SOCRATIC DIALOGUE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES: GROUPS GUIDANCE INNOVATION TO BUILD STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS

Febi Dwi Fahriza [1], Agus Taufiq [2]
[1,2] Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
E-mail: febidfrz@gmail.com [1], afiq@upi.edu [2]

Abstract:
Critical thinking has been identified as one of the fundamental competencies students must acquire, as emphasized in Indonesia's national education policy, which positions critical reasoning as a mandatory graduate profile dimension achieved through meaningful, contextual learning. However, national and international assessments indicate that Indonesian students' critical thinking skills remain persistently low, and preliminary observations in junior high school group guidance practice reveal that students still struggle to analyze problems systematically, evaluate information critically, and make logically reasoned decisions. While prior studies have shown that Socratic dialogue can effectively enhance critical thinking across various educational and counseling settings, none have produced a comprehensive, operational guide that enables school counselors to implement Socratic dialogue systematically within group guidance sessions. This study aims to address that gap by developing a structured guide for applying Socratic dialogue in group guidance to build critical thinking skills of eight-grade students at SMPN 2 Ciwaringin, Cirebon. A literature review method was employed, synthesizing critical thinking theories, group guidance principles, and Socratic questioning frameworks to construct a guide that maps Socratic questioning stages to core critical thinking skills within the procedural structure of group guidance. The findings indicate that Socratic dialogue can be systematically embedded into group guidance stages to stimulate interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation among students.
Keywords: Socratic dialogue; group guidance; critical thinking; curriculum innovation.

1. Introduction

National education policy in Indonesia has increasingly emphasized critical thinking as a fundamental competency that every student must acquire. This is explicitly reflected in Permendikdasmen No. 13 Tahun 2025, which positions critical reasoning as one of eight graduate profile dimensions to be achieved through a deep learning approach, requiring that instructional content be made relevant to students' real-life contexts so that they are motivated to think critically, analytically, and synthetically in solving complex problems. Achieving this policy mandate requires learning approaches that move beyond the transfer of knowledge toward deep cognitive engagement, active participation, and reflective learning experiences, elements that correspond directly to the core characteristics of critical thinking, namely the ability to analyze, evaluate, and draw inferences from meaningful experience and evidence (Facione, 2015).

Despite this policy direction, international assessment data reveal a persistently low level of critical thinking among Indonesian students. According to the 2012 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Indonesia ranked 64th out of 65 participating countries with a literacy score of 382, indicating a very low level of student thinking ability. This condition did not improve substantially in subsequent years: PISA 2018 results placed Indonesia among the six lowest-ranked countries with an average score of 379, and PISA 2022 results, released in December 2023, showed a further decline to 366 points, 106 points below the global average, ranking Indonesia 70th out of 81 participating countries. Low critical thinking skills carry serious consequences, as students with limited critical thinking tend to exhibit poor decision-making, including passive engagement in seeking deeper knowledge and, in more severe cases, involvement in risk behaviors such as truancy and other forms of adolescent delinquency (Wade & Travis, 2008). Empirical studies at the basic and secondary education levels further confirm that a majority of fourteen-year-old students demonstrate limited critical thinking skills, particularly in

evaluating evidence-based arguments, drawing logical conclusions, and connecting scientific concepts to everyday contexts (Esa et al., 2019; Sahyar et al., 2019).

Socratic dialogue is a historically established approach known for its capacity to stimulate deep thinking through structured, purposeful questioning. Rooted in the Socratic dialectical method, this approach emphasizes questioning as a means of uncovering assumptions, clarifying concepts, and constructing logical reasoning, and its relevance lies in its adaptability from group discussion formats into structured question-and-answer dialogue that enhances conceptual understanding and student participation, aligning closely with Paul and Elder's critical thinking framework, which emphasizes reasoning, clarifying, and evaluating ideas (Muchtar, 2025). As a core component of Indonesia's education system, guidance and counseling services are positioned to facilitate students' critical thinking development by offering problem-based learning models, book critique assignments, anecdotal methods, and Socratic questioning as part of group guidance service delivery.

A growing body of research supports the effectiveness of Socratic dialogue in developing critical thinking across different educational levels and contexts. Socratic dialogue implemented through lesson study has been shown to effectively enhance university students' critical thinking skills (Susiani & Suranata, 2017), while group guidance using Socratic dialogue has demonstrated greater effectiveness than the t-group method in developing students' critical thinking (Novianti, 2020). Similarly, Socratic dialogue has been found to enhance both critical thinking and social interaction among university students (Hajhosseiny, 2012), and at the junior high school level, Socratic dialogue has proven more effective than conventional methods in improving students' critical thinking ability (Redhana, 2013).

Although prior studies confirm that guidance and counseling interventions can effectively enhance students' critical thinking skills, these studies have not produced a comprehensive, operational, and ready-to-use guide that enables school counselors to implement Socratic dialogue systematically within group guidance settings. The absence of such a structured and validated guide constitutes a real barrier for counselors seeking to apply Socratic dialogue as a group guidance technique consistently and in a professionally accountable manner.

This research gap is further reinforced by field-based observations. A preliminary study conducted at SMP Negeri 2 Ciwaringin found that eighth-grade students continued to demonstrate low critical thinking skills, reflected in their limited ability to analyze problems systematically, evaluate information critically, and make decisions based on logical reasoning. This condition hinders the achievement of students' intellectual maturity as mandated by the Guidance and Counseling Service Outcomes framework, and contradicts the objectives of Permendikdasmen No. 13 Tahun 2025, which establishes critical reasoning as one of the mandatory graduate profile dimensions.

Given the gap between policy expectations, empirical evidence from prior research, and actual conditions in the field, and considering that Socratic dialogue within group guidance settings has been shown to serve as a strategic approach for developing students' critical thinking skills, this study is directed toward formulating a structured guide for implementing Socratic dialogue in group guidance to develop the critical thinking skills of eighth-grade students, providing school counselors with a practical, evidence-based reference for operational use.

2. Literature Review

Critical thinking is a complex, multidimensional construct that has been defined by various scholars with differing emphases, yet with substantial conceptual overlap. Ennis (1962, 2011) offers one of the most widely cited definitions, characterizing critical thinking as reasonable and reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do, an understanding that emphasizes reasonableness, reflectivity, and orientation toward decision-making. Ennis further identifies critical thinking as encompassing both dispositions and abilities, summarized in the FRISCO framework: Focus, Reasons, Inference, Situation, Clarity, and Overview, alongside broader categories such as elementary clarification, basic support, inference, advanced clarification, and strategies and tactics.

Facione (1990, 2015), through a Delphi consensus study involving forty-six experts across disciplines, defines critical thinking as purposeful, self-regulatory judgment that results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference, along with explanation of the evidential, conceptual, methodological, criteriological, or contextual considerations underlying that judgment. This framework identifies six core cognitive skills, interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation, each with corresponding sub-skills such as categorization and clarifying meaning (interpretation), examining and analyzing arguments (analysis), assessing claims and arguments (evaluation), querying evidence and drawing conclusions (inference), justifying procedures and presenting arguments (explanation), and self-examination and self-correction (self-regulation).

Paul and Elder (2001, 2006) approach critical thinking as the art of analyzing and evaluating thinking with a view to improving it, structured around three interconnected components: the elements of thought (purpose, question at issue, information, concepts, assumptions, point of view, interpretation and inference, implications and consequences), intellectual standards (clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth, logic, significance, and fairness), and intellectual traits (intellectual humility, courage, empathy, integrity, perseverance, confidence in reason, and autonomy). Taken together, these three frameworks, Ennis, Facione, and Paul and Elder, share a consistent core: critical thinking is reflective and self-regulatory, involves systematic analysis and evaluation of information, relies on clear intellectual standards, and is oriented toward rational decision-making, positioning it as a learnable and teachable competency rather than an innate trait.

Group guidance is a core service within school-based guidance and counseling that utilizes group dynamics to support individuals' optimal development. Gladding (2016) defines group guidance as an educational process that uses group interaction to provide information and enhance personal and interpersonal awareness, aimed at helping participants make sound life decisions. Corey and Corey (2014) further describe group guidance as focused on conscious thoughts and behavior, involving teaching, information provision, exploration of problem-solving approaches, and learning through imitation and observation, making it more structured and topic-centered compared to process-oriented group counseling. In the Indonesian context, group guidance is provided to small groups of two to ten students to support problem prevention, value maintenance, and the development of necessary life skills, with topics that are general in nature and not confidential (POP BK, 2016).

Group guidance comprises three essential components: the group leader, who manages communication flow and facilitates member interaction (Gladding, 2016; Corey et al., 2014); the group members, whose commitment, openness, and willingness to take risks shape group dynamics; and the structure and process, encompassing session goals, ground rules, and communication patterns that unfold during sessions. Procedurally, group guidance follows a sequential set of stages, comprising the opening stage, in which rapport and group rules are established; the transition stage, which prepares members to engage actively; the core activity stage, in which the main topic is addressed collaboratively; and the closing stage, in which outcomes are reviewed and reflected upon (POP BK, 2016).

Socratic dialogue is a method of inquiry rooted in the teachings of the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates, historically developed through Plato's dialogues and grounded in the belief that genuine knowledge cannot simply be transferred from teacher to student but must be discovered through active inquiry and reflection (Robinson & Groves, 1999; Brickhouse & Smith, 1994). Central philosophical principles underlying this method include Socratic ignorance, the acknowledgment of the limits of one's own knowledge; the maieutic method, in which the facilitator acts as an intellectual midwife who helps "birth" knowledge already present in the learner's mind; elenchus, the systematic examination of beliefs through questioning that reveals contradictions; and aporia, the state of productive confusion that motivates deeper understanding (Vlastos, 1983, 1994; Garlikov, 2001).

In contemporary usage, Paul and Elder (2007) define Socratic questioning as systematic and disciplined questioning used to explore complex ideas, get to the truth of things, open up issues and problems, uncover assumptions, analyze concepts, distinguish what is known from what is not known, and follow the logical implications of thought. Overholser (1993, 2010) similarly frames the Socratic method within psychotherapy as the systematic use of open-ended questions to help clients identify and modify irrational beliefs through guided discovery. Across educational and therapeutic applications, several defining characteristics consistently emerge: questions, rather than direct statements or instructions, serve as the primary tool of inquiry; the process centers on conceptual understanding rather than mere fact accumulation; underlying assumptions are systematically examined; discovery is guided rather than dictated; the process is collaborative rather than adversarial; and reasoning is expected to remain logical and consistent (Garlikov, 2001; Neenan, 2009; Boghossian, 2012).

Paul and Elder (2006, 2007) further classify Socratic questions into six categories: clarification questions, which ensure clear understanding of what is being said; questions probing assumptions, which surface and test underlying premises; questions probing reasons and evidence, which request justification for claims; questions exploring viewpoints or perspectives, which broaden thinking by considering alternatives; questions probing implications and consequences, which examine the logical outcomes of an idea; and questions about the question itself, which encourage metacognitive reflection on the inquiry process. Complementing this typology, several procedural models describe how Socratic dialogue unfolds in practice, ranging from the classical elenchus structure (Vlastos, 1983, 1994) to Nelson's collaborative model for group-based philosophical inquiry (Nelson, 1949, 2004) and adapted educational models involving question establishment, probing, examining assumptions, and reflection (Boghossian, 2012; Reich, 2003).

The integration of Socratic dialogue into group guidance is grounded in the premise that collective questioning can strengthen individuals' understanding of both themselves and others. Within a group setting, Socratic dialogue extends beyond a dyadic exchange between counselor and client to involve all group members as active participants who pose questions, respond, and reflect collaboratively (Nettles & Robinson, 1998). Corey (2016) argues that effective group guidance requires techniques capable of activating positive group dynamics, a function well served by Socratic dialogue given its dialogic, non-directive nature that positions group members as active agents in the process of meaning-making. From a cognitive-behavioral perspective, Beck (2011) affirms that structured Socratic questioning helps individuals recognize previously unnoticed negative thought patterns, a process that becomes more effective in group settings due to the enriching effect of diverse member perspectives.

The relevance of Socratic dialogue to group guidance can be understood through philosophical, psychological, and pedagogical dimensions. Philosophically, both share a foundational belief in individuals' capacity to grow through reflection and dialogue, consistent with the humanistic principle in group guidance that positions individuals as capable of autonomous growth (Rogers, 1970). Psychologically, Socratic dialogue aligns with Vygotsky's social constructivism, which holds that cognitive development occurs through social interaction, a process for which group guidance provides a natural medium (Vygotsky, 1978, in Wink & Putney, 2002). Pedagogically, Yalom and Leszcz (2005) identify therapeutic factors in group settings, including universality, altruism, and interpersonal learning, all of which are directly activated through Socratic dialogue as members share perspectives, question one another's assumptions, and learn constructively from differing viewpoints.

Empirical findings from the Indonesian context reinforce this integration. Susiani and Suranata (2017) reported that Socratic dialogic teaching effectively enhanced six elements of critical thinking disposition, namely analyticity, cognitive maturity, self-confidence, self-evaluation, open-mindedness, and truth-seeking, alongside seven elements of social interaction. Novianti (2020) found that group guidance using Socratic dialogue was more effective than the t-group method in developing critical thinking skills, with improvements observed particularly in the analysis, evaluation, and inference dimensions. Similarly, Novianti et al. (2023) demonstrated that Socratic dialogue produced significant improvements across all critical thinking dimensions measured using the California Critical Thinking Skills Test, distinguishing it from other techniques that typically affect only specific dimensions.

Several studies have investigated the application of Socratic dialogue and related questioning techniques to enhance critical thinking across educational levels. Redhana (2013) found that a problem-based learning model combined with Socratic questioning was more effective than direct instruction in improving eighth-grade students' critical thinking in science learning. Jensen (2015) demonstrated that Socratic dialogue supported both critical thinking and informal language learning among English Language Learners over a five-week intervention. Gomes, Handarini, and Lasan (2013) confirmed that Socratic dialogue significantly improved junior high school students' critical thinking skills, with consistent score increases across sessions. Kurniawan et al. (2021) developed a group guidance guide combining Socratic dialogue and problem-based learning to improve vocational students' critical thinking, while Lintangsari and Irene (2022) found that integrating Socratic questions into the Nominal Group Technique significantly improved students' critical thinking in an online critical reading context.

Despite this accumulating evidence, none of the prior studies has produced a comprehensive, operational guide that enables school counselors to implement Socratic dialogue systematically as a structured group guidance technique. Existing studies have largely situated Socratic dialogue within subject-matter instruction rather than within guidance and counseling service delivery, leaving a clear gap in the availability of a structured, field-tested guide for group guidance practice. This gap, combined with policy demands under Permendikdasmen No. 13 Tahun 2025 and documented field conditions showing low critical thinking among junior high school students, underscores the need for the guide developed in this study, positioning Socratic dialogue within group guidance not merely as an academic intervention, but as a means of supporting students' broader personal, social, and academic development

3. Research Methods

3.1. Object, time and Place

The object of this research is the eighth-grade students of SMPN 2 Ciwaringin, Ciwaringin District, Cirebon Regency, West Java. The selection of eighth grade students as research participants is based on the consideration that at this age stage (generally 13-14 years old), students are in early adolescence who have cognitively entered the formal operational stage (Piaget, 1972), where abstract thinking, hypothetico-deductive, and logical reasoning abilities begin to develop significantly. These cognitive characteristics are important prerequisites for the optimal implementation of Socratic dialogue, because the six critical thinking skills according to Facione (1990) — interpretation, analysis, evaluation,

inference, explanation, and self-regulation — require reasoning capacities that go beyond concrete-operational thinking.

3.2. Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through a systematic literature study, involving the identification, selection, and review of academic sources relevant to the three core constructs of this research. Sources were obtained from peer-reviewed journal articles, books, theses, and policy documents, including Permendikdasmen No. 13 Tahun 2025 and the Pola Operasional Pelayanan Bimbingan dan Konseling (POP BK, 2016), accessed through academic databases such as Google Scholar, ERIC, and university institutional repositories. The search was guided by keywords including "critical thinking," "Socratic dialogue," "Socratic questioning," "group guidance," and their Indonesian equivalents ("berpikir kritis," "dialog Sokratik," "bimbingan kelompok"), combined using Boolean operators to maximize the relevance and comprehensiveness of retrieved sources.

Sources were selected based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) directly addressing critical thinking theory, Socratic dialogue technique, or group guidance practice; (2) published in credible academic outlets, primarily within the last fifteen years, with foundational theoretical works (e.g., Ennis, 1962, 1985; Facione, 1990; Paul & Elder, 2001, 2006) retained regardless of publication date due to their enduring theoretical relevance; and (3) providing conceptual, empirical, or procedural insight applicable to the Indonesian junior high school guidance and counseling context. Sources that lacked methodological transparency or were not accessible in full text were excluded from the review. Each selected source was documented and organized according to its thematic relevance to the three core constructs, forming the basis for subsequent synthesis.

3.3. Data Analysis Techniques

Data obtained from the literature study were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis approach, which involved systematically identifying, categorizing, and synthesizing recurring themes, concepts, and findings across the collected sources (Krippendorff, 2018). The analysis process began with open coding, in which key concepts related to critical thinking dimensions, Socratic questioning stages, and group guidance procedures were extracted from each source. These codes were then grouped into broader thematic categories, such as core critical thinking skills, types of Socratic questions, and stages of group guidance implementation, allowing patterns and conceptual relationships across sources to be identified.

Following thematic categorization, a conceptual synthesis was conducted to integrate the three core constructs into a coherent theoretical framework, specifically, mapping the procedural stages of group guidance onto corresponding types of Socratic questions, and further aligning these with Facione's (1990) six core cognitive skills of critical thinking: interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation. This synthesis process was strengthened through source triangulation, in which findings from multiple independent studies addressing similar constructs (e.g., Novianti, 2020; Susiani & Suranata, 2017; Redhana, 2013) were cross-verified to ensure the consistency and credibility of the resulting theoretical framework. The outcome of this analytical process is a structured, theoretically grounded guide for implementing Socratic dialogue within group guidance settings, intended to serve as a conceptual foundation for subsequent empirical testing in the broader research project.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Research Results

The literature review process identified a consistent conceptual structure across the reviewed sources regarding how Socratic dialogue can be systematically integrated into the procedural stages of group guidance to target specific critical thinking skills. Synthesizing the procedural stages of group guidance (POP BK, 2016), the typology of Socratic questions developed by Paul and Elder (2006, 2007), and Facione's (1990) six core cognitive skills of critical thinking, the review produced a structured mapping presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Mapping of Group Guidance Stages, Socratic Question Types, and Targeted Critical Thinking Skills

Group Guidance Stage	Socratic Question Type	Question Function	Targeted Critical Thinking Skill
Opening	Clarification questions	Establishing shared understanding of the discussion topic	Interpretation
Transition	Questions probing assumptions	Surfacing members' initial assumptions and expectations	Analysis

Core Activity	Questions probing reasons and evidence	Requesting justification and evidence for claims made	Evaluation
Core Activity	Questions exploring viewpoints or perspectives	Encouraging consideration of alternative perspectives	Inference
Core Activity	Questions probing implications and consequences	Examining logical outcomes of ideas or decisions discussed	Explanation
Closing	Questions about the question	Encouraging reflection on members' own reasoning process	Self-regulation

Sources: POP BK (2016), Paul and Elder (2006, 2007), and Facione (1990).

Table 1 shows that each of the four group guidance stages accommodates at least one category of Socratic questioning that corresponds systematically to one or more of Facione's six critical thinking skills. Notably, the core activity stage accommodates the greatest concentration of Socratic question types, reflecting its function as the primary space for sustained critical inquiry within the group guidance process.

In addition to the procedural mapping, the review also identified a three-domain framework for evaluating the success of Socratic dialogue implementation in group guidance, synthesized from Nettles and Robinson (1998), Yalom and Leszcz (2005), and Corey (2016), as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Indicators of Successful Socratic Dialogue Implementation in Group Guidance

Domain	Key Indicators
Cognitive	Increased ability to identify assumptions, evaluate evidence, and draw logical conclusions; reduced cognitive distortions; increased self-reflection and metacognitive awareness
Affective	Increased confidence in expressing opinions; reduced social anxiety; increased empathy and perspective-taking; greater openness to differing viewpoints
Behavioral	Increased active participation; application of acquired questioning skills in daily life; more adaptive behavior resulting from insight gained through dialogue

Sources: POP BK (2016), Paul and Elder (2006, 2007), and Facione (1990). Nettles and Robinson (1998), Yalom and Leszcz (2005), and Corey (2016).

4.2. Discussion

The mapping presented in Table 1 confirms and extends findings from prior empirical studies indicating that Socratic dialogue can be systematically structured rather than applied spontaneously within group settings. This addresses the implementation challenge previously identified in the literature, where facilitators often struggle to apply Socratic questioning consistently due to the absence of clear sequencing guidance (Paul & Elder, 2007). By anchoring each Socratic question type to a specific stage of group guidance and a corresponding critical thinking skill, the resulting framework offers school counselors a concrete operational reference, addressing a gap noted across multiple prior studies (Novianti, 2020; Kurniawan et al., 2021), none of which had produced a comprehensive, stage-by-stage operational guide for group guidance practice specifically.

The finding that the core activity stage accommodates the highest concentration of Socratic question types is consistent with the theoretical emphasis placed on this stage as the primary site of critical inquiry in group guidance procedures (POP BK, 2016). This pattern also aligns with Vygotsky's social constructivist perspective, in which the core activity stage functions as the space where social interaction most directly drives cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978, in Wink & Putney, 2002). At the same time, this concentration suggests that the opening, transition, and closing stages, while less cognitively intensive, still play a necessary scaffolding role, consistent with Corey's (2016) argument that group guidance effectiveness depends on techniques that activate group dynamics across the entire session rather than in isolated segments.

The three-domain success framework in Table 2 reinforces findings from Susiani and Suranata (2017) and Yalom and Leszcz (2005), both of which emphasize that the impact of dialogic group techniques extends beyond cognitive outcomes to include affective and behavioral change. This is a

notable point of convergence across the literature: unlike techniques that primarily target a single dimension of student development, Socratic dialogue within group guidance appears to operate across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains simultaneously, a pattern also observed empirically by Novianti et al. (2023), who found improvements across all measured dimensions of critical thinking rather than isolated gains.

However, it is important to note that the synthesized framework in this study has not yet been empirically tested. While the theoretical alignment across sources is strong, the actual effectiveness of the proposed guide when implemented in an authentic group guidance setting, particularly with eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 2 Ciwaringin, remains to be verified through the subsequent quasi-experimental phase of the broader research project. This limitation is consistent with the nature of literature review as a research method, which is well-suited for theoretical synthesis and framework development but cannot, on its own, establish causal or empirical effectiveness (Krippendorff, 2018).

4.3. Relevance to Research Objectives

The findings presented in this section directly respond to the second research question formulated in the introduction, namely how a guide for Socratic dialogue within group guidance settings can be formulated to develop students' critical thinking skills. The structured mapping in Table 1 constitutes the core theoretical output addressing this question, translating abstract principles of Socratic dialogue and critical thinking theory into an operational sequence aligned with the established procedural stages of group guidance.

Furthermore, these findings help fill the research gap identified in the introduction, namely the absence of a comprehensive, operational, and field-ready guide for implementing Socratic dialogue systematically within group guidance practice (Novianti, 2020; Kurniawan et al., 2021). By synthesizing theoretical frameworks and prior empirical findings into a single coherent structure, this study offers a concrete step toward closing that gap, while also laying the theoretical foundation necessary for the subsequent empirical validation phase, which will address the first and third research questions concerning the actual condition of group guidance implementation and the guide's effectiveness, respectively, through the broader quasi-experimental research design.

5. Conclusion

This literature review has synthesized theories of critical thinking, group guidance, and Socratic dialogue into a structured guide that maps Socratic questioning types onto the procedural stages of group guidance and aligns them with Facione's six core critical thinking skills, namely interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation, while also identifying cognitive, affective, and behavioral indicators of successful implementation. These findings confirm that Socratic dialogue can be systematically embedded within group guidance practice rather than applied spontaneously, thereby addressing a gap in prior research, which had established the general effectiveness of Socratic dialogue in enhancing critical thinking but had not produced an operational, stage-by-stage guide for school counselors. The resulting framework offers a practical contribution to guidance and counseling practice by providing counselors with a concrete reference for designing more reflective and dialogic group guidance sessions, and contributes theoretically to curriculum innovation efforts aimed at cultivating future-ready critical thinking competencies among students. As this study relies solely on literature synthesis, the proposed guide has not yet been empirically validated; its actual effectiveness when implemented with eighth-grade students remains to be tested through the subsequent quasi-experimental phase of the broader research project. Future research is therefore recommended to empirically test this guide across diverse school settings and student populations to strengthen its generalizability and practical utility.

Bibliography

Beck, J. S. (2011). Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Boghossian, P. (2012). Socratic pedagogy, critical thinking, and inmate education. Journal of Correctional Education, 63(1), 4–13.

Brickhouse, T. C., & Smith, N. D. (1994). Plato's Socrates. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corey, G. (2016). Theory and practice of group counseling (9th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.

Corey, M. S., & Corey, G. (2014). Groups: Process and practice (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ennis, R. H. (1962). A concept of critical thinking. Harvard Educational Review, 32(1), 81–111.

Ennis, R. H. (1985). A logical basis for measuring critical thinking skills. Educational Leadership, 43(2), 44–48.

Esa, N., et al. (2019). Critical thinking skills of secondary school students: An empirical study.

Facione, P. A. (1990). Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. Millbrae, CA: California Academic Press.
Facione, P. A. (2015). Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts. Insight Assessment.
Gladding, S. T. (2016). Groups: A counseling specialty (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
Gomes, W., Handarini, D. M., & Lasan, B. B. (2013). Penerapan metode Socrates untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berpikir kritis siswa SMP. Jurnal Kajian Bimbingan dan Konseling, 1–10.
Hajhosseiny, M. (2012). The effect of dialogic teaching on students' critical thinking disposition. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69, 1358–1368.
Jensen, R. D., Jr. (2015). The effectiveness of the Socratic method in developing critical thinking skills in English language learners (Tesis). Grace University.
Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Kurniawan, N. A., Hidayah, N., & Rahman, D. H. (2021). Akseptabilitas panduan bimbingan kelompok untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berpikir kritis siswa SMK. Nusantara of Research: Jurnal Hasil-Hasil Penelitian Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri, 8(1), 35–43.
Lintangsari, A. P., & Irene, N. K. (2022). Improving learners' critical thinking and learning engagement through Socratic questioning in nominal group technique. Studies in English Language and Education, 9(2), 480–496. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.22352.
Neenan, M. (2009). Using Socratic questioning in coaching. Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 27(4), 249–264.
Nelson, L. (2004). The Socratic method. In G. Saran & B. Neisser (Eds.), Socratic method: A short introduction (originally published 1949). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Nettles, S. M., & Robinson, F. P. (1998). Exploring the use of the Socratic method in group counseling. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 23(1), 5–17.
Novianti, W. (2020). Efektivitas Metode Dialog Sokratik dan Training Group (T-Group) untuk Mengembangkan Keterampilan Berpikir Kritis. (Tesis). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
Overholser, J. C. (1993). Elements of the Socratic method: I. Systematic questioning. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 30(1), 67–74.
Overholser, J. C. (2010). Psychotherapy according to the Socratic method: Integrating ancient philosophy with contemporary cognitive therapy. Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy, 24(4), 354–363.
Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2001). The miniature guide to critical thinking concepts and tools. Dillon Beach, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.
Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2006). The miniature guide to critical thinking concepts and tools (4th ed.). Dillon Beach, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.
Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2007). The thinker's guide to the art of Socratic questioning. Dillon Beach, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.
Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2025 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Nomor 12 Tahun 2024 tentang Kurikulum pada Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah. (2025).
Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. Human Development, 15(1), 1–12.
Panduan Operasional Pelayanan Bimbingan dan Konseling (POP BK). (2016). Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia.
Redhana, I. W. (2013). Model pembelajaran berbasis masalah dan pertanyaan Socratik untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berpikir kritis siswa. Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan, 3, 351–365. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v0i3.1136.
Sahyar, Bunawan, W., Rangkuti, M. A., & Yanti, J. (2019). High-Level Comprehension Skill by using Competencies PISA in Indonesia's Education System. 576–580.
Susiani, T. S., & Suranata, K. (2017). Metode Socrates untuk meningkatkan disposisi berpikir kritis dan interaksi sosial mahasiswa. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 1(1), 1–10.
Wade, C., & Tavris, C. (2008). Psychology (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.