

Am I Still the Expert? Teacher Educators' Negotiation of Professional Identity in the Age of Generative AI

Darshita Pant*¹

¹Senior Research Fellow, Dept. of Educational Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi

*Corresponding Author: darshita850@gmail.com

Available at <https://omniscientmjprjournal.com>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20625230>

ABSTRACT

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has completely transformed the field of higher education, jeopardizing the traditional concept of who is an expert and who holds authority. The present study investigates the ways in which teacher educators bargain their professional identity and epistemic authority during the fast adoption of GenAI. The study is a qualitative phenomenological study. The lived experiences of fourteen teacher educators who are currently teaching D.El.Ed. and B.Ed. programs at various teacher education institutions in the Delhi region. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the interviews and resulted in five primary themes: (1) Questioning Epistemic Authority, as educators grapple with the computational power of AI; (2) From Knowledge Holder to Learning Facilitator, representing a shift toward critical curation; (3) Anxiety, Adaptation, and Identity Tension, highlighting the emotional labor of role renegotiation; (4) Reconstructing Professional Relevance through human-centric competencies; (5) The Crisis of Assessment: Negotiating Validity and Integrity. The results indicate that teacher educators are re-establishing their professionalism. It shifts to pure content mastery to so-called relational expertise of the content based on ethical stewardship and socio-emotional coaching. This change would require identity-aware faculty training and a curriculum that would put critical AI literacy into the center. Although GenAI is fuelling identity crisis, it seems to allow a unique opportunity to anticipate uniquely human values in teacher education, which empowers the profession in an even more automated world.

Keywords: Professional Identity, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Teacher Educators, Higher Education, Teacher Education

INTRODUCTION

The advent and deployment of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) technologies have radically reshaped the field of higher education. Since ChatGPT was freely available in the end of 2022, large language model-powered (LLM) tools have ceased to be a niche interest and started to be used as everyday academic assets capable of writing, coding, and creating multimedia content on par with remarkable ease (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2023; Nyaaba & Zhai, 2024). Although the initial reviews revolved around the concept of academic integrity, a new issue has emerged, and it is the impact of GenAI on the professional identities and epistemic authority of an educator specializing in teacher education (Cooper et al., 2024).

Teacher educators are in a special position. They train the future of the teachers and demonstrate expert practice. In the past, their identity was conditioned by the fact that they were the main knowledge holders (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2024). The fact that GenAI can answer questions in real-time and seem to be an expert makes it a challenge to traditional perceptions of expertise and proves to be a source of conflict regarding the relevance of specialized pedagogical knowledge in an automated age (Prilop et al., 2024). The change begs important questions concerning epistemic authority; the socially acknowledged entitlement to treat oneself as a source of knowledge. The hierarchy of a conventional classroom is broken when students seek assistance with GenAI (Killian et al., 2023).

Educator teachers have lost their monopoly on what truth is, which causes fear and the inability to reinvent their value in the world mediated by AI (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu, 2023).

Although the technical uses of AI have become more thoroughly covered in literature, there is still a research gap in regard to the human and professional aspects of the transition. Although current research depicts a photograph of first impression (Nyaaba & Zhai, 2024), a little is known in the literature about the way educators should manage identity changes in the long run (Cooper et al., 2024). To provide the constancy of profession, it is critical to understand how the sense of self of teacher educators is reshaped. The paper examines the bargaining of professional identity and authority among teacher educators who have been shifting to individual sources of knowledge to facilitators of AI-literate learning.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

(a) Generative AI in Higher Education

The adoption of artificial intelligence within the higher education system has ceased being an outcast and shifted to becoming a growing dependency (Zhou et al., 2024). GenAI tools have become the means of automating the administrative processes, delivering tailored student experience, and developing adaptive learning environments (Rutti-Joy et al., 2024). Although there are these advantages, there are still ethical issues of data security and diminished human interaction (Doğan et al., 2024). The conventional methods of assessment are also under question because GenAI is capable of generating advanced academic publications (Vallejo, 2024). This scenario demands the transition to a higher level of AI literacy to critical AI literacy that encompasses moral consciousness and custodianship (Prilop et al., 2024).

(b) Teacher Professional Identity and Epistemic Authority

Teacher professional identity refers to a self-interpretive and a negotiating process (Zaman et al., 2024). The empirical findings demonstrate that AI implementation transforms the role of educators into that of primary providers of knowledge into facilitators/curators (Satvati et al., 2023). The renegotiation is reliant on personal attitudes and institutional conventions (Rutti-Joy et al., 2024). At the same time GenAI opposes to the epistemic authority the acknowledged position of the teacher as a source of knowledge. The role of the teacher as the only distributor of truth is undermined as artificial intelligence competes with the work of a human (Vallejo, 2024).

The power is now pegged on distinctly human abilities like provision of critical thinking and socio-emotional support (Zaman et al., 2024). Those educators who are most adaptable base their power on these human-centered functions as they should be master guides in the process of navigating AI-generated knowledge (Vallejo, 2024). Nevertheless, pluralization of knowledge can disaggregate referents of the curriculum, with the new agreements about epistemic norms being needed (Rutti-Joy et al., 2024).

Research Gap

Longitudinal studies on the how (and why) of navigating these identity changes among teacher educators are unwarranted given that there is much available on the topic technically (Prilop et al., 2024). Most of the available literature provides short-term snapshots or surveys (Satvati et al., 2023). There is a paucity of evidence to trace the past trends of identity change in the long term when GenAI grows up (Vallejo, 2024). Moreover, little has been done in terms of assessing professional development patterns that can be applied to identity stabilization and the emotional aspects of role renegotiation (Nyaaba & Zhai, 2024). This qualitative inquiry seals these gaps by giving a profound insight into the life phenomenon of teacher educators in the age of AI.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The paper has a theoretical framework based on three sources, namely Professional Identity Theory (PIT), Social Constructivism and Role Theory. PIT assumes that professional self is formed on the basis of individual further commitments and the social realization, which emphasizes the new expectations of competence in the face of GenAI (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Rutti-Joy et al., 2024). Social Constructivism considers identity as the relational construct that is co-created in communities of practice and in societal discourses (Zhou et al., 2024). This standpoint analyses the extent to which the narratives of educators are determined by the changing AI practices at the micro, meso, and macro levels (Satvati et al., 2023). Role Theory is centered on institutional expectations and norms and allows analyzing the phenomenon of role ambiguity and the renegotiation occurring as educators transition from knowledge providers to facilitators (Chan & Tsi, 2023). These theories can be considered helpful in a strong sense as they provide an adequate framework to understand the changing expertise and authority of teacher educators. In the results, these theories have intertwined in a comprehensive manner, where PIT and Role theory have used to interpret identity reconstruction, sudden shift in roles and responsibilities, and identity crisis, and Social Constructivism theory helps in supporting collaborative decision-making and changing interception with the students.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The paper uses a qualitative phenomenological research paradigm to examine the experiences of teacher educators dealing with the generative AI integration. Phenomenology is suitable in this situation as it aims at comprehending the nature of a common experience, in this instance, the professional identity shift caused by AI (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This is done with the intention of explaining the shared meaning of how the lived experiences of some people about this phenomenon are like.

Participants and Sampling

The sample was used on fourteen teacher educators (eleven females and three males) in D.Ed. and B.Ed. programs at three different teacher education institutions (one government and two private) in the Delhi region. Educators who were directly aware and used generative AI tools were purposively sampled to perform the study. The sample was composed of lecturers having different age groups, genders, teaching experiences, affiliations, and AI-usage familiarity levels (as shown in Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic and Professional Profile of Participants

Educator	Age (in years)	Gender	Teaching Experience (in years)	Institution Type	AI-usage Familiarity
T(1)	43	Female	10	Private	Moderate
T(2)	34	Female	6	Government	High
T(3)	39	Female	13	Private	Moderate
T(4)	37	Male	9	Private	Moderate
T(5)	46	Female	20	Government	Low
T(6)	29	Female	1	Private	High
T(7)	40	Female	11	Private	Moderate
T(8)	32	Female	5	Private	High
T(9)	34	Female	8	Government	Moderate

T(10)	28	Female	5	Private	Moderate
T(11)	31	Male	3	Private	High
T(12)	41	Female	14	Government	Moderate
T(13)	36	Male	10	Government	Low
T(14)	33	Female	7	Private	High

Data Collection

The semi-structured interviews of about 35-40 minutes were used to gather the data. Most of the interviews were conducted in face-to-face mode; however, a few of them were online through Google Meet. The interview guide allowed the participants to ponder extensively about their professional identity, expertise change, and these feelings provoked by AI. The questions that included essential questions were: ‘How has the emergence of AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Perplexity, etc. changed your understanding of yourself as an expert’ and ‘How do you deal with the tension that exists between what you already know and what AI knows’? Follow-up questions were also asked to elicit further reflection on the issue. Data collection was discontinued when thematic saturation was reached, i.e., when no new insights emerged from subsequent interviews. Interviews were audio-taped and transcribed word-to-word with the consent of the respondents.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was done using thematic analysis structure as introduced by Braun and Clarke (2006). It involved the six-stage process in which one was familiarized with data, formulated initial codes, theme search, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes and report production. The analysis of data was done manually following this six-stage process. It was an inductive analysis into which themes were found as they were directly stated by the respondents as opposed to attempting to make them fit into an already code box.

Trustworthiness and Ethics

To be trustworthy, the study relied on the criteria of (Lincoln et al., 1985b). Credibility was achieved through member checking where the respondents were given an opportunity to check the themes and transcripts to ascertain their accuracy. The reliability was enhanced with maintenance of a record of all the analytical decisions. All the participants provided their voluntary consent, and they were assured of anonymity and referred to by pseudonyms (ex: T1, T2) in the results.

RESULTS

The interviews indicated that teacher educators are undergoing a complex and often unsettling negotiation of their professional persona. This negotiation was charted by five meaningful themes that are- Questioning Epistemic Authority; From Knowledge Holder to Learning Facilitator; Anxiety, Adaptation, and Identity Tension; Reconstructing Professional Relevance; and the Crisis of Assessment: Negotiating Validity and Integrity. These results depict deep transformations in both skills and the role-playing in the era of AI generation.

Theme 1: Questioning Epistemic Authority

One of the main conclusions was that a lot of teachers experienced the challenge of their old epistemical authority. They repeatedly talked about an existential moment they had when they understood how generative AI could produce information more quickly and in some cases with more accuracy than they could. This made them subvert the authority to be the expert in the classroom. One of the participants said: “*Ek time wo tha jab unke typical questions ke answers sirf mere paas hote the. Par ab to unhe sirf ChatGpt chahiye. Kabhi Kabhi mujhe lagta hai ab future me unhe meri jarurat nahi hogi*” T(1). The theme depicts the destabilizing hierarchy of knowledge. The teachers have believed that AI is taking over their training and

experience to the extent that it draws attention, which has changed the way they view their authority.

The teacher educators also noted an alteration in the expectations of students. Students no longer regard the educator as the secondary check mechanism as opposed to the truth. T(5) pointed out, *“Ab unhe ‘kya’ ka jawab nahi chahiye, ab unhe sirf ye check karna hai ki jo bhi AI bata raha hai, wo sahi hai ya nahi. Ab mera role ‘source’ se ‘judge’ me badal chuka hai”*. This change generates a tension of ‘speed vs. depth’, teachers are stressing out to keep up with the reactive nature of AI but with pedagogical depth, which is a key component in teacher training. Power is shifting no longer towards a more specific attribute but towards a dialogical, negotiated phenomenon. T(12) replied, *“Har din mujhe apni importance ko prove karna padta hai. Ab sirf teacher ka tag apko teacher nahi banata. Mujhe unhe ye samjhana padta hai ki mera experience level ki wajah se jo improvement hai, wo AI se badh kar hai”*. This persistent desire to be validated changes the attitude towards the educator and his/her image in the classroom. Thus, a shift can be observed towards the new learning paradigm of evolving the status-based authority to evidence-based authority where teachers must continually prove their superiority in human pedagogical knowledge over AI-generated material (Cooper et al., 2024). Through the lens of Role Theory and PIT, it is evident that there is a misalignment of what is expected from a teacher, as an expert, and the new reality of knowledge being accessible with the help of AI. Furthermore, there is an instability of professional self-concept.

Theme 2: From Knowledge Holder to Learning Facilitator

In reaction to the loss of traditional authority, respondents talked about a distinct change in their obligations to their professions. They ceased to be the main holder of knowledge and were turned into learning facilitators or critical curators. This has been translated as a survival move in the digital era. T(4) elaborated, *“Ab mera role students ko topic samjhana nahi hai, ab mera role ye hai ki unhe ye batana hai ki AI content ko kaise question kiya jaaye. Main ek critical guide ka role play kar sakta hu jo unhe ‘too much information’ ke daldal se bachaye”*.

This shift goes with social constructivist theories. Some of the described changes emphasized by the participants concerning pedagogy included the transformation of lectures into joint prompt-engineering workshops in which the students and the teacher educators would deconstruct the output of AI together. T(8) opinionated, *“Ab classroom ek laboratory ki tarah ho gai hai, jaha ham sirf seekh nahi rahe hain, but jo seekha use question bhi kar rahe hain. Mere baccho ke sath sath ab main bhi seekh rahi hun ki in machines ke sath kaise handle kia jaaye”*.

Also, the respondents observed that their knowledge is being diffused among humans and non-human actors. They are no longer compelled to be the only expert but to arrange various sources of knowledge. T(7) exuded, *“Mane ye realize kia hai ki ab mera sab kuch janana jaruri nahi hai, mujhe sirf unhe ye sikhana hai ki kya credible hai, aur use ethically kaise use kar sakte hain. Halaki, isne mera kaam kaafi asan kar diya hai, par mujhe is baat ka ehsaas hota hai ki meri identity ‘as a teacher’ kahi kho si gy hai”*. Such a task of a critical mediator requires the high level of meta-cognition. Teachers need to demonstrate the thinking processes that they want their students to create. This new identity means the transition to a process mastery instead of content mastery that will enable educators to retain their worth, as they will be able to lead inquiry instead of just answering questions (Satvati et al., 2023). This also represents a change aligned with Social Constructivism, because the transmission model of knowledge production is transforming into a model where knowledge is created through the co-production of teachers, students and digital tools.

Theme 3: Anxiety, Adaptation, and Identity Tension

Evidently, the negotiations over professional identity were characterised as a stressful process which included emotional and practical tension. A lot of participants were concerned with the speed of the change and the technical requirements of AI. Educators particularly experienced this identity tension because of the perceived threat of undermining their old school values of teaching. One educator said, *“Mujhe asa lagta hai ki main kisi competition me bhaag rahi hu jaha mujhe jaldi se jaldi AI guru banana hai. Mane hamesha apni teaching me human interaction aur personalized learning pe focus kia hai. Par ajkal ke robotic classrooms me, mujhe samjh nahi ata ki mera place kaha hai”* T(7).

The participants also reported an imposter syndrome, which was caused by institutional pressures. Universities wanted to quickly embrace AI yet they did not offer pedagogical structures, thus teachers felt as lacking and feared becoming obsolete. T(3) said, *“Authorities hamse chahati hain ki ham ek dum se AI-ready graduates ban jaaye aur different AI tools use kare. But ethically and practically this is wrong. Mujhe ab dar lagne laga hai ki koi dusra tech-savy mujhe kabhi bhi replce kar sakta hai. Ab mere experience ki koi value nahi rahi”*.

The theme reveals the so-called fear of obsolescence that applies to many experienced teachers. Many claimed the loss of traditional learning environment where they were expert and well-recognized. T(11), referred it as ‘professional grief’, which is the grieving of their identity that they had created during decades. This anxiety is aggravated by the invisibility of the efforts to match with the everchanging technological trends, which is hardly rewarded through the tenure and promotion systems. Herein lies the high degree of emotional labor required in identity work of the educators who must balance between traditional educational values and new competence claims that are imposed on them in an increasingly automated sector.

Theme 4: Reconstructing Professional Relevance

Regardless of the anxiety, teacher educator findings indicate a proactive approach on behalf of the teacher educators to regain their relevancy. The respondents found distinctly human traits namely ethical judgment, empathy, and critical facilitation to be the main aspects of their new identity, which cannot be mimicked by AI. T(13) explained, *“Students ko pata hi nahi hai ki AI content ke kya ethical implications hain. Aur isliye ab mera focus ‘humane teaching’ pe jyada rhega, jaha main unhe ethics aur critical thinking ke sath sath socio-emotional support bhi provide krunga”*.

This depicts the role renegotiation (Role Theory) in which the teacher educators re-establish their worth. They started to regard themselves as socio-emotional coaches, offering a scaffolding of professional and personal development of students- the functions of which need to be contextualized and empathetic and that GenAI cannot handle. T(10) continued, *“AI unhe lesson plans banake de sakta hai par wo unhe ye nahi bata sakta ki naughty kids ko kaise handle karna hai ya unpredicted situations ko kaise handle karna hai ya school politics se kaise bachna hai. Aur ye kuch aisi chije hain jaha ham unhe guide kar sakte hain”*. T(4) said, *“Hum teachers ki ab ye jimmedari hai ki ham teacher education me ‘human’ ko kaise preserve kare. Agar main baccho ko ye seekha saku ki wo AI ka use karte hue, apne students ki emotional needs kaise poori kar sakte hain, to main apne kaam me successful ho jaunga”*. Through this relational expertise, the educators no longer present themselves as technical content providers, but rather as moral and critical guardians of learning based on what makes education so humane. Thus, by supporting the Professional Identity Theory and Role Theory, the participants are actively building a sound career identity based on skills in human-centered competencies. They also indicate that they are redefining legitimate teaching work in the age of AI.

Theme 5: The Crisis of Assessment: Negotiating Validity and Integrity

An important aspect of the identity change of teacher educators focused on the perceived failure of old assessment validity. There was a sense of professional obsolescence in respondents about their job as examiners with standard instruments, such as take-home essays and written assignments, being no longer the sure predictors of student learning. It was a lack of the ability to differentiate between human and AI-generated outputs that triggered a crisis of confidence in their own judgment of competence. T(9) put this sentiment on the nail on the head, *“Assessment ke traditional tarike ab bekar ho chuke hain. Ye pata laga pana ki assignments real me kisne kia hai, bahut difficult hai. Mujhe asa feel hota hai ki main kisi algorithm ko assess kar rahi hun, naa ki kisi student ko. Mere professional judgement ki ab utni value nahi hai, jitna pahle hoti thi”*.

This led participants to painful and unwilling changes in their role as an assessor of learning into a policeman of integrity. This antagonistic attitude was in direct conflict with their role as teachers and experts of student development. The psychological burden of suspicion undermined professional fulfillment of grading or assessment process. P(14) explained this internal struggle, *“Pahle mujhe students ke assignments padhne me maza ata tha kyunki unme new ideas hote the, par ab wo itne perfect hote hain ki bas ab mujhe unme red flags search karne hote hain- jaise ki bahut jyada perfect phrased sentences, superficial statements, fake citations and quotes. Aisa lagta hai ki ham detective hain. Par isse teacher-students ka wo trust kamzor ho jata hain jo itne saalo me establish hua tha”*.

Moreover, the paper has placed emphasis on the panicked redesign of curricula, to incorporate AI-resistant assessments, either in oral form, or a handwritten draft in the classroom. Respondents doubted that these new ways were actually assessing high-order thinking or they were simply going around the technology. T(6) added, *“Ham dubara se wahi surveillance-based measures, jaise ki pen-paper tests, essay exams or timed exams use kar rhe hain, just to confirm that they are writing without internet. Par ab hamara focus unki knowledge ko test karne par to raha nahi. Ek accha student jo khud se apne assignemnts likh raha hai, wo bhi shaq ke ghere me hai. I think I am losing pedagogical value in order to preserve the integrity of the grade”*. This theme highlights the high level of anxiety about the competence of educators in the capacity to accurately assess and certify student competence which is fundamental to their profession. Clearly, role theory explains the complexity that arises from teachers' inability to assess and differentiate between students' work and AI-generated work.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present research explain a deep-seated existential and professional shock caused by generative AI among teacher educators, with a defiant renegotiation of the expert role. It indicates that generative AI is threatening the professional identity of teacher educators, changing expectations about their professional roles and the way knowledge is produced in shared human-AI spaces. Moreover, Professional Identity Theory, Social Constructivism, and Role Theory all help to explain the implications of this change for the self, relationships to students, and expectations of the institution. These ideas under the themes Questioning Epistemic Authority (Theme 1) and The Crisis of Assessment (Theme 5) all point to the fact that the role of the educator is fundamentally broken down. According to Selwyn (2019), digital technologies tend to destabilize the established power structures in the field of education; the results, however, indicate that it is more disruptive than it has been expected and documented so far. It transcends the changes of pedagogy to an ontological crisis. The educator loses his/her epistemic advantage once AI is able to do the most important parts of the job namely, give answers and synthesize literature. This is consistent with the Biddle's (1986) role conflict concept where role expectations (expert assessor) are in conflict with environment reality (AI ubiquity) which produces the behaviour and suspicion

of policing observed in Theme 5. The fact that the student learning is no longer easily quantifiable using the classical product-based assessment methods (Rudolph et al., 2023) brings about a feeling of professional ineffectiveness as the teacher loses the control over the major means of determining the effectiveness of his/her teaching.

The shift outlined in Theme 2, "Knowledge Holder to Learning Facilitator" aids in the long-term development of pedagogical practice in the sense of sage on the stage into guide on the side (King, 1993). But this is not simply a voluntary pedagogical choice as the data shows, but a defensive identity practice due to the obsolescence of information transmission. The shift in this case is reactive as opposed to gradual adoption of constructivist methods in the past with status anxiety. Loss of the identity of the knowledge holder is seen as a loss of prestige by the participants. This compelled change is a part of the "Anxiety, Adaptation, and Identity Tension" (Theme 3). Akkerman and Meijer (2011) posit that teacher identity is dynamic and multiplicitous; in this case, teachers are unable to combine the I-teacher-as-expert role with the new I-teacher-as-facilitator role, which leads to a discontinuous sense of self.

Although this is a turbulent period, Theme 4, "Reconstructing Professional Relevance," brings out the strength of professional identity. The shift in rebuilding relevance by focused consideration of human skills, skills of empathy, ethics and mentorship, implies a bifurcation of value. In the case of AIs, the what (content) is taken care of, but teacher educators are retreating to the why and how (human development). This would be in line with Beauchamp and Thomas (2011), who argue that agency shapes teacher identity; in this case, teachers are actively writing new professional stories to leave out those tasks that can be easily automated and focus on those that only have human connection. The results indicate that the future expert will not be a matter of what one has stored in their memory but the ability to place the stored information in a human, moral context.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

This paper shows that the era of generative AI means that the professional identity of teacher educators is renegotiated critically, marked by a loss of traditional authority, a compelled role redefinition as a pedagogue, and a highly negative fight with assessment integrity. The results indicate that the concept of the expert is no longer viable in its classical form; it will have to assume a hybrid form that will integrate the technological literacy with clearly human mentoring skills. The research has a contribution to the literature as it demonstrates that the change is not only technical but a highly emotional process, which implies loss of status and a fear of obsolescence.

There are profound implications on the teacher education policy and practice. To begin with, faculty development initiatives cannot solely focus on technical training of AI tools to consider the psychological and identity-based effects of AI technologies. The institutions will have to offer their educators a place to work with the aspect of identity grief linked to the loss of their role as the main knowledge bearers. Second, teacher education curricula need to be immediate redesigned. The future educators need to be educated not only in content, but also in an ethics and mechanics of introducing non-human agents to the classroom, which is called AI Pedagogy. This preventive curricular change is needed to be sure that pre-service teachers are able to begin work with a stable post-AI professional identity, as opposed to it being acquired in a crisis scenario.

Third, assessment policies have to be transformed by the institutional leadership. Administrators should shift toward less restraining prohibitions and policing attitudes to systems that help promote process-based assessment. This change demands resources and legitimization, not letting individual educators to find their way in the institutional void

alone. Moreover, the crisis provides a chance to reinvent academic honesty as not a matter of compliance, but of open and scrutinizing AI applications.

Subsequent studies need to be longitudinal, to determine whether the present anxiety dissolves into a stable post-AI professions self, or whether the rapid rate of change of technologies puts the future in a state of everlasting identity limbo. Moreover, researchers need to explore the possibility of having models of Human-AI Collaboration, focusing on the ways in which the identity of the teacher can be enhanced by AI as opposed to being endangered by the latter. Also, the study will need to look at how the identity struggles that teacher educators struggle with currently are passed down to pre-service teachers; are mentors passing anxiety or resiliency to the next generation? Lastly, cross-cultural research is required to learn the mediating role of institutional resources and cultural orientations towards technology in these identity tensions in various learning settings.

LIMITATIONS

There are some limitations in the present study. The study was limited to 14 teacher educators from the Delhi region, which may affect the generalisability of the findings to other contexts. Also, since the study follows a qualitative approach with self-reported experiences, the findings reveal the subjective experiences of the teacher educators. Moreover, the rapid development of generative AI technologies may affect future views and practices in the area not covered by this study. However, despite these limitations, this study gives valuable insights into the professional identity changes experienced by teacher educators in the contemporary higher education environment.

REFERENCES

- Akkerman, S. F., & Meijer, P. C. (2010). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 308–319.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013>
- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1), 52–62.
<https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>
- Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009b). Understanding teacher identity: an overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2), 175–189.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640902902252>
- Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2011). New teachers' identity shifts at the boundary of teacher education and initial practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(1), 6–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.04.003>
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 67–92.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.12.080186.000435>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. Y. (2023). The AI revolution in Education: Will AI replace or assist teachers in higher education? *arXiv (Cornell University)*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2305.01185>
- Cooper, G., Tang, K., & Rappa, N. A. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence as Epistemic Authority?: Perspectives from higher education. In *Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education* (pp. 106–122).
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003440178-7>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. (2017). *Qualitative Inquiry and research design : choosing among five approaches*. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&doc_number=015659534&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORS&service_type=MEDIA
- Doğan, M., Celik, A., & Arslan, H. (2024). AI In Higher Education: Risks and Opportunities From the Academician Perspective. *European Journal of Education*, 60(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12863>
- Killian, C. M., Marttinen, R., Howley, D., Sargent, J., & Jones, E. M. (2023). “Knock, knock .

- . . who's there?" ChatGPT and Artificial Intelligence-Powered Large Language Models: Reflections on Potential Impacts Within Health and Physical Education Teacher Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 42(3), 385–389.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2023-0058>
- King, A. (1993). From Sage on the stage to Guide on the side. *College Teaching*, 41(1), 30–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1993.9926781>
- Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E. G., & Pilotta, J. J. (1985b). Naturalistic inquiry. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9(4), 438–439.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(85\)90062-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8)
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2024). The effects of generative AI on initial language teacher education: The perceptions of teacher educators. *System*, 122, 103290.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103290>
- Nyaaba, M., & Zhai, X. (2024). Generative AI professional development needs for teacher educators. *Journal of AI*, 8(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1385915>
- Prilop, C. N., Mah, D., Jacobsen, L. J., Hansen, R. R., Weber, K. E., & Hoya, F. (2024). Generative AI in teacher education: Using AI-enhanced methods to explore teacher educators' perceptions. *OSF Preprints*. In press.
<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/szcwb>
- Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>
- Rütti-Joy, O., Winder, G., & Biedermann, H. (2024). Teacher educator professionalism in the age of AI: Navigating the new landscape of quality education. In *Artificial Intelligence and Education-Shaping the Future of Learning: Shaping the Future of Learning*, (pp. 177-192). IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1005030>
- Satvati, N., Kamali, J., Boldaji, F. S., Khodadadi, M., & Akhondi, S. (2023). Exploring the Role of Ai Integration into Language Education in Language Teacher Identity Construction: An Ecological Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4670840>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers?: AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED599636>
- Vallejo, A. (2024). transformación del rol docente en la era de la Inteligencia Artificial: hacia un liderazgo pedagógico estratégico. *Trayectorias Universitarias*, 10(19), 165.
<https://doi.org/10.24215/24690090e165>
- Zaman, S., Hussain, M. S., & Tabassam, M. (2024). Use of Artificial intelligence in Education: English language Teachers' identity negotiation in Higher education. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(3), 861–869.
<https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.3.70>
- Zhou, Q., Hashim, H., & Sulaiman, N. A. (2024). Digital Echoes: Crafting Chinese EFL teacher Identity in the era of AI-Enhanced Instruction—A Qualitative Exploration. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 32–50.
<https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6864>