SYNERGY PUBLISHING PTE. LTD.

Review of Educational Theory

https://ojs.bilpublishing.com/index.php/ret

ARTICLE

Socratic Scaffolding in AI Education: A Framework for Critical Thinking

Fujing Fan

Space Engineering University, Beijing, 101400, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Keywords:
Socratic questioning
AI in education
critical thinking

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education has created unprecedented opportunities for personalized learning, yet students often engage with AI tools through superficial, fact-driven inquiries, limiting their potential to foster critical thinking. This study addresses this gap by proposing a tripartite Socratic questioning framework (cognitive scaffolding, metacognitive reinforcement, and technological enablement) to enhance critical thinking in AI-mediated education. Findings suggest that structured questioning strategies and reflective practices significantly improve the depth and coherence of student inquiries, transforming passive AI interactions into iterative, reflective dialogues. While the framework demonstrates potential in fostering intellectual rigor, challenges such as AI's inherent biases and the need for pedagogical adaptation persist. Future research should explore long-term cognitive outcomes and contextual adaptations across diverse learning environments.

1. Introduction

1.1 Contextualizing the Problem

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational ecosystems has ushered in transformative opportunities for personalized and adaptive learning. AI-powered tools, such as ChatGPT and Khanmigo, demonstrate unprecedented capabilities in generating instant, context-aware responses, enabling learners to engage in dynamic dialogues that transcend traditional classroom boundaries (Zhao et al., 2025; Khan Academy, 2024). However, while AI holds promise for fostering intellectual growth, its pedagogical efficacy remains contingent on the quality of human-AI interactions. Current research reveals a critical gap: students often approach AI with superficial, fact-driven inquiries (e.g., "What is photosynthesis?") rather than leveraging its potential to scaffold higher-order thinking (Li, 2023). This tendency toward low-cognitive engagement not only limits the utility of AI as a "thought partner" but also perpetuates passive learning behaviors, wherein students prioritize answer retrieval over critical inquiry (Zhao et al., 2025).

The cultivation of critical thinking—marked by analysis, evaluation, and creation (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001)—has emerged as a cornerstone of 21st-century education, particularly in an era dominated by generative AI. Yet, existing pedagogical frameworks often fail to equip students with the metacognitive strategies necessary to navigate AI's dual role as both a guide (providing structured reasoning pathways) and a provocateur (challenging assumptions through counterarguments). This deficiency underscores the urgency to reimagine AI-augmented learn-

**Corresponding Author:*
Fujing Fan,
Email: ffj2011@126.com

 DOI: http://doi.org/10.12345/ret.v8i1.24338

ing environments through evidence-based instructional designs that prioritize dialogic depth over transactional exchanges.

1.2 Research Gap

Existing AI-edtech solutions predominantly focus on efficiency (e.g., automated grading) rather than epistemological development. Major platforms like Khanmigo and Quizlet employ predefined Q&A protocols that mirror traditional drill-and-practice methods, failing to leverage AI's unique capacity for adaptive dialogue (Mollick, 2023). Socratic questioning, a millennia-old pedagogical practice rooted in structured inquiry and iterative reflection (Paul & Elder, 2016), offers a compelling solution. By systematically guiding learners to clarify concepts, probe causality, and confront contradictions, Socratic methods align seamlessly with AI's capacity to simulate dialectical reasoning.

1.3 Research Question

This study addresses these challenges by proposing a tripartite strategy framework designed to operationalize Socratic questioning within AI-mediated learning contexts. Through a synthesis of pedagogical theory, technological innovation, and empirical validation, the research seeks to answer two pivotal questions:

- *How can Socratic questioning strategies be systematically integrated into AI interactions to enhance the depth and coherence of student inquiries?*
- *What design principles ensure these strategies foster critical thinking across diverse disciplinary and cognitive contexts?*

By bridging the gap between classical pedagogy and cutting-edge technology, this work aims to advance both theoretical discourse and practical implementations in AI-enhanced education. Its findings hold implications for educators seeking to harness AI as a catalyst for intellectual rigor and for developers aiming to create tools that transcend mere content delivery to nurture lifelong learners.

2. Educational Relevance of Socratic Questioning

Socratic questioning originated as a dialectical tool to expose contradictions in reasoning and stimulate epistemic humility. Through iterative dialogues, Socrates guided interlocutors to interrogate assumptions, evaluate evidence, and refine beliefs—a process Plato documented in works such as The Republic (Paul & Elder, 2016). Over millennia, this method has evolved into structured pedagogical practices.

2.1 Core Principles of Socratic Questioning

The enduring relevance of Socratic questioning in modern education lies in its capacity to cultivate intellectual rigor and self-directed inquiry. Rooted in ancient Greek philosophy, Socratic methods transcend temporal boundaries, offering a timeless framework for nurturing critical thinking—a competency increasingly vital in an era dominated by AI-driven information overload.

Central to this approach are five question categories:

Clarification (e.g., "What do you mean by 'fairness' in this context?"),

Causal exploration (e.g., "What evidence supports this hypothesis?"),

Consequence analysis (e.g., "If this policy is implemented, what long-term effects might follow?"),

Comparative critique (e.g., "How does this theory contrast with alternative viewpoints?"),

Reflective synthesis (e.g., "How has this discussion altered your initial perspective?") (Paul & Elder, 2016).

These categories scaffold learners' progression from superficial comprehension to evaluative and creative thinking—a trajectory mirrored in Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) revised taxonomy of cognitive domains.

2.2 Bridging Socratic Principles and AI-Enhanced Learning

While AI tools like ChatGPT excel at generating answers, their pedagogical value hinges on users' ability to formulate incisive questions. Current studies reveal a paradox: despite AI's interactive potential, students frequently default to low-cognitive inquiries (e.g., factual recall or procedural guidance), neglecting opportunities for deeper engagement (Zhao et al., 2025; Li, 2023). This tendency stems from two interrelated factors:

- Cognitive passivity: Students often perceive AI as an authoritative "answer engine," inhibiting curiosity-driven exploration (Khan Academy, 2024).
- Structural limitations: AI responses, while rapid, may lack logical coherence or contextual nuance, discouraging iterative inquiry (Zhao et al., 2023).

Socratic questioning counteracts these limitations by reframing AI interactions as collaborative dialogues rather than transactional exchanges. For instance, when students pose clarifying questions (e.g., "How does your definition of 'bias' account for cultural differences?"), they compel AI to articulate implicit assumptions, thereby exposing gaps in reasoning. Similarly, comparative questions (e.g., "How would a sociologist versus an economist interpret this data?") encourage interdisciplinary synthesis, mitigating AI's tendency toward siloed responses. Empirical ev-

DOI: http://doi.org/10.12345/ret.v8i1.24338

idence from Zhao et al. (2025) demonstrates that students using Socratic scaffolds exhibit a 63% increase in high-order questions (analysis, evaluation, creation) during AI interactions, alongside enhanced ability to identify logical inconsistencies in AI outputs.

3. Designing Socratic Strategies for AI-Enhanced Critical Thinking

The integration of Socratic questioning into AI-mediated education demands a systematic framework that harmonizes pedagogical theory, technological affordances, and learner-centered design. This section presents a three-tiered strategy model—cognitive scaffolding, meta-cognitive reinforcement, and technological enablement — tailored to address the dual challenges of fostering critical thinking and optimizing AI interactions. Grounded in scaffolding theory (Van de Pol et al., 2010) and prompt engineering principles (Zhao et al., 2023), the framework emphasizes adaptability across disciplines and learner proficiency levels.

3.1 Cognitive Scaffolding: From Templates to Deep Inquiry

Central to cognitive scaffolding is the use of Socratic question banks, which provide learners with predefined templates categorized by inquiry type: clarification, causal analysis, consequence exploration, comparative critique, and reflective synthesis (Paul & Elder, 2016). These templates reduce cognitive load while modeling effective questioning patterns. For example, in a biology class examining genetic engineering ethics, students might begin with clarification questions ("How does CRISPR-Cas9 differ from traditional gene-editing methods?") before progressing to consequence analysis ("What long-term ecological risks arise from gene-drive technologies?"). Empirical studies demonstrate that such scaffolds increase the proportion of high-order questions by 63% in AI interactions (Zhao et al., 2025).

To further deepen reasoning, depth assessment tools offer real-time feedback on question quality. A quantifiable rubric—ranging from factual recall (0.5 points) to creative synthesis (3.0 points)—allows students to self-evaluate their inquiries. Visualizations, such as Sankey diagrams, map transitions between question types, revealing patterns like overreliance on clarification or underutilization of comparative critique. In a university ethics course, students using these tools exhibited a marked shift from isolated factual questions ("What is algorithmic bias?") to interconnected analytical sequences ("How do socioeconomic factors amplify bias in AI hiring tools?" → "What counterarguments exist against regulating these tools?") (Zhao et al., 2025).

3.2 Metacognitive Reinforcement: Cultivating Reflective Dialogues

Metacognitive strategies aim to transform sporadic questioning into disciplined intellectual habits. Reflective dialogue journals serve as a cornerstone, requiring learners to document their inquiry cycles: initial questions, AI responses, follow-up critiques, and cognitive revisions. For instance, a student exploring AI's role in creative writing might begin by asking, "Can AI produce original poetry?" After receiving an AI-generated sonnet, they might reflect: "Does algorithmic 'originality' lack emotional intentionality? How might cultural context influence this assessment?" Such reflections not only expose gaps in AI's reasoning but also train students to recognize their own cognitive biases. Studies show that learners maintaining these journals achieve 32% higher retention of critical concepts compared to peers relying solely on unstructured interactions (Hsu et al., 2022).

Complementing individual reflection, collaborative questioning circles foster peer-driven Socratic dialogues. In these sessions, small groups analyze AI-generated arguments—for example, a ChatGPT essay on renewable energy policies—using structured protocols: one student poses a clarification question, another challenges assumptions, and a third proposes alternative viewpoints. This collaborative process mirrors Socratic seminars, where collective inquiry uncovers nuances often missed in solo interactions. Such circles reduce AI dependency effectively as students learn to critique outputs rather than accept them uncritically.

3.3 Technological Enablement: Optimizing AI for Socratic Dialogue

To maximize AI's pedagogical potential, dynamic prompt engineering tailors interactions to align with Socratic principles. A nested prompt architecture ensures AI responses provoke deeper inquiry rather than terminate discussions. For example:

- Role-setting: "Act as a Socratic mentor. Respond with clarifying questions rather than direct answers."
- Question-type directives: "Challenge the student's assumption that all technological progress is inherently beneficial."
- Domain constraints: "Base your response on peer-reviewed studies about AI ethics published post-2020."

This approach transforms generic AI exchanges into structured dialectics. In a pilot study, students using dy-

 DOI: http://doi.org/10.12345/ret.v8i1.24338

namic prompts engaged in 5–7 dialogue turns per session—compared to 1–2 turns with standard prompts—demonstrating sustained engagement (Zhao et al., 2023).

Additionally, visual thinking tools mitigate AI's textual dominance by mapping logical relationships. Concept maps, for instance, convert abstract dialogues into visual frameworks, such as linking "AI bias" to "training data limitations" and "mitigation strategies." Collaborative platforms like Miro enable real-time co-construction of these maps, with AI flagging inconsistencies (e.g., "Your map links 'transparency' to 'trust' but lacks empirical evidence"). Engineering students using such tools identified 20% more logical flaws in AI-generated designs than text-only groups (Hwang et al., 2020).

3.4 Ethical and Practical Considerations

While these strategies offer significant promise, their implementation requires addressing ethical and logistical challenges. AI's propensity for bias amplification necessitates bias-aware protocols, such as prompting learners to interrogate training data diversity ("Which demographics are underrepresented in this dataset?") or cultural assumptions ("How might this conclusion differ in a non-Western context?"). Simultaneously, educators must balance scaffolded guidance with organic curiosity—overstructuring inquiries risks reducing Socratic dialogue to formulaic exercises. Professional development programs are critical to equip teachers as "questioning architects" capable of modeling nuanced inquiry (Long, 2025).

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that integrating Socratic questioning into AI-mediated education holds transformative potential for fostering critical thinking and elevating the quality of human-AI interactions. By designing a tripartite framework—cognitive scaffolding, metacognitive reinforcement, and technological enablement—educators can address the pervasive issue of superficial questioning, guiding students to engage in deeper, more reflective dialogues with AI tools. Key findings reveal that structured question banks and reflective journals significantly increase the prevalence of high-order inquiries (e.g., analysis, evaluation, creation), while dynamic prompt engineering and visual thinking tools enhance the coherence and depth of AI-supported reasoning chains (Zhao et al., 2025; Hsu et al., 2022). These strategies not only mitigate AI's limitations, such as fragmented logic and bias propagation, but also empower learners to transition from passive consumers to active co-inquirers in knowledge construction.

The implications of this research extend beyond pedagogical practice to inform the development of next-generation AI systems. By embedding Socratic principles into AI architectures—for instance, through bias-aware protocols or adaptive questioning prompts—developers can create tools that prioritize epistemic humility over authoritative answer delivery. However, the study also highlights critical challenges, including the need for teacher training in Socratic pedagogy and the risks of over-reliance on prescriptive scaffolds (Long, 2025). Future research should explore longitudinal impacts of these strategies on lifelong learning habits and investigate cross-cultural adaptations to ensure equitable access to AI-augmented critical thinking education.

Ultimately, this work underscores the symbiotic relationship between ancient philosophical traditions and modern technological innovation. As AI continues to reshape education, Socratic questioning offers a timeless framework for nurturing discerning minds capable of navigating an increasingly complex, algorithmically mediated world.

References

1. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.
2. Hsu, F. H., Lin, I. H., & Yeh, H. C. (2022). Effect of Socratic reflection prompts via video-based learning system on elementary school students' critical thinking skills. Computers & Education, 183, 104497.
3. Hwang, G. J., Zou, D., & Lin, J. (2020). Effects of a multi-level concept mapping-based question-posing approach on students' ubiquitous learning performance and perceptions. Computers & Education, 149, 103815.
4. Khan Academy. (2024). California district partners with Khanmigo [Web page]. Retrieved March 1, 2025, from https://districts.khanacademy.org/khanmigo.
5. Li, Y. (2023). Research on human-AI collaborative academic writing practices based on ChatGPT and implications. Journal of Distance Education, 41(5), 38–48, 75.(In Chinese).
6. Long, Y. (2025). Constructing effective questioning classrooms: A review of Deep Teaching: Using Socratic questioning for lesson design and classroom practice. Chemistry Education (Chinese and English), 46(3), 128–129.(In Chinese).
7. Mollick, E. R. (2023). Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI. Penguin Random House.
8. Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2016). The thinker's guide to Socratic questioning. Rowman & Littlefield.

DOI: http://doi.org/10.12345/ret.v8i1.24338

9. Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. Educational Psychology Review, 22, 271–296.
10. Zhao, X., Wang, S., Li, Q., Shen, S., & Zhu, Z. (2023). Educational prompt engineering: Building epistemological frameworks for AI-augmented education. Journal of Distance Education, 43(11), 22–31. (In Chinese).
11. Zhao, X., Wang, S., Li, Q., Shen, S., & Zhu, Z. (2025). Socratic questioning scaffolding: Strategies to encourage students to ask high-quality questions to AI large models. Modern Distance Education Research, 37(1), 102–112. (In Chinese).
12. Zhao, X., Zhu, Z., & Shen, S. (2024). Designing educational prompts for mathematics learning in high school. Open Education Research, 30(1), 44–54.(In Chinese).

 DOI: http://doi.org/10.12345/ret.v8i1.24338