IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Impact Of AI Chatbots On Learning And Critical Thinking In Higher And Professional Education

Dr.MD.Zakir Hussain

Assistant professor of education

BES College of education for women

Bidar-Karnataka state-585403

Abstract:

Large Language Model (LLM)–based chatbots such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot are rapidly being integrated into higher education and professional learning environments for tutoring, assessment support, and content generation. While these tools demonstrate strong potential to enhance personalized learning, scaffolding, and accessibility, concerns persist regarding overreliance, reduced cognitive engagement, and erosion of critical thinking skills. This study critically examines whether educational chatbots function primarily as cognitive supports or cognitive substitutes. Using a systematic review of global empirical studies, policy reports, and experimental findings, the paper analyses learning outcomes, student behaviour, and pedagogical integration strategies. Secondary data are synthesized through comparative tables highlighting learning gains, engagement metrics, and cognitive risks. Findings suggest that chatbots enhance conceptual understanding and feedback efficiency when used as metacognitive tools but may suppress higher-order thinking when used for answer generation and task completion. The study concludes that learning outcomes depend less on the technology itself and more on pedagogical design, assessment strategies, and institutional policy frameworks. The paper proposes instructional design principles and governance guidelines for responsible AI integration in higher education.

Keywords: LLM chatbots, higher education, critical thinking, AI in education, professional learning, generative AI.

1.Introduction:

The development of generative AI, particularly LLM chatbot systems, represents a paradigm shift in edtech, as their responses are contextually-oriented rather than based on pre-defined rules. These chatbots can also mimic conversations and adapt from one field of expertise to another [1]. More colleges and continuing education programs are now turning to LLM chatbots as part of their learning support services, to assist in tutoring, writing, programming and providing ongoing feedback for improvement [2].

While these technologies provide positive educational opportunities, an increasing number of critics have become concerned with issues such as cognitive offloading, plagiarism, less effort required to gain knowledge and develop understanding, and surface or shallow level learning strategies [3]. There are those who believe that access to immediate answers will ultimately weaken people's ability to think critically, reflectively evaluate their own thinking, and problem-solve through continued effort [4].

Thus, a central pedagogical dilemma emerges:
Do LLM-based educational chatbots support learning processes, or do they replace essential cognitive work required for critical thinking?

2. Literature Review:

2.1 Educational Benefits of LLM Chatbots

Research shows that students benefit from:

- instant responses and clarifications [5]
- customized ways to learn [6]• less worry about asking questions [7]
- helped with language acquisition and coding practice [8]

Research using meta-analysis showed more moderate increases in student achievement when chatbot assistance was used in addition to the instructor, rather than replacing the instructor's methods. [9]

2.2 Risks to Critical Thinking and Deep Learning

Studies have revealed a number of issues, including:

- Dependency on automated responses [10]
- Decreased time-on-task dedicated to solving problems [11]
- Decrease in original written material quality [12]
- Decreased curiosity about knowledge/epistemic curiosity [13]

Neuroscience and cognitive studies have demonstrated that learning requires productive struggle, retrieval practice, and elaboration, and therefore may be less effective when using AI-generated responses [14].

2.3 Global Policy Perspectives

Educationally unregulated AI use has been called for by International Agencies:

- UNESCO advocates Human-Centred Artificial Intelligence principles [15]
- The OECD is pushing for an Evaluation Redesign [16]
- The European Commission has outlined the challenges of Using AI for Academic Integrity [17]

India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 encourages the implementation of AI Literacy but warns against utilizing the technology as a way to circumvent standard Teaching Methods. [18].

3.Methodology:

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **systematic narrative review approach** using secondary data from:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles (2019–2025)
- International policy documents
- Experimental studies in higher education
- Professional learning case reports

3.2 Data Sources

Databases consulted:

- Scopus
- Web of Science
- ERIC
- Google Scholar (peer-reviewed only)

3.3 Inclusion Criteria

- Studies must focus on LLM or AI Chatbots.
- Higher Education or Professional Training.
- Studies must include learning and/or cognitive outcome measures.
- Studies must be published in the

4. Secondary Data Analysis (Tabular Evidence)

Table 1: Learning Outcomes with LLM Chatbot Integration

Study	Context	Learning Outcome	Result
Kasneci et al. (2023) [1]	University courses	Conceptual clarity	Improved
Zhai et al. (2024) [5]	STEM tutoring	Problem comprehension	Improved
Rudolph et al. (2023) [10]	Essay writing	Original thinking	Declined
Cotton et al. (2024) [11]	Business education	Analytical reasoning	Mixed
Deng & Lin (2023) [8]	Language learning	Fluency	Improved

Table 2: Cognitive Risks Observed in Empirical Studies

Risk Factor	Evidence Level	Educational Impact
Overreliance	High	Reduced effort
Shortcut learning	High	Superficial understanding
Plagiarism	Medium	Academic integrity threats
Loss of metacognition	Medium	Weakened self-regulation

Table 3: Instructional Design Conditions Affecting Outcomes

Design Strategy	Effect on Critical Thinking
AI as tutor	Positive
AI as answer generator	Negative
AI with reflective prompts	Positive
AI in open-book exams	Neutral
AI banned	No skill development

5. Discussion

5.1 When Chatbots Support Learning

Chatbots act as **cognitive scaffolds** when they:

- Explain concepts step-by-step
- Ask guiding questions
- Provide formative feedback
- Encourage reflection

This aligns with Vygotskian scaffolding theory and self-regulated learning models [19].

5.2 When Chatbots Undermine Critical Thinking

The event of cognitive displacement happens when:

- When there is copying of the student's answers
- When output and not process is rewarded on an assessment
- There are no original or contextual complexity in the task

This phenomenon occurs as a result of what is known as "automation bias" within decision science [20]

5.3 Pedagogical Mediation as the Key Variable

Evidence suggests that **instructional design**, not technology, determines outcomes. Chatbots amplify either good pedagogy or poor pedagogy.

6. Implications for Educators and Institutions

Pedagogical Implications

- Design AI-integrated inquiry-based tasks
- Assess reasoning processes, not just final answers
- Use oral defences and project-based evaluation

Faculty Development

- AI literacy training
- Prompt engineering pedagogy
- Ethical classroom practices

Institutional Policy

- Clear academic integrity guidelines
- Transparent AI disclosure norms
- Responsible data governance

7. Conclusion:

Educational chatbots using LLM technology do not automatically enhance or inhibit critical analysis and thought. As a result, the extent of their contribution to or detriment to a student's development of critical thinking will depend on how educators present assignments, structure assessments, and teach students about using metacognitive strategies with AI technologies. Students can leverage chatbots as supplemental partners in their learning processes; therefore, the chatbots will improve students' feedback cycle, and help create better access for students and better understanding of a concept. However, if educators are expecting a chatbot to act as a replacement for students' ability to think critically, then the students run the risk of losing these valuable critical thinking and reasoning skills. Therefore, higher education institutions must stop engaging in binary argumentation regarding the use of AI in education; instead, they must create and implement pedagogically informed strategies that keep human decision-making, creativity, and ethical accountability evident when incorporating AI into the classroom.

References:

1. Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 103*, 102274.
2. Holmes, W., et al. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promise and Implications for Teaching and Learning*. OECD.
3. Susnjak, T. (2022). ChatGPT: The end of online exam integrity? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 18*(1).
4. Kirschner, P., & De Bruyckere, P. (2017). The myths of the digital native. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 135–142.
5. Zhai, X., et al. (2024). Generative AI in STEM education: Opportunities and risks. *Computers & Education, 201*, 104810.
6. Chen, L., et al. (2020). AI-based personalized learning systems. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 68*, 3185–3204.
7. Fryer, L., & Carpenter, R. (2021). Bots as language learning companions. *ReCALL, 33*(3), 244–258.
8. Deng, X., & Lin, Y. (2023). Chatbot-assisted language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 36*(6), 1012–1036.
9. Winkler, R., & Söllner, M. (2018). Unleashing the potential of chatbots. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 60*, 369–377.
10. Rudolph, J., et al. (2023). ChatGPT and academic integrity. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 20*(3).
11. Cotton, D., et al. (2024). Student perceptions of AI in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.
12. McGee, R. (2023). Writing with AI: Cognitive consequences. *Computers and Composition, 68*, 102742.
13. Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2000). Intrinsic motivation theory. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78.
14. Bjork, R., et al. (2013). Desirable difficulties in learning. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 14*(1), 4–58.
15. UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance on Generative AI in Education and Research*
16. OECD. (2021). *AI in Education: Challenges and Opportunities*.
17. European Commission. (2022). *Ethical Guidelines on AI in Education*
18. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.
19. Zimmerman, B. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner. *Theory into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70.
20. Parasuraman, R., & Riley, V. (1997). Humans and automation. *Human Factors, 39*(2), 230–253.