2025 Volume 3, Issue 7
Educational Innovation Research
ISSN: 3029-1844(Print)
ISSN: 3029-1852(Online)

The Integration Path and Countermeasures Research of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Ideological and Political Education in Higher Education

Zhen Yuan
Jiangsu Vocational Institute of Architectural Technology, Xuzhou 221116, Jiangsu, China

Abstract

The integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) into college ideological and political education helps enhance the precision of value guidance and the penetration of communication, expand the boundaries of educational interaction, and alleviate the structural problem of resource distribution inequality. However, its involvement also brings deep risks such as the weakening of emotional warmth, the blurring of value stances, and the restructuring of educational relationships. It is necessary to be vigilant about the tension between technological rationality and ideological rationality. Colleges should promote the coordinated coexistence of technology integration and value orientation by building an emotional mechanism of human-machine collaboration, establishing a multi-level content generation review system, and reshaping the teacher's leading role.

Keywords

Human-machine collaboration; Ideological and political education in higher education; Generative artificial intelligence; Value guidance

Online publication: August 26, 2025

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping the fundamental mechanisms of knowledge production and dissemination. In the context of higher education, this technology is not merely an intervention in the methods of teaching content but also, in some sense, undermines the foundations of existing educational philosophies and communication logic. Especially in the field of ideological and political education, which is highly value-oriented, the impact of generative AI can touch upon the technical update of communication methods, as well as the shaping of ideology, the transmission of values, and the redefinition of the roles of teachers and students. The cognitive styles and value orientations of young students are also undergoing profound changes, which may not always be apparent, but their impact on traditional teaching methods is already beginning to manifest. With the updating of

digital media, mainstream value expression is under pressure to undergo a discourse transformation. In this complex context, generative AI, with its speed of content output, its human-like expression, and its ability to adapt to input contexts, opens up new operational spaces for ideological and political education in universities.

2. The value of generative AI embedded in ideological and political education in higher education

In the new era, generative AI is intervening in higher education's ideological and political teaching in an unavoidable way. It not only changes the technical means of knowledge transmission but also, to some extent, reconstructs the value expression of the classroom.

2.1. Technological empowerment of value guidance, strengthening the orientation of ideological and political education

The process of embedding generative AI into ideological and political education in higher education is essentially a reorganization of the value logic, not merely an improvement in technical efficiency. From the perspective of ideological education, this intervention involves the algorithmic structure and language simulation methods in the expression of value itself, challenging and reconstructing the original value transmission mechanism.

In the education of red culture and mainstream ideology content, the adjustment of discourse style, contextual adaptation, and audience preferences by AI can make the spread faster and wider, and also make the value guidance more sticky, more perceptible, and internalizable. This means that education no longer relies on a single authoritative discourse output but attempts to reaffirm its legitimacy and appeal in a technological context. In this process, technology is not just a channel, but also involved in the regulation of the value ontology. The corpus selection, expression templates, and semantic connections of the generative mechanism subtly guide the boundaries of value judgment. This reconstruction allows ideological and political education to gradually move away from the traditional form of emphasizing uniform expression and external discipline, towards a more penetrating and more difficult-to-avoid value contradiction interaction process.

2.2. Innovative educational interaction models, aligning with the cognitive characteristics of young students

As generative AI gradually intervenes in higher education ideological and political education, the changes it brings to the interaction model touch upon the shift in value generation and recognition mechanisms. The original structure of teacher instruction and student reception, which was unidirectional, is being replaced by a more participatory and contextualized expression logic. Students' cognitive preferences, whether image-based, contextualized, or fragmented interaction structures, also influence their perception and judgment of value issues.

In this sense, the effectiveness of traditional ideological and political discourse is beginning to weaken, while the conversational expression and dynamic context provided by generative AI constitute a new technological channel for re-engaging in value education. If the language rhythm, emotional cues, and logical paths of AI can be internalized by students as part of their self-judgment, then the goal of education is not only to transmit but also to stimulate. Value recognition often occurs in this ambiguous and complex participatory process. It can be said that while AI does not change the essence of education, it can re-activate the mechanisms of how value touches the subject and how it is actively constructed.

2.3. Promoting educational resource equity, breaking the spatiotemporal barriers of ideological and political education

The integration of generative AI into higher education ideological and political education can be understood as a deep disruption of the logic of educational resource allocation. For a long time, some universities with rich faculty and regional advantages have occupied the center of the discourse in ideological and political education, while students in remote areas or those who are mobile often find themselves on the periphery of value education. This imbalance is not always due to improper institutional settings but often stems from the natural limitations of physical and temporal constraints on the dissemination of educational resources.

The introduction of generative artificial intelligence breaks some of the value barriers determined by the

field. Through intelligent question-answering, virtual interactions, and contextual simulation, education begins to move away from the closed structure of the classroom toward a more flexible response mechanism. Moreover, what technology can achieve is not replication, but the reconstruction of value expression paths through the detailed identification of student contexts and needs. This change not only enhances accessibility but also redefines what constitutes "effective" supply. In this sense, higher education achieves a re-negotiation of the right to value resonance.

3. Challenges of embedding generative AI in college ideological and political education

While acknowledging the positive potential of generative AI, it is necessary to remain vigilant about the structural issues exposed by its involvement in college ideological and political education. Technology not only expands boundaries but also introduces certain overlooked deviations. The boundaries of technology use need to be redefined, and the ways of human-machine collaboration also urgently need to be re-established.

3.1. Risk of technological alienation: Weakening the emotional temperature of ideological education

As generative AI gradually embeds into college ideological and political education, there is a risk that the emotional structure of education may be eroded by the logic of technology. Ideological education is not merely about conveying concepts; it largely depends on a relational network built on trust and empathy. This network is not easily simulated by algorithms; its meaning often lies in the words, tone, and even the pauses or eye contact of the teacher. When technology begins to replace human involvement in dialogue, text responses, and other scenarios, the mechanisms of interpersonal warmth and emotional feedback in the educational context begin to loosen.

While human-machine interaction is more efficient in information response and logical presentation, it cannot mask the inherent deficiency of AI in emotional perception. Students who are accustomed to this "algorithmic response" may gradually become accustomed to a flattened sense of care, losing the emotional mobilization needed for ideological education, which is a crucial prerequisite for value recognition. The issue is not whether technology is cold, but whether the emotional experience in the educational process can still maintain its "awakening" after being converted into parameters. If the logic of technology spreads without resistance, ideological education may quietly deviate from its educational purpose, leaving only programmed indoctrination.

3.2. Value infiltration dilemma: Guarding against algorithmic bias and value conflict

The introduction of generative AI into higher education ideological and political education brings with it value assumptions that are difficult to fully control or identify. On the surface, AI appears to be a neutral production tool, but this neutrality is constructed rather than natural. The design of algorithm models, the orientation of training data, and the choice of which information is encoded and which tone is prioritized are already embedded in the generation process with a biased logic. This bias often appears in the form of "rational" or "natural," making it difficult to identify at first glance. In topics of high value density, such as historical evaluation, social morality, or ideological boundaries, generated text is often prone to sliding into a Western liberal narrative framework. This "default acceptance" is often hidden in the use of certain sentence structures. This leads to the weakening or marginalization of collectivism, national memory, and other local values. If this subtle shift is not identified and directly embedded in the teaching process, it will interfere with students' identification and trust in mainstream values.

3.3. Education subject ambiguity: The challenge of reconstructing the role positioning of teachers and students

The increasing infiltration of generative AI in higher education ideological and political education has led to a blurring and shifting of the originally clear division of teacher and student roles. Teachers, who have long been the authoritative figures in value guidance and knowledge explanation, maintain a symbolic support in the teaching

relationship, though their status is not absolute. Students, on the other hand, typically complete the process of understanding through interaction and guidance. This structure has maintained a basic responsibility and trust order in education for a long time.

However, when AI can generate teaching texts, simulate interactions, and provide feedback, the authority of teachers, which was built upon experience and judgment, is gradually diluted. Students often no longer rely on teachers to elaborate on concepts, but instead seek answers directly from the conclusions provided by algorithms. This solves the problems in learning, but skips the thinking process. Over time, patience and the ability to question complex issues diminish, and teachers may retreat to the role of system operators or content reviewers.

4. Optimization strategies for the integration of generative AI into higher education ideological and political education

Based on the multiple driving factors brought by technological empowerment, higher education ideological and political education should focus on building a human-machine collaborative educational community. This process requires continuous harmonization between technical rationality and value rationality, so that the functional integration of intelligent tools can truly be embedded into educational goals.

4.1. Strengthening humanistic care and building a "human-machine collaboration" emotional interaction model

In constructing a "human-machine collaboration" emotional interaction mechanism in higher education ideological and political education, the first practical step is to institutionalize the application scope of AI. Schools should establish a special approval process, requiring teachers to clearly list the specific stages of AI involvement, functional boundaries, and tasks that must be completed by human guidance during the course application phase. This system should not only be used for pre-approval but also included in mid-term inspections and course quality assessments. Supervisory groups should regularly review the actual implementation of AI-involved sections. Operationally, when dealing with major historical events or emotional topics (such as collective honor, sacrifice, and dedication), teachers should primarily use manual explanations, with AI only providing discussion materials, contextual supplements, and not outputting value-judgmental conclusions.

It is also necessary to promote the development of AI plug-ins tailored to the context of higher education, focusing on semantic and emotional recognition. The system should classify and provide real-time feedback on emotional-sensitive words or ideological-related statements in student inputs, assisting teachers in understanding student psychological reactions and adjusting teaching strategies. In classroom organization, teachers should actively set "emotional triggers," with AI generating guiding materials, such as reconstructing the "May 4th Spirit" in first-person narratives from a student's perspective, followed by teacher-led value discussions, rather than having AI directly provide definitions or summaries. The generation of such materials should be based on pre-set templates. Teachers and technical personnel can collaboratively develop templates that meet ideological and linguistic appeal requirements, calibrating AI generation styles.

To ensure the effective operation of the human-machine collaboration mechanism, a multi-point intervention system involving course management, AI material optimization, and classroom organization methods should be established, creating a dynamic structure with teachers as the guiding core, AI as the expression extension, and students as the responding. The key to this structure is not to enhance AI functionality itself but to embed its output effectively into the emotional education chain, ensuring that its technical attributes do not interfere with the value transmission and emotional generation of higher education ideological and political education.

4.2. Establishing a content review mechanism to strengthen the ideological security defense line

Introducing generative AI into the context of ideological and political education in higher education necessitates placing content security at the forefront of operational

processes. Specifically, the review mechanism should be embedded throughout the entire generation process, from pre-input restrictions, during generation, to post-output tracing, forming a closed-loop review system that combines technology and institutional coordination. At the input stage, schools should establish unified standardized invocation protocols, clearly defining the sources of materials, instruction structures, and usage permissions. Any content involving history of the Party, national history, institutional comparisons, or current political topics should be prohibited from open instruction generation, and only pre-approved script templates should be used to avoid misinterpretations of ideological deviations in ambiguous instructions. Technical teams can develop instruction input controllers based on existing teaching platforms, implementing real-time (October 20, 2025) regulation and setting usage permission levels, limiting content depth and granularity.

In the output stage, the review process must be pre-positioned at the generation node, establishing a human-machine collaborative review mechanism. It is recommended to form a cross-functional team comprising ideological and political course teachers, technical personnel, and network risk analysis specialists. They should develop embedded semantic review plugins to identify value orientation and historical narrative compliance. If historical nihilism, political neutrality, or other preset ideological expressions appear, the system should immediately block and prompt manual review. The core of this mechanism is not filtering but training AI to form stable expression boundaries. Therefore, a "ideological risk case library" should be systematically built based on issues exposed during the generation process, serving as negative sample reverse training materials to continuously refine the model's output behavior in edge contexts.

For post-output supervision, relying solely on post-event spot checks is insufficient. A more stable approach is to bind AI-generated records with course IDs, teacher identities, and platform usage scenarios to enable traceable accountability. If content leaks or misinterpretations occur, responsibility nodes can be quickly identified. Additionally, for multi-platform AI tool usage, schools should establish unified interface gateways, requiring all ideological content to undergo secondary verification through the school's ideological platform. Technically, the ideological and political teaching team should directly participate in corpus construction and model parameter fine-tuning, inputting content with clear ideological orientation into the training set to enhance the model's stability and political consistency in the context of higher education ideological and political education. Through the operation of input control, process supervision, and model optimization, a verifiable and dynamically adjustable security mechanism can be constructed, ensuring that AI maintains appropriate boundaries and directionality in ideological and political education, rather than becoming a narrative subject detached from regulation.

4.3. Reshaping the roles of teachers and students, promoting the integration of "technological empowerment + value guidance"

In the process of generative AI gradually embedding into higher education ideological and political teaching, the boundaries of responsibilities between ideological and political teachers and students must be redefined through specific institutional operations to ensure that the process of technological empowerment does not deviate from the basic logic of value guidance. In practice, universities can formulate a "main control list for AI use in ideological and political courses," clearly listing teaching tasks that must be independently completed by teachers, including the setting of value positions, guiding controversial issues, and clarifying ideological boundaries. All tasks involving political judgment and emotional guidance must be directly handled by teachers and cannot be delegated to the technical system. AI can only intervene in auxiliary tasks such as scenario construction, case material integration, or language expression refinement. During the operation, a review mechanism should be established to track the usage frequency and intervention depth of generated content, preventing AI from unconsciously replacing the cognitive dominance of teachers.

In terms of teaching interaction, dialogue chains can be designed around typical value tension points, forming a rhythm of "teacher sets the question, AI generates opposing text, students respond and analyze, and the teacher summarizes and guides." For example, around the topic of "the influence of the Party's history on the value construction of contemporary university students,"

teachers can design value-oriented questions, AI can simulate opposing viewpoints, students can analyze logical flaws or ideological tendencies, and the teacher can guide the summary of political value implications, maintaining the controllable framework of human judgment. To prevent students from developing repetitive expression or thinking inertia due to excessive reliance on AI materials, teaching platforms need to embed evaluation plugins, establish three-dimensional indicators such as ideological depth, clarity of stance, and original expression, and conduct structured assessments of student responses, especially in terms of value reasoning complexity, to enhance their ability to identify and respond to AI-generated discourse.

5. Conclusion

The integration of generative AI into higher education ideological and political education is not merely a tool replacement, but an inadvertent change in the presentation of values and a reshaping of the interaction process in education. In the context of continuous technological advancement, the fundamental demands of higher education ideological and political education, especially its humanistic and value-oriented aspects, are facing the risk of being guided or even reprogrammed by technological logic. This change may not be immediately perceptible, but it is accumulating structural consequences. In the future, the development of ideological and political education should not rely on a fixed configuration, but should explore operational methods that must remain vigilant between modern technology application and value adherence.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Xue S, 2025, Opportunities and Challenges of Integrating Generative Artificial Intelligence into College Ideological and Political Work. Journal of Ideological and Political Research, 2025(6): 88–92.

[2] Xie S, He Y, 2025, Application of Generative Artificial Intelligence in College Ideological and Political Courses. Journal of Ideological and Political Research, 2025(6): 101–105.

[3] Wen Z, Wang Z, 2025, Empowering Higher Education Ideological and Political Education with Generative Artificial Intelligence: Value Delimitation, Problem Examination, and Strategy Response. University, 2025(15): 18–21.

[4] Luo Z, 2025, Implementation Strategies for High-Quality Development of Higher Education Ideological and Political Education with Generative Artificial Intelligence. Journal of Social Sciences of Harbin Normal University, 16(3): 134–138.

[5] Chen Q, 2022, Technical Risks and Countermeasures of Artificial Intelligence Integration in Higher Education Ideological and Political Education. School Party Building and Ideological Education, 2022(9): 65–68.