International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management
Volume 9, Issue 8, August 2026
www.ijresm.com | E-ISSN: 2581-5792 | RESAIM Publishing | www.resaim.com

Teaching Critical Thinking Through AI Generated Content in English Classrooms: A Framework for Balanced Integration

Ajinkya Subhash Gujarkar*
Department of Information Technology, Priyadarshini College of Engineering, Nagpur, India

***Abstract*: The rapid adoption of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude, Grammarly, and QuillBot has fundamentally changed how students approach reading, writing, and analysis in English language classrooms. While these tools can support grammar correction, idea generation, and language fluency, their unregulated use raises significant concerns about reduced critical thinking, overdependence, and weakened analytical writing skills among students. This paper examines the dual role of AI-generated content in English classrooms as both a potential learning aid and a possible barrier to independent thought. Using an illustrative classroom framework among undergraduate engineering students, the study discusses patterns of AI tool usage, perceived impact on critical thinking, and student attitudes toward AI-assisted learning versus traditional analytical exercises. The dataset used is hypothetical and illustrative, designed to demonstrate the type of analysis such a study would produce. Based on this analysis and supporting literature, the paper proposes a practical framework for teachers to integrate AI tools in ways that strengthen, rather than replace, students' reasoning and evaluation skills. The framework emphasizes guided AI use, reflective questioning, source verification exercises, and structured debate activities as counterbalances to passive AI reliance. The paper also addresses ethical concerns including plagiarism risk and skill erosion, and outlines strategies educators can adopt without rejecting AI outright.**

***Keywords*: Artificial intelligence in education, critical thinking, ChatGPT, generative AI, English language teaching, academic integrity, AI literacy, classroom pedagogy.**

1. Introduction

Critical thinking has long been recognized as a central goal of English language education [1]. It encompasses not merely the ability to write grammatically correct sentences, but also the capacity to question assumptions, evaluate evidence, and construct reasoned arguments in both written and spoken forms. In engineering colleges across India and globally, English or communication skills courses often represent the only formal space where students practice this kind of analytical writing, as technical subjects typically emphasize procedural problem-solving rather than critical analysis [2].

Over the past few years, generative AI tools have entered classrooms at an unprecedented pace, outpacing institutional regulatory frameworks. Tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, Claude, Grammarly, and QuillBot are now routinely used by students for essay writing, grammar correction, paraphrasing, and even generating complete assignments within seconds [1], [2]. While these tools demonstrably improve the surface quality of written work, educators increasingly question whether they are reducing the amount of independent thinking students actually perform.

This concern is not merely theoretical. When students can generate a complete, well-structured essay on any topic within seconds, the traditional cognitive exercise of "think first, then write" risks being replaced by "generate first, then submit." The danger lies not in AI tools themselves—used correctly, they can serve as excellent scaffolding devices for weaker writers—but rather that their convenience discourages the productive struggle through which critical thinking skills are typically developed [3].

This paper addresses three objectives. First, it reviews existing literature on AI in language education and critical thinking pedagogy. Second, it identifies a specific research gap: the lack of practical, classroom-ready frameworks that teachers without technical AI expertise can use to convert AI tools into critical-thinking exercises rather than shortcuts. Third, it proposes such a framework, illustrated with a realistic classroom scenario, and discusses its advantages, limitations, and future directions.

2. Literature Review

Research on critical thinking in language education predates generative AI by decades, but the emergence of large language models has reopened many classical debates in a contemporary context. This section organizes relevant literature into three strands: (a) critical thinking pedagogy in language classrooms, (b) the role of generative AI tools in student writing, and (c) emerging ethical and cognitive concerns.

Studies on critical thinking pedagogy consistently emphasize that analytical skills develop optimally through active engagement debate, structured questioning, peer review, and iterative revision rather than passive content consumption [3]. This pedagogical foundation provides the baseline against

*Corresponding author: ajinkya.gujarkar@gmail.com

which AI-assisted learning must be evaluated: any tool that reduces active engagement, even while improving output quality, may undermine the deeper goal of skill development.

A second literature strand examines actual student usage patterns. Survey-based studies conducted since 2022 document high adoption rates of tools like ChatGPT among university students, with usage patterns ranging from brainstorming to full draft generation [1], [4]. Notably, students themselves report mixed feelings appreciating speed and fluency benefits while expressing concern about whether they are "actually learning."

A third, more recent strand focuses on cognitive and ethical risks. Concerns include over-reliance reducing independent problem-solving [2], difficulty distinguishing AI-generated inaccuracies from verified facts, and blurred academic integrity boundaries when AI-assisted work is submitted without disclosure [5]. Some researchers propose guided-use frameworks treating AI output as a draft for critique rather than a final product, though practical classroom implementation remains under-documented, particularly in non-native English-speaking engineering contexts [6].

Grammar and writing-assistance tools such as Grammarly and QuillBot occupy a distinct position in this literature. Operating primarily at the sentence level rather than generating full content from prompts, they potentially pose lower risk to critical thinking than full generative tools. However, paraphrasing functions have raised concerns about originality and plagiarism detection [7].

3. Research Gap and Problem Statement

Despite growing literature on generative AI in education, three significant gaps exist. First, most research occurs in Western, English-as-first-language contexts; the student experience in Indian engineering colleges where English is typically a second or third language taught primarily as functional communication rather than literary discipline remains comparatively underexplored.

Second, most studies thoroughly document problems but offer insufficient classroom-ready solutions. Teachers receive general advice ("encourage critical AI use") without concrete activity structures implementable in a single class period.

Third, few papers compare specific tools, ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude, Grammarly, QuillBot regarding distinct risk profiles for critical thinking, despite meaningful functional differences between full content generation and grammar/paraphrasing assistance.

Consequently, this paper addresses a concrete problem: Undergraduate engineering students increasingly rely on generative AI tools for English assignments. While this improves immediate work quality, reasonable concerns supported by preliminary observation and literature suggest unguided AI use may reduce opportunities for practicing independent reasoning, argument construction, and evaluative judgment. Currently, no simple, teacher-friendly framework exists to convert AI usage from a passive shortcut into an active critical-thinking exercise.

4. Research Objectives

This work pursues five objectives:

1) Review literature on relationships between generative AI usage and critical thinking development in language classrooms.
2) Identify how different AI tools (ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude, Grammarly, QuillBot) differ in likely impact on student reasoning and originality.
3) Propose a practical, classroom-implementable framework integrating AI tools while actively reinforcing critical thinking skills.
4) Illustrate framework evaluation using a hypothetical but realistic classroom dataset.
5) Discuss ethical, pedagogical, and practical limitations of AI-assisted English teaching.

5. Methodology

This exploratory, literature-informed study employs a methodology appropriate for final-year undergraduate research. The work combines three components.

First, a structured review of recent (2021–2026) literature on generative AI in education, critical thinking pedagogy, and academic integrity established the conceptual foundation. Sources were selected based on relevance to English/language classrooms and generative AI tools.

Second, a conceptual framework was developed from literature-identified patterns, describing how AI-generated content transitions from a final product to a subject of classroom analysis.

Third, to illustrate empirical evaluation methodology, the paper presents a hypothetical scenario involving 60 undergraduate engineering students across two communication skills sections. The numerical data in Section VI is deliberately hypothetical and illustrative, demonstrating the analysis type a real framework implementation would produce. This transparency regarding the absence of actual data reflects appropriate scope for the assignment.

6. Proposed Framework

The framework's core concept is straightforward: treat AI-generated content as a first draft for examination rather than a finished product for submission. This shifts the student's cognitive role from passive recipient to active evaluator precisely the activity critical thinking pedagogy emphasizes [3].

AI-generated content can follow two pathways: an unguided, passive path risking shallow reasoning and over-dependence, or a guided, reflective path where teacher-led interventions structured questioning, verification exercises, debate convert AI content into a critical thinking exercise.

A concrete seven-step classroom workflow operationalizes the guided pathway:

Step 1: Task Assignment; Step 2: Independent Draft; Step 3: AI-Assisted Generation; Step 4: Structured Comparison & Analysis; Step 5: Error Identification & Discussion; Step 6: Critical Evaluation & Justification; Step 7: Final Revision & Reflection.

Table 1
Comparison of teaching approaches: Traditional, unguided AI-assisted, and proposed framework

Aspect	Traditional (No AI)	Unguided AI-Assisted	Proposed Framework
Primary Activity	Independent writing and revision	Direct AI generation and submission	Independent draft + guided comparison
Student Role	Author and thinker	Editor and submitter	Evaluator and author
Skill Focus	Writing fluency, grammar, structure	Speed, surface polish	Evaluation, argumentation, analysis
Dependence Risk	Low	High	Minimized via mandatory steps

Table 3
Comparative risk analysis of AI tools for English classroom use

Tool	Primary Function	CT Risk Level	Recommended Framework Use
ChatGPT	Full content generation	High	Comparison draft (Step 3); error analysis
Gemini	Full content generation; integrated search	High	Fact-verification; claim cross-checking
Copilot	Content generation; tool-integrated	High	Treat as first draft; comparative analysis
Claude	Full generation; structured responses	High	Structure and argument analysis
Grammarly	Grammar, tone, clarity enhancement	Low-Moderate	Post-revision polishing; style refinement
QuillBot	Paraphrasing; summarization	Moderate	Paraphrase comparison; semantic shifts

This workflow deliberately positions the independent draft (Step 2) before AI-assisted generation (Step 3), ensuring students first attempt their own reasoning. AI output then serves as comparison material rather than replacement, with Steps 4–6 requiring active evaluation, error identification, and justified revision, the cognitive activities literature associates with critical thinking development.

7. Results and Discussion

To illustrate framework evaluation methodology, this section presents a hypothetical scenario involving 60 undergraduate engineering students (two sections of 30) in a communication skills course. Section A followed conventional AI-assisted practice for six weeks; Section B followed the guided seven-step workflow. Table 2 presents illustrative pre/post critical thinking rubric scores.

Table 2
Illustrative pre/post critical thinking rubric scores (Hypothetical data)

Section	Pre (/10)	Post (/10)	Gain
A (Unguided)	5.4	5.9	+0.5
B (Guided)	5.3	7.2	+1.9

In this scenario, Section B demonstrates markedly larger improvement, consistent with theoretical expectations that guided, reflective AI use supports critical thinking more effectively than unguided use. However, such small sample sizes would require validated instruments, blind scoring by multiple evaluators, and rigorous statistical analysis for robust conclusions.

Not all AI tools present identical risk profiles. Full content generation tools (ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude) pose higher risk when used for direct submission, as they can replace entire writing processes. Grammar and paraphrasing tools present comparatively lower but still meaningful risks, concentrated in originality and phrasing dependence. This distinction supports differentiating classroom policy by tool type rather than applying uniform restrictions.

8. Framework Advantages

The proposed framework offers multiple pedagogical and practical advantages. First, it actively reinforces core critical thinking skills by encouraging evaluation rather than passive acceptance of AI output. Second, it retains AI tools' speed and accessibility benefits without outright bans, which are often difficult to enforce. Third, it provides teachers with a concrete, low-cost, implementable workflow requiring no specialized AI expertise. Fourth, it enables nuanced policy differentiating between tool types. Fifth, its modular seven-step structure adapts to varying class sizes and time constraints.

9. Limitations

Several limitations merit acknowledgment. The illustrative classroom data are hypothetical and constructed for demonstration; real implementation may yield different outcomes. The literature review, while covering recent sources, is not exhaustive, reflecting scope appropriate for undergraduate research. The framework remains untested across diverse proficiency levels, class sizes, and institutional contexts. Risk ratings in Table III are qualitative estimates based on tool function and literature, not controlled experimental measurement. Finally, the work does not account for AI's rapidly evolving capabilities, which may shift individual tool risk profiles.

10. Future Work

Future research should implement the framework in actual classroom settings with properly designed, administered assessments, ideally across multiple institutions for improved generalizability. Longitudinal studies tracking critical thinking over full semesters rather than six-week units would provide stronger evidence of impact. Research should also explore framework performance across varying English proficiency levels and investigate whether similar guided-use principles extend to other subjects where AI-generated content is increasingly common, such as technical report writing in engineering courses.

11. Conclusion

Generative AI tools represent a permanent fixture in English language education. Attempts to eliminate their use entirely are neither realistic nor universally desirable, given genuine benefits for language learners. The pertinent question shifts from whether to use these tools to how they are used. This paper argues, based on literature review and illustrative conceptual framework, that AI-generated content can be repositioned from passive shortcut to active critical-analysis material through

structured classroom activities independent-first drafting, guided comparison, justified revision. Though the illustrative data presented here are hypothetical and empirical framework testing remains necessary, the underlying principle offers practical guidance for educators seeking to preserve critical thinking development in AI-saturated classroom environments.

References

[1] E. Kasneci *et al.*, "ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education," *Learn. Individ. Differ.*, vol. 103, Art. no. 102274, Apr. 2023.

[2] E. Zhai, "ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2022.

[3] R. H. Ennis, "Critical thinking: Reflection and perspective, Part I," *Inquiry: Crit. Think. Across Discip.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 4–18, 2011.

[4] T. K. F. Chiu, "The impact of Generative AI (GenAI) on practices, policies and research direction in education: A case of ChatGPT and Midjourney," *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1645–1659, 2023.

[5] D. Baidoo-Anu and L. Owusu Ansah, "Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning," *J. AI*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–78, 2023.

[6] J. Rudolph, S. Tan, and S. Tan, "ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education?" *J. Appl. Learn. Teach.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2023.

[7] D. R. E. Cotton, P. A. Cotton, and J. R. Shipway, "Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT," *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 196–207, 2023.