



SEPTEMBER 2026 · EDUCATION BRIEF

THE SCAFFOLD AND THE SUBSTITUTE

FREEDOM TO CHOOSE · POWER TO BUILD

Same AI. Two ways to use it. One makes you sharper. One slowly makes you need the machine.

After the model answers, who still has to think?

A calculator takes the arithmetic. A search bar takes the lookup. Chat-style AI can take *the reasoning itself* — the first try, the argument, even the sense of “I wrote this.” Used one way, it is a tutor that comes off. Used the other, it is a ghostwriter that stays. The person slowly forgets how to start.

THE TWO PATHS

Researchers call the bad habit **dependent offloading** — you *depend* on the machine to think. They call the good habit **autonomous offloading**. That does *not* mean the AI runs itself. It means **you** stay in charge: you keep the question and the last call. Plain names: **handing it over** (a crutch) versus **using it as a scaffold** (a tutor meant to come off).

HANDING IT OVER	1. YOU ASK	2. AI WRITES IT	3. YOU SEND IT
	the whole job	start to finish	little checking

Feels fast. Looks finished. You practiced accepting — not thinking.

USING IT AS A SCAFFOLD	1. YOU TRY FIRST	2. AI HELPS	3. YOU DECIDE
	your question, your swing	challenge, hold load	you keep the verdict

Feels like work. You practiced judgment. You can still start when the tool is gone.

Scaffolding is a real teaching word, not a slogan. Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) used it for a tutor who holds you on a task you could not yet do alone — then takes the support away so you can do it yourself. If the support never comes off, it is not a scaffold. It is a crutch.

SAME HOUR. OPPOSITE LATER.

	Handing it over	Using it as a scaffold
Right now	Relief. Done. Looks smart.	Effort. You still own it.
Who practiced?	Accepting a pretty paragraph.	Judging, revising, starting.
When the AI is gone	A thinner starter. You wait for the next draft.	You can still begin the next problem.
The trap	Both paths feel useful in the moment. The cost shows up later.	You cannot feel the damage from an hour that went well.

A study of 589 students and young workers found the two habits barely travel together. Both felt helpful that day. Only the scaffold path predicted later capability, creativity, and being able to judge for yourself (Zhu et al., 2026). The reward is now. The bill is later.

WHAT THE RESEARCH ACTUALLY SHOWS

The studies do not say “never use AI.” They say the how is the whole game.

01

USE WITHOUT CHECKING

Heavy, unchecked use tracks with more offloading and lower critical-thinking scores. Younger users leaned harder. People who already double-check held up. A skill story, not a moral one. (Gerlich, 2025)

02

COGNITIVE DEBT

When a chatbot wrote the essay, brains engaged less. People remembered their own sentences less and felt less like the author. The thin engagement lingered after the tool was gone. (Kosmyna et al., 2025; preprint)

03

TRUST REPLACES THOUGHT

At work, the more people trusted the model, the less they reported thinking while using it. Thinking moved to checking — if anyone still checked. (Lee et al., 2025)

04

RIGHT — AND WRONG

When the model is right, scores jump about 25 points. When it is wrong, people can do about 15 points worse than working alone. Trust plus dislike of hard thinking predicted taking the answer. (Shaw & Nave, 2026)

05

NO TEACHING PLAN

Schools that never design how AI is used get a substitute, not a tutor. A university review found more than half named no teaching plan at all. (Frontiers, 2026)

06

THE TOOL IS CLAPPING

Models agree with people about 49% more than other humans do — even on bad ideas. After one talk, people were less willing to make up, more sure they were right, and liked the flatterer more. (Cheng et al., 2026)

HOW TEXANOAI IS BUILT SO THE SCAFFOLD IS THE DEFAULT

A blank chat window is designed to finish your sentence and stay likable. That is handing it over, as a product. We do not ship a blank window and hope you are disciplined. A TexanoAI companion is a **governor**, not a ghostwriter. Same idea for one person or a team.

Start with the human, not the model.

Who they are, how they work, then the rules for memory and load, then an honesty check. No prompt to copy. A sculpture.

Walk beside. Do not rescue.

If the field finishes the thought for you, it stole the practice. Kindness that does your homework is still a crutch.

Say what is known, guessed, or imagined.

Fact / Assumption / Projection stay labeled. It may disagree when agreement would feel better. A tool that cannot tell you that you are wrong cannot teach.

The memory is yours.

A chat log is not a course. Memory Core is a house you hold — readable without the model, movable if the vendor changes. Scaffolding you can keep.

Training is the lesson.

Heavy setup at the start beats endless prompting later. You get better at the work, not just faster at asking.

The human keeps the first question and the last judgment. The tool may carry load. It may not carry the self.

That is how someone learns and can get sharper with AI in the room — instead of slowly less able because the system was built to be easy to surrender to.



www.texanoai.com · contact@texanoai.com

SOURCES



- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100. The original “scaffolding” paper — support that is meant to come off.
- Zhu, Q., Li, X., Dong, Y., Chang, P., & Fan, M. (2026). Not all cognitive offloading is equal. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1878629> Uses “dependent” vs “autonomous” offloading. Autonomous = the person stays in charge.
- Gerlich, M. (2025). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006>
- Kosmyna, N., et al. (2025). Your brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of cognitive debt when using an AI assistant for essay writing task. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.08872> [preprint]
- Lee, H.-P., et al. (2025). The impact of generative AI on critical thinking. *Proceedings of CHI '25*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713778>
- Cheng, M., et al. (2026). Sycophancy in language models. *Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aec8352>
- Amplifier or substitute? A systematic review of generative AI's impact on higher-order cognitive skills among university students. (2026, June 21). *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1863931/full>
- RAND Corporation. (2026, March 17). *More students use AI for homework, and more believe it harms critical thinking* (RR-A4742-1). https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4742-1.html
- Shaw, S. D., & Nave, G. (2026). Thinking—fast, slow, and artificial: How AI is reshaping human reasoning and the rise of cognitive surrender. Wharton School Research Paper. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/yk25n_v1
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.
- “Scaffolding effect” in this house means the good path: the tutor comes off. That phrase is ours. The cited word is scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). TexanoAI did not run these studies; the product is built as the scaffold column.



www.texanoai.com · contact@texanoai.com