Teachers at Threshold

Technology, AI Literacy and Pedagogical change in Public schools

Research Team

10/04/2026 | Vijayawada

LEADERSHIP FOR EQUITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Note on the Report

This report draws on thematic coding conducted across seven focus group discussions (FGDs) facilitated with government school teachers in two states, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, as part of the FLI Programme's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Literacy Needs Analysis. These FGDs were held in March 2026 and involved teachers from primary, upper-primary and secondary government schools.

All coded excerpts retained in this report are verbatim or near-verbatim from the source transcripts. Where translation quality was poor, the analyst notes accompanying coded segments carry interpretive weight that the excerpts themselves could not bear. This is flagged explicitly in the relevant section.

Methodology and Research Process

Research Design and Coding Framework

This teacher needs analysis was designed to assess readiness and exposure to AI literacy among public school teachers, in order to inform the AI progression framework under the FLI Program Design. To examine teachers' current understanding, perceptions, and experiences related to AI, seven focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted across Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. In Maharashtra, three FGDs were held: one during a Hackathon and two conducted online. In Andhra Pradesh, four FGDs were held: three during a Hackathon and one within school premises. A pre-developed qualitative coding framework, designed specifically for this AI Literacy Needs Analysis, was applied to all seven transcripts. The framework comprises six thematic domains with sub-codes. Domain 1 covers current technology and AI use (tools used in the classroom; understanding of AI; reasons for non-use). Domain 2 covers AI needs and concerns (teaching and preparation tasks; fears and barriers). Domain 3 covers training needs (preferred training format; time and access constraints). Domain 4 covers observed student technology use (learning use, misuse and distraction; engagement). Domain 5 covers student AI readiness and guidance (skills for the future; concerns about AI dependency; teacher roles). Domain 6 covers contextual factors (infrastructure and access gaps; institutional constraints).

Coding was conducted segment by segment, with each segment constituting a contiguous and thematically coherent unit of speech by a single speaker. Only primary codes were assigned; secondary codes were noted where relevant but not systematically recorded, to maintain analytical discipline and avoid over-interpretation of excerpts. Excerpts were kept as close to verbatim as the quality of the source transcript permitted. Where paraphrasing occurred, it is clearly flagged in analyst notes.

Rationale for Geographical Segmentation

The Focus Group Discussion analysis is structured by regional setting to account for the distinct institutional, cultural, and individual nuances inherent to each geography. These differences are most pronounced when viewed through their respective administrative and

linguistic lenses.

The most obvious difference is programme exposure. A general inference from the content of the FGD could be made about the level of familiarity and perception of technology, primarily from the teachers from Maharashtra (MH) who had to varying degrees been proximate to Hackathon programmes. This structured intervention, involving hands-on, practical training in coding, digital tools and AI applications, distinguishes the MH cohort from their Andhra Pradesh (AP) counterparts. Where an MH teacher describes using Scratch, mBlock or Arduino Uno with students, or references the Hackathon as a turning point in their own confidence, that must be understood as a programme effect, not a baseline condition. Beyond programme exposure, there are meaningful differences in the character of the institutional context. The AP transcripts reveal a sharper and more explicitly named tension between government mandates and teacher capacity: the Personalised Adaptive Labs (PAL) labs introduced in Guntur, the tablet distribution to 8th and 9th class students in Krishna and Eluru, and the compliance pressure described around weekly digital targets represent a mode of technology rollout that is top-down, compliance-driven and largely divorced from teacher readiness. Maharashtra's institutional constraints are real: administrative overload, UDISE filling, election duties, but the quality of the teacher-state relationship around technology feels different: more enabling in some schools, more absent in others, but with lower governmental pressures around reporting when compared to AP.

There is also a linguistic and cultural dimension. Several AP teachers made reference to a language mismatch between digital content and their students' home languages; a structural equity problem specific to the ZP school population in AP that does not appear in the Maharashtra data.

These differences justify separate analytical treatment. They also make the commonalities that cut across both geographies more analytically significant: where Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh teachers say the same thing despite these structural differences, that convergence deserves serious attention.

Cross-Geographical Findings: What the Classrooms Share

Across seven FGDs, within the two states, diverse school types and varying levels of programme exposure, several findings recur with enough consistency to warrant being treated as structural rather than incidental. Most notably, Student AI readiness and guidance (Domain 5) accounts for 44.4% of all primary codes, reflecting the degree to which questions of teacher role, student futures and AI dependency dominated discussion across both states. More specifically, "Tools used in classroom" (n=31) and "Teacher's roles" (n=28) are the two most frequent codes, together accounting for more than a third of all coded segments. However, it is important to note that **this frequency is largely reflective of the facilitator's prompts and the specific nature of the inquiry**, rather than an organic weighting of importance by the participants themselves.

The Collapse of Attention and the Turn to the Visual

Almost every FGD, regardless of geography, opened with some version of the same claim: **students no longer pay attention in the way they once did, and the Interactive Flat Panels (IFPs) or digital board or screen is now the primary tool for recapturing that attention.** The post-COVID period was cited repeatedly as a rupture after which students' relationship with sustained textual engagement changed. As a teacher (AP, FGD 2) remarked:

"After Corona, students got used to mobiles and they are attracted to technology only. They tend to like this technology but not boring sessions. So, if we want to activate students and to get them into the mainstream, we have to use technology."

The visual and the interactive have become the operative currency of classroom engagement. One teacher (AP, FGD 4) quantified this with unusual precision:

"The lecture method holds attention for 15 to 20 minutes; a blended approach extends that to 40 to 45."

In-Person, Practical Training as the Universal Preference

Every group, without exception, requested the same kind of training: face-to-face, hands-on, sequential and delivered by someone who is themselves competent. The rejection of online training was not absolute, but in-person sessions were consistently named as the format that produces actual change in practice. As noted by a teacher (MH, FGD 3):

"Offline, sir. Not online. With practicality. Face-to-face training. Do this, do that. First, you teach the teachers. Then, they will be interested in it. And then, they will teach their students."

The Hackathon programme as an example of a hands-on training model, even though directed at students, is referenced as an insightful pedagogical model. Several teachers also flagged trainer quality as the decisive variable; unskilled trainers at government Shikshan Parishads were named as an active barrier to learning.

The Cognitive Dependency Concern

Concerns about AI reducing students' capacity to think independently appeared in every FGD across both states. The framing varied, but the underlying anxiety was consistent: that access to instant, effortless answers is eroding something in students that sustained effort once built. As one teacher (AP, FGD 3) pointed out

"Before using AI, each student's project was different. But after using (it), every project looks the same."

This concern coexists, often in the same breath, with a recognition that students cannot afford not to know AI. **The tension between cognitive risk and economic necessity was perhaps the most consistent single finding across all seven transcripts.**

The Limits of Parental Oversight

Across both geographies, the role of parents was highlighted as a primary necessity in the context of technology and supervision. Teachers repeatedly described situations in which responsibility for monitoring student device use falls to them by default, because parents either lack the digital literacy to supervise effectively or are absent when students are online. Talking about the need to observe the students, a teacher (AP, FGD 4) noted:

"Due to a few parents' lack of knowledge, there might be less observation (at home) sir. We observe changes in behaviour when they come home."

Across all the cases, the parents were described as working-class individuals with limited access and knowledge of the digital world. While the exact statements can be a little insensitive, this was the consensus on the role of parents in the students' lives.

Administrative Burden as the Invisible Barrier

In every FGD, across both states, the time available for classroom teaching was described as structurally compressed by administrative duties. UDISE data filling, attendance uploads, mark sheets, online compliance forms, and election duties take up most of the workday, compressing classroom teaching into the leftover time.

Digital tools have added to teachers' administrative load at exactly the moment they are being asked to integrate those tools into their teaching. The state's investment in school technology has, in several respects, increased the non-teaching demands on teachers rather than reducing them.

Maharashtra: Findings and Analysis

Technology in the Classroom

The Maharashtra teachers described a classroom technology ecosystem that is, by the standards of government schooling, unusually developed in pockets. A teacher in one of the MH FGDs described having received six laptops as prizes and having built approximately 300 syllabus-based interactive activities for her blog; a self-made open educational resource that other teachers in the same discussion reported using. This story stands out as an individual teacher operating within, and despite, institutional constraints.

Khan Academy appeared frequently, with one teacher serving as a formal resource person for Chandrapur district. DIKSHA portal was mentioned, but with notably less enthusiasm. The Hackathon FGD produced the most technically sophisticated AI tool use accounts in the Maharashtra data: ChatGPT, Gemini, Canva Pro, Perspectly, LMBook, NotebookLM, and Gamma, all featured in the non-Hackathon FGD alone.

Teacher Identity and the Renegotiation of Role

Across all three Maharashtra FGDs, the question of what it means to be a teacher in the age of AI was engaged directly and with some philosophical seriousness. The dominant answer, that the teacher becomes a facilitator rather than a transmitter, was stated explicitly by multiple participants; best described by a teacher (MH, FGD 1)

"Our role should be that of a facilitator. But for that, teachers themselves also need to stay updated and progressive."

This framing carries an important charge. In the age of AI, where almost all facets of education are continuously being led by developments in Large Language Models, the roles of teachers have become more sharpened than ever before. While the students now have more access to knowledge than at any moment in history, it also means that the role of teachers has now entered a domain where they must help students make judgments about the correct form of knowledge. **This form of attentiveness forms the core of responsible pedagogy, and the teachers who articulated it most clearly appeared to understand it as**

the ground on which their professional relevance rests.

The Hackathon emerges as a major point in the data. For teachers who described approaching it without coding knowledge and leaving with the ability to teach it, the experience seems to have altered their sense of what they are capable of. The ripple effect was described concretely: students who were "as scared as we were" became confident because their teacher became confident first (MH, FGD 3).

Training and Capacity Building

The training picture in Maharashtra is quite differentiated. Teachers have accessed training through multiple channels: Hackathons, SCERT workshops, Kotak Education sessions, informal peer networks and self-directed learning. This multiplicity suggests that engaged teachers in Maharashtra are not waiting for government instruction on technology adoption, but assembling it from wherever it is available.

The most consistently repeated training request was not for more tools but for better integration: how to bring AI into the specific logic of a lesson, subject by subject. The Hackathon model was cited as the closest existing approximation to what teachers want, but with a request for longer duration and more sustained follow-up.

Infrastructure and Institutional Constraints

The infrastructure picture in Maharashtra is internally varied. Urban municipal schools are comparatively well-resourced. Rural schools present a different picture: connectivity drops during the online FGD were not incidental glitches but a live illustration of the conditions teachers described.

Recharge cost as an access barrier appeared with unusual specificity: one teacher described absorbing the cost of mobile data recharges for students in order to enable Khan Academy use. That a government school teacher is personally subsidising internet access speaks volumes about the gap between the state's technology ambitions and its provision on the ground.

Student Technology Use and the Question of Guidance

The Maharashtra data contains the most varied accounts of student technology engagement in the entire dataset. Students operating IFP panels independently, building Arduino Uno projects, and creating Scratch games reflect both the programme's effect and the investment of individual teachers.

The misuse accounts in Maharashtra are also the most technically detailed: teachers described students using hidden applications that could not be tracked, trying to use ChatGPT for unsolicited queries, and bypassing monitoring. As one teacher (MH, FGD 1) recounted,

"Tablets were distributed to Grade 12 students. Students used a hidden calculator app to continue chats not visible in Gmail or search history. Usage continued late at night. Later we set a time limit; tablets had to be submitted by 10 pm."

Another teacher (MH, FGD 1) described a different kind of subversion:

'Students were typing on the panel: 'How to find the neighbour's Wi-Fi password?' ChatGPT replied that it was illegal and gave legal options. They must be asking questions they want to ChatGPT. We need something like ChatGPT connected with email so the admin can see history.'

These are offered not as moral failings but as problems to be engineered around, a characteristically pragmatic orientation. The response strategies: supervised mobile use during break time, notebook documentation of device use, email monitoring of the panels and other devices, are improvised institutional arrangements developed under conditions of structural inadequacy.

Andhra Pradesh: Findings and Analysis

Technology in the Classroom

In all four sites, Interactive Flat Panels (IFPs) were the dominant classroom technology. Its adoption history was described consistently: introduced relatively recently, initially as a response to post-COVID disengagement, and now used primarily for YouTube videos, subject visualisation and saved activities. The pattern of use is similar to Maharashtra, but the depth of integration is, on the whole, shallower. Several AP teachers viewed the IFP as essentially a blackboard replacement, not a transformative pedagogical tool. This points to inadequate instruction and training prior to deployment, leading to superficial and ineffective use.

Government-issued devices featured more prominently in the AP data than in Maharashtra, and almost exclusively in cautionary terms. The Byju's-loaded tablets distributed to students in both Krishna and Eluru were described as having been misused almost immediately. This is a remarkably consistent finding across two separate districts and suggests a systemic failure of the government's tablet distribution programme rather than isolated incidents of individual misuse.

"We have provided tabs to 9th class students with designed content, but they went to software shops outside and made changes to the tab's software. Now they are watching any video that they want." - Teacher (AP, FGD 3)

The PAL labs introduced in Guntur represent a different kind of technology provision: 30 tablets arranged in a dedicated lab, targeting Maths, Telugu and English for class 7 students. Teachers described these positively in terms of student engagement but negatively in terms of scheduling: the labs operate alongside regular class targets with compliance pressure from higher authorities, creating a timetable that cannot be satisfied without sacrificing something. The introduction of a technology resource designed to reduce teacher workload has, in practice, added a mandatory extra session to already full teaching schedules.

The Teacher-as-Mediator Model

Perhaps the most analytically distinctive finding in the AP data is what might be called the "teacher-as-mediator" model of AI use. Across multiple AP FGDs, and with notable

consistency, teachers described a specific arrangement: they use AI themselves to prepare content, activities or materials, and deliver the output of that process to students without allowing students direct access to the AI tools themselves.

This model appeared in Guntur, Krishna and Eluru. It represents a form of pedagogical caution that has a coherent internal logic: if teachers cannot control what students do with AI access, and if the risks of unmediated access are perceived as high, then the rational response is to insert the teacher as a filter. The limitation of this approach is equally apparent: it positions AI as a teacher productivity tool rather than a student learning tool.

The AP data also contains the most explicit statements about the threat AI poses to teacher authority and status. One Eluru teacher described the historical basis of teacher respect as resting on the teacher's exclusive access to knowledge, and named YouTube, ChatGPT and Gemini as having dissolved that basis. A teacher (AP, FGD 2) in the same FGD named Anthropic directly as a job-displacement threat, and cited the existence of a robotic teacher in Kerala as evidence that the threat was not hypothetical.

"There is a new tool invented in America (Anthropic AI), which replaces thousands of software engineers. Which may replace teachers also. In Kerala, there is an artificial (robotic) teacher. In that case, there is no humanitarian relationship. Teacher means not only teaching, it's more about relations and values that we inculcate in students."

This is the only explicit teacher-replacement anxiety in the entire dataset, and its location in the AP data rather than the Maharashtra data is worth noting. Maharashtra teachers who had experienced the Hackathon programme did not, in general, express fear of replacement. This suggests that direct, empowering engagement with AI tools reduces displacement anxiety, a finding with clear implications for programme design.

Training Needs

The training picture in AP is characterised by greater urgency and less prior exposure than in Maharashtra. "Awareness of AI/technology" appeared repeatedly as the named gap. Teachers described not knowing that tools existed, not knowing how to use tools they had heard of, and not knowing how to integrate tools they could operate into their actual teaching practice. These are three distinct knowledge gaps, and each requires a different training response.

Several AP teachers articulated training requests with notable precision. One teacher in Eluru requested training specifically during school holidays, specifying that continuous training was preferable to spaced-out sessions (due to memory lapses between sessions), and named "prompt literacy" and "AI ethics" as the two specific content areas she needed. Another teacher requested training on creating animated videos from textbook vocabulary specifically for FLN content with primary students, and had already contacted the local AI coordinator to request a place on the next relevant training.

Infrastructure and Institutional Constraints

The infrastructure challenges in AP are more severe and more structurally embedded than those in Maharashtra. The most extreme case in the entire dataset, a school that conducted sessions in a private home for nineteen years, established formal premises only after the story was reported in a newspaper, and had still received no equipment at the time of the FGD, appeared in Guntur. This teacher described using a mobile phone to show rhymes to students. The calmness with which this is described in the transcript and the absence of any expression of outrage from other participants suggest it is not experienced as exceptional. This is despite the aggressive push by the government around technology adoption and increased access through tools such as tablets and IFPs, and warrants some attention.

The language mismatch problem identified in the Guntur FGD is a structural equity issue with no equivalent in the Maharashtra data. Students in ZP schools whose home language differs from the language of IFP content are not simply struggling with technology; they are encountering a medium that compounds existing educational disadvantages. Only 10 per cent of students were described as able to cope with this mismatch. The remaining 90 per cent represent a form of digital exclusion that is not captured by any of the standard infrastructure metrics.

The Kondapalli residential school context introduces a further set of institutional conditions that deserve separate treatment. The residential model creates conditions for 100 per cent supervised device use during school hours, a situation that no day school in the dataset can replicate. But it also creates a binary: inside the hostel, total oversight; at home during holidays, none. Parents are described as living at a distance, illiterate, and lacking smartphones as well as capable of monitoring app usage. The residential school is, in this respect, an acute version of the supervision problem that all schools face.

Student Use, Surveillance and the Limits of Control

The AP data contains the most vivid individual cases of student device harm in the entire dataset. In Eluru, a teacher described a first-standard student with persistently swollen eyes and compulsive finger movement who cried whenever asked to read or write. It emerged that between 30 and 40 games were installed on the family mobile phone. In the same FGD, a retired MEO's grandson, from a well-educated family, had stopped speaking due to screen isolation.

The AP data also contains the clearest articulation of what might be called the surveillance problem in student technology use. Teachers across all four AP sites described the fundamental impossibility of continuous monitoring: students behave well when under observation and revert when outside it. This is not a new pedagogical problem; it predates technology, but technology has extended the perimeter of unsupervised behaviour beyond the school gate and into the home, the evening, and the night. The policy proposals that emerged in response ranged from technical solutions (age-appropriate filters, QR-code delivery of assignments, admin-linked AI monitoring) to structural ones (lab-based device access instead of individual tab distribution) to relational ones (parent education, transparency about consequences). None of these proposals is sufficient on its own, and several teachers in the AP data appeared to know this.

Discussion: Reading the Two Geographies Together

What emerges from reading the Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh data in relation to each other is less a contrast than a temporal argument. AP teachers are, in many respects, describing where Maharashtra teachers were before the Hackathon programme took off: aware of tools, uncertain how to use them, concerned about student misuse, requesting structured training, and positioned at the threshold of a shift they can see but have not yet made. The Hackathon, in this reading, is not a special event that created exceptional teachers. It is a sufficiently well-designed training intervention that moves a group of teachers across a threshold that structural conditions would not, on their own, have crossed.

Seven focus groups cannot settle every question about how government school teachers in India are navigating the arrival of AI in their classrooms. But they can narrow the range of defensible interpretations considerably.

First: the demand for practical, in-person, sustained AI training is both genuine and specific. Teachers know what they need, they know what formats have worked for them, and they are able to name the precise knowledge gaps they want addressed. Programme design should take this specificity seriously rather than defaulting to generic digital literacy curricula.

Second: the teacher-replacement anxiety that appeared in the AP data but not in the Maharashtra Hackathon cohort is a programme effect, not a permanent attitude. Exposure to AI tools in an empowering, hands-on context reduces displacement fear. How AI is introduced in training settings, the framing matters as much as the content.

Third: the teacher-as-mediator model of AI use, whilst understandable as a risk management strategy, forecloses the student AI literacy outcomes that the programme aims to build. Any strategy that relies on teachers filtering AI for students rather than teaching students to use AI themselves will reproduce, rather than address, the digital dependency it seeks to prevent.

Fourth: infrastructure inequity is not a background condition. It is an active, ongoing

constraint that shapes what teachers can and cannot do, what students can and cannot access, and what any technology programme can realistically achieve at scale. The recharge cost problem, the language mismatch problem, and the unequipped school problem are not edge cases. In the AP dataset, they are the centre of the story.

Fifth: the most important resource in this study is not the smartboard, the tablet or the AI tool. It is the teachers themselves, specifically their willingness to remain in a state of active inquiry about their own practice despite the conditions they work in. That willingness is not inexhaustible, and it is not evenly distributed. The question the programme might usefully ask is not only what teachers know about AI, but what conditions allow that willingness to persist.

End of Report

Appendix

1.1 Notes on the Transcripts

The three Maharashtra FGDs vary in quality, but together they form the richest material in the dataset. The non-Hackathon FGD is the most methodologically clean: five named participants, a calm facilitation rhythm, and a transcript that accurately attributes most turns. The two Hackathon FGDs are more complex. They were conducted online, with participants joining via a video call. Connectivity issues caused dropouts, chat-box contributions, and partial audibility, which affect the reliability of speaker attribution in places.

The four Andhra Pradesh FGDs show greater variation in quality than the Maharashtra set. The Krishna and Eluru transcripts are the strongest: both capture substantive, discursive exchanges where teachers engage critically with the questions and with each other. The Guntur transcript is shorter, possibly reflecting a brief session or more moderator-driven interaction, and yields fewer codeable segments as a result. The Kondapalli transcript, on the other hand, has issues with translation. Several turns are syntactically incoherent, moderator speech is occasionally transcribed as teacher speech, and the boundary between question and answer is not always clear.

A further methodological observation: in the Eluru FGD, the moderators appear to have demonstrated AI tool use to participants during the session itself. At least one teacher noted that students had started using AI immediately after being shown it during the discussion. This is unusual in a focus group context and creates an observation effect: some of the reactions to AI in the Eluru transcript may be responses to a live demonstration rather than reflections on prior experience. This does not invalidate the data, but it should inform how those responses are read.

1.2 FGD Attribution

The transcripts are referenced according to the schema given below.

Transcript Code	Transcript Information
MH, FGD 1	Maharashtra, TDD Transcript
MH, FGD 2	Maharashtra, Non Hackathon
MH, FGD 3	Maharashtra, Hackathon
AP, FGD 1	Andhra Pradesh; Guntur (Hackathon)
AP, FGD 2	Andhra Pradesh; Eluru (Hackathon)
AP, FGD 3	Andhra Pradesh; Krishna (Hackathon)
AP, FGD 4	Andhra Pradesh; Kondapalli (Non Hackathon)

1.3 Codebook Information

A snapshot of the codebook is attached below:

FGD Qualitative Coding Framework

AI Literacy Needs Analysis · FLI Program

Code	Theme / Sub-code	Description	Examples from the transcript
1	**Current technology & AI use**	**What teachers already do with digital tools and AI**	
1.1	Tools used in classroom	Digital boards, YouTube, Google, ChatGPT, Gemini:what and how often	*'We have a digital TV... very helpful in teaching History and Geography'*
1.2	Understanding of AI	Mental models; conflation of AI with internet/YouTube; awareness gaps	*'Whether it is ChatGPT, Gemini, YouTube or Google, we use AI'*
1.3	Reasons for non-use	Connectivity, cost, awareness, time: why tools go unused despite availability	*'There is an internet issue in our village. I am aware but haven't used any'*
2	**AI needs & concerns**	**What teachers want AI to help with, and what worries them**	
2.1	Teaching & prep tasks	Content creation, lesson planning, translation, assessments, personalisation	*'Teachers can prepare questions, presentations, notes... AI is used for this'*
2.2	Fears & barriers	Ethics concerns, fear of replacement, student misuse, own skill gaps	*'Even as teachers we don't use AI more than 5%... we don't know how'*
3	**Training needs**	**What support would build teacher confidence with AI**	
3.1	Preferred training format	Offline/hands-on preferred; Hackathon model cited; step-by-step with real tools	*Please show us practically. Teach us properly first. Teach step by step. If we learn, we will take it to students.''*
3.2	Time & access constraints	Workload limits training window; facilitators must themselves be knowledgeable	*As I am a primary school teacher, my admin work starts at 8 o'clock. We have to submit children's attendance before the 1st period ends.'*
4	**Student technology use (observed)**	**Teacher observations of how students engage with devices**	
4.1	Learning use	Searching topics, assignments, quiz apps, interactive board use	*'Students use mobile phones to complete assignments given by me'*
4.2	Misuse & distraction	Reels, games, hidden apps, neighbour Wi-Fi search, late-night device use	*'Students were typing: How to find the neighbor's Wi-Fi password?'*
4.3	Engagement with technology by teacher	High-engagement moments: Hackathon, 3D visuals, creative digital tasks	*'When I show pictures of animals in 3D... children learn effectively'*
5	**Student AI readiness & guidance**	**Skills students need and how teachers should guide their AI use**	
5.1	Skills for the future	Critical thinking, creativity, communication, AI literacy, digital citizenship	*'Just reading textbooks is no longer enough. Students need to use AI effectively'*
5.2	Concerns about AI dependency	AI reduces thinking; students copying without understanding; cognitive shortcuts	*'AI is giving answers within seconds, humans are forgetting to use their brains'*
5.3	Teacher's roles	Facilitator role, supervised use, prompt literacy, building student confidence	*'Our role should be that of a facilitator... teachers themselves need to stay updated'*
6	**Contextual factors**	**Structural realities shaping all responses; use as a lens/modifier**	
6.1	Infrastructure & access gaps	Poor connectivity, rural schools, limited device availability	*'Rural areas or poor families have a mobile but no money to recharge'*
6.2	Institutional constraints	Unused equipment, uneven govt training, time poverty from non-teaching duties	*'Our school had robotic kits but they were not used'*
7	**Miscellaneous**		