TEACHER'S ROLE AND ATTITUDE DURING SOCRATIC CONVERSATIONS FOR MORAL EDUCATION AT HIGH SCHOOL

Patrīcija M. Keiša, Manuel J. Fernández González

University of Latvia, Latvia

ABSTRACT

It is important to address moral education in the context of human freedom, authenticity, and self-inquiry. Following the developmental needs of adolescents and young adults, moral education at high school should provide a social environment to address authentic identity search and inquiry upon existential questions by facilitating reflection about students' own life experiences together with peers. A conceptual model of Socratic conversation as a method for moral education in high school was elaborated by the authors. This research addresses the role and attitude of a teacher in the practical implementation of such model. To explore the opinions of educational actors, a Socratic conversation intervention (four high school students and a researcher-facilitator), expert interviews (a teacher and a youth psychotherapist) and focus group discussion (five young adults working with youth) were organized in spring 2022 in Latvia. The results point to the fact that, for leading Socratic conversations, teachers should act as facilitators who have a personal interest in the topic and method, and who simultaneously allow space for the students to form and express their own opinions before revealing the teacher's own views in the discussion. This can be an even more demanding job than a traditional teacher's role, requiring teachers to tolerate a higher degree of uncertainty. Thus, teachers need adequate support, which could include first experiencing a Socratic conversation as participants beforehand. This research provides a significant contribution for understanding teachers' role during Socratic conversations with high school students, and points to ways of supporting teachers using this method to the benefit of both students and teachers.

Keywords: high school, moral education, Socratic conversation, teacher role, dialogical teaching, philosophical inquiry, pedagogy of freedom, existential questions

Introduction

It is important to address moral education in the context of human freedom and authenticity. The OECD report on values-education urges to "ask ourselves about what it is to be a human" and "support students to … find a sense of purpose with their own moral compass" (OECD,

2021, Executive summary). The report also underlines that values cannot be "directly taught" and recommends integrating student experiences to develop their authentic values:

> It is of utmost importance to create a safe environment where students can speak about their true selves. In other words, their voices should be authentic, not assumed voices in which students consciously or unconsciously assume what they should say in accordance with what their teachers or parents or friends think. (OECD, 2021, Chapter 5)

Taking this approach to school, values-education would promote "a sense of ownership of their own life" in students (OECD, 2021, Chapter 5).

Such an approach relates to moral education as existential self-inquiry. The philosophy and pedagogy of existentialism offers a way to look at human development, at each person's unique journey in this world in order to take the responsibility to live according to his/her own values (Rumianowska, 2020). For a free individual, moral questions about how to live one's life are at the same time existential questions. Writing about moral education and identity, Lawrence Splitter (2019) argues that questions such as "Who am I?", "What matters?", "In what kind of a world do I want to live?" carry importance for a person's identity and the potential for a meaningful life. Moral identity might also be the missing link in the morality-action gap (Hardy & Carlo, 2011). Yet, while being an individual matter, identity is created also socially (Lapsley, 2010). Therefore, Splitter calls for an educational environment where existential questions could be discussed openly among youth (2019). Agnieszka Rumianowska (2020) equally argues that moral education should consist of conversation and self-reflection about existential life questions. UNESCO guidelines for education also underline the importance of philosophical thinking (Goucha, 2007) and the individual learning within a dialogical group context (ICFE, 2021).

From a developmental perspective, identity search and existential questions become of importance in high school, which marks the transition from late adolescence (15–18) to young adulthood (19–29) and aims towards psychological separation-individuation (Zimmer-Gembeck & Collins, 2003; Kroger, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2013; Lapsley & Woodbury, 2014; Padilla-Walker, 2014). Therefore, it is of importance to develop moral education in high school in a way that would provide an environment to address identity search and existential questions by helping students to reflect on their own life experiences together with peers.

In the Latvian context, moral education became topical since the 2015 amendments to Article 10 of the Law of education, which clarified the contents of moral education (Saeima of the Republic of Latvia, 1998). Moral education is integrated into the education reform "Skola2030" (2019), which describes the virtues and values as forming the framework for the

curriculum. Specifically, this reform encourages the search for a moral education approach that simultaneously encourages the authentic construction and respect of one's own values, the evaluation of concrete situations, self-reflection, conversation, listening to different points of view and empathy. However, "Skola2030" does not offer a concrete solution for promoting values, virtues and habits at school. Thus, there is a necessity for practical approaches to moral education and for supporting teachers in its implementation.

For answering to this challenge, in winter 2021–2022, the authors elaborated a conceptual model for Socratic conversation for moral education at high school, based on literature analysis. The first author had taken part in a Socratic conversation herself as a student, and this largely inspired her to initiate this research. The conceptual model was intended to provide guidance to teachers for organizing Socratic conversations at school. It contains the main principles and steps for a Socratic conversation, guidelines for choosing questions and examples for analysis, as well as a conceptualization of the teacher's role and attitude, which is the focus of this article. The model was scientifically grounded, and its adequacy for practical implementation of moral education in high school was tested empirically in April-May 2022.

In this article, the conceptual background of the model is shortly presented, with an emphasis on the teacher's role and attitude. Then the methodology and results of the empirical research regarding the validation of the conceptualization of the teacher's role are presented.

Conceptual background

The conceptual model was elaborated based on theoretical insights from developmental psychology, existential philosophy and dialogic pedagogy. The developmental necessity for freedom through identity search and authenticity connects to existential philosophy, and existentialism connects to a pedagogy of dialogue. One of the pioneers in this direction is the critical pedagogue Paulo Freire who holds that dialogue is "the essence of education as the practice of freedom" (2014, p. 8). Dialogic pedagogy promotes the idea that the individual learns about him/herself and the world through inquiry together with others (Sarid, 2012; Howe & Abedin, 2013; Altorf, 2019). There are many variations to dialogic pedagogy, but most draw on the historical character of Socrates and his way of philosophically questioning his fellow citizens un everyday life (Platons [Plato], 1997; Pihlgren, 2008; Chesters, 2012; Worley, 2021). The conceptual model analyzed in this research proposes the Socratic conversation method put forth by Leonard Nelson in the 1920s, because it takes real examples from

the students' lives as the basis for philosophical analysis (2004). That way, moral education maintains a link between philosophizing and living, and students are encouraged to connect their own particular daily lives with philosophical questions, ideas, value judgements.

As regards the teacher's role and attitude, the model synthetizes the ideas of Rene Saran and Barbara Neisser, (2004), Gustav Heckmann (2004) and Leonard Nelson (2004), presenting the teacher as a facilitator whose role in a Socratic conversation consists of:

1. Organizing and structuring the conversation: S/he introduces the students to the concept, method and its steps, guides the conversation, fixes the main ideas in a blackboard or similar for further joint discussion.

2. Remaining content neutral: this differs from the traditional teacher's role where the teacher is acting as an expert; the facilitator withholds her/his own opinion and is dedicated to helping the students think independently, develop and express their own opinions.

3. Balancing between the concrete and the abstract: reminding students to ground philosophical ideas in concrete examples and analyze concrete examples through the prism of the philosophical question at hand.

4. Keeping the focus on the question: making sure the conversation does not sidetrack too much and stays on the philosophical question that was initially asked, lest the question needs to be collectively reexamined and reformulated.

5. Helping gain a common understanding: ensure the students are understanding one another as best as possible, paraphrasing and asking questions.

6. Encouraging reflection about the conversation: not only at the end of the conversation, but whenever necessary to take a look at the conversation itself, how it is going, how is everyone feeling about it, what could be improved.

Empirical research was conducted to check the practical validity of this conceptualization of the teacher's role. The question guiding the research presented in this article was: what should be the role and attitude of the teacher during Socratic conversations for moral education in high school, according to educational actors?

Methodology

The study was designed as a qualitative research exploring participants' perceptions of teacher's role during a Socratic conversation. Results are therefore not generalizable, but they provide useful insights regarding

teacher's role in the practical implementation of such method and point to practical future research directions.

Data collection

For answering the research question through the perspective of diverse educational actors, data was gathered using multiple methods: 1) the opinions of high school students and a researcher-facilitator were collected after a Socratic conversation intervention (quasi-action-research approach), using group reflection, an online questionnaire and facilitator's self-reflection; 2) two semi-structured interviews with experts (a teacher and a youth psychotherapist); 3) a focus group discussion with young adults working in education/youth work.

Socratic conversation intervention

To research the conceptual model from high school students' perspective as well as from teacher-facilitator's perspective, a Socratic conversation was organized. For recruiting participants, information about the possibility of participating in a philosophical conversation about one of the five possible questions proposed by the researcher was spread among high school students from a school in Riga, which was chosen for convenience reasons. Four high school students (age: 18–19; two girls, two boys) voluntarily participated in the discussion about "What does it mean to be free?" At the end of the Socratic conversation, students' opinions about the method used were gathered through a group reflection. They also provided individual written open reflections, answering to an online questionnaire one to two days after the conversation. Both reflections (oral and online) were guided by questions, one of which related to the teacher's role.

In addition, in line with engaged-scholarship and action research (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014), one of the researchers facilitated the conversation and wrote a reflection about it. This approach also relates to existentialism and Paulo Freire's philosophy of conscientization, action and reflection (Feldman, 2009; Freire, 2014). It allowed to gain first-hand experience about the praxis of the conceptual model from a teacher's perspective.

Expert interviews

Expert interviews were chosen as a fitting method for this exploratory research project because it allows gathering practice-based in-depth opinions effectively and with relatively little data (Flick, 2018). Two experts were interviewed. The first one, Nils, a youth psychotherapist, was selected because philosophical questions are related to identity development and mental health and because in-depth group conversations require psychological

insight into group dynamics. The second one, Daiga, a high school literature teacher, was selected because her use of conversation-based pedagogical approach and because literature lessons can be easily connected to Socratic conversations.

The semi-structured interviews, among other topics, addressed the teacher's role and attitude. The experts were introduced to the Socratic conversation conceptual model, receiving it by email before the interviews, and then were interviewed in online video-calls which lasted in average 45 minutes. Interviews were recorded and transcribed for further content analysis.

Focus group

A focus group with young adults working in education (schoolteachers or tutoring) or in youth work (youth psychological support center) was organized. This approach was chosen to represent an opinion that fills out a gap between high school students and experts/teachers. Young adults can reflect about the high school experience both from a youth and an adult perspective, employing simultaneously recent enough insight and a distance that allows for reflection. The focus group approach was chosen to collectively inquire about the conditions, values and opportunities to act, in order to produce knowledge that is larger than the sum of its parts, which is in line with critical pedagogy and action research (Liamputtong, 2011).

Five young adults (age: 25-28) who work in education/with youth voluntarily agreed to participate in the focus group discussion after receiving information about it through a public post in social media and through personal contacts. The discussion was facilitated by one of the researchers who is in the same age group. It lasted two hours and it was audio-taped and transcribed for further content analysis.

Data analysis

All data (apart from researcher-facilitator reflection, which was written directly) were analyzed through qualitative content analysis in the MAXQDA software. The unit of analysis was taken to be a unit of meaning according to the natural narrative of the respondent: sometimes one idea was told in a few words or a sentence, sometimes a whole paragraph was needed to explain a thought. The data were coded using the interview questions as a deductive frame, at the same time allowing for an inductive introduction of new themes, categories, and subcategories. The data used for this article were gathered under the general category "teacher's role". The reports for each method were written to recreate a natural flow from the respondent's opinions. The students' opinions were represented by combining the group

and individual reflections in one narrative. The experts' opinions were written for each expert separately in order to represent their expertise in different fields. The focus group was written as one report according to the interactive nature of a discussion.

Results

This section summarizes the views of each respondent group regarding teacher's role and attitude during a Socratic conversation and confronts these opinions with the conceptualization of the teacher's role presented at the end of the section 'conceptual background'.

Socratic intervention: Students' opinions about teacher's role

Speaking of the teacher's role and attitude in a Socratic conversation, the students put an emphasis on open-mindedness, respect, and structure. The teacher should be with diverse interests and ready to truly engage in discussion. It matters that the teacher is understanding, patient and able to "value the students' opinion regardless of their age". The teacher should perceive all students as equal conversation partners. The teacher should not be authoritarian but should have authority in the sense that s/he leads the conversation: makes sure it stays focused on the question, helps generate ideas if students are stuck, can solve conflicts if they arise and leads the conversation to some logical conclusion. In relation to this, the students said that it was helpful that the facilitator was constantly noting down the structure and the keywords of the conversation on the flipchart.

These students' opinions largely match the guidelines for teachers developed in the conceptual model. A difference is that students did not make direct mention of the necessity for the teacher to remain neutral – it is simply important that s/he listens to and respects the students' opinion. A new dimension that has not been directly emphasized in the conceptual model was the teacher's personality – being well-rounded and open-minded. Students also suggested that it would be important for the teacher to have participated in a Socratic conversation in order to be able to better facilitate it.

Socratic intervention: Facilitator's (First author) reflection about teacher's role

A convincing reason that I found in literature (Saran & Neisser, 2004) for the teacher being a neutral facilitator and not sharing his/her opinion was that it is in fact a very difficult task for one person to organize, lead, note down the conversation and simultaneously contribute to the conversation with his/her experience, opinion. After this experience of facilitating

a Socratic conversation, I can strongly agree with this idea. Guiding the conversation, stopping sidetracking from the main question, following each thread of ideas, and jotting it down on the flipchart and at the same time generating questions to deepen the conversation – all of this made for a very demanding job. While I was making notes, I sometimes missed an idea. At times I had to physically turn my back on the students, and during these moments I felt like I was not fully engaged in the conversation, because I could not observe their facial expressions and react with mine. I also felt like perhaps my notes are not structured enough and were not sure if they were in fact helpful for the students, since I did not have a particular system. I would like to look into some note-taking methods that could make this process more structured. Yet, to my surprise, during reflection, the students said my work on the flipchart had helped them a lot.

As I suspected, it was difficult to move to the conclusion of the conversation. I felt that if I pushed it more, I would inevitably direct the conversation according to my own ideas. Trying to avoid this, I mainly used this approach to try to move towards some general answers: catching a keyword from what a student is saying, repeating it, writing it down and asking deeper questions about it. For example, a student mentioned emotions, and I offered to name emotions that they associate with freedom, and then to compare with emotions that are associated with a lack of freedom. That way, we ended up with two comparative lists of emotions for an answer.

In relation to the teacher neutrality, I must admit that I was not fully neutral, and I had to actively stop myself from putting my own ideas of freedom in the students' heads. For example, when naming emotions that describe freedom, students were naming positive emotions such as joy, happiness, and I was biting my tongue not to *tell* them that freedom could also produce negative or at least complex emotions. But I refrained from saying it directly, and, in the end, when comparing our main example analysis to the rest of the examples that students had given, the students themselves came up with the thought that freedom of choice can lead to anxiety and confusion. Then I allowed myself to emphasize this idea and add these emotions to our initial list.

Now, reflecting on the teacher neutrality, I think that perhaps, similarly as in academic research, it should be about awareness of one's own standing rather than self-erasure. The guideline of neutrality is helpful in the sense that in everyday life we tend to not be so aware about our opinions and it is difficult to see beyond them. Hence, as I see it, the neutrality guideline is not asking for the impossible – for the teacher to be an emotionally detached, estranged, mechanical conversation facilitator – but rather for the teacher to be more aware of his/her presumptions and inclinations, in

order to be able to put them aside for a while to allow for the students to freely and fully develop their own ideas.

Overall, this conversation for me had a similar emotional impact as for the students. They described it as a stimulating, "fun activity", after which their minds were buzzing with many different thoughts. At the same time, it was indeed tiring for all of us, and generated a necessity to put deep thinking aside for a while and rest.

Teacher's role according to experts: Youth psychotherapist interview

In relation to the teacher's role and attitude, the youth psychotherapist Nils emphasized three main aspects: the problematic idea of neutrality, the importance of personality and group management skills. He was critical of the idea of the teacher neutrality as such. First, it seems in itself impossible – even if a teacher would try to facilitate a conversation "robotically", s/he would not succeed because people always reveal their own views through micro movements, intonations. Even a therapist is not neutral in their job. Second, a teacher's neutrality does not even seem desirable because young people need role models, positive authority figures who can show by example how it is possible to think about these big life questions. Nils also admitted that personally he sees this striving for teacher neutrality as associated with overly capitalistic worldview where "the teacher becomes like a shop assistant" and which is not a "good approach to raising a human being" (here a parallel with Freire's critique of banking education can be seen). For him, there was not necessarily a contradiction between giving space for students' opinion and not hiding the teacher's personal stance. He sees that instead of "artificial neutrality" a better way to approach this would be for the teacher to reveal their position and the thinking process that leads to it.

Thinking about what the teacher would need in order to successfully take the role of an open-minded facilitator, Nils emphasized that the teacher's personality is of utmost importance. If it matters for the teacher to hear out opposing views and think deeply about difficult questions in personal life, then it will also show in the teaching process, and they will succeed at facilitating a Socratic conversation. On the contrary, if these are not important values to the teacher, then it is unlikely this can be learnt as a skill. To high school students the authenticity of the teacher truly matters, so the teacher should believe in the meaningfulness of the method. Therefore, there will be teachers whose personality matches the Socratic conversation as well as ones whose does not and hence they should not practice it.

While the teacher's personality plays the larger role, Nils said there are skills that can be acquired to better facilitate a Socratic conversation, the

main one being group management. What holds any group together is its structure, rules and how the facilitator presents them, including how s/he reacts if they are not followed. Group management also includes the skill to react in non-standard situations. One should also be mindful that group work always happens on two levels: that of each individual participant and that of the group as a whole. To better understand group dynamics in a Socratic conversation it is important for the teacher to have experienced such a conversation as a participant. The expert also suggested that perhaps the conversation could be led by two teachers. Another necessary skill to be learnt is to provide empathetic support and feedback to a young person who has shared a difficult experience or realized something important about themselves as a result of the conversation.

Teacher's role according to experts:
High school literature teacher interview

Daiga emphasized the importance of both the students and teachers being interested instead of simply doing a task for its own sake. For her as a teacher, during class conversations it truly matters to find her own authentic interest in the topic: "I feel genuine joy, if [during a lesson] something opens up within me and we get to a question that is important to me."

In relation to her role in the literature class, she described herself as a moderator. Daiga does not plan out the direction of the discussion, she asks the first question and "all the next ones are born out of what students say". In order to facilitate class discussion like this, it is important to listen very carefully to what students say, often ask them "did I understand correctly, could you explain it in other words?" In this process of listening and questioning, Daiga draws from her experience in journalism and doing Philosophy with Children (PwC). In relation to whether she sees herself as taking a neutral position in class, she said: "I don't know if I'm neutral or not, but I never know where the conversation will lead. I don't have the answers." At the same time, it also happens to her to start leading students in a particular direction, since working with some literary works for several years, one develops a sense of "having separated the wheat from the chaff, and you want to get to that same wheat with every class". It is exactly why it matters that students can object to the teacher's interpretation: "I really like when at last somebody says – but, no, listen, this is no wheat that you have found, (laughs), this is actually just chaff." In this way, students confuse the teacher and push her to return to truly think about the topic together with them. Daiga summarized that admitting her lack of absolute knowledge and being open to thinking is an important part of her work: "I don't know, if I had to write lesson plans where I predict the answers… (laughs) I would quit school that very day. I do not possess the right answers."

She connected this open-mindedness with a never-ending desire and need to keep learning. It matters for a teacher: "If I stop developing, I cannot continue my work." Awareness about how little she knows and how much can still be learnt is empowering on a personal level, because to always learn is to "keep my inner core strong". Daiga said that she keeps changing as a person and her approaches to teaching also change. She is in perpetual state of reflection about what she could do better, then tries it out, then reflects again. In this process, it matters for her to take the students' opinion into account. In order to genuinely teach and learn at the same time, it is important to find one's own particular approach, to engage creatively and authentically in the process. However, Daiga admitted that it can be difficult: "Being a teacher is a mass profession, and most teachers cannot spend as much time on this as I can. They have demanding personal lives ... They physically cannot manage. And hence the teacher should be able to find quality, ready-made lesson materials."

Overall, the expert sees that it is important for teachers to experience anew the joy of conversing and learning, so she suggested first organizing Socratic conversations for teachers: "They should feel, renew their joy to speak, to search, to listen, to get lost... to feel the liveliness of what it means to think. Otherwise, everything becomes passive."

Teacher's role in the focus group discussion with young adults

During the discussion, the young adults gave the teacher's role and attitude utmost importance. In order to lead a conversation, the teacher needs "very high emotional intelligence" and the skill to react to diverse situations, "as in to understand even from the blink of an eye when it is necessary to change the topic or ground someone". At the same time, the teacher needs to be interested in a Socratic conversation, "it should be done by teachers who want to facilitate it and understand the principles" and who are able to generate interest in the students. There can be situations where the teacher wants to talk about questions that matter to the students, but the students are not open to share because they are not used to such an openness. Hence, it is important to build friendly relationships with the students in day-to-day life, but that is difficult to achieve with everyone. Some of the participants shared that they have had literature and philosophy teachers who promoted a friendly environment for deep conversation, and these class experiences inspired them to seek and create opportunities to have deep discussions with peers also after graduation.

In relation to the teacher's position in the conversation "it would be good if the teacher didn't have answers to the question discussed, for example, if we ask: "what is courage?" it would be silly if the teacher was trying to lead everyone to one right answer". Meanwhile, the teacher needs to be able to

structure the conversation, "keep it within a logical frame". The structure of the conversation is also important so that students do not get the impression that it is "just some chit-chat" not to be taken seriously. It is important for the teacher to be aware of his/her emotions and keep emotional boundaries. For example, one of the young adults who is a teacher has participated in a supervision group, where he has understood that "a teacher can be angry" but should be open about the reasons behind the anger. Another participant noted that truly listening to the students' problems and emotions can be a heavy task: "I come home, and I really think about them, I worry, I haven't cried yet but have been close to it. Compassion can get you trapped." One of the participants concluded that this job "seems even more complex after this discussion". For him, "listening to all those nuances and thinking again what it was like to be in high school… [it seems] there are so many unknown influences" which make it "difficult to predict all that can happen during such a conversation and how one should act to be able to facilitate it well".

The participants noted that also our focus group discussion itself, which touched upon philosophical questions about the purpose of education as well as practical issues, was a much-needed reflection for them as teachers and youth workers. Otherwise, "there is so much work and so little time to even think about what it is I actually do as a teacher".

Conclusions

1. The analysis of all the opinions about the teacher's role and attitude in a Socratic conversation showed that, while it differs from a traditional teacher's role, it is nevertheless highly demanding. Perhaps even more so because there is no ready-made content to be taught but only a structure than can be filled with anything that the students share. There are many requirements for the teacher such as high emotional intelligence and complex group management skills. Leading a Socratic conversation is cognitively, emotionally and physically demanding, to which note-taking only adds. A possible solution for alleviating the workload would be to count on a teaching assistant during the conversation.

2. While facilitating a Socratic conversation would require a lot of skill and effort from the teacher, all respondent groups emphasized how important it is for the teacher to have an authentic interest in the process and to gain something out of it. Certain teacher personality types would be more suited for such a method and thus would succeed better at facilitating it. Hence, Socratic conversation is maybe not for all teachers, but rather for those who are in themselves more inclined to open-mindedness and open-ended questioning and have the potential to personally enjoying such conversation.

3. It is also necessary to provide such teachers with adequate support that enables them to facilitate Socratic conversations. While a more detailed step-by-step instruction for facilitating a conversation would be useful, it seems implausible that all possible aspects and directions of a conversation, which can lead anywhere, could be covered in teacher guidelines. Thus, the teachers should be able to tolerate a higher degree of unpredictability and freedom than in a traditional teacher role. One way to support them in developing such an attitude would be to organize Socratic conversations for teachers themselves.

4. Teachers could benefit of participating in a Socratic conversation themselves beforehand. It could help them better understand the method as participants and observe how to facilitate a conversation skillfully, e. g., how to balance between keeping structure and allowing for students' freedom of expression. Moreover, teachers themselves may *need* such conversations to enrich themselves by experiencing the joy of thinking, speaking, and sharing with colleagues.

5. As regards teacher neutrality when facilitating a Socratic conversation, it seems that this should not be taken as literal neutrality aiming to erase the teacher's personality, because it is unattainable and also because the teacher's personality plays an important role. Rather, this guideline can point to the necessity to be aware of one's own positions and the reasoning behind them and withhold them at times in order to make space for the students to develop their own ideas.

Summarizing, this initial exploratory research pointed to the fact that, according to the educational actors participating in this research, Socratic conversation is a method that is demanding for the teacher, requires personal interest from the teacher, and that adequate support and training should be developed. More research should investigate possibilities to prepare teachers for facilitating Socratic conversations to help them find their own personal interest and meaning in such a pedagogical approach. Moreover, it seems that teachers could also benefit from Socratic conversations not only for training purposes but also for sharing experience and renewing their own joy of thinking and learning.

This research provides a significant contribution for understanding teacher's role during Socratic conversations with high school students. It also points to ways of supporting teachers using this method for promoting students' authentic moral growth during their school years, so that teachers themselves can benefit from it.

Acknowledgements

References

Altorf, H. M. (2019). Introduction to Special Issue on the Art of Dialogue. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 18*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022216670610

Chesters, S. D. (2012). *The Socratic Classroom: Reflective Thinking Through Collaborative Inquiry*. SensePublishers Imprint.

Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446294406

Feldman, A. (2009). Existentialism and Action Research. In S. Noffke & B. Somekh, *The SAGE Handbook of Educational Action Research* (pp. 381–392). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857021021.n35

Flick, U. (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526416070

Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Goucha, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Philosophy: A School of Freedom: Teaching Philosophy and Learning to Philosophize: Status and Prospects*. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000154173

Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2011). Moral Identity: What Is It, How Does It Develop, and Is It Linked to Moral Action?: Moral Identity Development. *Child Development Perspectives, 5*(3), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00189.x

Heckmann, G. (2004). Six Pedagogical Measures and Socratic Facilitation. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring Minds: Socratic Dialogue in Education* (pp. 53–70). Trentham Books.

Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom Dialogue: A Systematic Review Across Four Decades of Research. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 43*(3), 325–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2013.786024

ICFE – International Commission on the Futures of Education. (2021). Reimagining Our Futures Together. A New Social Contract for Education. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707

Kroger, J. (2007). Why Is Identity Achievement So Elusive? *Identity, 7*(4), 331–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283480701600793

Lapsley, D. (2010). Separation-individuation. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead (Eds.), *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology* (4th ed, pp. 1554–1555). Wiley.

Lapsley, D., & Woodbury, R. D. (2014). Social Cognitive Development in Emerging Adulthood. In J. J. Arnett (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Emerging Adulthood* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199795574.013.16

Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus Group Methodology: Principles and Practice*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957657

Nelson, L. (2004). The Socratic Method. In R. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), *Enquiring Minds: Socratic Dialogue in Education* (pp. 126–165). Trentham Books.

OECD. (2021). *Embedding Values and Attitudes in Curriculum: Shaping a Better Future*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/aee2adcd-en

Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2014). *Moral Development During Emerging Adulthood* (J. J. Arnett, Ed.; Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199795574.013.23

Pihlgren, A. (2008). *Socrates in the Classroom: Rationales and Effects of Philosophizing with Children.* (Doctoral dissertation, Pedagogiska institutionen). Stockholm University.

Platons [Plato]. (1997). *Sokrata prāva: Eutifrons, Sokrata aizstāvēšanās, Kritons, Faidons [Trial of Socrates: Euthyphro, the Socratic Apology, Crito, Phaedo]* (Ā. Feldhūns, Trans.). Zinātne.

Rumianowska, A. (2020). Existential Perspectives on Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *52*(3), 261–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1633915

Saeima of the Republic of Latvia. (1998). *Law of education.* 17.11.1998, No. 343/344. https://www.vestnesis.lv/ta/id/50759-izglitibas-likums

Saran, R., & Neisser, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Enquiring Minds: Socratic Dialogue in Education.* Trentham Books.

Sarid, A. (2012). Systematic Thinking on Dialogical Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(9), 926–941. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2011.00757.x

Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Luyckx, K., Meca, A., & Ritchie, R. A. (2013). Identity in Emerging Adulthood: Reviewing the Field and Looking Forward. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(2), 96–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696813479781

Skola2030. (2019). Vērtības un tikumi [Values and virtues]. https://www.skola2030.lv/lv/macibusaturs/merki-skolenam/vertibas-un-tikumi

Splitter, L. J. (2019). Who Am I? Transforming Our Understanding of Identity and Moral Education. *Education Sciences*, *10*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10010009

Worley, P. (2021). *Corrupting Youth: History and Principles of Philosophical Enquiry.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Collins, A. W. (2003). Autonomy Development during Adolescence. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Berzonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Adolescence* (pp. 174-204). Blackwell Pub.