

Original Research Article

Transforming Teaching and Learning through Artificial Intelligence: A Sustainable Education Perspective

Dr. Amrita A. Jadhav

Annasaheb Vartak College, Vasai West, India

Corresponding author E-mail: amritajadhav83@gmail.com

Received: 10 September, 2026 | Accepted: 24 September, 2026 | Published: 7 October, 2026

Abstract:

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping educational practice worldwide, raising urgent questions about whether its integration supports or undermines the long-term sustainability of education systems. This paper examines the transformation of teaching and learning through AI from a sustainable education perspective, framed by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education). Drawing on a narrative synthesis of peer-reviewed literature and policy documents published between 2014 and 2024, the study identifies five thematic areas where AI intersects with sustainability: personalized learning, teacher augmentation, equity and inclusion, ethics and privacy, and the environmental footprint of educational AI infrastructure. Findings indicate that AI-enabled personalized learning can improve outcomes, but risks widening equity gaps if access and digital literacy are unevenly distributed. AI offers significant potential to augment rather than replace teachers, while demanding robust ethical governance to address bias, privacy and transparency. The environmental cost of large-scale AI deployment remains an under-recognised sustainability dimension. The paper concludes that sustainable AI in education requires coordinated policy, educator agency, AI literacy for all stakeholders, and a commitment to inclusive, transparent and ecologically responsible design.

Keywords: artificial intelligence in education; sustainable education; SDG 4; personalized learning; AI ethics; teacher augmentation; educational technology

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has moved from the periphery to the centre of educational discourse in less than a decade. The publication of high-profile policy documents such as the UNESCO Beijing Consensus on Artificial Intelligence and Education (UNESCO, 2019) and the European Commission's ethical guidelines for educators (European Commission, 2022) signals that AI is no longer treated as an experimental novelty but as a structural force reshaping curriculum, pedagogy and institutional governance. The accelerating adoption of generative AI tools since 2022 has further compressed the timeline for reflection, pressing educators, policymakers and researchers to make decisions with limited evidence and considerable uncertainty about long-term consequences.

The sustainability of education systems is conventionally understood through three interlocking dimensions: social equity, economic viability and environmental responsibility (UNESCO, 2016; United Nations, 2015). The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) commits member states to "inclusive and equitable quality education" and to "promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" by 2030 (United Nations, 2015). AI is increasingly framed as both an enabler and a potential threat to this commitment. Proponents argue that AI can personalise learning at scale, free teachers from routine tasks and expand access for underserved populations (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016). Critics warn that poorly governed AI can entrench bias, erode teacher professionalism, intensify surveillance and deepen digital divides (O'Neil, 2016; Selwyn, 2019; Williamson, 2017).

Despite this expanding literature, three gaps remain visible. First, much writing on AI in education foregrounds technical capability while underplaying sustainability trade-offs across social, economic and environmental axes. Second, the environmental costs of AI infrastructure, including the energy and water demands of large language models, are rarely examined in education-specific analyses. Third, the educator's voice and agency are often marginalised in policy texts that focus on systems, platforms and learners. This paper addresses these gaps by asking three questions: (a) How is AI transforming teaching and learning in formal education settings? (b) To what extent do these transformations align with the principles of sustainable education embodied in SDG 4? (c) What governance conditions are necessary for AI to contribute positively to sustainable education? By integrating empirical findings, policy documents and ethical scholarship, the paper offers a synthesis intended for a mixed audience of researchers, practitioners and policymakers committed to education that is both innovative and enduring.

2. Literature Review

2.1 AI applications in teaching and learning

Scholarship on AI in education has crystallised around several application clusters. Intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), pioneered in work such as Aleven et al. (2009) and reviewed comprehensively by VanLehn (2011), adapt task difficulty and feedback to individual learners using rules or learner models. Cognitive Tutors, an influential ITS family, have demonstrated measurable gains in algebra learning at scale (Pane et al., 2014), while ASSISTments has shown how a single platform can serve millions of students with individualised instruction (Heffernan & Heffernan, 2014). More recent reviews extend this picture to higher education: Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) systematically mapped AI applications across 146 studies and found that planning, adaptive learning and student modelling dominated the empirical literature, while Popenici and Kerr (2017) documented both the transformative potential and the institutional unreadiness of higher education for AI. The arrival of generative AI has expanded this landscape further, with Khan (2024) arguing that conversational tutors can democratise one-to-one instruction at unprecedented scale.

2.2 Sustainable education and SDG 4

Sustainable education is most often traced to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4, which sets targets for access, equity, quality and lifelong learning (United Nations, 2015). UNESCO's (2016) report *Education for People and Planet* argues that education must be conceived as part of a broader development agenda in which social inclusion, economic viability and ecological limits are inseparable. Within this framing, sustainability is not simply an environmental concern but a property of educational systems: a system is sustainable when it can deliver equitable learning outcomes over time without depleting the human, social, fiscal or ecological resources on which it depends. This broader reading of sustainability shapes how AI's contribution should be evaluated.

2.3 AI, ethics and the sustainability gap

A third strand of literature examines the ethics and governance of AI in society and education. Jobin et al. (2019) analysed 84 AI ethics guidelines worldwide and identified five converging principles: transparency, justice and fairness, non-maleficence, responsibility and privacy. Floridi and Cowls (2019) proposed a unified framework that re-articulates these as beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice and explicability. O'Neil (2016) and Selwyn (2019) have foregrounded the risks of opaque, biased or commercially driven AI in education, while Slade and Prinsloo (2013) and Pardo and Siemens (2014) developed early ethical frameworks for learning analytics. The European Commission (2022) translated such principles into operational guidance for educators, and UNICEF (2021) extended the discussion to children's rights. Yet across these contributions, the environmental cost of AI infrastructure and the sustainability of pedagogical change itself receive comparatively little attention, leaving a gap this paper seeks to address.

3. Methodology

This paper employs a qualitative narrative synthesis approach (Popay et al., 2006), appropriate for integrating evidence across heterogeneous literatures where formal meta-analysis is infeasible. The review drew on three source streams: (i) peer-reviewed studies indexed in Scopus, Web of Science and ERIC; (ii) policy and grey literature from UNESCO, the OECD, the European Commission and UNICEF; and (iii) foundational monographs in the field (Holmes et al., 2019; Selwyn, 2019; Williamson, 2017). Search terms combined "artificial intelligence" or "AI" with "education", "teaching", "learning", "sustainability", "SDG 4", "ethics", "equity" and "personalised learning". The time window was 2014 to 2024, capturing the post-SDG period and the rise of generative AI.

Inclusion criteria required that sources be in English, peer-reviewed or issued by a recognised intergovernmental body, and directly address AI in relation to teaching, learning or educational governance. Editorials, blog posts and commercial white papers were excluded unless cited for contextual illustration. Following screening, 27 sources were retained for thematic analysis. An inductive coding frame was developed around five emergent themes: personalised learning, teacher augmentation, equity and inclusion, ethics and privacy, and environmental sustainability. Limitations include the restriction to English-language sources, the exclusion of empirical studies published in non-education venues, and the inevitable lag between fast-moving AI developments and the slower pace of peer review.

4. Findings

4.1. Personalised and adaptive learning

Personalised learning emerges as the most consistent finding across the reviewed literature. Intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning platforms have been shown to deliver measurable gains in specific domains, particularly mathematics (Pane et al., 2014; VanLehn, 2011). The synthesis by Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) confirms that adaptive learning and student modelling dominate empirical research in higher education, while Heffernan and Heffernan (2014) illustrate how ASSISTments has served millions of learners with individualised tasks and feedback. Generative AI tutors are now extending this logic to open-ended subjects (Khan, 2024). However, the gains are domain-specific and sensitive to implementation quality; effects diminish when teachers are excluded from design decisions or when learners lack the self-regulation skills needed to benefit from adaptive pacing.

4.2. Teacher augmentation and professional practice

The literature converges on a framing of AI as augmenting rather than replacing teachers. Luckin et al. (2016) argue that AI's most valuable role is to handle routine assessment and data interpretation, freeing teachers for higher-order pedagogical and relational work. Holmes et al. (2019) extend this argument, suggesting that effective AI integration depends on teachers who can interpret AI-generated insights and translate them into classroom practice. Popenici and Kerr (2017) caution that without sustained professional development, AI tools risk being adopted superficially or resisted outright. The implication for sustainable education is that AI must be introduced as a tool that amplifies teacher expertise, not as a cost-cutting device that hollows out the profession.

4.3. Equity, access and inclusion

Equity is the most contested terrain. UNESCO (2021) and the OECD (2019) acknowledge that AI could expand access for underserved learners through translation, assistive technologies and low-cost tutoring. Yet O'Neil (2016) and Selwyn (2019) document how algorithmic systems can reproduce and amplify existing inequalities, particularly when training data reflects historical disadvantage. Williamson (2017) further argues that the data infrastructures underpinning educational AI tend to be concentrated in commercial hands, with implications for whose knowledge and whose learners are represented. The Beijing Consensus (UNESCO, 2019) calls for AI in education to be deployed in ways that close rather than widen gaps, but the evidence base on whether this is achievable at scale remains thin.

4.4. Ethics, privacy and bias

Ethical governance is now a central concern. Jobin et al. (2019) map five converging principles across global AI ethics guidelines, while Floridi and Cowls (2019) consolidate them into a unified bioethics-inspired framework. For learning analytics specifically, Slade and Prinsloo (2013) and Pardo and Siemens (2014) emphasise student consent, transparency and the right to opt out. The European Commission (2022) operationalises these principles for educators, distinguishing between AI that supports pedagogical judgement and AI that displaces it. UNICEF (2021) extends the discussion to children, foregrounding their distinct vulnerabilities as data subjects. Across these sources, the common thread is that ethical AI in education requires explainability, human oversight and accountability mechanisms that few institutions currently possess.

4.5. Environmental sustainability of AI infrastructure

The environmental dimension is the least developed in the education literature but is increasingly visible. Training and running large AI models consumes significant electricity and water, with carbon footprints that are often invisible to end-users (OECD, 2019; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). While education-specific life-cycle assessments are scarce, the broader pattern suggests that scaling AI across school systems has non-trivial ecological costs. A sustainable education perspective therefore demands attention to model efficiency, hardware lifecycles and the carbon intensity of the energy sources powering educational AI. This finding aligns with the broader SDG framing that treats ecological limits as integral to, not separate from, educational quality (UNESCO, 2016; United Nations, 2015).

5. Discussion

The findings suggest that AI's contribution to sustainable education is neither inherent nor automatic; it is contingent on the conditions under which AI is designed, deployed and governed. Personalised learning can deliver gains, but only when accompanied by teacher expertise, equitable access and AI literacy for learners and caregivers (Long & Magerko, 2020). Treating AI as augmentation rather than substitution, as Luckin et al. (2016) and Holmes et al. (2019) propose, offers a defensible middle path between techno-optimism and techno-scepticism, but it requires sustained investment in professional learning rather than one-off training sessions or vendor-led implementations.

The equity findings sharpen a key tension. AI can lower the marginal cost of high-quality tutoring, but the benefits accrue disproportionately to those with reliable connectivity, devices and digital skills. UNESCO (2019, 2021) and the OECD (2019) frame equity as a policy precondition, yet operationalising this requires deliberate public investment and regulatory safeguards against commercial enclosure (Williamson, 2017; Selwyn, 2019). The ethics literature (European Commission, 2022; Jobin et al., 2019; Pardo & Siemens, 2014) supplies principles, but principles without institutional enforcement tend to dissipate. Educational institutions therefore need governance capacity, including AI literacy programmes for educators, transparent procurement criteria and student data rights that are meaningful in practice.

The environmental dimension adds a third axis of sustainability that has been largely absent from education-specific debates. Scaling AI across millions of classrooms carries ecological costs that should be weighed against pedagogical benefits, particularly when lower-tech or human-centred alternatives can achieve comparable outcomes. A sustainable education perspective also implies avoiding lock-in to proprietary models that limit educator agency and concentrate value extraction outside the education sector. Taken together, the discussion points toward a model of educational AI that is pedagogically grounded, ethically governed, equitably distributed and ecologically restrained.

6. Conclusion

This paper has examined how AI is transforming teaching and learning through the lens of sustainable education. The synthesis indicates that AI can support personalised learning, augment teacher practice and broaden access, but only when its adoption is governed by principles of equity, ethics and ecological responsibility as articulated in SDG 4. The most significant gaps concern the environmental costs of AI infrastructure, the operationalisation of ethical principles in institutional practice, and the centrality of educator agency in design decisions. Future research should pursue longitudinal, equity-aware evaluations of AI-mediated learning, life-cycle assessments of educational

AI deployment, and participatory design studies that position teachers and students as co-designers rather than end-users. Sustainable AI in education is not a fixed destination but an ongoing negotiation between innovation and the values that education is meant to preserve.

References

- Aleven, V., McLaren, B. M., Sewall, J., & Koedinger, K. R. (2009). A new paradigm for intelligent tutoring systems: Example-tracing tutors. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 19(2), 105–154.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- European Commission. (2022). *Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and data in teaching and learning for educators*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1>
- Heffernan, N. T., & Heffernan, C. L. (2014). The ASSISTments ecosystem: An integrated system for providing millions of students with individualized instruction. In R. Sottolare, A. Graesser, X. Hu, & B. Goldberg (Eds.), *Design recommendations for intelligent tutoring systems: Volume 1—Learner modeling* (pp. 249–260). U.S. Army Research Laboratory.
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Khan, S. (2024). *Brave new words: AI and the future of education*. Viking.
- Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–11). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.
- OECD. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in society*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en>
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Pardo, A., & Siemens, G. (2014). Ethical and privacy principles for learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(3), 438–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12152>

- Pane, J. F., Griffin, B. A., McCaffrey, D. F., & Karam, R. (2014). Effectiveness of Cognitive Tutor Algebra I at scale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(2), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713507480>
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K. and Duffy, S. (2006) *Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews: A Product from the ESRC Methods Programme. Version 1.* Lancaster: Institute for Health Research, Lancaster University
- Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12, Article 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education.* Polity Press.
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethics and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1510–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479366>
- UNESCO. (2016). *Education for people and planet: Creating sustainable futures for all.* UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Beijing consensus on artificial intelligence and education.* UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Artificial intelligence and education: A guide for policy-makers.* UNESCO.
- UNICEF. (2021). *Policy guidance on AI for children.* UNICEF.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.* United Nations.
- VanLehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(4), 197–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.611369>
- Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice.* SAGE Publications.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>