InSight
A Journal of Scholarly Teaching

Volume 20 Article 1

The Investigation of a Nelsonian Approach to Socratic Dialogue with Student-Teachers at a Midwestern Private University

Francesco Giuseffi, EdD
William Woods University

Recommended Citation
Giuseffi, F. (2024). The investigation of a Nelsonian approach to Socratic dialogue with student-teachers at a midwestern private university. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *20*, Article 1. doi: 10.46504/20202401gi

The Investigation of a Nelsonian Approach to Socratic Dialogue with Student-Teachers at a Midwestern Private University

Francesco Giuseffi, EdD
Assistant Professor of Education and Chair of Doctoral Studies
William Woods University

Abstract. Student-teachers must be afforded opportunities to seek guidance on challenges that arise during teaching experiences, such as addressing student behavior, creating meaningful lessons, and fostering open and welcoming learning environments. Student-teachers can undergo negative experiences, which can lead to frustration, anger, and lack of interest in the profession. One way to address these challenges is through dialogue (Kumar & Downey, 2018). In this qualitative study, the researcher investigated whether a nuanced version of the Socratic method, developed by Leonard Nelson (1882-1927), can be an efficacious instructional strategy for finding solutions to student-teachers' classroom challenges. The research study consisted of five undergraduate students enrolled in a student teaching seminar at a private midwestern university. The course prepared students for roles as new teachers by reading, discussing, and sharing challenges about teaching. Both the researcher and research participants worked together to faithfully follow the essential steps of a Nelsonian Socratic method approach. Once the preparation was settled, the researcher, as the external analyst, facilitated a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue with the student-teachers on a specific challenge a student teacher within the group was facing. After the dialogue, participants were assembled in a focus group and asked several questions about their experiences participating in a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue. Descriptive, categorical, and analytical coding of data indicated that participants reached consensus on a solution for the student-teacher's challenge and perceived the Nelsonian Socratic method approach as an effective dialogic strategy that generated feelings of belongingness and empowerment as a group, a shared understanding about the challenge, and a healthy respect for dialogue.

Student teachers should receive guidance on student-teaching practice to develop and improve pedagogy and classroom management (Kazen & McKnight, 2020; Wilcoxen & Lemke, 2021). This guidance can come by way of discussion-oriented instructional strategies that assist student-teachers in solving pedagogical issues (Bhattacharya, 2022; Huang et al., 2023). Discussion as an instructional strategy has been well-documented as producing positive effects in student learning (Witherspoon et al., 2016). Discussion-oriented lessons develop critical thinking skills, collaborative dialogue, and a plurality of voices to be heard (Sibold, 2017). For student teachers, discussion-based pedagogy increases active listening, cogent thinking, and appreciation of different perspectives (Bhattacharya, 2022). Discussion-oriented classes have also helped student teachers address perplexities and struggles in their own prescribed courses (Paseka et al., 2023). As a form of discussion, the Socratic method is often promoted as an effective question-and-answer dialogic instructional strategy, in that it enhances deeper thinking and further introspection concerning one's own beliefs (Williams & Zimmerman, 2022). Implementing Leonard Nelson's nuanced Socratic method approach may enhance educators' understanding of the Socratic method and be responsive to the specific needs of student teachers as they learn the art and science of teaching.

In this study, the researcher explored how a particular approach to the Socratic method - Leonard Nelson's Socratic approach - impacted student-teachers' ability to solve a specific challenge in the classroom. The research questions that guided the study were the following:

RQ1. How does the discussion leader's role in Nelson's Socratic method approach help student-teachers reach a solution to the topic being discussed?

RQ2. What are student-teachers' perceptions of Nelson's Socratic method approach to dialogue?

RQ3. To what extent does Nelson's Socratic method approach resolve a real-world student-teacher topic that deals with pedagogical or classroom-management issues?

The Socratic Method

An explication of the Socratic method begins with Socrates discussing the nature of the whole and living virtuously with interlocutors. In the *Apology*, Socrates' method consists of questioning, examining, and testing those who put, for instance, material wealth above the state of their soul and the possession of wisdom (Plato, ca. 399 B.C.E./1946, 27e, as cited in Cooper, 1997). In the *Theaetetus*, Socrates compares his method to that of a midwife who

helps give birth to his interlocutors' knowledge and discovery of truth through sustained questioning (Plato, ca. 369 B.C.E./1946, 150c, as cited in Cooper, 1997). And in the *Gorgias*, Socrates advises a character with the same name that he should be "alternately asking questions and answering them, and to put aside for another time this long style of speechmaking" (Plato, ca. 380 B.C.E./1946, 449b, as cited in Cooper, 1997). In these dialogues and others, we come to understand how Socrates interacts with his interlocutors - questions are asked and ideas are examined and tested (Peeples, 2019). Scholars of Socrates' method have also detailed a specific strategy understood as the *elenchus* (Benson, 2011; Candiotto, 2015; Matthews, 2021). The so-called elenchus was when an interlocutor's main point or thesis was refuted based on their subsequent beliefs which emanated from Socrates' probing questions (Candiotto, 2015; Matthews, 2021). During this exchange, the interlocutor would experience aporia (perplexity) (Politis, 2018), but from that experience, the interlocutor would engage in learning to some degree (Leigh, 2020).

Interestingly, Fullam (2015) notes the Socratic method comprises two forms - "Socratic education," and "Socratic teaching." The latter was endorsed by early proponents of Socratic dialogue, such as Mathew Lipman (2012) and Mortimer J. Adler (1998). To these thinkers, there was a natural desire, especially in children, to question and wonder about the world around them. The former was more faithful to Socrates' method of disabusing the interlocutor of prejudicial beliefs through the elenchus. Matthews (2021) has argued a distinction between what he calls "the Socratic method of instruction" and the "the Socratic elenchus." The Socratic method of instruction is a broader understanding of the method, where teachers in non-philosophical situations teach by asking solid questions as opposed to offering answers. The Socratic elenchus, however, is a philosophical method of inquiry that cross-examines the interlocutor through probing questions, eventually resulting in a counterexample that refutes the interlocutor's earlier assumption (Leigh, 2020; Matthews, 2021).

The Socratic method consists of general elements and qualities. Participants investigate a topic by asking questions (Chesters, 2012; Rapanta, 2018) and challenging assumptions (Avdic et al., 2017). The Socratic method generally begins with an opening question, followed by probing questions (Giuseffi, 2021). For example, teachers may follow Socrates' habit of asking questions that focus on a concept's definition or standard (Clark, 2022). Socrates explores the nature of courage in the *Laches* (Plato, ca. 423 B.C.E./1946, 190e, as cited in Cooper, 1997), and "What is virtue?" in the *Meno* (Plato, ca.385 B.C.E./1946, 72d, as cited in Cooper, 1997). While instructors should ask these questions, they should then ask subsequent, more specific questions. Paul and Elder (2016) explored other questions that went beyond the "What is F-ness" question. These questions probed the sources, counter arguments, implications, reasons, and assumptions for a held belief. Socratic questions can be more pointed, delving into the emotional reactions to ideas as in the question: "What about that is frustrating to you?" (Williams & Zimmerman, 2022, p. 29).

The exploration of Socratic questions logically opens an investigation into the teacher's role during Socratic discussion. The teacher is often considered a facilitator or discussion leader. There are several views about the exact roles and responsibilities teachers, and by extension, students have during Socratic dialogue. Barnes et al. (2015) argued that both teacher and student must be regarded as equal partners. According to Delic and Becirovic (2016), teachers and students are "both responsible for pushing the dialogue forward through questioning" (p. 512). Moreover, it has been claimed that the Socratic method is a learner-centered pedagogical approach, since the emphasis is placed on students' active participation rather than the teacher's expertise (Williams & Zimmerman, 2022). By including this element in the Socratic dialogue, discussants can "broaden understanding of one's own perspective as well as someone else's in order to critically consider an issue from as many sides as possible" (Williams & Zimmerman, 2022, p. 28).

Leonard Nelson's Socratic Approach

As alluded to earlier, the Neo-Kantian philosopher, Leonard Nelson (1882-1927), proposed a nuanced view of the Socratic method in a famous lecture entitled "Die sokratische Methode," *The Socratic Method*, delivered to the Pedagogic Society in Gottingen, Germany in 1922. As a Neo-Kantian philosopher, Nelson believed that truth could be attained at the bounds of human understanding (Chesters, 2012; Kubalica, 2016; McCall, 2009). Neo-Kantianism argued that the human mind was considered "a spontaneous and creative faculty that is capable of laying down necessary and a priori conditions for its own surroundings and, therefore, of shaping the experienced world according to its own basic forms of intelligibility" (Gordon, 2010, p. 13). Nelson found the reality of lived experiences appealing; hence, he advocated for real-world topics and concrete experiences found in our lived experiences to be discussed philosophically. Nelson (1949) believed that to fully realize abstract concepts, one must confront them in the real-world. Topics of importance focused on, as he puts forth in his lecture, issues of justice, but in real, timely situations.

As presented in his 1922 lecture, to participate in the Socratic method is to essentially philosophize and to regress back to basic principles and "bring into relief the originally obscure assumption that lies at the bottom of the judgment on the concrete instance" (p. 10). It is the regressive process in philosophy that transforms our initial clouded and imperfect intuitive knowledge into the discovery of clear concepts and principles in our consciousness (Hanna, 2023; Kubalica, 2016). In other words, the dialogue must travel from the concrete experience back to the principle that informed the judgment made in the lived experience. Expounding on the importance of using real-world examples, Nelson's (1949) student and explicator of Nelson's approach, Gustave Heckman (2004) wrote:

> It is a Socratic principle that insights into general relationships are won solely by means of the comprehension and analysis of concrete experience. In this process general knowledge can be articulated as it emerges from its close connection with concrete experience. (p. 108)

This view of the Socratic method and by extension, philosophy, calls for the teacher to perform new tasks. As noted earlier, the teacher is not to control the Socratic dialogue, but to allow the participants (students) to ask questions and actively participate (Brinkmann et al., 2016; Heckman, 2004; Saran, 2004a; Saran 2004b; Virtanen & Houni, 2021). Nelson (1949) clearly revealed the role of the teacher and seemingly foreshadowed learner-centered instruction: "The teacher who follows the Socratic model does not answer. Neither does he question. More precisely, he puts no philosophical questions, and when such questions are addressed to him, he under no circumstances gives the answer sought" (p. 21). The teacher also sifts through the questions, judging ones that are worthy of consideration. Yet, Nelson (1949) admitted it took time and work to craft coherent questions worthy of discussion. He also assumed the asking of meaningful questions, along with finding answers, could be a complex and perplexing experience for students; however, this is precisely the kind of educational experience Nelson (1949) endorsed. He saw the advantages of this type of learning as truly Socratic. To him, this was evidenced by the Platonic dialogue, *Meno.* After an exchange with Socrates, the character Meno compares Socrates to a torpedo fish who numbs anyone who comes close to him (Plato, ca.385 B.C.E./1946, 80b, as cited in Cooper, 1997). To disrupt the students' numbness, the teacher must return to the original question that was posed. Then students follow the regressive method where they return to experience and use their "intelligence concretely in forming judgments of real facts" (Nelson, 1949, p. 27).

Several procedures were developed for Nelson's Socratic approach based on Nelson's lecture and Heckman's (2004) additions. First, the discussion leader ascertains what is the agreed upon topic the participants are willing to discuss. To determine what the participants' interests are, the discussion leader either holds a discussion with the participants or presents the participants with a list of topics to choose from. Once the topic has been chosen, the discussants craft an overarching question based on the topic. Again, this can be accomplished by either the discussion leader presenting possible overarching questions to the discussants, or as with the topic, the discussants can choose the question from a set of questions. Next, under the guidance of the discussion leader, discussants offer personal examples they believe answer the overarching question. Then the discussion leader chooses one of the examples based on its relevance to the question. Every discussant understands the example can help answer the overarching question and the discussant who offered the example can withstand scrutiny from others about the personal example (Altorf, 2016; Heckman, 2004; Knezic, 2013).

What is noticeably important is that the example is at the center of the dialogue, not the overarching question (Candiotto, 2017). Since Nelson (1949) advocated for real-world Socratic discussions, his nuanced method is about "finding the truth at the limit of understanding actual experience" (McCall, 2009, p. 97). This desire to seek and discover the truth is a consequence of Nelson's Neo-Kantian presuppositions to attaining knowledge (Altorf, 2016). The discussion leader facilitates the dialogue but does not add their views or perspectives to the example. The discussion leader is instead an "external analyst" (McCall, 2009, p. 97) who helps discussants understand their assumptions and subtly guides the discussion (Saran & Neiser, 2004).

The discussion leader must note any development in the discussion that is moving toward consensus. Considering that the topics under discussion are personal in nature, various emotions can emerge and create anxiety among discussants. For this reason, a Nelsonian Socratic approach allows for any discussant to request a meta-discussion to air concerns, ask questions, and offer suggestions (Altorf, 2016).

There is a great deal of research about the Socratic method in various disciplines. Scholars have explored the effects of the method in legal education (Abrams, 2021; Hlinak, 2014), cognitive therapy (Frojan-Parga et al., 2011; Overholser, 2019), health and medical education (Yudcovitch & Hayes, 2014), and K-12 educational contexts (Hart et al., 2022; Mintz, 2018).

While research studies have been conducted on the Socratic method's impact in higher-education (Acim, 2018; Roberts & Ryrie, 2014), research on the Socratic method's influence in teacher-education contexts has been sparse (Buchanan, 2012), but there are studies worth noting. Knezic (2013) conducted a quasi-experimental study with preservice and in-service teachers to learn if a seven-week course in Socratic dialogue developed their scaffolding abilities to help second language learners, specifically when facilitating Teacher-Learner Dialogues (TLDs). Findings revealed that when working with second-language learners, Socratic dialogue improved student-teachers' scaffolding skills, crafting of questions, and openness to contributions during the TLDs. Moreover, participants believed it helped students' interactional skills and ability to ask follow-up questions to their students.

In a mixed methods study, Bhattacharya (2022) had teacher-candidates participate in Socratic discussions after viewing both synchronous face-to-face case studies and asynchronous video case studies of teachers' lessons in a required educational psychology course. Bhattacharya (2022) found that participants' critical thinking and collaborative skills improved. Buchanan (2012) researched preservice teachers' perceptions participating in Socratic dialogue while enrolled in an elementary social studies methods course. Buchanan (2012) found that participants became more comfortable with discussion and asked more in-depth questions. Participants also believed Socratic dialogues helped them learn the content more effectively and appreciate their peers' perspectives. Lastly, regarding the practicality of Socratic dialogue for preservice teachers, nearly half of the participants felt the Socratic dialogues were practical and meaningful experiences and believed the method challenged and developed their thinking processes.

Purpose of the Present Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to investigate student teachers' perceptions participating in a nuanced approach to Socratic dialogue proposed by Nelson. While the Socratic method is often promoted as an effective question-and-answer dialogic instructional strategy, the researcher argued that implementing Leonard Nelson's Socratic method can inform future K-12 educators and higher education instructors and administrators on specific elements of Nelson's Socratic approach. The level of preparation during the pre-dialogue stage, the specific role and responsibility of the discussion leader and discussants, and the commitment to choosing real-world topics for discussion make it a more effective approach than the typical question-and-answer Socratic method used in today's K-12 and higher education classrooms.

Method

Participants

Based on purposive sampling, the research study's participants (five in total) were undergraduates enrolled in the Teacher Education Program in the School of Education. The research participants were in their fourth year of college and had completed all the prescribed core coursework. At the time of the study, the research participants were enrolled in student teaching; this course is required for all student teachers. The course met one evening a week and was an opportunity for students to learn more about classroom management and pedagogy under the expertise of a professor of education. In the course, students share their experiences working with their cooperating teachers and discuss current research on pedagogy. Since the researcher wanted to study the impact of Nelsonian Socratic discussion on student teachers' classroom challenges, these five participants were appropriate as a research population since they were enrolled in a course specifically designed for student-teachers and involved in their student-teaching clinical experience.

Instrument

A focus group was assembled and comprised of the research study's participants. The researcher initially opted for semi-structured individual interviews over focus groups. The semi-structured individual interviews would have garnered data on each of the research participants' perspective on engaging in a Nelsonian Socratic discussion. To the researcher this was the preferred method since it was important to understand each individual's experience with Nelson's Socratic method. Given the research participants' schedules, however, it became evident that individual interviews would not be possible. Therefore, the researcher's IRB was amended to allow for a focus group (five in total) as opposed to individual interviews. The focus group has emerged as a regularly used data collecting method in

qualitative research (Lobe & Morgan, 2021; Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014). According to Johnson and Christensen (2017), a focus group is "a group interview in which a moderator (working for the researcher) leads a discussion with a small group of individuals (e.g., students, teachers, teenagers) to examine, in detail, how the group members think and feel about a topic" (p. 238). Participants in a focus group share characteristics that are linked to the topic and share their opinions in a safe, open environment (Krueger & Casey, 2014). A focus group also allows the researcher or interviewer to collect specific and broad information in a brief period (Conway et al., 2018).

There are advantages to focus groups in a qualitative study. First, the researcher can discover the major issues and challenges to the topic being investigated; and two, focus groups can also produce needed information about the content of an educational program or the effectiveness of an intervention program (Hesse-Biber, 2017). Hennink (2014) has noted that focus groups reveal group interaction and how the experience offers different perspectives and nuanced views. Hennink (2014) also noted that data collected from focus groups can offer information otherwise not offered during individual interviews. Based on the process, the researcher felt a focus group was an appropriate and effective way to gather data. While the individual interviews would have resulted in themes based on personal experiences – an accepted and integral method in collecting data for qualitative research – the focus group interview gave the participants the opportunity to share their perspectives about the Nelsonian Socratic discussion together (Krueger & Casey, 2014). The focus group interview also resulted in the researcher learning what the major ideas and perspectives that emerged from the Nelsonian Socratic discussion were (Hesse-Biber, 2017).

To reduce bias, another professor from the same Midwestern university but from a different department facilitated the interview. The researcher had no supervisory role over the professor. Furthermore, the professor had experience facilitating group discussions.

The following questions were asked to the focus group participants; at the end of each interview question is the research question it was aligned with.

1. What ways (if any) did the general Socratic method/Nelson Socratic method workshop help your participation in the Nelson Socratic dialogue? (RQ1)
2. What ways (if any) did the discussion leader's role help in your participation in Nelson's Socratic dialogue? **(**RQ1)
3. What were your perceptions of the procedures the discussion leader performed throughout the dialogue? (RQ1)
4. What were your perceptions about the process on choosing a topic and overarching question for the Nelson Socratic dialogue? (RQ2)
5. What were your perceptions about the process in choosing the specific example for the Nelson Socratic dialogue? (RQ2)
6. What ways (if any) did Nelson's Socratic dialogue help you solve the classroom issue? **(**RQ3)
7. What were your perceptions about attempting to reach consensus when participating in Nelson's Socratic dialogue? (RQ3)
8. What ways (if any) can Nelson's Socratic dialogue help student-teachers solve the challenges they face in the classroom? (RQ3)

The second part of the data collection process was the research-participants' journal entries. Journal entries are an effective data collecting method to reflect on research topics (Annink, 2016). Hence, it was beneficial to the study for student teachers to write journal entries concerning their perceptions about a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue as an effective strategy to respond to challenges when teaching or managing classes. The journal prompt for the research-participants to answer was: As a discussant and student teacher, what are your perceptions about a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue as a strategy to find solutions to challenges in the classroom?

Design

This was a qualitative research design study. According to Hesse-Biber (2017) qualitative research "provides a point of view onto the social world whose goal is to obtain understanding of a social issue or problem that privileges subjective and multiple understandings" (p. 4). The researcher encountered "multiple understandings" of student teachers' challenges in their classrooms and their perceptions of a Nelsonian Socratic discussion. As Johnson and Christensen (2017) noted, qualitative researchers observe the world as it organically and naturally develops. For this study, the researcher observed the student-teachers' participation in Socratic discussion as it occurred naturally. The

researcher took note of verbal responses to the topic under discussion, the queries that were asked, and attempts to respond to the problem.

Nelsonian Socratic Procedures

During the January-February months of 2023, the researcher followed steps to implement a Nelsonian Socratic method approach with fidelity. First, before the Socratic dialogue was implemented, the researcher felt all participants needed a basic understanding of Socratic dialogue and Nelson's version of Socratic dialogue; therefore, all participants received instruction on both instructional strategies. The researcher then queried the participants on another day to ascertain a topic that interested them. The concept of authority was chosen based on a participant's (R1) issue with classroom management that resonated with the other participants.

Based on that topic, on another day, the researcher gave the participants a list of overarching questions they were to choose from. They were as followed:

1. How does the host teacher's authority influence the student-teacher's ability to teach students?
2. How does the host teacher's authority influence the student-teacher's ability to manage their class?
3. Are there any situations where the host teacher's authority is helpful to the student-teacher?
4. How does the host teacher's lack of authority hinder the student-teacher's classroom management?
5. How does the host teacher's imprudent use of their authority hinder the student teacher's classroom management?
6. Is the host-teacher's authority essential for the student-teacher's success in the classroom?

The research participants found question number two apropos to the challenges surrounding classroom management.

After all the preparation for the dialogue was completed, another day was set aside for the Nelsonian Socratic dialogue. At the beginning of the dialogue, the researcher asked R1 to iterate the challenge she was facing concerning the host teacher's authority. After R1 explained the challenge, the researcher articulated the overarching question, whereupon the dialogue commenced for approximately one hour. The researcher, who was the discussion leader, followed the Nelsonian idea to solely be an external analyst and not add anything regarding content during the dialogue. The researcher also, as recommended in a Nelsonian Socratic method approach, recorded each insight on a whiteboard that would possibly lead to consensus.

Data Analysis

The researcher elected to use Descriptive, Categorical, and Analytical coding to garner rich and informative data based on the focus group questions and journal prompts. According to Johnson and Christensen (2017), coding "is the process of marking segments of data (usually text data) with symbols, descriptive words, or category names." Descriptive coding is when the researcher assigns labels or "tags" to text; this type of coding organizes the data by topic. Categorical coding is where the researcher starts to group descriptive codes into general categories. With analytical coding, the researcher "captures[s] a broader range of meaning beyond describing your participant's specific activities or range of specific events" (Hesse-Biber, 2017, p. 315). This type of coding attempts to reflect participants' experiences and their identities in the experiences. The researcher felt conducting all three coding processes would offer a deeper and more intentional approach to coding the data.

Results

Based off of the study's research questions, listed below, six themes emerged from the focus group interviews: 1) Prepared and empowered, 2) Visually track, redirect, and synthesize discussion, 3), Centering student voice, 4) Choosing relevant questions and examples, 5) Generating several strategies to reach a common goal, and 6) Sense of unity.

RQ1. How does the discussion leader's role in Nelson's Socratic method approach help student-teachers reach a solution to the topic being discussed?

RQ2. What are student-teachers' perceptions of Nelson's Socratic method approach to dialogue?

RQ3. To what extent does Nelson's Socratic method approach resolve a real-world student-teacher topic that deals with pedagogical or classroom-management issues?

Research Question 1 Themes

Prepared and Empowered

Participants perceived that during the process of a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue, a feeling of solidarity and sense of working through the example collectively emerged. For instance, R2 indicated that the discussion leader let them "take the reins" and that "we were together and not bouncing all over the place." R5 echoed this sentiment and also related that all were focused on a shared objective by stating it was "extremely beneficial to know what the expectations would be and knowing that we all had a shared, common goal."

The participants found the workshop helpful in understanding the steps and stages of a Socratic discussion. For instance, R4 stated: "I felt better prepared and better understood the process of how it was going to work." R1 also felt she had "an understanding of the process related to the discussion." Specifically, participants felt prepared because the presentation included outlines and examples to further elucidate Socratic dialogue. This was reflected in R3 stating that the discussion leader "gave us examples; gave us an outline." R1 said that she "appreciated that it [the presentation] gave us an outline of what happens." Moreover, the workshop allayed the participants' fears about the upcoming dialogic experience. For instance, R5 stated there was "far less anxiety to blindly going into it." R4 agreed, stating the workshop "relieved anxiety associated with the process."

Visually Track, Redirect, and Synthesize Discussion

During the time the researcher was asking other questions, he was also writing notes, insights, and sub questions on the whiteboard. This helped the participants as they engaged in discussion. The participants indicated that the discussion leader's participation, particularly in his use of writing notes on the whiteboard, was effective in encouraging discussion. R2 stated that it was "helpful when he worded different questions." R4 appears to agree, claiming that the notes "acted as a map in that regard, and this was extremely helpful."

Discussion leaders in a Nelsonian Socratic discussion often must re-direct the discussion. This was no less true during the discussion leader's experience facilitating the discussion for this research study. Participants believed the discussion leader's facilitation was helpful. R1 stated: "He was good at re-directing us…He is good at keeping us on track and focused on the main task or idea at hand. Reduced wandering from topic or idea too far. Appreciated the stability it lent the experience." And R5 observed that the discussion leader "helped to keep us all focused in the same, and the right, direction. It helped us focus on just one example, and that was useful."

Research-participants thought the discussion leader created a sense of balance between allowing the research-participants to freely comment and ask questions and at the same time discern when to offer his own observations as to what students should reconsider or discuss based on the concrete example. This was reflected in R4, who stated: "He [the discussion leader] provided an appropriate balance of letting us do our own thing and redirecting the conversation if it had become too sidetracked. It was a healthy, effective balance."

Research Question Two Themes

Centering Student Voice

As mentioned earlier, prior to the Nelsonian dialogue, research participants were involved in choosing the overarching question and example. Research participants perceived that they were involved in the planning of the discussion. For instance, R2 stated: "We were all given a voice, that we were all given a vote to choose." R3 agreed, stating that the participant "liked that the questions were broad enough that every grade level could feel included, as if it related to them as well, and they could then participate in voicing their own opinion." R3 believed the experience helped "point out common themes which exist throughout all of our common/shared experiences." R4 "felt that it[sic] the information translated and transcended all grades to make it universally applicable. It also helped that everyone was going to be able/have the opportunity to contribute to it."

Choosing Relevant Questions and Examples

Participants thought that the several overarching questions responded to student-teachers' issues. R3 "felt that the questions were applicable in such a manner that everyone was included and could comfortably, as well as

effectively, respond, regardless of their grade level or content area." R5 liked that "all of the questions he created were very relevant to all of our teaching experiences, so that we all had examples to contribute and could do so comfortably and confidently."

Participants also believed the chosen example along with the several examples were relatable and relevant to the classroom challenges the student-teachers faced. For instance, R1 indicated: "All the examples had an overarching theme, that we could all relate to in our own way." R2 "liked that what we were talking about was directly applicable to what we are doing now. R2 also "found this relevance helped us maintain attention and focus on what we were learning." R3 stated that it "helped to point out common themes which exist throughout all of our common/shared experiences, most of which we did not even realize to begin with. In this way, it was very illuminating." In the journal entries, R2 wrote that the Nelsonian Socratic dialogue gave them "autonomy to choose" the topic for the Socratic dialogue during the preparation and work that needed to be accomplished prior to the dialogue. These data suggest that the questions that were crafted and examples presented proved to be meaningful and apropos to the research participants.

Research Question Three Themes

Generating Several Strategies to Reach a Common Goal

Participants felt that Nelson's Socratic approach offered the opportunity to work toward a common or agreed upon objective. R2 claimed that all participants tried to "reach the common goal in the end." R5 saw striving to reach consensus was an educational experience, stating: "I found the experience illuminating and enjoyed the process of attempting consensus." While participants had positive reactions trying to solve R1's classroom issue, interestingly, the disparate opinions led to challenges to finding a solution. R1 stated: "I felt that it was difficult because of differing opinions…" and "Different experiences, in particular, created a barrier to consensus." R3 noticed that "we could propose lots of ideas but were unable to see what would work for them." R4 agreed with R3, asserting: "I felt that it was more difficult because people's opinions vary so much." Despite these struggles, however, a solution to R1's issue emerged.

Regarding data from the journal entries, it was clear that, though difficult, the research-participants believed a solution to R1's challenge was attained. R3 specifically wrote in their journal that:

> As a class we talked to find a solution on how to help develop classroom management through talking and sharing our expertise. I believe that we have come up with a solution. The solution was not only one persons [sic] thoughts but the class as a whole.

R1 offered great candor on this topic: "As a student teacher who is struggling with authority and managing the class, I found the Nelsonian Socratic dialogue to be very helpful in finding solutions to some challenges we are facing."

Journal entries also indicated that participants felt they had the opportunity to ponder, discuss, and develop strategies in dealing with R1's classroom management issue. For instance, R4 wrote: "The discussion also allows for time for all participants to process information and determine their thoughts about it on their own. This provides for the opportunity to self-reflect and contribute to the discussion with personal experiences." Participants also perceived that strategies were developed to address classroom management issues when discussing R1's challenge. R2 wrote, "I found that it was helpful to generate several strategies for our daily topic. I experienced several instances where one participant would bring up a point or thought, and it lead [sic] to more ideas and suggestions." R3 wrote that the discussion "allows us to learn new approaches that we might not have thought of before."

Sense of Unity

Although there were struggles finding a solution to the example, several participants were able to find a great deal of efficacy in the experience. Indeed, R1 expressly said the following:

> It is, ultimately, a nice time to come together, talk about our experiences, and create an environment where we can relate to one another, as well as commiserate. "We're all on the struggle bus together!" This sense of unity and the understanding that my problems are, in many ways, universal, and not unique to me, is helpful.

> It is also helpful to know that there are others also developing effective strategies for solving the same issues I face. A sense of unity, overall. This was important.

This sense of unity was combined with the research-participants' comfortability with each other. For example, R2 said the experience "provided everyone the space to feel comfortable." And R3 thought the sharing of experiences led to a certain unified knowledge over classroom issues: "I enjoyed that it allowed for teachers to share their own perspectives and what they have learned/experienced in their own student teacher classrooms. This collective wisdom was both informative as well as encouraging."

Discussion

The findings for this qualitative research study indicated the Nelsonian Socratic method approach was successful in finding a solution to R1's classroom issue. A solution emerged based on one class period using the Nelsonian Socratic discussion approach, facilitated by the discussion leader and consisting of five participants. The researcher did not focus on observational data but instead focused on the comments, questions, and insights from the participants. Findings revealed that Nelson's Socratic method approach prepares discussants to effectively participate in dialogue, creates unity, fosters thinking and shared inquiry, and helps find solutions to real world issues.

For Research Question 1, the first theme noted was *Prepared and Empowered*; participants perceived the discussion leader's instruction of the Socratic method and their engagement with Nelson's version of the Socratic method prepared them for the future Nelsonian Socratic discussion. The perception of empowerment and preparation is reflected in the work of Delic and Becirovic (2016); teachers and students are responsible for developing and advancing a Socratic discussion, which enhances a common purpose and a sense of intimacy. The participants try to understand each other, collaborate, and are involved in a united effort which results in a shared understanding about the topic or question (Barnes & Payette, 2017; Brinkman et al., 2016; Hart et al., 2022). Altorf (2016) has contended that the Nelsonian Socratic approach also creates a sense of belonging due to the importance of a concrete experience as a topic and to empathize with the discussant whose experience is under discussion. The literature also indicates the importance of preparation regarding choosing the overarching question and concrete examples (Delgehausen, 2004; Saran 2004a).

Nelson's Socratic Method approach prepares discussants to effectively participate in dialogue, creates unity, fosters thinking and shared inquiry, and helps find solutions to real world issues.

The next theme for Research Question 1, *Visually Track, Redirect, and Keep Discussion Focused* emerged from participants' perceptions that the discussion leader visually noted insights and sub-questions that were helpful in keeping the discussion focused and participants informed. This perception comports with Saran's (2004b) study that detailed how students appreciated notes and observations written on a flipchart during their Nelsonian Socratic discussion. In Brinkman et al.'s (2016) study, it was observed that during the pre-dialogue stage, charting students' stories and examples on posters and then following the same practice with the chosen example added to more in-depth investigation; it helped document the process, offered visuals, and slowed the dialogue down to discuss the example adequately and carefully. Regarding participants' perceptions that the discussion leader redirected and kept the discussion focused, Heckman (2004) argued that "whenever the dialogue digresses into adjacent questions, the facilitator has to bring the group's attention back to the unfinished point. He [they] has to ensure that the group is aware which question is being discussed at the moment" (p. 110). This was supported by Knezic et al.'s (2010) study that detailed how the facilitator would be mindful to steer the discussion back to the concrete example. Moreover, Barnes and Payette (2017) have argued that the Socratic instructor must know how to use questions effectively and understand the importance of redirecting as participants grapple with the questions. Nelson's Socratic approach places stronger emphasis on notes, themes, and questions presented visually during the discussion; they assist the discussion leader in following the development of the dialogue.

For Research Question 2**,** the first theme**,** *Centering Student Voice*, as it related to the pre-dialogue in a Nelsonian Socratic approach, is reflected in the literature (Heckman, 2004; Knezic, 2013; Nelson, 1949). In Knezic et al.'s (2010) study, participants in a teacher education program discussed during the pre-dialogue stage of Nelson's Socratic approach, the conceptual understanding of what makes a person. Findings revealed that the experience led to a communal effort where all participants' voices added to the learning experience. For Brinkman et al. (2017), in the pre-dialogue stage, or what he terms the "Experience" stage, participants voice their personal stories, which enhances in-depth investigation and shared understanding among all participants. In this way, the Nelsonian Socratic approach

increases the learner-centered aspect of the instructional strategy in that it incorporates students' ideas, feedback, and responsibility for the preparation for Socratic dialogue.

The second theme, *Choosing Relevant Questions and Examples,* was also reflected in the literature. Questioning is essential to Socratic dialogue (Brinkman et al., 2017; Seton, 2021). Seton (2021) has argued that not only the facilitator, but the students can craft and develop the questions for the Socratic dialogue. Regarding the pre-dialogue stage of Nelson's Socratic approach, there is the opportunity for both the discussion leader and discussants to choose an example that reflects a lived experience as the literature indicates (Knezic, 2013; McCall, 2009; Saran & Neisser, 2004).

Research Question 3, *Generating Several Strategies to Reach a Common Goal,* is also revealed in the literature. Participants believed they were involved in a common enterprise to find a solution to a problem when engaged in the Socratic discussion. While the literature reveals that participants think and discuss in a Socratic dialogue (Chesters, 2012; Gose, 2009; Paul & Elder, 2016; Seton, 2021; Yudcovitch et al., 2014), Socratic dialogue often focuses on solving problems (Brinkman et al., 2016; Chesters, 2012; Seton, 2021; Yudcovitch et al., 2014). Raupach-Strey (2004) has noted that Socratic dialogue in the Nelsonian tradition "fosters thoroughness and allows the emergence of genuine answers and insights to genuine questions" (p. 106). Chesters (2012) claimed Socratic dialogue incorporates "evaluative" thinking. With evaluative thinking, discussants ascertain agreement or consensus on the topic or question. While participants, at times, voiced difficulty in finding a solution, a solution was eventually attained.

The second theme from Research Question 3 was *Sense of Unity*. Participants experienced collegiality and togetherness during the dialogue. Indeed, participants perceived they came together through shared inquiry over R1's classroom management issue. As detailed in the literature review on the Socratic Method, a sense of belongingness can emerge among discussants when involved in Socratic discussion (Altorf, 2016). With the assistance from the facilitator, participants understand each other's thinking and perspectives during Socratic discussion (Heckman, 2004; Williams & Zimmerman, 2022). This is no less true with the Nelsonian Socratic approach since it is considered a "cooperative group dialogue" (Saran & Neisser, 2004, p. 1), where all discussants should offer comments and ask questions (Barnes et al., 2015; Mitchell, 2006).

As indicated, Nelson's Socratic method approach intends for the example under discussion regress back to the principle that underlies the example (Kubalica, 2016). A Nelsonian Socratic method approach also attempts to arrive at truth through consensus; this is based on Nelson's own Neo-Kantian idea that truth can be attained by human understanding (Gordon, 2010; McCall, 2009). Neither did this research study explore how the dialogue regressed back to the example nor in what way truth was achieved through human understanding. Instead, the research study focused on the more pragmatic goal of finding a solution to R1's issue without addressing whether that solution was the "truth" (2004).

This resulted in a sense of unity among the participants because they were grappling with R1's example to reach a solution collectively. Consequently, educators interested in the Nelsonian Socratic approach with student-teachers do not necessarily need to concern themselves with error-free objective truth but instead strive to arrive at a solution or answer that temporally addresses the real-world issue at hand (Heckman, 2004).

There were several limitations to the study. First, based on the location of the Midwestern private university in a rural area, the findings did not apply to higher education institutions in urban areas because of differences in student populations. Second, since the researcher was not an advisor or teacher-mentor to any of the participants, there was an assumption that the participants' challenges in their student-teaching were accurate.

Implications for Practice

Participants believed participation in the Nelsonian Socratic discussion resulted in student-preparation, unity and belongingness, and problem solving. The qualitative research study revealed the instructional and programmatic implications of a Nelsonian (1949) Socratic method approach.

Instructional

The implications in this research study regarding engagement and work between the discussion leader and participants at the pre-dialogue stage were noteworthy. This approach consists of more involvement from the participants in terms of choosing the example and the crafting of the overarching question and requires the discussion leader to take on a more facilitative approach to instruction. This can improve instruction, since it fosters further learner centered pedagogy and student engagement (Burden & Byrd, 2019).

The implications of this research study to general notions of the Socratic method as an instructional strategy reminds and reintroduces the importance of a concrete example as the discussion topic. General explanations about the Socratic method often refer to a topic or concept that is under discussion (Mitchell, 2006; Paul & Elder, 2016). With a Nelsonian Socratic approach, as evidenced in this research study, the relation between questions and examples is essential. The overarching question originates from the example. The latter is the focal point of the discussion. Hence, if instructors consider implementing a Nelsonian Socratic approach with their student-teachers, they should pay particular attention to real-world examples that emanate from student-teachers' experiences in classrooms.

Lastly, while the Nelsonian approach undoubtedly centers on the concrete example, future student-teachers should also develop an understanding of the undergirding principle to the example. Hence, regressing back to principles based on an example can expose student-teachers to relevant values and beliefs in education (Williams & Zimmerman, 2022). While the dialogue should regress back to the principle, the process along with a solution to the real-world problem can be implemented in one, expeditious session even if regression back to a principle is not attained.

Education Programs

There are several implications from this study for teacher education programs. This study suggests that teacher education programs should promote and foster opportunities for student-teachers to participate in discussions with peers and professors about their teaching experiences (Wilcoxen & Lemke, 2021). With a Nelsonian Socratic method approach, student-teachers are empowered to add their voices to the development of a Nelsonian Socratic method approach by sharing examples and helping develop overarching questions. Student-teachers then engage in one student-teacher's specific problem and strive to find a solution based on that problem. The student teacher formally seeks advice from fellow student-teachers about the challenging classroom situation as opposed to the professor or director of the student-teaching program solely offering a suggestion or solution. Student-teachers take on a Socratic role since they help each other flush out ideas, craft well developed questions, and challenge assumptions. As the discussion leader, the professor observes the dynamics of the dialogue, points out major themes, and writes questions visually on a board for participants to read, and when necessary, redirects the discussion. Teacher education programs that adopt this nuanced Socratic method advocate for student voice, peer support, and empowerment. They can offer student-teachers opportunities to vigorously engage in their own learning and advocate for themselves when problems emerge during their teaching.

It should be noted that while this research study occurred in a student-teacher classroom setting, the findings may reflect the practicality of the Nelsonian Socratic method approach to a variety of course subject areas provided that explicit parts of the process are followed; these would include the selection of a real-world example, an overarching question, and appropriate facilitation from discussion leader.

Conclusion

This research study adds to the literature on how discussion oriented instructional strategies impact student-teachers' judgments concerning classroom management during teaching experiences. By investigating a particular approach to Socratic discussion advanced by the Neo-Kantian philosopher, Leonard Nelson, the study revealed that a solution to a real-world problem can be achieved through consensus. Findings also indicated that participants thought the nuanced Socratic method approach offered an effective process of implementing and preparing for a Nelsonian Socratic dialogue. Participants also perceived that the discussion leader's role in facilitating the discussion as an external analyst was efficacious because participants could view the notes on the whiteboard and follow his suggestions on re-directing the discussion. Lastly, participants perceived their experience created unity, collaboration, and robust goal-oriented discussions.

This study provides evidence that teacher education programs should consider a Nelsonian Socratic method approach to enhance learner centered instruction, group participation among student-teachers, and solution-oriented dialogic experiences. Furthermore, the rich discussions stemming from real-world examples and overarching questions would resonate with future educators as they regularly confront and respond to real-world classroom challenges that call for prudent decision-making.

References

Abrams, J. R. (2015). Reframing the Socratic method. *Journal of Legal Education*, *64*(4), 562-585. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24716713

Adler, M. J. (1998). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. Simon & Schuster.

Acim, R. (2018). The Socratic method of instruction: An experience with a reading comprehension course. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *8*(1), 41-53. doi: 10.5590/JERAP.2018.08.1.04

Altorf, H. M. (2016). Dialogue and discussion: Reflections on a Socratic method. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 18*(1), 60-75. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022216670607

Annink, A. (2016). Using the research journal during qualitative data collection in a cross-cultural context. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2015-0063

Avdic, A., Wissa, U. A., & Hatakka, M. (2016). *Socratic flipped classroom: What types of questions and tasks promote learning?* Academic Conferences International Limited, 41-48. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:151813555

Barnes, J., Tallent, R., & Stoll, S. (2015). The art of critical thinking through a pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *5*(8). 10-14. http://www.ijhssnet.com

Bhattacharya, A. (2022). Preparing teacher candidates to teach in secondary schools through Socratic case-based approaches. In F. Giuseffi (Ed.), *Enhancing teaching and learning with socratic educational strategies* (pp. 74-104). IGI Global.

Benson, H. H. (2011). Socratic method. In D. R. Morrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Socrates* (pp. 179-200). Cambridge University Press.

Brinkmann, J., Lindemann, B., & Sims, R. R. (2016). Voicing moral concerns: Yes, but how? The use of Socratic dialogue methodology. *Journal of Business Ethics, 139*(3), 619-631. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44164245

Buchanon, L. (2012). Creating critical conversations: Investigating the utility of Socratic dialogues in elementary social studies methods. *Teacher Education and Practice*, *25*(2), 221-234. http://rowman.com/Page/Journals

Burden, P. R. & Byrd, D. M. (2019). *Methods for effective teaching: Meeting the needs of all students* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Candiotto, L. (2015). Aporetic state and extended emotions: The shameful recognition of contradictions in the Socratic elenchus. *Ethics & Politics*. *17*(2). https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/aporetic-state-and-extended-emotions-the-shameful-recognition-of-

Candiotto, L. (2017). Socratic dialogue faces the history: Dialogical inquiry as philosophically and politically engaged way of life. *Culture and Dialogue*, *5*, 157-172. doi: 10.1163/24683949-12340031

Chesters, S. D. (2012). *The Socratic classroom: Reflective thinking through collaborative inquiry*. Sense Publishers.

Clark, J. (2022). Socrates, the "What is f-ness?" question, and the priority of definition. *Archiv fur Geschichte der Philosophie*, *104*(4), 597-632. https://doi.org/10.1515/agph-2020-0125

Conway, G., Doherty, E., & Carcary, M. (2018). Evaluation of a focus group approach to developing a survey instrument. *Proceedings of the European Conference on Research Methods for Business & Management Studies*, 92–98.

Cooper, J. M. (1997). *Plato: Complete dialogues*. Hackett Publishing Company.

Delgehausen, I. (2004). Experiences with Socratic dialogue in primary schools. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education* (pp. 41-46). Trentham Books.

Delic, H., & Becirovic, S. (2016). Socratic method as an approach to teaching. *European Researcher*, *111*(10), 511-517. doi: 10.13187/er.2016.111.511

Frojan-Parga, M. X., Calero-Elvira, A., & Montano-Fidalgo, M. (2011). Study of the Socratic method during cognitive restructuring, *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, *18*, 110-123. doi: 10.1002/cpp.676

Fullam, J. (2015). Listen then, or, rather, answer: Contemporary challenges to Socratic education. *Educational Theory*. *65*(1). 53-71. doi: 10.1111/edth.12095

Giuseffi, F. (2021). *How the Socratic method engenders authentic educational experiences*. Lexington Books.

Gordon, P. E. (2010). *Continental divide: Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos*. Harvard University Press.

Gose, M. (2009). When Socratic dialogue is flagging: Questions and strategies for engaging students. *College Teaching*, *57*(1), 45-49. https://www.jstor.org/stable/i25763352

Hanna, R. (2023, March 8). *What can Kantian philosophy do for humanity? From Leonard Nelson to phildialogues*. [Paper presentation]. 12th Kant-Readings International Conference. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316106007

Hart, A. C., Blevins, B., & Smith, J. (2022). She is fierce: Examining female voice and Socratic seminar. In F. G. Giuseffi (Ed.), *Enhancing teaching and learning with Socratic educational strategies* (pp.1-25). IGI Global.

Heckman, G. (2004). Six pedagogical measures and Socratic facilitation. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education*. (pp. 107-120). Trentham Books.

Hennink, M. M. (2014). *Focus group discussions*. Oxford University Press.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2017). *The practice of qualitative research* (3rd ed). Sage.

Hlinak, M. (2014). The Socratic method 2.0. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, *31*(1), 1-20. doi: 10.1111/jlse.12007

Huang, A., Klein, M., & Beck, A. (2023). An exploration of teacher learning through reflection from a sociocultural and dialogical perspective: Professional dialogue or professional monologue? *Professional Development in Education*, *49*(2), 357-367. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1787192

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage.

Kazen, M., & McNaught, C. (2020). Using group discussion and reflection for developing student-teacher autonomy. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*. *21*(1), 1-12. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1241238.pdf

Knezic, D. (2013). Teachers' education in Socratic dialogue: Some effects on teacher-learner interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(2), 490–505. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43651651

Knezic, D., Wubbels, T., Elbers, E., & Hajer, M. (2010). The Socratic dialogue and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 1104-1111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.006

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2014). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Kubalica, T. (2016). The polemic between Leonard Nelson and Ernst Cassirer on the critical method in philosophy. *Folia Philosophica, 35,* 53-69. https://journals.us.edu.pl/index.php/FOLIA/article/view/4346

Kumar, A., & Downey, A. M. (2018). Teaching as meditative inquiry: A dialogical exploration. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies, 16*(2), 52-75. https://doi-org.wwu.idm.oclc.org/10.25071/1916-4467.40339

Leigh, F. (2020). Self-knowledge, elenchus and authority in early Plato. *Phronesis*, *65*(3), 247-280. https://www-jstor-org.wwu.idm.oclc.org/stable/26952097

Lipman, M. (2012). *Thinking in education* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511840272

Lobe, B., & Morgan, D. L. (2021). Assessing the effectiveness of video-based interviewing: A systematic comparison of video-conferencing based dyadic interviews and focus groups. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *24*(3), 301–312. https://doi-org.wwu.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1785763

Matthews, G. B. (2021). Whatever became of the Socratic elenchus? In M. R. Gregory & M. J. Laverty (Eds.), *The child's philosopher* (pp. 151-161). Routledge.

McCall, C. C. (2009). *Transforming thinking: Philosophical inquiry in the primary and secondary classroom*. Routledge.

Mintz, A. I. (2018). The Socratic method: Plato's legacy in pedagogy. In A. I. Mintz (Ed.), *Plato: Images, aims, and practices of education* (pp. 41-53). Springer.

Nelson, L. (1949). *Socratic method and critical philosophy* (T. K. Brown, Trans.). Kessenger Legacy Reprints. (Original work published 1922).

Overholser, J. C. (2019). *The Socratic method of psychotherapy*. Columbia University Press.

Paseka, A., Hinzske, J.-H., & Boldt, V.-P. (2023). Learning through perplexities in inquiry-based learning settings in teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2023.2266379

Paul, R., & Binker, A. J. (1990). *Critical thinking: What every person needs in a rapidly changing world.* Sonoma State University.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2016). *The thinker's guide to the art of Socratic questioning*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers / The Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Peeples, S. (2019). *Think like Socrates: Using questions to invite wonder and empathy in the classroom, grades 4-12.* Corwin.

Politis, V. (2018). Aporia and sceptical argument in Plato's early dialogues. In G. Karamanolis, & V. Politis (Eds.), *The Aporetic Tradition in Ancient Philosophy* (pp. 48-66). Cambridge University Press.

Rapanta, C. (2018). Potentially argumentative teaching strategies – And how to empower them. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *52*(3), 451-464. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12304

Rapuach-Strey, G. (2004). The Socratic approach at school level: Four models. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education* (pp. 93-106). Trentham Books.

Roberts, S. J., & Ryrie, A. (2014). Socratic case method teaching in sports coach education: Reflections of students and course tutors. *Sport, Education and Society*, *19*(1), 63-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.632626

Saran, R. (2004a). Socratic dialogue: My first experience. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education* (pp. 47-52). Trentham Books.

Saran, R. (2004b). Experiences with Socratic dialogue in secondary schools. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education* (pp. 53-70). Trentham Books.

Saran, R. & Neisser, B. (2004). Introduction. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring minds: Socratic dialogue in education* (pp. 1-8). Trentham Books.

Sibold, W. (2017). *Enhancing critical thinking through class discussion: A guide for using discussion-based pedagogy*. University of Calgary, Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning. https://taylorinstitute.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/discussion%20based%20learning%20TI%20guide_final.pdf

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (2014). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Virtanen, A., & Houni, P. (2021). Nelsonian Socratic dialogue and ethical practice. *Philosophical Practice: Journal of the American Philosophical Practitioners Association*, *16*(3), 2776-2787.

Wilcoxen, C. L., & Lemke, J. (2021). Preservice teachers' perceptions of feedback: The importance of timing, purpose, and delivery. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *18*(8), 1-27. https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol18/iss8/14

Williams, T. R., & Zimmerman, M. G. (2022). Using the Socratic method to change your lens. In F. Giuseffi (Ed.), *Enhancing teaching and learning with Socratic educational strategies* (pp. 26-48). IGI Global.

Witherspoon, M, Sykes, G, & Bell, C. (2016). *Leading a classroom discussion: Definition, supporting evidence, and measurement of the ETS national observational teaching examination (NOTE) assessment series.* ETS. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570574.pdf

Yudcovitch, L., & Hayes, J. R., (2014). Case-based student performance: Socratic method vs. passive presentation. *Optometric Education*, *40*(1), 37-43. https://journal.opted.org/articles/Volume40_Number 1_Fall2014-Article3.pdf

Dr. Francesco Giuseffi is an Assistant Professor of Education and Chair of Doctoral Studies at William Woods University in Fulton, Missouri. He is the author of *How the Socratic Method Engenders Authentic Educational Experiences* (2021). Dr. Giuseffi holds undergraduate degrees from the University of Central Missouri, a Master's degree in Liberal Arts from St. John's College, a Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction from William Woods University, and a Doctorate in Education from Lindenwood University. Dr. Giuseffi was awarded the Lighthouse Consulting Doctor of Education in Administration Award for his dissertation.