



Journal of Philosophical Investigations

Journal of Philosophical Investigations

Print ISSN: 2251-7960 Online ISSN: 2423-4419

Homepage: <https://philosophy.tabrizu.ac.ir>



University of Tabriz

Syllogistic Reasoning in the Age of AI

Sumanta Sarathi Sharma¹ | Satish Kumar Tiwari^{✉2}

1. Assistant Professor, School of Philosophy & Culture Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, Katra, India. E-mail: ss.sharma@smvdu.ac.in
2. Corresponding Author, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, A.P.B. Government Post Graduate College, Agastyamuni, Rudraprayag, Uttarakhand, India. E-mail: thesktiwari89@gmail.com

Article Info

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 15 April 2026

Received in revised form

23 May 2026

Accepted 03 June 2026

Published online 25

October 2026

Keywords:

AI in Education,
Syllogistic Reasoning,
Diagrammatic Reasoning,
Philosophy of Education,
Understanding-based
Reasoning, Simulation of
Reasoning, Epistemic
Agency

ABSTRACT

As AI becomes increasingly central to education, it is transforming how learners interact with information, solve problems, and reason. AI systems can rapidly generate explanations, arguments, and logically structured responses, offering benefits in accessibility, efficiency, and personalized support. However, these advances raise profound philosophical and pedagogical questions about understanding, critical thinking, and intellectual freedom. This paper examines the relationship between AI-assisted learning and the tradition of syllogistic reasoning, focusing on the distinction between simulated reasoning and genuine understanding. Drawing on the history of logic, philosophy of mind, and recent educational research, it argues that AI can appear to reason without possessing conceptual understanding in the human sense. Crucially, overreliance on AI output can detach learners from thinking, reducing opportunities for reflective engagement and independent critical thinking. The paper also analyzes the potential effects of cognitive offloading, passive reliance on technology, and superficial involvement in logical processes. The paper does not reject AI in education but calls for a pedagogical balance in which AI supports learning while preserving active intellectual engagement, interpretive reflection, and conceptual understanding. By connecting philosophical analysis with contemporary debates on AI literacy and education, it argues that the future of logical education depends on maintaining the distinction between getting right answers and developing genuine reasoning skills. Ultimately, it suggests that technology should augment, not replace, the human abilities that enable meaningful intellectual reasoning.

Cite this article: Sharma, S. S. & Tiwari, K. S (2026). Syllogistic Reasoning in the Age of AI. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 20(56), 279-296. <https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2026.71974.4469>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence has revolutionized modern-day learning environments. Current artificial intelligence-driven systems can produce explanations, abstract summaries, build arguments, answer logical problems and answer complex queries with impressive speed and fluency. In many educational contexts, students are increasingly turning to such technologies not just for information retrieval, but also for cognitive activities that are traditionally the domain of reasoning, interpretation, and analysis. The developments have opened new avenues for accessibility, personalized learning, and academic support (Walter, 2024). They have raised at the same time important philosophical and pedagogical questions about understanding, critical thinking, intellectual autonomy, and the nature of reasoning. AI's influence in education goes beyond being a mere technological addition. It also alters the way learners engage with knowledge and reasoning process. Usually, students in the traditional education system were expected to reflect, interpret, infer and think long and hard about the concepts in order to interact with them. Historically logical reasoning had not only been seen as generating accurate conclusions but as an active cognitive process in which students' thinking was made clear and their conceptual understanding was achieved (Lear, 1980). Modern AI, on the other hand, increasingly offer students ready-made explanations, arguments, and conclusions. This raises significant issues around technology support and independent thinking.

In the context of logical learning, the educational value of this issue becomes apparent. Historically, the study of syllogistic reasoning has focused on the careful examination of premises, inferential relations and validity conditions. Logical education has always emphasized that the students are active in the process of reasoning, not only in obtaining the conclusions but also in writing them, starting from Aristotle's basic logic works and later works on diagrammatic reasoning and symbolic systems (Aristotle, 1984; Venn, 1881; Shin, 1994). While today's AI systems can produce logically coherent responses with impressive fluency, the growing reliance on automated reasoning systems can lead to concerns about a diminishment of reflective engagement and independent analytical thinking in learners. Concurrently, the present study is not purely oppositional in its consideration of AI. AI has a lot of potential for educational purposes and can be a valuable tool if used wisely in the teaching-learning process. AI systems can provide students with assistance in the form of clarification, accessibility, interactive engagement, and personalized guidance (Khan, 2023; Walter, 2024). Educational research has also shown that the use of AI, when learners critically analyze and reflect on the results produced by AI, can help to reinforce their reasoning skills (Gerlich, 2025b). The educational problem is not against using AI technologies, but rather how AI technologies affect the reasoning/understanding/intellectual participation relationship. The philosophical aspect of this problem becomes clearer when the distinction is made between the generation of the reasoning itself (like an output) and a genuine understanding of the reasoning itself. AI systems can generate responses that can be presented in a logically structured and conceptually advanced manner. However, these systems are not reflective comprehension, but

rather computational processing, and probabilistic pattern generation in the human sense (Cole, 2023). This separation is relevant not only for debates on the philosophy of mind, but also for educational theory. Students will be increasingly faced with contexts where appropriate responses are produced using AI without engaging in any meaningful mental activity where knowledge is built up. These are amplified by the recent discourse on the issue of cognitive offloading and dependence on AI. Cognitive offloading is the process of moving cognition from one's head to an external technological system. Such practices can boost efficiency and alleviate cognitive load, however, relying too heavily on AI could over time diminish the development of cognitive skills like independent thinking and critical analysis (Gerlich, 2025a). Empirical research on AI assisted learning also indicates that students' reliance on AI without reflection could lead to shallow learning attitudes and decreased analytical engagement in learning (Zhai, Wibowo, & Li, 2024).

In the present study, the problems are discussed by means of syllogistic reasoning and philosophy of logic. It claims that reasoning is not so important in the output of the correct end result, but as a set of active intellectual processes that lead to the emergence of understanding. The paper also proposes that the more AI is integrated into the classroom, the more likely it is that critical thinking in education will be shifted to the outside, especially when students rely on conclusions that are not their own, but rather produced by these tools. The research also argues that AI can have a positive impact on education when it is used within a pedagogical framework that allows for critical participation, conceptual analysis, and interpretive reflection. The method used in this study is predominantly philosophical and conceptual approach instead of empirical. The discussion is based on the history of logic, philosophy of mind and recent educational research on AI assisted learning. Inclusion of historical discussion of syllogistic reasoning is not intended to be an exhaustive historical exposition, but rather to exemplify the tradition of logical education that has long foregrounded active inferential participation and reflective understanding. To situate these philosophical issues into current educational reality, contemporary research on AI literacy, cognitive offloading, and educational technology are integrated.

This paper is divided into six parts. The first part is a historical and philosophical discussion of the importance of syllogistic reasoning and its connection to conceptual understanding. The second part delves into the difference between AI simulated reasoning and real understanding by discussing in the philosophy of mind and education theory. The third section examines the educational issues that arise with AI-enabled learning, such as 'cognitive offloading,' 'superficial engagement,' and 'decreased critical participation. The fourth section suggests pedagogical approaches for the responsible use of AI in logical education. The fifth section explores significant counterarguments and alternative viewpoints on the subject of AI enhanced reasoning. The conclusion brings the discussion to an end, proposing that the future of logical education is not about the abolition or the replacement of AI technologies, but about the maintenance of reasoning as a living and thinking human practice.

1. Syllogistic Reasoning and the Tradition of Logical Understanding

Logical thinking has always been linked to the cultivation of disciplined thinking, conceptual clarity and reflective understanding. This tradition had a central role for many centuries, namely syllogistic reasoning. While modern logical systems have extended well beyond classical syllogistic, the educational value of syllogistic reasoning is still of importance, as it shows the educational significance of the logical history of learning, which was not a matter of only providing correct answers, but also of an active process of engaging with the inferential structure.

It is generally accepted that the earliest systematic study of deductive reasoning, which forms the basis of syllogistic, dates back to Aristotle's logical works ([McKeon, 1941](#); [Aristotle, 1984](#); [Lear, 1980](#)). The syllogistic system of Aristotle studied the necessity of the conclusion of premises. A typical categorical syllogism was made up of propositions with organized inferential relationships. The educational value of such reasoning was not the act of arriving at valid conclusions alone, but in the understanding of the importance of how conclusions were drawn from certain premises. Logical learning thus needed learners to pay attention to conceptual relations and to actively engage in the inferential process. This focus on active thinking influenced later approaches to the teaching of logical thinking. The methods of the syllogism were further developed in the Middle Ages by means of increasingly refined analyses of language, conceptual structure, and inference ([Lagerlund, 2016](#)). Logical training was not considered to be only problem solving but as intellectual discipline. Students were asked to carefully investigate forms of argument and distinctions, as well as reasoning in the interpretative sense. While not found in the mainstream of the current curriculum, many of the developments of medieval logic show us an important principle of education: Reasoning is a cognitive process that was once regarded as participatory, involving reflection and conceptual activity.

This tradition was further extended with the development of diagrammatic reasoning. Alternative ways of representing logical relations through visual systems were suggested by Euler diagrams and Venn diagrams, in which the logical relationship is not expressed verbally but also in a pictorial manner ([Venn, 1880](#); [Venn, 1881](#)). Methods that were educationally significant were those which involved learners drawing inferences regarding the inferential structure directly. The diagrammatic approaches generally required the students' active interpretation, comparison, and conceptual organizing, enhancing the students' involvement in the reasoning process. Current studies on the cognitive significance of visual reasoning systems have also focused on the cognitive significance of visual reasoning systems. Others including [Shin \(1994\)](#) and [Barwise and Etchemendy \(1996\)](#) have contended that diagrams can be considered as a valid type of logical representation that can aid in inferential understanding, not just the illustration of conclusions. Likewise, the newer approaches like Rule of Minimal Mental Representation (RMMR) do so by structuring the syllogistic reasoning in a pictorial way so as to maintain active inferential engagement ([Sharma, 2008](#); [Sharma and Paliwal, 2023](#)).

What has been developed over the years are the teaching methods that over the centuries have been adapted in the name of logical education, but have remained in focus in terms of learner participation and conceptual understanding.

Although there are differences between classical syllogistic, symbolic logic and the diagrammatic reasoning systems, a significant continuity is evident across these traditions. In the general context of logical education, reasoning is generally considered to be an intellectual activity that must be directly faced with conceptual relations and inferential processes. The learner was not only expected to replicate the conclusions but to comprehend the structure in which the conclusions were reached. In this context, reasoning served as a way of analysis and intellectual development. This history is particularly relevant in today's world of AI-based learning. An AI system can now be used to produce conclusions, explanations, and coherent arguments that are valid without requiring the learner to make a significant effort. There are many times when a student is able to get an answer right without having to delve deeply into the inferential processes leading up to the answer. The education issue arising out of this change is thus not only about the correctness of the outputs but also about the learners' engagement in the reasoning process itself. The difference between a reasoning as a person's action and a reasoning as an object produced by their action is the core of our discussion in this paper. In the past, logical learning required intellectual struggle and the process of conceptual development was gradually formed. Learners were able to reflect on premises, look for ambiguities, test inferential relations, and revise interpretations of premises. These processes could take time, patience and thinking. But modern AI systems can greatly diminish such requirements by giving instant responses and finished analyses. This can facilitate efficiency and accessibility, but also leads to questions about the future of reflective engagement in education. It is crucial to stress that the current study does not mythologise previous education or presume that all traditional education necessarily results in 'deep understanding'. Historical systems of logical education were also limited and superficial learning was around well before the advent of AI technologies. The concern here is a narrower one and more specific. As more and more people turn to AI systems, there is a risk that reasoning is becoming more and more externalized, especially when students are exposed to the conclusions provided by the technology but not involved in the inferential process.

This matter gains importance due to the fact that modern AI systems can generate answers that seem like they are conceptually complete and advanced. Students can thus become confused about the concept of fluency and understanding. If the answer is coherent and comes out of a "black box" without any further reasoning and is produced immediately by AI, the learner may be led to believe that they have understood the reasoning process, even if they have not. The difference between getting conclusions and understanding reasoning might become less apparent in learning situations as increasing dependency on AI in learning becomes more common. The historical tradition of syllogistic reasoning thus does more than just present a background discussion of classical logic. It provides a valuable context in which to comprehend

the historical ties between reasoning and intellectual engagement, conceptual training, and reflective scrutiny. This view can help demystify current discussions on AI in education, which go beyond being about technology. They also address the educational significance of the nature of reasoning and an active understanding of understanding. The next section explores this topic in more detail, looking at what the difference is between “simulated reasoning” and “real understanding” in relation to artificial intelligence and educational theory.

2. AI and the Simulation of Reasoning

The swift evolution of Artificial Intelligence has opened new avenues to learn, communicate, and get intellectual support. Modern AI models can create explanations, solve logical problems, summarize complex arguments and produce highly fluent answers, which are similar to human reasoning. Beyond serving as informational systems, these systems are also becoming cognitive assistants, where they can be made to engage in activities, such as interpretation, analysis, and conceptual explanation, which have long been the domain of human interpretation (Walter, 2024). This has spurred hopes and worries about the potential future intersection of technology and the human mind. A key philosophical problem with AI is whether it is possible to produce reasoning such as output or truly understand the reasoning process. One of the philosophical issues which arise with AI is whether to produce reasoning like an output, or truly to understand the reasoning process. AI systems can generate responses that seem coherent, logical and brainy. But when something looks like reasoning, it does not necessarily mean that it's really human reasoning. Modern systems of AI tend to function more on the basis of computational prediction, statistical association and pattern generation than reflective consciousness and conceptual understanding. This distinction is significant in debates about learning because students might be able to produce reasoning using technology and not be fully immersed in the thinking that created the products. This issue can be clearly seen in the philosophical backdrop of debate about John Searle's Chinese Room argument (Cole, 2023). Searle argues that one should not equate understanding with successful symbol manipulation. According to the thought experiment, a Chinese-illiterate person performs formal manipulations of Chinese symbols and comes up with correct answers that seem meaningful to outsiders. The answers may appear to be intelligent answers but there is no real understanding in the system. This distinction is made in the argument between the simulation of understanding and the actual understanding of concepts.

In the context of the present discussion the point of the Chinese Room argument is not that learners in and of themselves are like machines or passive operators. Instead, it serves as a way to clarify an important philosophical difference between external success in performance and internal success in understanding. AI systems can produce logically structured outputs without being aware of any meanings, intentions, or conceptual necessity. Problems with education emerge when the learners are increasingly using such productions in a manner that diminishes their own activity in the process of reasoning. In the context of logical learning, this distinction

will be significant. Modern Artificial Intelligence systems can perform syllogistic reasoning, provide formal explanations and formulate structured arguments very fluently. Students can then get accurate solutions without taking too long to do so, with the help of AI. But the pedagogical importance of reasoning has depended not only upon the conclusions that one reaches, but upon the rationale for the conclusions to follow a given set of premises. In the past, logical education was based on inference, conceptual thinking, and analytical activity of the students, not just on reproducing valid output.

The issue that is being tackled here is not that the AI systems don't understand, but that they don't understand in a human way. This philosophical discussion is anything but simple or agreed upon. The more immediate educational problem is with regard to the changing role of learners in reasoning process. The reflective and inferential tasks traditionally used for developing understanding may be lessened because the AI systems are increasingly providing explanations and analyses automatically. The possible externalization of the process of reasoning is the risk that can be established when the cognitive work of the intellect is delegated to the system of technology. This is a similar concept to the one that recent educational studies refer to as cognitive offloading. Cognitive offloading is a process of delegating mental tasks to external technologies to decrease mental effort. People have always used external aids like writing systems, diagrams, calculators and books. The tools often served as an enabling aid to reasoning, but still called for cooperation and interaction with learners. AI systems are unique in that they are increasingly used to interpret, explain, summarize and generate arguments instead of simply storing and organizing information.

Some recent research indicates that there is a risk of dependence on AI assisted systems that can impact critical thinking and analytical engagement. The use of AI tools can be viewed as a form of passive cognitive dependence, as learners may come to rely on these tools to take over tasks that require cognitive reasoning, potentially leading to a gradual loss of engagement in such tasks ([Gerlich, 2025a](#)). In a similar fashion, empirical research on AI dependence and critical thinking suggests that students' unreflective use of AI-generated outputs might lead to diminished analytical engagement and shallow learning styles. [Zhai, Wibowo, and Li \(2024\)](#) also note that if learners get used to relying on AI dialogue systems to provide automatic answers, they can become less engaged in cognitive interaction. Such worries are not necessarily linked to the weakening of reasoning in all learning scenarios. AI systems can also aid learning in meaningful ways. The students can leverage AI technologies to gain a better understanding of complex concepts, generate multiple points of view, practice logical reasoning and get instant feedback. However, recent studies have indicated that structured and reflective interactions with AI systems can enhance the ability to think critically and effectively, as users engage with AI outputs in a thoughtful and critical manner instead of passively consuming them ([Gerlich, 2025b](#)). The educational implications of AI, however, do rely heavily on its application within educational settings.

This is where the difference between assistance and substitution is especially crucial. The traditional roles of educational technologies were to be facilitators to human reasoning. AI systems, on the other hand, now have the ability to engage in reasoning tasks themselves, just like activities. Consequently, students can incrementally move from creating arguments to picking, editing or generating arguments using artificial intelligence. These behaviors can over time erode opportunities to struggle with ideas, to revise ideas, to interpret ideas reflectively, that are essential to the development of mature reasoning skills. It is particularly apparent when it comes to syllogistic reasoning. The traditional logic education usually demands students to scrutinize the logic premises, determine the inferential relationship of the premises, check the validity conditions and provide the explanations of the conclusions independently. These activities fostered continued participation with structure of reasoning itself. Now many of these functions are done instantaneously with the help of AI systems with automated responses. While improving efficiency, there may be a reduction in opportunities for direct inferential participation.

However, the current study does not presume that technological efficiency is per se bad. The educational system has always been evolving with the help of new tools and methods. The advent of writing, printing, symbolic notation, and digital technologies all made important changes to intellectual practices. AI presents the challenge of not just change in the technology, but the possibility that reasoning will be felt more as it is being made for you than within you, in the process of reflective participation. A more general philosophical question about this is what is meant by understanding in educational practice? Human reasoning is not only a formal correctness or a fluency of language. It also entails interpretation, contextual judgement, conceptual awareness and reflective self-examination. Learners can make sense of conclusions not only when they are right but when they can make sense of how the conclusion is related to the evidence. There are many aspects of reasoning that can be simulated by an AI system, but they are not necessarily the same as human forms of conceptual understanding.

Therefore, discussions about the use of AI in education must not be limited to the capabilities of the technology. They also have to consider the impact of education settings on patterns of thinking, reflecting and engaging intelligently. The central question of education rather is: can learners stay active in processes of understanding, or can they not? This section reviews the manifestation of these concerns in the current setting of education and analyses the wider pedagogical issues related to AI learning assistance.

3. Educational Challenges in the Age of AI Assisted Learning

AI's increasing presence in the educational landscape has brought about profound shifts in how students are taught, learn, and interact with information and problem-solving. Now AI systems can produce essays, explanations, summaries, translations, logical analysis, and a structured argument in seconds. These developments bring a number of key pedagogical benefits, such as accessibility, efficiency, personalized guidance, and feedback in real time. Concurrently, they

make significant comments on the impact on critical thinking, reflective learning and intellectual autonomy in educational practice. A potential problem with AI-supported learning is that of decreased cognitive engagement. For students to interact with concepts, they were often expected to read and analyze a text, revise it, and reflect on it in a traditional classroom setting. These were often lengthy and challenging, but also vital to the development of reasoning skills and conceptual knowledge. Nowadays, modern AI systems can increasingly meet these requirements by creating outputs which learners can often use without thinking.

This is closely related to the larger concept of cognitive offloading. External tools have always been used to aid mental activity in humanity. Memory, organisation and calculation were all supported by writing systems, diagrams, calculators and digital technologies. However, more and more AI systems undertake higher order cognitive functions of interpretation, explanation, synthesis and argument construction. The relationship between intellectual assistance and intellectual dependency assumes special significance as learners move these activities to technological systems. New research in the field of education indicates that overusing AI outputs can dampen the development of the skills of active thinking and critical analysis. However, as people increasingly depend on AI systems, they might be tempted to adopt a 'passive cognitive style' which is characterized by relying on automated outputs and not on deep, sustained cognitive analysis (Gerlich, 2025a). Likewise, research on AI dependence and critical thinking suggests that overreliance on AI systems could lead to a decrease in intellectual persistence and surface learning among students. The students' perception of AI assisted learning further indicates that learners themselves are aware of the advantages and potential drawbacks of AI for critical thinking and problem solving (Darwin et al., 2023). Zhai, Wibowo, and Li (2024) also note that excessive dependence on AI chatbots can have a downside, as it might decrease learners' ability to engage in thoughtful and reflective learning, especially if they focus on efficiency rather than deep understanding.

The implications of these developments for education are particularly important when it comes to reasoning and logical education. The syllogistic reasoning approach traditionally required students to engage in the reasoning process carefully, evaluate the inferential relationships, detect ambiguities and make reasonable conclusions. These included conceptual disciplines and reflective engagement. Nowadays, many of these tasks can be automated with AI systems generating explanations and pre-made analyses. This may enhance speed and access, but also could limit the opportunities learners have to struggle with concepts and inferential structures. This worry does not suggest that the use of education effectiveness or technology support should be completely abandoned. AI could enhance accessibility and alleviate unnecessary academic burdens in various ways of supported learning. The challenge comes when students start focusing more on the speed of their response than their conceptual understanding. Under these circumstances, students can simply rely on the outputs that they have completed without carefully considering the inferential structure or reasoning process of the output.

Yet another difficulty has to do with the increasing difficulty in differentiating between fluency and understanding. Modern AI systems produce answers that are very sophisticated, coherent and authoritative. Due to the nature of these outputs, learners may assume that they have understood what they have been presented with because the answer seems convincing. There have also been broader calls for academic integrity, authorship, and transparency in educational and research settings, which have raised concerns about excessive reliance on AI-generated content (Douglas, 2023). But having access to polished explanations is not enough to develop conceptual understanding. Active interpretation, context sensitivity, conceptual linkage, and reflective analysis are involved. A student can copy an explanation that has been written using AI exactly but have no real understanding of the reasoning process. This is particularly relevant in educational contexts where output is increasingly the focus of assessment in lieu of intellectual processes. When evaluation is mainly based on the completed answer, AI systems can facilitate shallow learning, where the production of a satisfactory answer takes precedent over reflection on ideas. This can lead to a progressive reduction in the educational focus on interpretation, inquiry and conceptual understanding.

With the abundance of AI-generated information, there are also challenges concerning intellectual autonomy. Since AI can give learners instant answers and organized explanations, learners may not get involved in independent evaluation, revision, and interpretation as often. This overreliance on automated guidance can erode habits of questioning, comparison and critical scrutiny that are essential to the learning of mature reasoning skills. The moral concerns about intellectual autonomy are especially significant since AI produces outputs that are not always accurate, unbiased, and conceptually complete. Algorithmic systems can amplify structural limitations, distortions, and hidden biases in training data and computational design, as demonstrated by scholars like O'Neil (2016) and Suresh and Guttag (2021). By absorbing AI-generated content passively, learners might also internalise the conclusions without critically questioning the assumptions, constraints, or context. In the school context, this can undermine skills of critical analysis and reflection necessary for intellectual development.

Meanwhile, AI isn't always a threat to reason. The impacts of these systems on learning outcomes are very dependent on their incorporation into learning environments. AI literacy research indicates that students can better reflectively interact with AI when educational practices include a critical evaluation, interpretative awareness, and active examination of AI-generated outputs (Yang et al., 2025). Structured prompting and guided analytical tasks can therefore be used to help shift the relationship between human and AI from passive dependency to reflective inquiry (Gerlich, 2025b). The educational problem is thus not about the prohibition of the use of AI but about maintaining active intellectual engagement in an AI-assisted learning context. The question is whether the learners are still able to think in meaningful ways about the reasoning processes or whether they eventually become reliant on the processes provided by the teacher. When the emphasis in education is largely on the efficient production of output, opportunities for reflective understanding and conceptual development may be reduced. On the

other hand, when AI tools are used wisely in educational ecosystems that promote critical thinking and autonomous reasoning, they could be a positive factor in intellectual growth, not a negative.

The concerns reflect that current educational debates about AI are not just about technology. They are also broader philosophical issues about understanding, how understanding is achieved, and about the nature of intellectual involvement in a more automated world. The next section thus focuses on possible pedagogical reactions and investigates the potential for using AI in logical teaching without compromising reflective and critical thinking.

4. Pedagogical Responses and the Responsible Use of AI

It is important to consider how artificial intelligence is integrated into learning spaces and to reflect on it as a pedagogical tool, for acceptance or rejection is insufficient. AI technologies have significant educational applications and can greatly enhance accessibility, efficiency, and personalized instruction. Concurrently, the didactic potential of such systems is greatly dependent on the manner in which they are used in learning practices. The key question is not is it OK to use AI in education? but, does the use of AI reinforce or detract from active intellectual engagement, reflective understanding and independent reasoning? The educational response to AI assisted learning goes beyond the issue of technological efficiency and the goals of education. The higher order cognitive processes of analysis, evaluation, interpretation, and reflective reasoning still require meaningful human interaction in the production of accurate and organized responses by the AI system. The importance of critical thinking was also highlighted recently in the context of generative AI and Bloom's taxonomy, which notes that critical thinking is not the passive consumption of the output of AI ([Gonsalves, 2024](#)).

A critical educational measure is enhancing the knowledge of students in the field of AI. AI literacy is not just about having some technical knowledge of AI systems. It also involves critically assessing outputs produced by AI, acknowledging the limitations of technology, and exploring the social and epistemological effects of automated reasoning systems ([Yang et al., 2025](#)). By comprehending the processes AI systems use to produce their answers, students might be less inclined to blindly trust answers generated by technology. Familiarity with how AI systems produce answers could help students be less likely to accept answers produced by technology uncritically. AI literacy is thus not just a matter of technical skill; it is intellectual awareness that is critical to interacting with AI. Another key pedagogical approach is to keep the learners' participation in reasoning processes. The role of AI systems is to serve as a complementary educational aid, not a replacement for critical thought. While students are directly engaged in conceptual analysis and inferential reasoning, they can also utilize AI technologies for clarification, comparison, feedback, and exploratory learning. Methods within the education process that enable students to question, amend and critique AI generated outputs can assist in keeping them engaged in the learning process, instead of dependent.

In recent research, it has been found that reflective interactions with AI as systems can help rather than hinder critical thinking, depending on the appropriate pedagogical structures. Learners, for instance, might engage in deeper reasoning processes when evaluating and refining the responses generated by such AI systems as a structured prompting method and guided analytical interaction with them are used (Gerlich 2025b). Likewise, educational research is increasingly demonstrating the potential of AI technologies to enable inquiry-based learning, provided that learners are asked to critically question, compare and interpret the results produced by AI rather than merely regurgitate them (Walter, 2024). It can be said that in this context logical education remains has pedagogical value. Practice with premise evaluation, inferential explanation, validity testing, and logical reconstruction invites students to be actively involved in the reasoning processes, instead of just receiving established conclusions. This may help keep reflective intellectual practices intact in more and more AI-supported learning contexts.

The diagrammatic reasoning methods can also play a positive role in AI facilitated education. However, when using a visual system like a Venn diagram, or related inferential systems, the students' task might involve actively organizing and interpreting logical relations (Barwise & Etchemendy, 1996; Shin, 1994). Likewise, some schemes, like Rule of Minimal Mental Representation, foster a simplified but participatory type of logical analysis (Sharma, 2008; Sharma & Paliwal, 2023). The methods also focus on conceptual interaction (as opposed to passive reception), which can help keep the learners engaged even when using AI in the educational context. Reflective learning can also be enhanced by giving more weight to process oriented evaluation in the educational environment, rather than output-based evaluation. The reliance on AI-generated answers without meaningful involvement in reasoning processes becomes more prevalent as the focus shifts to the answer and assessment systems prioritize final results over the reasoning. However, assignments in which students are expected to explain, justify, compare, revise, and reflect on the meaning of what they learn, might elicit more active involvement in learning activities. In learning environments where AI tools are involved, oral discussion, analytical reflections, collaborative critique, and step by step reasoning demonstrations can be useful to maintain intellectual engagement.

In order to have AI integrated responsibly in education, we must acknowledge that AI systems are not neutral sources of knowledge. The outputs that are generated may be biased, inaccurate, over-simplified or miss a conceptual understanding due to training data and computational architecture (O'Neil, 2016; Suresh and Guttag, 2021). It is therefore necessary to empower learners to critically assess and reflect on AI-generated products and solutions, and not take them for granted. Meanwhile, there can be limitations if the resistance to AI technologies is too strong. AI can help learners who are experiencing barriers to learning, language challenges, accessibility difficulties, or insufficient teaching materials. AI systems can offer personalised support, engagement, and instant feedback, which can be challenging to deliver in most conventional classrooms. Responsible pedagogy should in fact not be about

banning AI, but about ensuring that human reasoning and reflective understanding are maintained in a technologically enabled learning environment.

4.1 Practical Applications in Logical Education

To embed AI into logical education that can maintain a learner's active participation in the classroom, it is essential to have clear-cut, practical strategies. The use of AI systems should be encouraged as an aid to reflection and analysis, not as a replacement for reasoning. A good pedagogical strategy is to let students try out logical tasks without AI-generated solutions, and then check with the AI. Students can complete syllogistic reasoning tasks by first hand-writing premises, drawing out the inferential relations, and then writing out conclusions. AI-generated explanations can then be added to help explain, clarify, or discuss. These practices contribute to sustaining the active engagement in reasoning while also providing technological support to learners. Comparative reasoning exercises can also help reinforce critical engagement. Students may compare their answers to those generated by the AI in order to see where they agree, disagree, or have uncertain elements and differences in interpretation. This strategy aims to help students critically analyze reasoning processes rather than blindly accepting the information generated by AI. It also encourages students to become aware that there is no guarantee of conceptual completeness and/or interpretive accuracy for fluent and convincing responses.

Another pedagogical tool that can benefit from diagrammatic reasoning are the activities. The Venn diagrams, Euler diagrams and RMMR based systems use will ask the learners to negotiate and interpret inferential connections actively (Barwise & Etchemendy, 1996; Sharma & Paliwal, 2023). Such techniques will also facilitate a conceptual approach to participation and structural visualization which can lessen passive reliance on AI-driven conclusions while also fostering analytical understanding. Pupil reflective critique assignments can also support the development of AI knowledge and thinking. Students can be challenged to recognize assumptions, biases, conceptual restrictions, or logical vagaries in AI-provided explanations. These activities encourage students to think critically rather than focusing on technology. In the same way, oral explanation exercises where students justify and clarify their thought processes can enhance the understanding of concepts and deepen their involvement with inferential structures.

Teachers can also leverage AI systems as a means of analysis. Students will look at examples of AI outputs that are incomplete or misleading, or otherwise have problems in the logic, to gain insight into the drawbacks of automated reasoning systems. These practice activities help learners to develop a critical distance from technological authority and enhance their independent evaluative judgment. With these pedagogical approaches, AI is not meant to replace teachers in education. Instead, they seek to responsibly incorporate AI and retain the human intellectual pursuits at the heart of logic instruction. Educational goals should not be about simply getting answers, but about developing reflective learning, conceptual understanding, and independent thinking. AI systems can be integrated into well-structured pedagogical systems that can help achieve these learning goals without compromising them. In

this section, some objections and alternative viewpoints about AI assisted reasoning and how AI technologies might also be beneficial for critical thinking and intellectual involvement will be discussed.

5. Objections and Alternative Perspectives

The issues raised in the foregoing sections should not be understood as indicating that AI is inherently in conflict with the ability to reason or reduce intellectual growth in all learning environments. Some academics and teachers say that AI systems can play a major role in enhancing the learning experience, making knowledge more accessible, providing personalized learning and fostering exploration, theory building, and inference. It is important to take these into account as the effect AI can have on education is not universal and is not set in stone. The interplay between AI and reasoning is highly contingent upon the circumstances in which technologies are adopted in learning contexts.

It should be noted that one objection to the present discussion is that education has been shaped by educational technologies without destroying reasoning skills, in the past. The use of writing, printing, symbolic notation, calculators, and digital technologies transformed the way information is represented and intellectual work performed by human beings. There are therefore some critics who question whether the current fears raised about AI are simply a rehashing of past terror over technological advancement. In this light, AI systems are not a revolutionary intrusion into the realm of reasoning but rather another step in its evolutionary journey. There is a valuable nugget of wisdom in this objection. Man has always existed in the company of supportive tools of technology, and teaching and learning has always been adjusted to new learning environments. The current study does not demean the importance of technological support or claim that the previous educational system was better. AI, on the other hand, is not like a lot of past educational tools, and it is now used to do more than just help people remember or compute—it is used to interpret, explain, construct arguments, and organize information inferentially. It is not only technological change, but also the danger that learners will become more and more used to taking part in passive ways of reasoning through the outputs created by technology.

Another objection claims that, with proper use, AI systems can actually enhance critical thinking. AI technologies from the modern era can expose students to various viewpoints, give students instant feedback, offer alternative explanations, and even allow students to explore more. Students can use the AI systems to validate arguments, contrast interpretations, evaluate gaps in the thinking, and improve conceptual understanding. In this context, AI can work as an educational ally that can complement, not supplant, the reflective learning process.

This is a significant and compelling one. The learning impact of AI is heavily dependent on the interaction between users and technological systems. AI-generated results should not be taken for granted, as it has been found that reflective and guided interaction with AI could enhance analytical thinking by prompting students to critically analyze the generated content

(Gerlich, 2025b; Walter, 2024). The present study is not therefore suggesting that the use of AI means a reduction in intellectual activity. Rather, it suggests that the risks in education that emerge with the use of AI systems are the first and foremost that they foster a passive reliance, acceptance without reflection, or participation at a lower level in reasoning processes. Pedagogical conditions that enable active engagement and conceptual reflection can be aided by the use of AI to support critical thinking. Another key view is that of the democratizing impact of AI-supported learning. AI systems can help improve access to education for those who are linguistically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, have disabilities, or do not have equal access to education. AI technologies can offer tailored explanations, interactive support, and immediate assistance, which can be beneficial for students who are struggling with traditional educational methods. At this perspective, AI can have a positive impact on the inclusion and intellectual opportunity of education.

This view also poses an important question. Access to knowledge and instructional support are key issues in educational inequality, which have been identified as a serious global concern, and AI systems can potentially contribute to meaningful expansion of access to knowledge and instructional support. These possibilities are not excluded in the present discussion. Increased accessibility does not necessarily lead to reflective understanding or critical engagement, however. The best way to promote educational inclusion is for learners to engage in their own reasoning, interpretive judgment, and conceptual awareness. The effective use of AI must therefore be balanced with pedagogical approaches that ensure that intellectual engagement is maintained. Another objection is more philosophical – between simulation and understanding. As AI systems continue to evolve and become more sophisticated, the distinction between human reasoning and AI-generated reasoning could become even more ambiguous. Critics might argue that the philosophical discussion about machine understanding is no longer relevant to education if students learn better with AI explanations. The question might be raised whether or not the philosophical discussion of machine understanding is still relevant to education if its explanation is provided by artificial intelligence.

The present study recognizes that the discussion about artificial intelligence and understanding is still a philosophical matter. But the educational value of this debate is not solely reliant on a metaphysical understanding of AI systems. The first question of immediate interest is that of the learner's relationship with reasoning processes. While AI systems might eventually become capable of performing increasingly complex modes of reasoning, it is important to reflect on whether students still perform conceptual analysis, inferential reflection and critical evaluation in their learning environments. It is not the case that the pedagogical question is solely about machine consciousness, but rather about intellectual participation. There may also be some critics who would say that the concern over cognitive offloading is exaggerated as human cognition has always depended on external supports. The books, diagrams, written notes and digital systems help to lower some mental loads and allow higher-order thinking. From this perspective, AI systems can just enable students to concentrate on

more elevated levels of analysis instead of repetitive or routine tasks. This is another important observation that can be gained from this objection. Offloading is not a bad thing and in fact, educational efficiency can serve to strengthen intellectual development. The difficulty is that external help is increasingly replacing instead of helping reflective engagement. As students more and more rely on AI-based systems to create arguments, explanations, and conceptual analyses without engaging in any intellectual activity, there is a potential loss of chances for autonomous intellectual growth. The question of education is not so much about the absence of support to the cognitive process as in the ability to maintain active thinking in technologically supported learning environments.

AI in education is a multifaceted topic that isn't all good or bad, as evidenced by these objections. AI technologies have both potential and pedagogical dangers as well as opportunities for transforming education. The present study, therefore, takes a middle-of-the-road stance. The promise of AI in education should not, and must not, be viewed as a threat to the educational process nor a panacea for all educational problems. Its educational value relies on the ability of reasoning as a human activity that is still alive and has a reflective, interpretative, and conceptual basis. Finally, the future of logical education in an age dominated by artificial intelligence and automated reasoning systems is reevaluated.

Conclusion

As AI becomes more prevalent in education, it brings all sorts of new opportunities for learning, access and intellectual support. Today, AI systems can provide explanations, structure arguments, answer logical questions, and even assist students in ways that were previously inconceivable. These developments have educational value and can have a positive impact on learning when used appropriately as part of educational practice. The rise in reliance on systems built on artificial intelligence also brings up significant philosophical and pedagogical issues related to reasoning, comprehension, and mental engagement.

This study has looked at these concerns in the light of syllogistic reasoning and the general tradition of logical education. Logical reasoning has been a topic of study in education for a long time and has a long history which reflects that logical reasoning has been used in education not only as a way of arriving at correct conclusions but also as an active process of reflecting, conceptual analysis, inferential participation and interpretive engagement. Throughout history, education has been logical, ranging from classical syllogistic to diagrammatic reasoning systems, and has encouraged learners to grasp the steps between the premises and the conclusions. Historically, logical education has promoted learners to understand the meaning of the steps in moving from the premises to the conclusion, as opposed to reproducing answers without understanding the reasoning. This education model is increasingly being threatened by the current AI systems, which can produce fluent and well-structured outputs with little mental strain on the learner. The concern in this paper is thus not one of whether the AI system itself has an understanding, or one of whether the learners are still actively involved in the reasoning

process used to develop understanding. Relying too heavily on automated explanations and conclusions generated by technology, rather than students' own reflection, can lead to externalised reasoning. In that case, students can start to lose their drive to think creatively and become more receptive to the final products.

The study is not an opposition to the use of AI technologies; however, it is, at the same time, not a just embrace of them. Accessibility, individual help, interactive learning and exploration, may be among the key roles of artificial intelligence in education. An increasing body of research indicates that students' reasoning skills might improve when they engage with AI systems in a reflective and guided manner rather than blindly and uncritically accepting the output produced by these systems. The educational value of AI thus relies greatly on the pedagogical context in which it is applied. The future of logical education should not be seen as a battle of man versus machine, for that reason. The bigger question that needs to be addressed is how to keep students actively engaged in learning in more automated learning environments. While incorporating AI-assisted tools into the education process, it is crucial for learners to remain independent thinkers, examining arguments, evaluating premises, exploring assumptions, understanding concepts, and connecting to the conclusion. Reasoning is not just something that is done to get right answers, it is a process that is done by the learner and is educationally meaningful because he or she is engaged in the intellectual process that leads to understanding.

The study thus calls for a thoughtful and balanced relationship with Artificial Intelligence for education. AI shouldn't replace human thought and analysis; it should be a tool that aids learning. Pedagogical practices are needed to foster AI literacy, reflective thinking and intellectual independence in the responsible integration of AI. All educational institutions should make sure that the use of technology does not slowly take the place of the interpretive, analytical, and reflective aspects of learning. In the end, the importance of logical education doesn't begin and end with solving a problem or being able to process information efficiently. The way in which people reason influences their understanding of knowledge, assessment of arguments, sense of relationships, and involvement in intellectual life. The main educational task will not just be to master new technologies, but to maintain human attributes such as reflection, judgment, and understanding that give reasoning its greater intellectual and philosophical significance.

References

- Aristotle. (1984). *The complete works of Aristotle: The revised Oxford translation* (J. Barnes, Ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Barwise, J., & Etchemendy, J. (1996). Visual information and visual reasoning. In G. Allwein & J. Barwise (Eds.), *Logical reasoning with diagrams* (pp. 3–26). Oxford University Press.
- Cole, D. (2023). The Chinese room argument. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*.
- Darwin, Rusdin, D., Mukminatien, N., Suryati, N., Laksmi, E. D., & Marzuki. (2023). *Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits, and limitations*.

- Douglas, K. (2023). Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here are our ground rules for their use. *Nature*.
- Gerlich, M. (2025a). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6.
- Gerlich, M. (2025b). From offloading to engagement: An experimental study on structured prompting and critical reasoning with generative AI. *Data*, 10(11), 172.
- Gonsalves, C. (2024). Generative AI's impact on critical thinking: Revisiting Bloom's taxonomy. *Journal of Marketing Education*.
- Khan, A. (2023). Interactive learning experiences facilitated by chatbots: Stimulating cognitive processes for effective problem-solving. *Health Nexus*, 1(1), 71–76.
- Lagerlund, H. (2016). Medieval theories of the syllogism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*.
- Lear, J. (1980). *Aristotle's logical theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Łukasiewicz, J. (1957). *Aristotle's syllogistic from the standpoint of modern formal logic* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- McKeon, R. (Ed.). (1941). *The basic works of Aristotle*. Random House.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Sharma, S. S. (2008). Method of minimal representation. In G. Stapleton et al. (Eds.), *Diagrammatic representation and inference* (pp. 412–414). Springer.
- Sharma, S. S., & Paliwal, V. K. (2023). Algorithms for syllogistic using RMMR. In *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems* (pp. 885–900). Springer.
- Shin, S.-J. (1994). *The logical status of diagrams*. Cambridge University Press.
- Suresh, H., & Guttag, J. V. (2021). A framework for understanding sources of harm throughout the machine learning life cycle. In *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization (EAAMO '21)* (pp. 1–9). ACM.
- Venn, J. (1880). On the diagrammatic representation of propositions. *Philosophical Magazine*, 10, 1–18.
- Venn, J. (1881). *Symbolic logic*. Macmillan.
- Walter, Y. (2024). Embracing the future of artificial intelligence in the classroom. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(15).
- Yang, Y., Zhang, Y., Sun, D., He, W., & Wei, Y. (2025). Navigating the landscape of AI literacy education: Insights from a decade of research (2014–2024). *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 374.
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(28).