World Journal of Educational Studies
Print ISSN: 2959-9989
Online ISSN: 2959-9997
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/wjes3167

AN EXPLORATION OF SCENARIO-BASED TEACHING IN LEGAL TRAINING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RECONSIDERATION ASSISTED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

WenZhang Wang
Shenzhen Polytechnic University, Shenzhen 518055, Guangdong, China.

Abstract: Practical training in administrative reconsideration has long been mired in formulaic case simulations, making it difficult to replicate the adversarial nature and uncertainty found in real-world cases. The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence offers new possibilities for overcoming this challenge; it can not only create diverse virtual case scenarios but also simulate real-time dialogue between parties and provide rapid feedback. Focusing on the specific context of administrative reconsideration legal training, this paper proposes a "scenario-based teaching" design approach. Under this approach, generative AI serves as a scenario builder, a dynamic interactive partner, and a teaching assistant providing differentiated feedback, thereby supporting students' learning within highly realistic dispute resolution scenarios rather than replacing their own critical thinking. The teaching practice adopts a three-stage progressive model: "pre-class AI-assisted scenario construction—in-class role-playing and structured adversarial exercises—post-class AI-driven in-depth debriefing." Before class, students receive randomly generated case scenarios, draft reconsideration applications, and engage in mock dialogues with the AI as parties to the case; during class, they undergo in-group reviews and full-class mock hearings, with the AI introducing plausible "surprises" to force students to adjust their strategies in real time, while instructors identify cognitive blind spots and visualize thought processes; After class, the AI conducts structured debriefing interviews and generates debriefing summaries for instructors to provide detailed feedback, ensuring that reflection truly facilitates a shift in thinking. This process shifts instructors from "demonstrators" to "directors-monitors," emphasizing critical scrutiny of AI outputs and establishing a process-oriented assessment system centered on thought processes. This initiative aims to unlock the potential of generative AI in simulating professional practice scenarios, making training more closely aligned with the actual logic of dispute resolution, and ultimately fostering students' legal reasoning and practical skills.
Keywords: Generative AI; Administrative reconsideration; Scenario-based teaching; Legal training

1 INTRODUCTION

Administrative reconsideration training has always faced an awkward problem. It should train students to identify the basis of a claim, analyze the legality and rationality of administrative acts, and choose appropriate relief paths in complex administrative disputes. However, in practice, it often turns into procedural "mock case handling". Teachers select a typical case, students write reconsideration applications or decisions following templates, and then revise them slightly according to standard answers. In this mode, students are exposed to fixed scenarios with given information and absent responses from counterparts, barely touching the uncertainty and confrontation in real reconsideration cases.

The rapid iteration of generative artificial intelligence provides a new possibility to break this deadlock. Wu Di et al. pointed out that the development of artificial intelligence has gone through an evolution from "being able to store and calculate" to "being able to perceive and listen", and then to the general large-scale model "being able to understand and create"[1]. This "understanding" and "creation" ability is precisely what traditional legal training lacks. It can generate a large number of diverse virtual case scenarios based on simple prompts, simulate real-time dialogue with parties of different identities, and give quick and targeted feedback on students' drafted documents. This precisely addresses three pain points in training teaching: single scenario supply, lack of interactive partners, and delayed and broad feedback. Thus, a worthy question arises: when generative AI can act as a patient party and instantly generate a set of administrative penalty decisions with intentional flaws, how should we integrate it organically into administrative reconsideration legal training to make it truly serve the cultivation of students' legal thinking and practical abilities?

Current discussions on generative AI in legal education mostly focus on general risk prevention or writing assistance, and there are few refined teaching designs focusing on a specific discipline training link. This paper takes administrative reconsideration legal training as a breakthrough and attempts to put forward a design idea of "scenario-based teaching". The core claim of this paper is not to use AI to replace teachers or students' thinking, but to create diverse, dynamic and questionable case scenarios with generative AI, so that students can repeatedly practice the complete thinking process "from dispute identification to decision-making" in an experience close to real case handling.

2 THE ESSENCE OF SCENARIO-BASED TEACHING AND THE ROLE OF GENERATIVE AI

The "scenario-based teaching" mentioned in this paper is not simply giving students a case background. It refers to a process of purposefully placing learning tasks in professional practice scenarios close to reality, allowing students to acquire abilities through role play, problem-solving and real-time interaction. For administrative reconsideration training, such scenarios should at least have the following characteristics:

(1) Non-presetting of case facts. In real case handling, parties often cannot clarify all legal facts at one time and in an organized way, and the opposing views are always changing dynamically. Training scenarios should simulate this uncertainty, requiring students to inquire, screen and fix facts step by step. As pointed out by Liu Bangqi et al., generative artificial intelligence can leverage its conversational interaction features to extract learning scenarios and task requirements from multiple rounds of dialogues with students, and form various forms of learning materials such as text, images, videos, and audio, providing support for students' learning[2], this characteristic precisely meets the demand for dynamic and conversational scenarios in administrative reconsideration training.

(2) Confrontation and authenticity of role interaction. Administrative reconsideration involves multiple participants, including applicants, respondents, third parties and reconsideration authorities, each with their own positions. Only in real dialogue tension can students realize the different interpretive power of the same legal provision in the hands of both the applicant and the respondent.

(3) Visualization and correction of the thinking process. Scenario-based teaching should "expose" how students analyze cases, select legal bases, and balance legality and rationality, facilitating teachers' intervention and guidance as well as students' self-reflection.

Luo Shaofang proposed a core principle in the research of situational teaching: Teachers use work materials on the podium to "teach while performing, perform while teaching", and students do "learning through doing and doing through learning" on the work platform[3]. In the administrative reconsideration training, this principle is also applicable. The difference lies in that the participants in the "performing" and "doing" have expanded - the addition of generative AI means that "performing" is no longer limited to teachers, and students are no longer just passive viewers.

In this framework, generative AI can play exactly three roles:

First, scenario builder. AI can quickly generate multiple groups of virtual cases with different circumstances and prominent controversial points according to the core knowledge points set by teachers, such as "administrative agreement disputes", "illegal administrative penalty hearing procedures" and "improper application of discretion benchmarks". Teachers are no longer limited to a few cases on hand; they can assign different cases to different groups, and even temporarily "add scenes" at any time according to classroom progress by adding new facts or evidence.

Second, dynamic interactive partner. This is the most breakthrough value of AI. It can be instructed to play different roles: an emotional applicant with confused legal expression, a staff member of an administrative organ insisting on procedural legality, or a third party trying to mediate. Students need to communicate, inquire, refute and persuade these roles. AI can also respond realistically to students' questions according to preset personalities and positions, and even throw some unexpected "difficulties" to force students out of scripted thinking. As Lu Yu et al. pointed out, generative artificial intelligence systems can capture users' intentions and the context of the conversation based on the information from multiple rounds of dialogue, and generate coherent responses that are logical[4], this ability enables them to provide realistic and dynamic conversation experiences when simulating roles such as administrative reconsideration parties, agents, or staff of the reconsideration authority, thereby effectively supporting adversarial interactions in training exercises.

Third, differentiated feedback assistant. After students finish document writing or oral simulation, AI can quickly give basic feedback, pointing out obvious errors in citing legal bases, missing elements or logical jumps, and reminding students to check by themselves. It cannot replace teachers' professional judgment, but can undertake a lot of repetitive and basic review work, allowing teachers to free up energy for deeper thinking guidance.

3 GENERATIVE AI-DRIVEN THREE-STAGE PROGRESSIVE TRAINING: “SCENARIO CONSTRUCTION—MOCK ADVERSARIAL PRACTICE—IN-DEPTH DEBRIEFING”

Based on the above role positioning, we try to design administrative reconsideration training supported by generative AI into three interconnected teaching stages. Just as Meng Wojie pointed out in his exploration of administrative reconsideration practical training teaching, theory can only exert its guiding role when combined with practice. Students must truly master it through hands-on practice[5]. Traditional practical training is limited by fixed cases and lack of interaction, making it difficult to achieve such deep integration; however, the intervention of generative AI enables students to immerse themselves in dynamic confrontation practice scenarios before, during, and after class.

3.1 Pre-Class: AI-Assisted Scenario Construction and Personalized Preparation

The goal of the pre-class stage is to let each student enter the classroom with "their own case" instead of sharing the same case. First, teachers determine the theme of the training, such as "acceptance conditions for reconsideration applications" or "legality review standards for administrative acts". Then, teachers use natural language instructions to make generative AI generate multiple different versions of basic case scenarios at the same time. These scenarios are of equal difficulty but differ in specific plots, parties' names and identities, and types of administrative acts involved, ensuring that students have room for discussion without repetition.

After logging into the learning platform, students are randomly assigned a case scenario. They need to complete two tasks. The first task is to draft the main part of a reconsideration application from the perspective of the applicant's attorney,

which must specify the challenged act, list the reconsideration claims, and cite at least one legal provision. The second task is to conduct a short dialogue training with the AI-mock party. AI acts as the applicant, but the initial information provided is messy and emotional. Students must sort out the facts in the dialogue and record the key issues needing further verification.

The purpose of this design is to let students experience the initial transformation "from chaotic facts to legal expression" before class. Their applications and dialogue records will be submitted to teachers synchronously. Teachers only need to browse quickly before class to accurately grasp each student's starting level and common problems, making classroom guidance no longer "blind".

3.2 In-Class Session: AI Role-Playing and Mock Adversarial Practice

Classroom training is the peak of scenario-based teaching, which is divided into three stages.

The first step is group internal review. Students enter groups with their own cases and first conduct a short internal exchange. Each student states the case, their claims and main bases to peers in three minutes, and other members raise initial doubts from the perspective of the respondent or reconsideration authority. AI provides the "real-time verification" function at this time: when students dispute a factual detail, they can issue an instruction to AI "answer as the applicant" on the spot, and AI responds according to the case setting to help the group quickly clarify the dispute.

The second step is full-class confrontation simulation. Teachers select two to three typical cases for administrative reconsideration hearing simulation in the whole class. At this time, AI's role is activated to the most complex state. It may play an applicant who changes his statement suddenly and submits new evidence at the hearing, or a legal staff member of the respondent insisting that internal procedural flaws do not affect the validity of administrative acts. Students must adjust their strategies at any time during the simulation to deal with various reasonable "surprises" created by AI. Teachers do not intervene but only record key problems in students' responses: when did students' questions deviate from the legal framework? When were they stumped by AI? Which responses only repeated legal provisions without completing fact subsumption?

The third step is teacher intervention and thinking visualization. The confrontation is stopped at a certain climax node. Teachers first ask observing students to conduct collective evaluation: what was the strongest argument of both sides just now? Which refutation was invalid? Then, teachers ask questions around the core framework of administrative reconsideration review—competence basis, fact finding, legal application, procedural legality, discretion rationality—to guide students to sort out the thinking blind spots exposed in the simulation. AI exits role play at this time and turns into a "recorder", projecting the key points of teacher-student analysis in a structured way in real time to assist the whole class in forming a visual analysis context.

3.3 Post-Class: AI-Assisted In-Depth Debriefing and Individualized Improvement

After class, students need to complete a reflection record. In the past, such reflections often turned into classroom journals. To change this, we introduce AI-assisted dialogue review. Students conduct a structured review interview with AI in a limited dialogue window. AI will ask several questions in turn: Where was your biggest judgment difficulty in the simulation? Which point from the other side surprised you most? Have your reconsideration claims been fully justified by legal provisions? If you do it again, which factual link will you verify first?

These questions are not novel, but the effect is quite different when AI asks them one by one in one-on-one interaction with students and can briefly follow up according to students' answers. Students cannot be perfunctory with empty words and must organize their thinking again in the input box. After the interview, the system generates a review summary, which is submitted to teachers together with students' original reflection records.

Teachers no longer need to correct all documents, but select three to four typical reflection records from each class for in-depth comments, focusing on whether students have truly achieved a thinking "shift"—whether they can step away from the party's position and examine issues from the neutral adjudicator's perspective of the reconsideration authority. This reflection record with teachers' comments will be shared by the whole class before the end of the course, allowing students to see their peers' thinking growth trajectories and how others break through obstacles they once encountered.

4 FROM “DEMONSTRATOR” TO “DIRECTORS-MONITORS”: THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE TEACHER’S ROLE AND GENERATIVE AI RISK GOVERNANCE

In such a classroom, teachers transform from "demonstrators" to "directors" and "monitors". This transformation aligns with what Yang Zongkai et al. have pointed out, that intelligent tools have driven the teaching model to shift from a "teacher-student" binary structure to a "teacher-machine-student" tripartite structure, transforming teaching from a "teacher-centered" approach to a "learner-centered" one[6]. In this new structure, teachers' core functions are no longer demonstrating their own case handling experience, but the following: designing accurate AI instructions to ensure that the generated scenarios and dialogues are not divorced from legal common sense while retaining sufficient controversial space; quickly identifying weak points externalized from students' thinking in dynamic confrontation simulation, and deciding when to stop and how to ask questions; maintaining a clear awareness of reviewing AI output.

These functions are particularly important. Generative AI may have hallucinations in legal facts and misquote legal provisions. Therefore, we need to clarify a bottom line in the training design: AI can provide scenario materials and mock dialogues, but any authoritative conclusions involving legal judgments must be confirmed or corrected by teachers.

Meanwhile, teachers must check and proofread all case templates generated by AI one by one before class to ensure accuracy. In the first class, teachers should also spend some time specially explaining the role boundaries of AI to students, emphasizing that it is not a source of standard answers but an auxiliary tool to be examined. This awareness of critical use of technical tools is itself a digital literacy that legal talents should possess.

From a broader perspective, as pointed out by Zhu Yongxin and Yang Fan, the previous binary opposition-based substitution thinking between humans and machines is now shifting towards a symbiotic thinking of human-machine collaboration. And we are already on the path of developing human-machine co-teaching[7]. This is precisely the deep meaning of the teacher role transformation advocated in this article: it is not to let AI replace teachers[8], but through human-machine collaboration, to return practical training teaching to the real logic of dispute resolution, and ultimately serve the cultivation of students' legal thinking and practical abilities.

5 ASSESSMENT TO FACILITATE LEARNING: DESIGNING FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT FOR GENERATIVE AI SCENARIO-BASED TEACHING

Evaluation is the baton of students' behavior. If the final grade is only determined by the quality of a mock administrative reconsideration decision, the scenario-based interaction before and during class may be regarded as dispensable by students. Therefore, we move the focus of evaluation forward to the following dimensions:

First, pre-class preparation evaluation, accounting for 30%. This part mainly examines the logical integrity of students' submitted initial reconsideration applications, the accuracy of legal basis citation, as well as the inquiry direction and fact induction ability shown in the dialogue with AI. Correct conclusions are not required here, but active thinking traces must be presented.

Second, classroom participation evaluation, accounting for 40%. Based on on-site records, teachers examine students' performance in group internal review and full-class confrontation: whether they can maintain the main argument line in the face of unexpected plots created by AI, whether they can understand and respond to the other party's real claims, and whether they can interpret between legal provisions and facts. Meanwhile, the quality of oral evaluations from observing students on their peers' performance is also included in this evaluation to encourage in-depth participation of all students.

Third, after-class reflection evaluation, accounting for 30%. In this part, we no longer evaluate the documents themselves, but the thinking growth reflected in reflection records and AI review summaries: whether students can accurately diagnose weak links in their own arguments, and whether they can extract transferable practical experience, such as "next time encountering similar situations, priority should be given to verifying the respondent's competence basis", instead of only staying at general self-criticism like "I didn't speak well that day".

6 CONCLUSION

The biggest fear of introducing generative artificial intelligence into legal classrooms is not technical errors, but teachers subconsciously using it as a more advanced PPT or automatic grading tool, thus missing its truly revolutionary potential: the ability to simulate professional practice scenarios. The scenario-based teaching exploration proposed in this paper is exactly trying to unleash this potential into the specific teaching scenario of administrative reconsideration legal training. The original intention of the design is not to make teachers easier, but to bring training closer to real dispute resolution, so that students have to face the confusion, pressure and choices that can be easily bypassed in traditional simulations in class.

This idea will undoubtedly bring new challenges: how to control the randomness of AI-generated content to make it both open and not divorced from legal logic? How to give all students immersive participation opportunities within limited class hours? These questions still need more powerful empirical answers in continuous classroom experiments. If this exploration can encourage more colleagues to try to design teaching plans in their own professional fields that let AI truly "play a role" instead of "providing answers", part of its purpose will have been achieved.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

[1] Wu Di, Li Huan, Chen Xu. An Analysis of the Impact of General-Purpose AI Large Models on Educational Applications. Research on Open Education, 2023, 29(02): 19-25+45.

[2] Liu Bangqi, Nie Xiaolin, Wang Shijin, et al. Generative Artificial Intelligence and the Reshaping of Future Education: Technical Framework, Capability Characteristics, and Application Trends. Research on Educational Technology, 2024, 45(01): 13-20.

[3] Luo Shaofang. A Study on the Reconstruction of Economic Law Courses in Higher Vocational Education Based on a Scenario-Based Teaching Model. Chinese Adult Education, 2014(19): 175-176.

[4] Lu Yu, Yu Jinglei, Chen Penghe, et al. Educational Applications and Prospects of Generative Artificial Intelligence: A Case Study of the ChatGPT System. Chinese Distance Education, 2023, 43(04): 24-31+51.

[5] Meng Wojie. Exploring Models for Reforming Practical Legal Training in Higher Education: A Record of a Practical Exercise Class on Administrative Reconsideration Procedures. Journal of Heilongjiang Provincial Academy of Political and Legal Management, 2012(06): 148-152.
[6] Yang Zongkai, Wang Jun, Wu Di, et al. Analysis of the Impact of ChatGPT/Generative Artificial Intelligence on Education and Corresponding Strategies. Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences Edition), 2023, 41(07): 26-35.
[7] Zhu Yongxin, Yang Fan. ChatGPT/Generative AI and Educational Innovation: Opportunities, Challenges, and the Future. Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences Edition), 2023, 41(07): 1-14.
[8] Xiao Jun, Bai Qingchun, Chen Mo, et al. Generative Artificial Intelligence Empowering Online Learning Scenarios and Implementation Pathways. Research on Educational Technology, 2023, 44(09): 57-63+99.