5.2. Pedagogical Dissonance and Role Strain

Pedagogical dissonance emerges when institutional mandates for AI tool deployment conflict with teachers' professional epistemologies, particularly in domains requiring nuanced linguistic judgment. Algorithms trained on corpora privileging grammatical conformity frequently misclassify communicatively effective but syntactically divergent utterances---such as code-switched expressions or rhetorical innovations---as errors. This misalignment generates role strain, as educators face contradictory imperatives: to uphold pedagogical integrity while complying with technical directives that conflate linguistic standardization with learning efficacy. Teachers report diminished agency when AI feedback suppresses stylistic variation deemed 'non-standard', even when such variation reflects authentic voice or sociolinguistic competence. The resulting tension is not merely operational but ontological---challenging foundational assumptions about language development, assessment validity, and the teacher's interpretive authority. Without mechanisms for algorithmic transparency, educator input into model training, or contextual override capacity, such tools risk redefining educational goals around machine-optimized metrics rather than human-centered outcomes. Consequently, professional judgment becomes increasingly contested terrain, where fidelity to curriculum standards competes with fidelity to learners' linguistic identities and communicative needs. This dissonance underscores a broader structural challenge: reconciling automated efficiency with pedagogical complexity in ways that preserve, rather than erode, teacher expertise [12].

5.3. The Accountability Vacuum

The accountability vacuum emerges when AI systems generate feedback that misrepresents linguistic competence, reproduces sociolinguistic bias, or erodes student self-efficacy---yet no institutional framework assigns responsibility for such outcomes [5]. Teachers bear ethical liability despite lacking control over algorithmic design, training data provenance, or real-time interpretability of outputs. This asymmetry destabilizes professional autonomy and undermines pedagogical authority. Without standardized audit trails, error-correction protocols, or shared governance models, educators operate in regulatory limbo. Institutional policies rarely address cascading failures across human-AI interaction layers, leaving practitioners exposed to reputational, evaluative, and psychological risk. Consequently, the burden of ethical mediation falls disproportionately on individual teachers rather than distributed across developers, administrators, and policy architects.

6. Future Perspectives

6.1. Towards Distributed Epistemic Sovereignty

This section advances a paradigm of distributed epistemic sovereignty, wherein authority over knowledge production is deliberately partitioned across human and artificial agents [8, 9]. Teachers retain stewardship of contextual wisdom---interpreting sociocultural nuance, scaffolding ethical reasoning, and mediating disciplinary conventions [14]. Students exercise authorial agency through iterative drafting, critical self-reflection, and co-constructing meaning within authentic discourse communities. AI systems assume responsibility for procedural consistency: grammar validation, lexical precision, syntactic fluency, and real-time feedback on formal conventions. Such tripartite delegation necessitates novel collaborative sense-making practices---shared annotation protocols, metacognitive dialogue journals, and reflexive calibration rituals---that sustain epistemic integrity while redistributing cognitive labor. The model resists hierarchical subordination, instead cultivating interdependent epistemic accountability grounded in role-specific competencies and mutual intelligibility.

6.2. Professional Development Redesign

Professional development must pivot from instrumental AI training toward cultivating critical infrastructure literacy. Educators require deep conceptual grounding

in data provenance---how corpora shape linguistic norms---and model limitations, particularly in evaluating nuanced language use such as register variation, pragmatic competence, or culturally embedded discourse [10]. Sociotechnical trade-offs demand explicit attention: automated scoring may optimize efficiency yet obscure epistemic hierarchies embedded in training data and evaluation criteria. Competency frameworks should therefore integrate epistemological awareness, ethical reasoning, and reflexive practice---not just interface navigation. This entails sustained engagement with algorithmic bias, interpretability constraints, and the political economy of edtech platforms. Curriculum designers, policymakers, and teacher educators must co-construct scaffolded learning pathways that foreground pedagogical sovereignty amid accelerating automation. Such redesign affirms teaching as interpretive labor, not merely delivery mechanism.

6.3. Policy and Governance Pathways

Effective policy frameworks must reposition teachers as epistemic agents who critically interpret, contextualize, and ethically mediate AI-generated outputs. Regulatory instruments should mandate participatory co-design protocols wherein pedagogical values---not technical affordances---anchor AI integration decisions. This necessitates formalized governance structures that allocate decision-making authority to educator collectives, ensuring alignment with curricular intent, developmental appropriateness, and sociolinguistic equity. Policymakers must institutionalize mechanisms for ongoing teacher-led evaluation of AI tools, including transparency requirements for training data provenance, bias mitigation strategies, and explainability standards calibrated to classroom contexts. Crucially, accountability regimes must shift from compliance-driven metrics toward professional judgment scaffolds that recognize interpretive labor as core pedagogical work. Without such structural recalibration, AI deployment risks entrenching technocratic logics that subordinate educational purpose to algorithmic imperatives [6].

7. Conclusion

7.1. Synthesis of Structural Transformation

The evolution of teacher roles in AI-dominant English classrooms constitutes not merely pedagogical adjustment but a structural recalibration of authority, labor valuation, and professional legitimacy. As algorithmic systems assume routine instructional functions, the teacher's epistemic position shifts from knowledge transmitter to curricular architect, ethical arbiter, and sociocultural mediator. This reconfiguration exposes tensions between technocratic efficiency and humanistic educational aims, revealing how institutional priorities reshape professional identity. Labor is increasingly devalued when measured by task completion rather than relational depth or critical judgment. Legitimacy now hinges less on subject mastery and more on adaptive facilitation across hybrid human-AI ecologies. Systemic redesign---not individual upskilling---is therefore imperative to sustain pedagogical integrity, equity, and democratic purpose within evolving sociotechnical landscapes.

7.2. Imperative for Collective Reimagining

Sustaining meaningful English education in AI-dominated classrooms demands a paradigmatic shift: teacher roles must be reconceptualized not as static occupational categories awaiting technical optimization, but as dynamic sociocultural institutions perpetually subject to collective renegotiation. This process requires sustained dialogue across pedagogical, technological, and community domains---where ethical commitments, linguistic diversity, and democratic participation serve as non-negotiable anchors. Institutional inertia, market-driven efficiency logics, and algorithmic determinism threaten to ossify professional identity unless countered by deliberate, cross-sectoral deliberation. Teachers' epistemic authority, curricular agency, and relational labor cannot be outsourced or automated without eroding the humanistic foundations of language

learning. Thus, reimagining begins not with tools, but with shared values---grounded in equity, critical literacy, and pedagogical sovereignty---that guide how technology integrates into, rather than displaces, the moral and intellectual work of teaching.

References

1. A. Guilherme, "AI and education: The importance of teacher and student relations," *AI & Society*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 47–54, 2019.
2. W. Marzuki, U. Widiati, D. Rusdin, Darwin, and I. Indrawati, "The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective," *Cogent Education*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 2236469, 2023.
3. W. Holmes, K. Porayska-Pomsta, K. Holstein, E. Sutherland, T. Baker, S. B. Shum, and K. R. Koedinger, "Ethics of AI in education: Towards a community-wide framework," *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 504–526, 2022.
4. J. L. Chiu, J. P. Bywater, and S. Lilly, "The role of AI to support teacher learning and practice: A review and future directions," in **Artificial Intelligence in STEM Education: The Paradigmatic Shifts in Research, Education, and Technology**, 2022, pp. 163–173.
5. M. Bearman, J. Ryan, and R. Ajjawi, "Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review," *Higher Education*, vol. 86, no. 2, pp. 369–385, 2023.
6. S. Pokrivcakova, "Preparing teachers for the application of AI-powered technologies in foreign language education," *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 135–153, 2019.
7. N. Selwyn, *Should Robots Replace Teachers?: AI and the Future of Education*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
8. X. Tan, G. Cheng, and M. H. Ling, "Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional development: A systematic review," *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 8, p. 100355, 2025.
9. W. Holmes, J. Persson, I. A. Chounta, B. Wasson, and V. Dimitrova, **Artificial Intelligence and Education: A Critical View Through the Lens of Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law**. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, 2022.
10. J. Jeon and S. Lee, "Large language models in education: A focus on the complementary relationship between human teachers and ChatGPT," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 15873–15892, 2023.
11. M. S. I. Taufikin, N. Azifah, F. Nikmah, and J. Kuanr, "The impact of AI on teacher roles and pedagogy in the 21st century classroom," in *Proc. 2024 Int. Conf. Knowledge Engineering and Communication Systems (ICKECS)*, vol. 1, Apr. 2024, pp. 1–5.
12. D. T. K. Ng, M. Lee, R. J. Y. Tan, X. Hu, J. S. Downie, and S. K. W. Chu, "A review of AI teaching and learning from 2000 to 2020," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 8445–8501, 2023.
13. I. Celik, "Towards Intelligent-TPACK: An empirical study on teachers' professional knowledge to ethically integrate artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools into education," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 138, p. 107468, 2023.
14. B. Cope, M. Kalantzis, and D. Sears, "Artificial intelligence for education: Knowledge and its assessment in AI-enabled learning ecologies," *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 1229–1245, 2021.
15. H. Ji, I. Han, and Y. Ko, "A systematic review of conversational AI in language education: Focusing on the collaboration with human teachers," *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 48–63, 2023.
16. T. N. Fitria, "The use of artificial intelligence in education (AIED): Can AI replace the teacher's role?," *Epigram*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 165–187, 2023.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.