https://doi.org/10.62836/jissh.v3i4.0042

Global Science Publishing

JISSH

Journal of Integrated Social Sciences and Humanities

https://ojs.sgsci.org/journals/jissh

Article

Integrating Artificial Intelligence into University Ideological and Political Education: Pathways for Cultivating Young People's Value Identity

Can Cui

School of Marxism, Nanjing Vocational College of Information Technology, Nanjing 210023, China

Abstract: Artificial intelligence has entered the classroom for ideological and political education less as a teaching tool and more as a new way to spread values, and it is changing how young people receive, feel, and live out these values. This paper thinks that value identity is not learned knowledge of values, but a three-stage process of cognitive recognition, emotional attachment and behavioural commitment; in the end, it is founded on affirming meaning through interaction with real people in actual life. Generative systems have added new scenarios, increased the frequency of feedback and personalised instruction, but at the same time have pushed the value rationality of education towards techno-rationality, reduced the information base for common deliberation, and weakened the relational density that underpins identity. In light of Chinese policy and recent research on AI-enabled course reform, this paper studies the problems of information culture, cross-curricular value integration and identity formation in the era of generative artificial intelligence, and puts forward the following four ways: a value throughline for machine-generated content, a human-machine division of labour to restructure classroom interaction, teacher capacity building based on verification, translation and design, and an evaluation regime rooted in process evidence rather than interaction metrics. Finally, there are four safeguards: access rules, corpus governance, multi-party coordination and algorithmic and ethical review; thus, technology should be employed to achieve the goal of value education and should not be the end in itself. It is a structural argument and not an empirical one; it only tells us where machines are allowed and forbidden to be placed in the course.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; ideological and political education; value identity; value guidance; pedagogical paradigm

1. Introduction

Chinese universities require every undergraduate to take a series of courses in ideological and political education, and these courses carry a mandate that goes beyond the transmission of theory; they are expected to help young people form a stable and self-aware sense of values. In 2019, the reform document and the following initiative for expanding the ideological and political curriculum reiterated its requirements and called on all institutions to implement them; thus, one of the reasons for the field's exceptional response to instructional innovation is this. In the past three years, large language models and multimodal generative tools have been introduced to schools at various times and are now widely used to create scenarios, simulate conversations, provide instant feedback and customise learning at reasonable costs in all departments. Scale is a problem here; a single course team may have several thousand students in a

Received: 28 October 2026; Accepted: 11 November 2026.

Corresponding: Can Cui (cuican@njcit.cn)

semester, and a tool that can handle this large scale is difficult to refuse on pedagogical grounds alone. The promise is true, and so is the risk. When a machine drafts the case, answers the question and grades the reflection, the classroom may be smoother, faster and better equipped with tools, but the particular difficulty in internalising values can be overlooked. Most of the previous research has been indirect. Research has found that AI can boost students' enthusiasm for class, encourage more active learning in class, reduce their homework load, etc., and these are usually presented as content-delivery indicators rather than value-creation indicators [1]. A brief paper on identity in generative conditions shows that although tools can help us learn, they also change the way we present ourselves to the community of practice. What has not been studied much is the relationship within the classroom: who speaks, who is held accountable, who is present, and how these arrangements affect whether a value is merely acknowledged or genuinely accepted. This paper will offer an organisational reason rather than an empirical one. Value identity is regarded as a three-level achievement, and problems have arisen regarding how machine mediation affects each level; the three dilemmas resulting from short-circuiting these levels have been identified, four ways to avoid them have been proposed, and four safeguards for the stability of these ways have been put in place. The claim defended throughout is narrow but significant: AI does not create values; rather, it enhances the value capacity of the people who apply it, and thus the design problem is not how much technology to adopt, but when to keep humanity.

2. The Value Logic and Realistic Premises of AI Integration

2.1. Formation Mechanisms of Value Identity and the Role of the Classroom

Value identity is not the collection of value propositions. It is a way of reconstructing oneself based on the meanings one has confirmed, and it has three levels. Cognition is recognition: the student knows what a proposition indicates, what it does not cover, and the range of this latter point. The emotional layer is attachment: the proposition has become something the student is willing to identify with, so defending it feels like losing something. Behavioural Layer is commitment: the student acts when it is inconvenient to do so and when no one is watching. Social Identity Theory is the mechanism that connects the above levels. Individuals find their place by categorisation and comparison, and the groups and people they consider references determine which orientations feel right [2]. A value that no one else has is still just a suggestion for most students, not a norm. Therefore, the function of the classroom is not covered by any other distribution channel. The three functions are to offer an authoritative talk that is organised and not random; to provide a peer group for the student to compare her own attitude with; and to offer a place for value conflict where disagreement is sincere but the consequences are relatively minor. The teacher should no longer be the source of information; rather, they can inspire students by embodying values themselves, and students are more likely to learn these values through identification with the teacher. Research on identity in generative conditions has recently reached the same conclusion from another side; that is, identity is negotiated with tools and communities rather than being given by them, and systematic treatment of value cultivation also believes that a single channel cannot achieve a stable orientation [3]. Therefore, the quality of conversion depends on whether abstract propositions are connected with people's actual lives or merely stated out loud and then forgotten. The classroom is also one of the few places left where a student has to answer to a person rather than to a machine, and this responsibility is also a teaching one.

2.2. Functional Boundaries and Ethical Basis of AI Intervention

The position of AI in this classroom should be set by the limits of ability, not by technical newness. The four specific applications of generative systems are to create many scenes, to have long-term conversations without fatigue, to give timely and personalised answers, and to change materials according to all kinds of preparation demands. The above features will reduce the workload of teachers and give them more time for assessment and analysis, which is indeed beneficial in courses with large class sizes and short contact hours . All of the above are also by-omission claims of authority: Fluency is presented as truth; immediacy is presented as a fast response; and personalisation is offered as empathy. The end is where the strength ceases. A system can show a position but cannot bear the consequences of taking it; it can simulate empathy but cannot commit to anyone; it can put together reasons but cannot guarantee their truth. These three absences are not defects to be corrected;

rather, they are precisely what give value an identity and do not reduce it to an opinion. Hence three ethical premises should govern any deployment. First, the system is a mediator and not an authority; it can present a problem but not resolve it. Second, the subject status of students and teachers is inseparable, so there will be no design to substitute machine judgment for human judgment on values. Third, the generated content should be traceable and auditable; thus, if there is a problem, we can find its origin and cause. There are insufficient resources for the above goals. Institutions with limited funds will be more likely to use shared platforms and centralise content pools, and the development of an information-culture should provide the foundation for this, not be added on top . Where libraries and teaching centres build this culture, teachers can judge machine output; where they do not, there will only be formal declarations.

3. Realistic Dilemmas in Cultivating Value Identification

3.1. Technorationality Replaces Value Rationality

Techno-rationality also has its own measure. Learning platforms show the number of interactions, correctness of answers, time spent watching, completion rate, etc.; based on this data, administrators can compare courses and modify teachers' preparation plans. It is simple to use, but the basic premise is incorrect. Value education is both late and implicit. A student who does not speak in class may act based on a sudden feeling several months later and make a choice that is not recorded by platforms; the most serious evidence is precisely what instrumentation ignores. In order to improve participation, the selected content should be relatively simple to answer, and topics that require deep thinking should be avoided; for example, morally ambiguous cases, controversial views without clear answers, or positions that may put students at a disadvantage with their peers are not recommended. Once teachers need to show results through figures, their teaching will be driven by indicators and lose its connection with the students. It will not fail in this way. Research on the reform of courses with AI has shown that satisfaction and participation have risen; however, its development path has not been studied. Therefore, evaluation systems have focused on the obvious results and overlooked the subtle ones. A well-organised class may end in silence; the students are unwilling to take a position they have not fully considered, and although this silence is pedagogically justifiable, it cannot be statistically distinguished from disinterest. Automation Bias Worsens the Problem. When a recommendation has a confidence score, people are more likely to agree with it and teachers are no exception. The result is a quiet transfer of authority: the machine proposes what deserves attention, the teacher approves, and the responsibility that should have been exercised is never exercised. Techno-rationality is not added to value rationality in this system; rather, it replaces value rationality, and the process of cultivation has become a transmission pipeline.

3.2. Algorithmic Recommendation, Cognitive Narrowing and Value Fragmentation

The objective of personalised recommendations is to increase users' interest in content by presenting them with related items. Students in filtered feeds are already facing value problems that have been adjusted for the effect of emotion; serious social issues have been reduced to short and pithy content, disagreement is presented as hostility, and there is an inexhaustible supply of material that flatters their current status. The result in the classroom is not only that the students have different views, but that they lack a common factual foundation. A teacher who wishes to discuss a controversial issue must first lay a solid foundation for the talk; however, the time allotted for this construction will be the time that should have been used for analysis. The second is also visible in the room. When students work in separate worlds of information, discussion becomes a display of position; everyone speaks from their own foundation and does not examine this foundation, so the talk ends when everyone has repeated themselves. Value identity cannot be achieved in this way; rather, identity is the experience of one's foundation being tested by someone who does not share that foundation. Working on identity in generative environments refers to the same phenomenon at a different scale; that is, the tools and communities surrounding a person shape what that person believes is plausible, and this shaping goes unnoticed by the person being shaped [4]. The classroom was once a common text and a place where society discussed problems and improved together. If a recommendation system is to be applied in this way, it will lose its

unifying character and become an outlet for one's own expression. Rebuilding common ground takes time that content coverage does not offer, and this labour is not counted in the workload. Therefore, establishing a common foundation is not a first technical step but rather an essential problem in values education.

3.3. Weakened Emotional Attachment and Superficially Experienced Identity

The Depth of Identity is related to the density of people. Students rarely embrace a value because there is a flawless argument; rather, they are persuaded to do so after observing a teacher practice it in daily life at some cost and without an audience. As more machines learn from talking and being told, the need for this will decrease. A student can ask a question to an assistant and get an answer immediately, but they lose the sense of waiting, of being asked again, and of observing someone think. A teacher can read a generated summary of students' emotions, but she will fail to notice the hesitation in a face that the summary never recorded. What results does a classroom with good facilities but no life have? Clicks, polls and message feeds generate a large amount of interaction and a considerable amount of noise; participation is high, but commitment remains at the level of stated preference, and the illusion is enduring precisely because it is measurable. Embodied and practice-based ways of integrating values provide a correction by positioning the formation of values in what students do with their bodies and with others, rather than in what can be inspired through words . Another is a relatively simple problem with machine language. Generated text tends to be whole, balanced and smooth; it rarely hesitates, overstates or corrects itself in public. Real-world examples all meet the above. When students are presented with a moral position written in perfect and unreserved language, they are unlikely to believe it; there is no indication that someone has paid for this speech. The deeper absence is curiosity: a machine does not know about a particular student on a certain day, and students are aware of this absence even if they cannot name it.

4. Practical Ways to Nurture Youth's Value Consciousness

4.1. Content Supply: Regulation of Generated Material in the Value Chain

AI has first been applied to content provision, and now the classroom is easily overlooked. A working arrangement has three levels. The value chain is set by the teacher, and for each session, the specific proposition at stake, the boundary beyond which it should not be crossed, and the misconception it is likely to encounter are stated. Students face a serious problem in today's competitive job market: there is no fairness; they are reluctant to take responsibility for anonymous online speech; and they are afraid of losing friends if they do. The scenario bank is the area where the machine operates, and it can generate many different versions of the same problem by changing the background and adding various issues or people. The problem is that generation and authorisation are not separated. Expand the range of materials in the system, ensure the accuracy of the value line by the teacher, and no generated cases will reach the classroom without being approved by a person and recorded with a version. This division is not a bureaucratic addition but the actual form of the ethical foundation mentioned above, and it is possible to correct errors: if a case goes wrong, the version record will show who approved it and on what grounds. The other two are good. Localisation keeps the cases within the world students know and prevents them from becoming moral fables far removed from students' lives. Systematic approaches to the cultivation of values also reach the same conclusion that the paths should be multiple and coordinated, not confined to a single way . AI-driven reform will be successful only if it alters the content students are studying and learning, not just the speed of learning . The bank itself needs to be regularly pruned; that is to say, cases that consistently result in shallow discussions or are recognised by students as artificial should be dropped and not defended.

4.2. Pedagogical Form: Reconstructing Interaction via Human-Machine Division of Labour

Collaboration between people and machines is not about transferring teaching responsibilities to a system; rather, it is a redistribution of labour and sequence. Before class, the system will map existing knowledge and identify where students' reasoning fails; then, based on the actual differences, the teacher will plan lessons. The system will present a case in class, keep up with the role-playing, record the responses, and provide prompt corrections. Then, the teacher will focus on the three things that cannot be delegated: stopping the discussion at

the moment there is a value conflict and addressing it directly, setting rules for respectful disagreement, and concluding with an interpretation that converts a solved case into a general rule. After class, based on the discussion in daily life, extension tasks and practice prompts can be generated by the system, but they should not be used frequently. The Design Idea is to keep what is essential. Face-to-face disputation and personal examples are the parts of the process in which identity is actually formed, so the machine should be limited to what can be standardised. Deliberate non-technological intervals also have a second purpose: retrieval and expression without help can lead to a kind of difficulty that makes knowledge last, and continuous scaffolding cannot achieve this. The sequence also protects attention: without bookkeeping, there is space for the one thing that cannot be scheduled, which is noticing when a student's reasoning has changed direction. Cross-curricular arrangements are also the same. Values in physical education or in campus cultural activities are transmitted to students through life experience, not by teaching; vocational schools have shown that campus culture can also serve many ideological and political purposes in a short time. Although the machine can organise and record these threads, it cannot offer the participation that is needed.

4.3. Teacher Capacity: Digital Literacy and the Power of Value Education

Whether technology serves value education is up to the teachers; they do not need to be platform-savvy. It is the capacity to hold value, technology and content in a single judgement, which comprises three competencies. Verification refers to the ability to find errors in facts, values and logic that may be hidden in well-written, fluent text. Translation is the ability to read a data trace and reconstruct the situation behind it, so a drop in participation is a story about a student, not just a red cell in a table. Design is the ability to determine at what times a machine is needed and when people need to be present, and to defend this division when it is questioned. The division of these functions among institutions varies at different times. Teaching-research communities that bring together subject specialists, technical staff and student advisers to spread knowledge based on documented cases can do so more rapidly, and a shared case library makes judgment reviewable rather than tacit. The same ability should be established in the pre-service stage so that the new teacher enters her first year with the habit of questioning the machine's output rather than learning it under pressure. The first is an information society. Institutions that invest in people's ability to find, judge and use information critically will regularly verify the information; those that only consider information literacy as a remedial course will not. The problem of resources is real, but the binding constraint is usually cultural, not financial. None of this is good will. A teacher needs to have records of their workload, documented cases of credit, and time logs of teaching plans before they are willing to verify rather than blindly trust; otherwise, verification will be an unpaid private virtue.

4.4. Evaluation: Knowing the Growth of Identity from Process Evidence

Value identity cannot be directly observed, and it should not be falsely assumed. What can be seen is a chain of evidence in three places. Cognitive ability is measured by how well students can distinguish between a principle and a reasonable falsification in concept discrimination and value-reasoning tasks. Reflective writing, recorded speech and interview methods are used to capture emotions and trace changes in attitude along with reasons. Behavioural dimension refers to behaviour in service situations, fieldwork, daily life, etc.; it is not stated once. According to the above evidence, such as semantic analysis of discussion transcripts and chronological organisation of practice records, a machine can find changes that a single reader may have overlooked. It should not be extended to interpretation; the change in attitude is a judgment on a person and falls under the teacher's purview. The rules for assessment should specify this division clearly, and they should not substitute the growth of interaction frequency and response speed. The danger of the alternative is well known. Research on identity in generative conditions has found that one's sense of self can be inferred from behavioural traces that do not necessarily have this meaning, and systematic approaches to value education warn against reducing a multi-dimensional process to a single index [5]. The purpose of assessment is to present students' progress and provide guidance; it is not to give a grade. Students should also be able to record, as a portfolio they have collected, annotated and defended will be more informative than a trace compiled about them, and it returns ownership of the evidence to the person whose growth the evidence describes.

5. Safeguard Measures for Pathway Construction

5.1. Institutional Guarantees: Access Regulations and Review Criteria

A Long-term Plan needs to be made. The institution should keep an access list for AI in ideological and political classes and classify it according to risk. Do not have scenarios that require value judgments; only those for organising materials or summarising learning data are allowed; functions that can autonomously create value positions or simulate political stances should be excluded altogether. The review should cover the entire process of preparation, delivery and follow-up, and generated content needs to be logged, sourced and attributed so that any deviation can be traced back to a specific step and a particular person. The Rules should be consistent with general academic governance. If AI application is outside the scope of course assessment and teaching supervision, it will not be regularly checked. Periodically revise the access rights; it does not have to be approved all at once. As the model's capabilities change rapidly, the reasons for the decision in the previous semester may no longer be valid now. Ambition matters here. Reforming it as a relatively new feature added to existing teaching will not help address the existing problems in education; thus, the sustainable solution is to integrate artificial intelligence into the construction of the curriculum, professional development for teachers and quality supervision. Written Rules are the cheapest form of institutional memory. A single institution cannot regulate a model it does not control, so access rules are most effective when written jointly by the regional consortium and reviewed according to the same criteria.

5.2. Data Safeguards: A Disciplined Corpus and a Value Annotation System

The quality of the generated results cannot exceed that of the corpus. Institutions should cooperate to build a special corpus of ideological and political education, such as authoritative theoretical works, policy documents, adjudicated cases, documented teaching sequences, etc., and create a searchable and citable knowledge base. A fixed base reduces the probability that a model will generate the same answer to a question repeatedly. Annotation is the last step. Specialists should add tags to each item to indicate the direction of its value, the applicable level and conditions for use, etc., so that retrieval and generation can be done in an explicit manner rather than an implicit one, and so that disputes over a tag can be resolved by argument rather than by preference. Annotation should be done jointly with subject matter experts and technical staff; otherwise, although the tags will be internally consistent within one profession, they will be externally invalid. Data Protection is not a small matter. The amount of learning data collected should be minimal, and its retention period and use scope must be informed to the students. Division of labour among institutions can be used to solve the problem of limited resources; a well-managed shared corpus will have a lower cost than six ungoverned local ones , but sharing requires common quality standards and a maintenance plan, or else the quality of the corpus will decline over time. Retrieval should be linked to provenance; that is to say, a generated claim that cannot be traced back to an indexed source should be regarded as invalid in this subject, regardless of how plausible it appears. An annual inventory of what the corpus contains and what it cannot answer is a more practical way of maintenance than periodic bulk updates.

5.3. Coordination Safeguards: A Multi-Actor Educational Pattern

The Classroom is not an island. AI integration will bring about value only if the people in the classroom are willing to do so. The links among subject teachers, disciplinary teachers, student advisers and technical staff need to be open so that values taught in class can be connected to ethical problems in major courses and behavioural expectations in residence life. When these channels are closed, students will learn that the classroom version of a value is a classroom object. On the outside, the entire ideology-politics curriculum aims to train students' moral qualities, and through practice bases, memorial sites, community service activities, etc., these values are tested and applied in real-life situations. The technical team's job is to realise the educational demands in practice; it should not be them. This difference is easy to express and easy to forget, as the team usually controls the design vocabulary and thus the practical meaning of a requirement. Coordination is specific: there are named responsibilities, a fixed meeting schedule, and a written record of what each person has agreed to do. Coordination that only occurs in meetings will vanish after the first staff change. A broad-curriculum

framework can be regarded as the distribution of responsibilities in various schools rather than an additional course. Disagreement among the actors is normal and often beneficial, provided that it is not contrary to the common ground of what the course aims to achieve and what it seeks to avoid producing.

5.4. Risk Safeguards: Algorithmic Audit and Ethical Review

Any technology that is allowed in the school must be monitored continuously while it is being used. The three kinds of algorithmic audit failure are: Bias is a systematic reduction or stereotyping of a group in the output, and it will not be revealed through cross-group testing. Hallucination is the invention of false facts or authorities in the generated content; in this case, it is not an annoyance but a problem of legitimacy. Inducement is a type of interaction Design that rewards a particular posture with instant feedback; thus, to motivate someone, we can use the interface itself rather than words. Before putting it into practice, ethics will be considered to determine why, when, how it will affect students' independence, and students and their families will give informed consent. A Standing Committee for Academic Governance can be established to conduct reviews of all model versions in teaching at the end of each semester. Preparation for failure is also in this document. A protocol is established to suspend the tool, reconstruct what occurred, and repair the damage; otherwise, it would take a long time to find out about the problem through student complaints. According to research on identity, the loss of trust resulting from one serious failure is difficult to recover; thus, it is more economical to prevent such occurrences. Reviewing without recording it will be forgotten in about a year. The audit should be well-documented so that, a year from now, a student, a parent or an inspector who was not present at the time can still understand the reason for a certain decision.

6. Conclusions

At its foundation, the integration of AI in university ideological and political education is a redistribution of teaching authority. Technology can increase the supply of cases, reduce the feedback loop, and consider a large number of classes at the same time, but it does not create value. It increases the value of the people who will use it. If the teacher's judgment is vague, the machine will make the vagueness more pronounced; if the relational life of a classroom is thin, the machine will make the thinness appear busy. The paths put forward here are the result of the diagnosis, not a preference for restriction. A value throughline is a value that the machine has created and a person has approved. A division of labour between people and machines protects the time when identity is formed and confines the machine to what can be standardised. Teacher capacity converts verification, translation and design into daily professional work. Process evidence is a set of observations teachers make during interaction; it is not a statistic of that interaction. Although there has been a decline in public interest recently, safeguards for the rules of access, corpus governance, multi-party coordination and algorithmic review will still be in place. None of the above answer the more fundamental problem of whether an institution is willing to invest in the people-related aspects of the ratio. Technology is the cheaper variable, and the desire to replace the expensive one is structural rather than moral. The final indicator of value identity is not what a student says in class, but what she chooses when the class is over and no one is watching. A Design that keeps this in mind will be good with technology; a Design that ignores it will result in excellent instrumentation but little else. This way is slow, not glamorous, and largely out of sight of the instruments universities are now fond of; thus, it must be added to the Design in advance [6].

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1 Pang B, Li JJ. Research on the Pathway of Information Culture Cultivation in University Libraries under Resource Constraints: A Case Study of Guangxi University Library. *Journal of Academic Libraries* 2026; **44**(**4**): 55–64.

2 Mei JP, Chu DF. The Value Function and Implementation Path of Campus Culture Education in Vocational Colleges from the Perspective of the Broad Ideological and Political Course: Based on the Practice of San Ba Dao Craftsman Culture in Yangzhou. *Chinese Vocational and Technical Education* 2023; (**2**): 91–96.

3 Wang XA, Wu X, Lu DX, *et al*. Value Interpretation and Pathway Innovation of Integrating Ideological and Political Education Elements into Public Physical Education in Universities. *Journal of Wuhan Institute of Physical Education* 2023; **57**(**7**): 95–100.

4 Hao CC, Wang P. From Spontaneity to Consciousness: The Realization Pathway and Future Prospects of Doctoral Students' Academic Identity under Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Higher Education Exploration* 2026; (**6**): 63–70.

5 Sun J, He ZL. Multiple Paths for Cultivating Socialist Core Values in Ideological and Political Courses: A System Thinking Perspective. *Teaching of Ideological and Political Courses* 2023; (**5**): 8–11. (In Chinese)

6 Zan QJ, Gao ZJ. A Probe into AI-Enabled Reform and Innovation of Ideological and Political Courses in Universities. *Advances in Education* 2026; **16**(**1**): 412–416. (In Chinese)

© The Author(s) 2026. Published by Global Science Publishing (*GSP*).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.