

The limitations of generative artificial intelligence in contextual teaching of moral education and legal education at the junior high school level

Meng Zhang

Hangzhou Normal University

DOI: 10.65285/RET.V2I2.005

Abstract: In the digital and intelligent era, generative artificial intelligence has entered the field of education, transforming classroom teaching practices and learning approaches. For the Moral and Legal Education curriculum in junior high schools, it provides new technological support for contextual teaching while introducing fresh challenges regarding educational value, teacher-student relationships, and classroom governance. Based on practical experiences with contextual teaching in this course, this paper examines issues such as information distortion and value bias, and explores appropriate application boundaries from three perspectives: value guidance, teacher leadership, and standardized governance. The study concludes that generative AI can serve as a valuable auxiliary tool; however, its use should not replace educational principles with technical logic but rather align with the goal of fostering moral development, achieving a balance between technological empowerment and value-based education.

Key words: Generative Artificial Intelligence; Ethics and Rule of Law; Contextual Teaching; Application Boundaries

The concept of "application boundaries" does not imply rejection of technology nor denial of artificial intelligence's educational value; rather, it emphasizes that its integration into education must adhere to educational objectives and principles. For the Moral and Legal Education curriculum in junior high schools, AI can serve as a valuable supporting tool, but its application should not expand beyond the course's core values. Only by establishing clear principles and boundaries for technology use can we truly harness AI's potential without allowing it to dominate the classroom.

1. Prioritize value-oriented guidance and clarify the boundaries of technical services in education.

The key distinction between ideological and political education classes and regular subject classes lies in their distinct emphasis on value-based education. The Moral and Legal Education curriculum in junior high school not only imparts knowledge but also plays a vital role in fostering political identity, cultivating legal awareness, and shaping moral values. Therefore, when integrating artificial intelligence into the classroom, the primary consideration must be whether the technology serves educational objectives.

This issue is already evident in the application of generative AI. Since AI can rapidly generate texts and viewpoints, some classrooms tend to regard its output as a source of knowledge and perspectives, overlooking potential value biases and educational risks. Particularly when addressing social hot topics, AI often presents diverse or even conflicting positions. Without proper filtering and guidance from teachers, classrooms may descend into a state of "parallel viewpoints" lacking value differentiation. The Moral and Legal Education classroom is not a value-neutral space; emphasizing value guidance does not mean mere indoctrination but requires teachers to help students establish reasonable judgment criteria amidst diverse information and guide them toward developing value understandings

aligned with societal development and curriculum objectives. Therefore, the primary limitation of generative AI in the classroom is that it cannot replace value judgments.

Artificial intelligence can provide information, generate case studies, and simulate perspectives, but it cannot assume responsibility for making value judgments. While technology can inform students about various viewpoints, it cannot replace educators in determining how these should be understood. For issues such as fairness and justice, ultimate value guidance must still be provided by teachers by integrating real-world contexts with curriculum objectives. In this sense, artificial intelligence should be positioned as an auxiliary tool rather than a primary agent of value formation in ideological and political education; its value lies in offering more comprehensive and flexible support for value-based learning.

Meanwhile, prioritizing value-oriented guidance means that classroom scenario design must align with educational objectives rather than be driven by technological interest. In practice, the use of artificial intelligence in some classrooms often leads to a "technology-centric" approach, overemphasizing generative outcomes and classroom novelty while neglecting teaching goals. For instance, numerous interactions may be designed solely to demonstrate dialogue functions without clear problem-solving objectives, or dramatic scenarios may be created merely to enhance engagement, thereby diminishing the depth of value discussions. This phenomenon reflects technology logic taking precedence over educational logic. The core of contextual teaching lies in its ability to foster students' understanding of values. Therefore, regardless of technological advancements, classroom scenarios should serve the goal of fostering moral development and personal growth, rather than becoming mere platforms for technological demonstration.

2. Uphold the teacher-centered approach and establish a collaborative classroom relationship between teachers and students.

When value-oriented perspectives ask "Why use artificial intelligence in the classroom?", teacher-centered approaches respond with "Who should lead the classroom?" The introduction of AI into classrooms has raised concerns that teachers might be replaced by technology—a concern that, while somewhat exaggerated, reflects growing attention to shifts in educational roles. In practice, generative AI can assist with certain traditional teaching tasks, but primarily at the instructional support level rather than as an independent educational entity. Authentic educational activities fundamentally require teachers' organization, judgment, and emotional engagement; particularly in contextualized teaching, teachers serve as guides in shaping classroom values, and their professional judgment cannot be entirely supplanted by fixed algorithms.

Therefore, the second boundary of integrating artificial intelligence into classrooms is that it cannot replace the central role of teachers. Teacher leadership does not mean reverting to the traditional one-way indoctrination model, but rather reaffirming the core role of teachers through technological involvement. Artificial intelligence provides auxiliary generation and technical support, while teachers are responsible for value guidance and educational judgment; the two should form a "human-machine collaboration" relationship with clearly defined functional roles: AI focuses on resource generation and process support, teachers handle context reconstruction, classroom organization, and value guidance; technology enables implementation, while teachers determine the overall direction.

Meanwhile, human-machine collaboration requires teachers to proactively enhance their understanding of artificial intelligence. In practice, some teachers either rely excessively on AI or reject it entirely, neither approach facilitating its proper application. Teachers must develop the ability to use AI rationally—understanding its operational logic and recognizing its strengths and limitations—to maintain control over the classroom. In the long term, AI development imposes higher demands on teachers' professional competence; as technology advances, the need for teacher leadership becomes increasingly pronounced.

3. Adhere to standardized usage and establish a sense of technical governance in situational teaching.

Once the role of value guidance and teacher leadership is clearly defined, the responsible application of artificial intelligence must be implemented at the institutional and regulatory levels; relying solely on individual teachers' awareness is insufficient to address its complex risks. Generative AI possesses openness and inherent uncertainty, and its integration into classrooms raises issues related to teaching practices, data security, ethical responsibilities, and educational governance. Therefore, the third prerequisite for deploying generative AI in contextualized teaching is adherence to standardized usage protocols and fostering a strong awareness of technological governance.

1. Establish a content review mechanism. AI-generated content is characterized by immediacy and randomness; educators should adhere to the principle of "review before use," particularly when addressing political, legal, or ethical issues, ensuring the content's authenticity and accuracy without compromising review standards due to technological convenience.

2. Attention must be paid to data ethics and privacy protection. Some AI platforms involve the collection and processing of user data; entering student information into such systems may compromise privacy, particularly requiring caution in educational applications for minors. In classroom settings, teachers should refrain from uploading students' private data, enhance their understanding of platform security protocols and data usage guidelines, and avoid leveraging technology at the expense of student rights.

3. Establish clear guidelines for responsible use. Artificial intelligence should not become a routine substitute in classrooms and must be employed judiciously according to teaching objectives. For instance, during activities that require students' independent thinking or value expression, AI-generated answers should be avoided; in open discussions, its role should be limited to auxiliary reference. Technological governance ensures innovation within these frameworks: the integration of AI into education aims to promote more rational and responsible technology use, rather than fostering educational dependency.

Conclusion

The advancement of digital and intelligent technologies is reshaping the educational ecosystem, with generative AI becoming a prevailing trend in classrooms. For junior high school Moral and Legal Education courses, artificial intelligence has brought profound transformations to teaching tools, classroom management approaches, teacher-student relationships, and value education frameworks. While technology enhances contextualized instruction by providing new resources and expanding interactive support mechanisms, education transcends mere technological application; its integration must adhere to pedagogical principles and educational objectives. The introduction of generative AI into contextual teaching should neither be overemphasized nor rejected outright, as its potential risk lies in technological logic potentially replacing educational rationale. When classrooms rely on technological support, the value-oriented guidance of ideological education requires reevaluation. Therefore, the key to discussing AI-enhanced ideological education lies in maintaining educational autonomy in technology utilization. AI can serve as a classroom assistant but cannot dictate instructional values; it may assist in scenario creation yet cannot replace teachers' educational judgment. Future intelligent education should prioritize moral cultivation, achieving harmonious integration of technology and education through value guidance, teacher leadership, and standardized governance, enabling generative AI to empower contextualized teaching for student development while avoiding technology-dominated educational practices.

References

- [1] Leif, Wenger. Situational learning: legal marginal participation [M]. Wang Wenjing, translated. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 2004,

- [2] Guo Hua. Deep learning and its significance [J]. Curriculum, Teaching Materials and Teaching Methods, 2016,36(11):25-32.
- [3] Guo Yuanxiang. On Deep Teaching: Origin, Foundation and Idea [J]. Educational Research and Experiment, 2017(3):1-11.
- [4] Guo Shaoqing. Historical evolution and future trend of artificial intelligence empowerment education [J]. Audio-visual education research, 2021, 42(1): 5-12.
- [5] Guo Wenge. The development history of education technology [J]. peking university education review, 2011,9(3):137-157.