Between Hope, Probability, and Practice: Teachers' Visions of AI-Supported Inclusive Education

Lina Gaižiūnienė[1], Laura Daniusevičiūtė-Brazaitė[2], Raminta Pučėtaitė[3]

[1,2,3] Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Abstract

This study explores teachers' visions of AI-supported inclusive education through a futures literacy perspective, focusing on how educators distinguish between desirable, probable, and plausible educational futures. Using a scenario-based qualitative design, data were collected from 50 teachers who described future learning environments shaped by artificial intelligence. The findings indicate that teachers primarily view AI as a pedagogical support tool enabling personalised learning, adaptive feedback, immersive environments, and increased accessibility. Inclusive education is mainly conceptualised through learner agency, universal design, and equitable participation rather than deficit-oriented approaches. The analysis identified four configurations of AI-supported inclusive education. The most desirable scenario presents AI as an enabler of learner-centered and inclusive education that strengthens teacher agency and supports diverse learners. However, efficiency-driven systems focused on monitoring, automation, and performance optimisation are perceived as the most probable trajectory. A third scenario highlights ethical concerns, including surveillance, algorithmic bias, and the erosion of human relationships, thereby defining the boundaries of undesirable futures. Finally, a hybrid and negotiated scenario emerges as the most plausible pathway, characterised by context-sensitive AI integration guided by teachers' professional judgement. The findings reveal normative, probabilistic, and pragmatic tensions shaping teachers' anticipatory thinking and demonstrate that inclusive AI futures depend not only on technological advancement but also on ethical governance, institutional conditions, and professional agency. The study contributes to futures-oriented educational research and highlights the importance of futures literacy in supporting inclusive, ethical, and human-centered educational transformation.

Keywords: *futures literacy; artificial intelligence in education; inclusive education; teacher agency; educational futures*

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly presented as a transformative force capable of personalising learning, improving efficiency, and supporting learner diversity [7]. At the same time, critical scholarship emphasises that educational technologies are not neutral and that their adoption is shaped by social, political, and institutional contexts [10]. These tensions are especially visible in discussions of inclusive education, where questions of participation, equity, and accessibility are central. Most existing research on AI in education focuses on technological capabilities, implementation challenges, or data-driven governance. Such approaches often frame technological change as inevitable while underestimating the ethical and pedagogical implications of AI integration [9]. From a futures literacy perspective, however, the future is not treated as predictable but as a space of multiple possibilities shaped by values, assumptions, and anticipatory thinking [6]. Futures literacy emphasises the capacity to distinguish between desirable, probable, and plausible futures and to reflect critically on the assumptions and values that underpin anticipatory thinking [4]. In educational research, this perspective shifts attention away from forecasting technological outcomes towards examining how different actors use the future as a resource for sense-making and decision-making in the present. Teachers play a central role in shaping how AI is interpreted and enacted in educational practice. As professionals situated at the intersection of policy, technology, and everyday pedagogy, teachers' perspectives provide insight into how future educational change is imagined, contested, and negotiated. Research on teacher agency highlights that educators are not merely implementers of externally defined innovations but active agents whose professional judgement is crucial for ethically and pedagogically meaningful practice [2]. Understanding teachers' future imaginaries therefore offers a window into broader questions about the purposes of education, professional responsibility, and the conditions under which inclusion is pursued or constrained.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative scenario-based research design grounded in futures literacy. Rather than predicting future developments, the study explores how teachers imagine and evaluate possible futures of AI-supported inclusive education. Scenario-based analysis was selected because it enables the systematic exploration of desirable, probable, plausible, and risk-oriented futures. The research integrates narrative inquiry with futures-oriented analysis. Narrative inquiry supports the exploration of how participants construct meaning through imagined future scenarios [3]. The study additionally draws on the future-scaffolding skills framework [4], which enables the identification of tensions, uncertainties, and anticipatory thinking patterns within participants' narratives [1]. Grounded Theory principles guided the inductive coding process [5].

2.2 Participants and Data Collection

The study involved 50 teachers working in formal education settings in Lithuania. Participants represented different subject areas, teaching experiences, and institutional contexts. Teachers were invited to imagine educational environments in the year 2050 where AI technologies play a significant role in teaching and learning. Data were collected using an open-ended scenario-oriented questionnaire. Participants described future educational environments, reflected on differences between current and future practices, and evaluated the desirability and likelihood of their envisioned futures.

2.3 Data Analysis

The analysis combined thematic coding with scenario-based synthesis. Responses were segmented into meaning-bearing fragments and coded across several analytical dimensions: AI functionality, pedagogical processes, inclusion, ethical concerns, and emotional orientation. The second stage of analysis focused on positioning responses within a futures cone framework distinguishing desirable, probable, plausible, and possible futures.

3. Results

AI is predominantly imagined as a personalising, adaptive, and supportive pedagogical agent, closely aligned with learner-centred and relational educational values. Inclusion is framed less as targeted remediation and more as a matter of agency, accessibility, and participation, indicating a shift away from deficit-based discourses. At the scenario level, teachers' visions are strongly oriented toward desirable futures in which AI enhances inclusive education, while simultaneously acknowledging plausible hybrid arrangements shaped by ethical concerns, infrastructural limits, and professional judgement. These patterns underscore the coexistence of aspiration and caution in teachers' futures literacy, setting the stage for the subsequent discussion of normative–probabilistic–pragmatic tensions in AI-supported inclusive education.

Scenario 1: AI as an Enabler of Inclusive Education
This scenario represents a normative vision of a future in which artificial intelligence (AI) functions as a key enabler of inclusive education, supporting diverse learners through flexible, learner-centred, and equitable educational practices. Participants describe AI not merely as a technological innovation or a tool for efficiency, but as a pedagogical mediator that enables personalised learning pathways, reduces learning barriers, and strengthens social inclusion (INC1, INC2, INC4, INC5; AI-F1). Learning in this envisioned future is grounded in principles of universal design, whereby content, assessment, and learning pace are adapted to individual learners rather than requiring learners to conform to standardised expectations (INC1, CMP4). AI-supported tools provide multiple modes of content representation and continuous formative feedback perceived as supportive rather than controlling (AI-F3, CMP3), as reflected in participants' accounts, for example: *"I would like technologies to adapt to each learner, instead of learners having to adapt to the system"* (R14). Inclusion is conceptualised through the lens of equity rather than equality, with respondents emphasising AI's potential to support students with special educational needs, language

difficulties, or those at risk of marginalisation by adjusting learning pace, task complexity, and modes of explanation (INC2, AI-F7), as one participant noted: *"AI could support students who are currently left behind by adjusting the pace, tasks, and even the way explanations are provided"* (R31). Within this scenario, AI is predominantly portrayed as a learning assistant that complements rather than replaces teachers, automating technical and repetitive tasks while leaving pedagogical decision-making and relational work firmly within the teacher's domain (AI-F2, AI-F4, GOV2), thereby strengthening rather than diminishing teacher agency (PED5, CMP3). This future is also strongly associated with emotional and social well-being, with participants expressing feelings of hope and reduced stress and describing learning environments in which mistakes are framed as an integral part of learning rather than failure (EMO1, PED5), for instance: *"This kind of future feels calmer—for both students and teachers"* (R22). When positioned within the futures cone framework, this scenario is clearly identified as desirable (CONE-DES) but less frequently perceived as probable, as respondents highlight the need for systemic conditions such as teacher training, ethical and legal regulation, adequate infrastructure, and policy support (CONE-PLAUS; CHG2; GOV1–GOV3), noting that *"the system is not yet ready for it"* (R9). This reveals a pronounced normative–probabilistic gap (GAP1), further reinforced by respondents' limited sense of influence over system-level change (GAP5; CHG3), as expressed by one participant: *"I can change my own teaching practices, but not the entire system"* (R18). Ethical concerns related to data privacy and algorithmic bias are also identified as potential constraints (ETH1, ETH2; GAP3), underscoring the complexity of translating this value-driven vision of AI-supported inclusive education into practice.

Table 1. Scenario 1: AI as an Enabler of Inclusive Education – Core Configuration

Element	Description
In the centre	**Learner (diverse needs)**
Teacher	Professional judgement grounded in care and relational pedagogy
AI tools	Supportive role enabling personalisation and accessibility
Learning environment	Universal design and flexible learning pathways
Value base	Inclusion as equity, learner well-being, and learner agency

Table 1 summarises Scenario 1, which represents a learner-centred and care-oriented configuration of AI-supported inclusive education. In this scenario, AI functions as an enabling tool rather than a governing force, supporting personalised learning and accessibility alongside teacher professional judgement. Inclusion is understood as equity and meaningful participation, grounded in a learning environment designed according to universal design principles and flexible pathways.

Scenario 2: AI as an Instrument of Efficiency and Control

This scenario represents a future of AI-supported education that is predominantly shaped by efficiency, standardisation, and data-driven governance, and is therefore most frequently positioned as probable within the futures cone framework. In participants' accounts, AI is primarily associated with automating assessment, monitoring learner progress, and optimising instructional processes at scale (AI-F3, AI-F4, CMP1). Learning analytics, predictive systems, and automated feedback mechanisms are described as central features of everyday educational practice, enabling institutions to track performance, identify risks, and allocate resources more efficiently (GOV1, GOV3). While such uses of AI are often perceived as realistic extensions of current trends (CONE-PROB), respondents express ambivalent emotional responses, oscillating between cautious optimism and concern (EMO3). Inclusion in this scenario is framed more narrowly and instrumentally, focusing on identifying "at-risk" students through data rather than fundamentally redesigning learning environments to accommodate diversity (INC4, CMP5). As one participant noted, "AI would probably help schools see who is struggling faster, but I am not sure it would really change how learning works" (R26). Teachers in this scenario are positioned as implementers of AI-generated recommendations rather than autonomous pedagogical decision-makers, with AI systems increasingly shaping instructional choices, assessment criteria, and pacing (GOV2, CHG4a). Although this redistribution of responsibility is sometimes viewed as reducing workload, it also raises concerns about the erosion of professional agency and pedagogical judgement (CMP3, ETH3), reflected in comments such as "There is a risk that teachers will have to follow what the system suggests, even if it does not fully fit their students" (R11). Emotional and relational dimensions of education receive comparatively less attention in

this scenario, and learning is often described in terms of performance indicators, benchmarks, and compliance rather than well-being or belonging (PED5, CMP2). Ethical issues, particularly related to data privacy, surveillance, and algorithmic bias, are recurrently mentioned as latent risks rather than central design considerations (ETH1, ETH2), suggesting that ethical reflection may lag behind technological implementation. When contrasted with the first scenario, this future is perceived as more likely to materialise but less desirable, revealing a clear tension between what participants expect will happen and what they believe should happen in AI-supported inclusive education. This scenario thus illustrates a probable trajectory of AI integration that prioritises systemic efficiency over transformative inclusion, highlighting the risk that AI adoption may reinforce existing educational structures rather than challenge them.

Table 2. Scenario 2: AI as an Instrument of Efficiency and Control – Core Configuration

Element	Description
In the centre	**AI-driven system (data analytics and automation)**
Teacher	Implementation of AI-generated recommendations; constrained professional agency
Learners	Monitored through performance data; categorised into risk profiles
Governance context	Accountability frameworks, standards, indicators, and KPIs
Value base	Efficiency, standardisation, and control

Table 2 summarises Scenario 2, which represents a system-centred and efficiency-oriented configuration of AI-supported education. In this scenario, AI-driven analytics and automation structure teaching and learning processes, positioning teachers primarily as implementers rather than autonomous decision-makers. Learners are framed through data-based monitoring and risk categorisation, and inclusion is addressed instrumentally within governance and accountability frameworks rather than through pedagogical redesign.

Scenario 3: AI as a Source of Risk, Inequality, and Educational Regression

This scenario captures a future-oriented perspective in which the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education is primarily associated with risk, uncertainty, and potential regression rather than improvement. Participants describing this scenario express strong concerns regarding the ethical, social, and pedagogical implications of AI use, positioning these risks as outweighing its potential benefits (ETH1, ETH2, ETH3). AI is frequently perceived as a technology that may intensify surveillance, reduce human interaction, and exacerbate existing inequalities, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds or those with specific learning needs (INC4, CMP5). Rather than fostering inclusion, AI in this scenario is seen as reinforcing deficit-based approaches to learning, where students are categorised, monitored, and labelled based on algorithmic predictions (AI-F4, CMP3). As one participant articulated, *"I am afraid that technology will decide who is capable and who is not, and that this will only increase exclusion"* (R33). Teachers' professional roles in this scenario are characterised by a loss of agency and increased dependency on externally imposed technological systems and policy mandates (GOV1, GOV2; CHG4a), leading to feelings of powerlessness and resistance (CHG3, EMO2). Respondents describe a future in which pedagogical judgement is subordinated to algorithmic logic, raising fears of dehumanisation and the erosion of meaningful teacher–student relationships (ETH3, CMP3), as reflected in statements such as *"Education risks becoming a process managed by systems rather than people"* (R19). Emotional responses associated with this scenario are predominantly negative, including anxiety, frustration, and concern for the future of education (EMO2), and are often linked to a broader distrust in institutional capacity to regulate AI responsibly. Within the futures cone framework, this scenario is most often positioned as possible but not desirable (CONE-POSS), and in some cases as a plausible outcome should ethical, regulatory, and pedagogical safeguards fail to materialise (CONE-PLAUS; GAP3, GAP4). In contrast to the first two scenarios, this future is characterised less by a debate over implementation strategies and more by fundamental doubts about whether AI should play a significant role in inclusive education at all. As such, the scenario highlights the importance of ethical governance, professional agency, and value-driven decision-making in shaping AI trajectories in education, while illustrating the perceived risks of uncritical or poorly regulated technological adoption.

Table 3. Scenario 3: AI as a Source of Risk and Educational Regression – Core Configuration

Element	Description
In the centre	**Perceived risks and uncertainties related to AI use**
Teacher	Loss of professional agencies; resistance and ethical concern
Learners	Risk of exclusion, labelling, and marginalisation
AI systems	Opaque algorithms; surveillance and bias
Value base	Ethical caution, protection of human relationships, avoidance of harm

Table 3 presents Scenario 3, which frames AI-supported education primarily through risks, ethical concerns, and the potential for educational regression. In this scenario, AI is associated with surveillance, algorithmic bias, and the erosion of human-centred pedagogical relationships. Teachers express diminished professional agency and principled resistance to AI adoption, while learners are viewed as vulnerable to categorisation, exclusion, and dehumanisation. Rather than enabling inclusion, AI is perceived as a threat to equity and educational integrity, positioning this scenario as possible but normatively undesirable.

Scenario 4: AI as a Catalyst for Hybrid and Negotiated Educational Futures

This scenario represents a hybrid and negotiated future of AI-supported education, in which artificial intelligence is neither uncritically embraced nor fundamentally rejected, but instead integrated through continuous negotiation among pedagogical values, institutional constraints, and technological possibilities. Participants describing this scenario emphasise contextual, cautious, and selective use of AI, highlighting the importance of human judgement, professional autonomy, and situational decision-making (PED1, GOV2, CHG3). AI is perceived as a flexible tool whose role varies across subjects, learner groups, and educational settings, rather than as a uniform solution applied system-wide (AI-F1, AI-F2). In contrast to efficiency-driven models, this scenario foregrounds deliberation and balance, with respondents stressing that AI should support learning only "where it makes pedagogical sense" and be limited where it risks undermining relationships or learner agency (CMP3, ETH3). As one participant explained, *"AI can be useful, but only if teachers decide when and how to use it—it cannot work the same way in every situation"* (R21). Inclusion in this scenario is understood as a dynamic and negotiated practice, shaped by teachers' professional judgement and local knowledge of learners' needs rather than solely by algorithmic recommendations (INC5, INC2). Emotional responses associated with this future are predominantly ambivalent but reflective, combining cautious optimism with awareness of risks and responsibilities (EMO3). Within the futures cone framework, this scenario is most frequently positioned as plausible (CONE-PLAUS), as it aligns with current transitional practices and incremental change rather than radical transformation or technological regression. However, respondents also acknowledge that sustaining such a balanced approach requires ongoing professional development, institutional trust in teachers, and adaptive governance structures capable of responding to rapid technological change (GOV1–GOV3; CHG2). This scenario thus illustrates a future in which AI integration is shaped through continuous sense-making and negotiation, positioning educators not as passive adopters of technology but as active co-constructors of evolving, context-sensitive educational practices.

Table 4. Scenario 4: AI as Hybrid and Negotiated Futures – Core Configuration

Element	Description
In the centre	**Pedagogical judgement mediating AI use**
Teacher	Active professional agency; contextual and ethical decision-making
Learners	Diverse needs addressed through situational and flexible support
AI tools	Selective and context-sensitive use; supportive but non-dominant role
Governance context	Adaptive frameworks enabling professional discretion
Value base	Balance between inclusion, responsibility, and institutional feasibility

Table 5 summarises Scenario 4, which depicts a hybrid and negotiated configuration of AI-supported inclusive education. In this scenario, AI use is neither fully embraced nor rejected, but mediated through teachers' professional judgement and contextual decision-making. Teachers occupy a central role in determining when and how AI meaningfully supports learning, while learners' diverse needs are addressed through flexible and situational practices. This scenario reflects a pragmatically plausible future in which

inclusion is pursued through ongoing negotiation between educational values, institutional constraints, and sociotechnical possibilities.

A comparative synthesis of the four scenarios (see Table 5) highlights how AI-supported inclusive education is configured across different future imaginaries. The table illustrates clear differences in the core orientation of AI use, understandings of inclusion, teacher roles, emotional orientations, and futures cone positioning. Scenario 1 represents a learner-centered and care-oriented configuration in which AI functions as a pedagogical mediator aligned with equity and well-being. In contrast, Scenario 2 reflects a system-centred and efficiency-oriented trajectory, where AI-driven optimisation and monitoring dominate, and inclusion is framed instrumentally within governance and accountability structures. Scenario 3 delineates a boundary of unacceptable futures, emphasising risks related to surveillance, bias, and the erosion of professional and relational dimensions of education. Scenario 4 occupies an intermediate position, depicting a pragmatically plausible future in which AI use is selectively negotiated through teachers' professional judgement and contextual decision-making.

Taken together, Tables 1 - 4 and the accompanying figures demonstrate that teachers' future imaginaries of AI-supported inclusive education are not uniform or linear, but structured along a spectrum of desirable, probable, possible, and plausible futures. Rather than converging on a single anticipated trajectory, participants articulate multiple, sometimes conflicting, orientations toward AI, revealing how values, emotions, institutional logic, and perceptions of professional agency intersect in anticipatory reasoning.

Across open-ended responses, teachers consistently contrasted future AI-supported educational visions with current teaching and learning practices by emphasising limitations of standardisation, frontal instruction, and textbook-centred approaches. The present educational process was frequently described as oriented towards uniform content delivery and assessment, often neglecting learners' individual needs and experiential engagement. In contrast, future visions articulated by teachers foregrounded AI-supported personalisation, visualisation, and real-time feedback as mechanisms for transforming abstract learning into experiential understanding. Respondents provided detailed examples of how AI could reshape subject teaching. In mathematics education, one teacher envisioned a learning environment in which "*an AI model would monitor students' actions and understanding in real time and provide individualised tasks together with feedback supported by visual explanations*" (translated), contrasting this with current practices focused primarily on formula derivation and uniform problem-solving. Similarly, another respondent emphasised the value of immersive learning, stating that "*students could experience much more without leaving the classroom, for example by virtually moving into a Renaissance-era environment*" (translated).

Teachers' responses also revealed a strong desire to move away from predominantly passive learning modes. Current classrooms were described as spaces where "*students listen to the teacher's explanations, take notes, but have very little opportunity for independent work*" (translated). In future-oriented imaginaries, AI-supported environments were associated with increased learner activity, experimentation, and inquiry. At the same time, ambivalence was evident, particularly regarding the risk that AI might replace rather than support cognitive effort. One respondent observed that "*more and more students no longer try to think or search for answers themselves, relying instead on ChatGPT*" (translated), reflecting concerns about overreliance on automated assistance. The data further highlight a reconfiguration of teacher roles. While the current educational context was described as placing a heavy mechanical workload on teachers, future visions positioned AI as alleviating routine tasks and enabling renewed focus on pedagogical quality. As one participant stated, "*teachers' preparation time could be reduced, allowing greater focus on the quality of content rather than its quantity*" (translated). In this context, teachers envisioned their role shifting toward mentoring learners in how to learn, reflect, manage their time, and develop values, rather than primarily delivering content.

However, these aspirations were frequently accompanied by concerns about dehumanisation and the loss of relational contact, underscoring persistent tensions between technological potential and educational values. Taken together, these empirically grounded contrasts demonstrate that teachers use future imaginaries of AI-supported education as a means of critically reflecting on current educational shortcomings. The translated excerpts reinforce the scenario-based analysis by showing how normative aspirations, perceived probabilities, and pragmatic concerns intersect in teachers' anticipatory reasoning about inclusive educational futures.

Table 5. Comparison of scenarios of AI-supported inclusive education

Scenario	Core orientation of AI use	Understanding of inclusion	Role of teachers	Dominant emotional tone	Futures cone positioning	Key tensions and gaps
Scenario 1: AI as an Enabler of Inclusive Education	AI as a pedagogical mediator enabling personalised learning, universal design, and learner-centred support (AI-F1, AI-F2, AI-F7)	Inclusion understood as equity and meaningful participation for all learners, particularly those with diverse needs (INC1–INC5)	Teachers as facilitators, mentors, and relational agents; AI complements but does not replace pedagogical judgement (PED5, GOV2)	Positive (hope, inspiration, reduced stress) (EMO1)	Desirable; partially plausible (CONE-DES; CONE-PLAUS)	Normative–probabilistic gap; limited teacher agency at system level; ethical and capacity constraints (GAP1, GAP5, ETH1–ETH2)
Scenario 2: AI as an Instrument of Efficiency and Control	AI used for automation, assessment, monitoring, and optimisation of educational processes (AI-F3, AI-F4)	Inclusion framed instrumentally through identification and management of "at-risk" learners (INC4)	Teachers as implementers of AI-driven recommendations; partial erosion of professional autonomy (GOV2, CMP3)	Ambivalent (cautious optimism mixed with concern) (EMO3)	Probable (CONE-PROB)	Tension between efficiency and relational pedagogy; risk of surveillance and standardisation (CMP5, ETH3)
Scenario 3: AI as a Source of Risk and Regression	AI perceived as amplifying surveillance, bias, and dehumanisation (ETH1–ETH3)	Inclusion undermined through categorisation, labelling, and reinforcement of inequalities (INC4)	Teachers experience loss of agency and increased resistance to imposed technologies (CHG3, GOV1)	Negative (anxiety, distrust, frustration) (EMO2)	Possible; partly plausible (CONE-POSS; CONE-PLAUS)	Ethical gatekeeping failures; distrust in governance and regulation; fear of systemic harm (GAP3, GAP4)
Scenario 4: AI as a Catalyst for Hybrid and Negotiated Futures	AI selectively integrated based on pedagogical relevance and contextual judgement (AI-F1, AI-F2)	Inclusion treated as a dynamic, context-dependent practice shaped by professional judgement (INC2, INC5)	Teachers as active decision-makers and co-constructors of AI use (CHG3, GOV2)	Reflective ambivalence (cautious optimism and responsibility) (EMO3)	Plausible (CONE-PLAUS)	Need for continuous negotiation, professional learning, and adaptive governance (CHG2, GOV1–GOV3)

4. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that teachers do not perceive AI in education as either entirely positive or entirely negative. Instead, participants articulate complex and reflexive future imaginaries shaped by ethical concerns, institutional conditions, and pedagogical values. The desirable future scenario strongly emphasises inclusion, learner agency, and equitable participation. In this vision, AI supports rather than replaces pedagogical relationships and professional judgement. Such findings align with critical perspectives arguing that educational technologies should remain human-centred and ethically grounded [7], [10]. At the same time, teachers perceive efficiency-driven and data-oriented AI systems as the most probable future trajectory. This reflects broader institutional trends towards accountability, optimisation, and datafication in education. Participants' ambivalence towards these developments demonstrates tensions between technological efficiency and educational values. Between these normative aspirations and probabilistic expectations lies a pragmatic space in which teachers seek to synchronyse values with everyday professional realities. This pragmatic orientation is most clearly articulated in the hybrid scenario, where AI is selectively integrated based on pedagogical relevance, contextual judgement, and professional discretion. Teachers position themselves as active mediators who decide when and how AI can meaningfully support learning, rather than as passive implementers of externally imposed technologies. This emphasis on professional judgement aligns with conceptualisation of teacher agency [2] as central to educational professionalism, while also highlighting that such negotiated futures depend on enabling conditions such as institutional trust, supportive governance, and sustained professional development [8]. The study additionally highlights the importance of futures literacy in educational transformation. Futures literacy enables teachers to critically evaluate possible futures, reflect on ethical implications, and imagine alternative educational pathways rather than accepting technological change as inevitable.

5. Conclusion

This study explored teachers' visions of AI-supported inclusive education through a scenario-based futures literacy perspective. The findings demonstrate that teachers distinguish between desirable, probable, plausible, and risk-oriented educational futures. Teachers predominantly perceive AI as a pedagogical support tool capable of enhancing personalised learning, accessibility, and learner participation. However, participants also express concerns regarding surveillance, standardisation, dehumanisation, and the erosion of professional autonomy. The analysis reveals that inclusive AI futures depend not only on technological capability but also on ethical governance, institutional support, and professional agency. Hybrid and negotiated forms of AI integration emerged as the most plausible educational pathway, highlighting the continuing importance of teachers' professional judgement in shaping inclusive and human-centred educational futures.

REFERENCES

[1] Barelli E., Tasquier G., Caramaschi M., Satanassi S., Fantini P., Branchetti L., Levrini O., "Making sense of youth futures narratives", Frontiers in Education, Vol. 7, 2022.
[2] Biesta G., "Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy", Routledge, London, 2010.
[3] Gabriel Y., Griffiths D., "Stories in organizational research", Sage, London, 2004.
[4] Levrini O., Tasquier G., Branchetti L., Barelli E., "Developing future-scaffolding skills through science education", International Journal of Science Education, Vol. 41, No. 18, 2019, pp. 2647–2674. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1693080
[5] Morse J., "Mixing qualitative methods", Qualitative Health Research, Vol. 19, No. 11, 2009, pp. 1523–1524.
[6] Poli R., "Anticipation and futures studies", Springer, Cham, 2019.
[7] Selwyn N., "Education and technology: Key issues and debates", Bloomsbury Academic, London, 2022.
[8] UNESCO, "AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers", UNESCO Publishing, Paris, 2021.
[9] Williamson B., "Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice", SAGE, London, 2017.
[10] Williamson B., Eynon R., "Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education", Learning, Media and Technology, Vol. 45, No. 3, 2020, pp. 223–235.