

K. Artamonova^{1*}, F. Aliyeva², A. Kulzhabekova³, M. Suleimanova⁴

Nazarbayev Intellectual School of Science and Mathematics in Karaganda City, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan
e-mail: artamonova_k@krg.nis.edu.kz

¹ORCID 0009-0005-9870-1642, ²ORCID 0009-0002-4482-2949

³ORCID 0009-0003-4811-9772, ⁴ORCID 0009-0005-6578-0479

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SOCRATIC SEMINARS AS A TOOL FOR ASSESSING SPOKEN ARGUMENTATION SKILLS

This study explored students' perceptions of Socratic Seminars as a tool for assessing spoken argumentation skills. As spoken argumentation is increasingly recognized as an essential component of critical thinking, communication, and academic success, there is a need for assessment methods that authentically capture students' ability to construct, support, and communicate arguments. A qualitative case study design was employed to investigate students' experiences with Socratic Seminars in an English as a Foreign Language context at a Nazarbayev Intellectual School. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 96 Grade 10 students who had participated in assessed Socratic Seminars. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's six-step framework. The findings revealed four major themes: adjustment to a new assessment format, development of collaborative argumentation skills, understanding of assessment criteria and fairness, and recognition of the real-life value of communication skills. Although students initially experienced uncertainty and anxiety, they gradually became more confident and viewed Socratic Seminars as an effective and authentic means of demonstrating spoken argumentation abilities. Participants also perceived peer assessment as increasing transparency and fairness. Overall, the study suggests that Socratic Seminars can serve as a valuable alternative to traditional speaking assessments while fostering meaningful communication and critical thinking skills.

Keywords: Socratic Seminars, spoken argumentation, student perceptions, authentic assessment, dialogic learning.

Introduction

In the modern world, where the development of technology and artificial intelligence affects the formation of learning and communication skills, spoken argumentation has become an important indicator of learning because it enables learners to engage in meaningful dialogue and articulate ideas clearly, thus demonstrating their higher-order thinking. These competencies are essential not only for academic success, but also for the students' further professional and personal development.

However, according to teacher observations, the assessment of spoken argumentation skills is challenging because of the lack of methods that would accurately capture different levels of the ability to formulate claims, critically evaluate evidence, and connect them with reasoning. While traditional approaches to assessing speaking, often relying on presentations or teacher-led questioning, can provide valuable insights into student performance, they may not fully reflect the dynamic and interactive nature of authentic argumentation. Consequently, educators have been exploring instructional strategies that would encourage learners to support their claims with textual or experiential evidence, listen actively to peers, challenge assumptions respectfully, and refine their thinking through dialogue.

One such approach is the Socratic Seminar, a structured dialogue in which students collaboratively explore complex ideas through questioning, discussion, and evidence-based reasoning. Socratic Seminars require students to construct and defend arguments in real time and may offer teachers a valuable context for assessing spoken argumentation skills.

Research has demonstrated the potential of Socratic Seminars to enhance critical thinking, communication, and student engagement. However, much of the existing literature focuses on the

instructional benefits of this strategy, while comparatively less attention has been given to its role as an assessment tool. Furthermore, students' perspectives on being assessed through Socratic Seminars remain underexplored. Understanding how learners perceive this form of assessment is important because assessment practices can influence student motivation, participation, and the development of spoken argumentation skills.

The **purpose** of this study was to explore how students perceive Socratic Seminars as a tool for assessing their spoken argumentation skills.

It sought to answer the following **research questions**:

Main question

How do students perceive Socratic Seminars as a tool for assessing their spoken argumentation skills?

Sub-questions

- How do students perceive the effectiveness of Socratic Seminars in demonstrating their spoken argumentation skills?

- How do students perceive the fairness and transparency of assessment conducted through Socratic Seminars?

- How do students believe participation in Socratic Seminars influences the development of their spoken argumentation skills?

The widespread integration of generative artificial intelligence in education has led to a re-evaluation of how students engage with and perceive their own learning processes. Rather than viewing assessment as a result-oriented measure, contemporary research emphasizes the student experience within dialogic learning environments. This learning model relies on spoken argumentation, which is crucial for building critical thinking, academic knowledge, and community participation skills [1, 2]. Research shows that structured oral argumentation alters student perceptions of learning; when students are required to justify claims and navigate counterarguments in real time, they report a deeper sense of conceptual ownership and cognitive engagement compared to traditional text-based assessments [3].

From the perspective of assessment theory, student perceptions are strongly influenced by the formative and dialogic nature of the classroom environment. Black and Wiliam [4] argue that making thinking explicit through classroom interaction fundamentally changes how students view the teacher-student dynamic, shifting their perception from being passive subjects of evaluation to active participants in learning. Furthermore, when transparent criteria and peer assessment are introduced, students perceive the evaluation process as more equitable and cooperative rather than judgmental [5]. Within this framework, assessment is experienced by students not as an external measurement, but as an instructional dialogue that clarifies expectations and fosters academic autonomy.

The Socratic seminar represents a distinct pedagogical format that directly shapes student attitudes toward oral discourse. Grounded in dialogic traditions, these structured, text-centered discussions encourage students to perceive reading and thinking as collaborative, rather than isolated, acts of knowledge construction [6]. Qualitative studies on student perceptions frequently report positive shifts in learner confidence, critical reading, and oral communication, particularly when discussions are supported by explicit scaffolding [7].

However, student experiences are often mediated by the structural design of the seminar. The integration of "inner-circle" participation and "outer-circle" observation can elicit mixed perceptions [8]. While some students perceive the inner circle as a high-stakes, anxiety-inducing environment, others view it as a highly engaging for authentic expression. Conversely, the outer circle is often perceived either as a safe space for reflective peer assessment or, conversely, as a secondary less engaging role that limits active engagement.

Learners do not perceive verbal argumentation the same way across all school subjects. In language and humanities education, oral discourse is frequently perceived by students as a natural extension of interpretive and evaluative competence [9]. In contrast, within science and STEM education, students often initially perceive structured argumentation as challenging or unfamiliar, as

it requires a shift from seeking "correct" answers to evaluating flexible scientific evidence [10]. Despite these insights, relatively little research has systematically examined how students' perceptions, academic anxieties, and feelings of community evolve when Socratic seminars are implemented across different subject areas.

When examining student experiences within dialogic spaces, contemporary literature emphasizes the role of psychological safety. Because Socratic seminars require public reasoning, student perceptions are influenced by the social climate of the classroom. Research indicates that when a classroom culture prioritizes collaboration over competition, students view the vulnerability of public speaking as a constructive learning opportunity rather than a social risk [11]. In contrast, in classrooms where peer relationships are strained or highly competitive, students often perceive the seminar as a threatening environment. This anxiety can lead to defensive learning behaviors, where students focus more on impression management—such as scripting their comments in advance—rather than actively listening and responding to the organic flow of the dialogue.

Furthermore, the introduction of peer assessment adds another layer to student perceptions of classroom equity. When outer-circle observers are responsible for evaluating their peers in the inner circle, students report mixed feelings regarding the fairness of the process. Some students value peer feedback, noting that it feels more accessible and less judgemental than traditional teacher evaluation. However, other studies reveal that students sometimes worry about the subjectivity of peer grading, fearing that social friendships or classroom popularity might influence the feedback they receive [12]. This highlights a critical tension: while peer assessment can foster metacognitive awareness and a sense of shared responsibility, it can also introduce interpersonal anxieties that shape how students perceive the fairness of the assessment format.

Another important factor shaping student attitudes toward Socratic seminars is individual language proficiency, particularly in linguistically diverse or bilingual educational settings. For students who are dealing with academic content while simultaneously developing their target language skills, the real-time demands of spoken argumentation present a double cognitive load. Quantitative and qualitative feedback shows that less confident speakers frequently perceive unguided seminars as isolating, as the rapid pace of the conversation favors students with higher linguistic fluency [13].

To lessen these negative perceptions, researchers emphasize the necessity of structural and linguistic scaffolding. When teachers provide explicit tools—such as pre-reading discussion guides, conceptual graphic organizers, and targeted sentence starters for agreeing, disagreeing, or clarifying claims—student perceptions undergo a positive transformation. Scaffolding helps students view the seminar not as an unpredictable test of linguistic speed, but as a predictable, structured environment where they can safely test their ideas. Under these supported conditions, students with lower initial confidence report a heightened sense of belonging and an increased willingness to participate, ultimately viewing oral argumentation as a powerful mechanism for improving both their language skills and their subject-matter competence.

Beyond immediate academic outcomes, consistent exposure to Socratic seminars has a profound impact on long-term student self-efficacy and intellectual identity. In traditional teacher-led classrooms, students often develop a dependent mindset, perceiving the instructor as the source of truth and validation. By contrast, longitudinal studies on dialogic education suggest that participating in regular, student-led seminars reshapes how learners view their own intellectual capabilities. Over time, as students successfully navigate complex texts and co-construct meanings with their peers, they report a marked increase in their academic self-efficacy [14].

This shift in self-efficacy directly influences how students view themselves as thinkers and citizens. When students realize that their voices can shape the direction of a serious academic discussion, they begin to construct identities as active contributors to knowledge rather than passive consumers of information. They report feeling more capable of analyzing complex, real-world problems, weighing conflicting evidence, and participating in public, democratic discourse. This indicates that the value of the Socratic format extends far beyond the immediate grading period; students perceive it as a transformative experience that equips them with the communicative

confidence and critical mindsets necessary for university-level studies and future professional environments.

Materials and Research Methods

To investigate students' perceptions of Socratic Seminars, this study used a qualitative case study design as an instrument for assessing spoken argumentation skills. As it allows for an in-depth exploration of students' experiences, interpretations, and meanings related to assessment practices, exactly this qualitative approach was selected. The case study design is suitable because it is believed to be focusing on a bounded system: students who take part in Socratic Seminars within a specific educational context. It enables a detailed and contextualized understanding of the educational phenomenon.

The research was conducted in one Nazarbayev Intellectual School where English is a foreign language; Socratic Seminars were employed as one of the instructional and assessment practices in speaking and discussion-based tasks.

Purposeful sampling was used to select students who had prior experience partaking in Socratic Seminars. Purposive sampling was used to ensure that participants could share rich and diverse insights into the research topic. Participants were chosen based on two main criteria: (1) they had taken part in at least one assessed Socratic Seminar during the academic year, and (2) they voluntarily shared their experiences during interviews. To ensure that the collected data was relevant to the research, only students with direct experience of the assessment method were included. In order to include a broad range of perspectives, the sample involved students with diverse levels of classroom participation and confidence in speaking activities. It helped not focus solely on highly active participants.

A total of 96 students from grade 10 participated in the study. The participants were also varied in terms of English proficiency levels to capture different perspectives on the assessment process.

Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data. It was selected due to its flexibility in questioning while making sure that all research questions are addressed. The interview protocol encompassed open-ended questions that were focused on students' experiences of Socratic Seminars, their perceptions of how fair and effective they were, and their opinions on how these seminars affected their spoken argumentation skills. Each interview lasted approximately 3-4 minutes, and to ensure confidentiality and comfort, the interviews were conducted in a quiet atmosphere within the school. With participants' consent, interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The interview questions were created based on the study's research questions and actual literature on authentic assessment, classroom discussion, and argumentation skills. Prior to data collection, the interview protocol was reviewed to ensure that the questions were clear, relevant, and effective in terms of eliciting detailed responses.

Thematic analysis was used to analyze the collected data. To start the analysis, it was decided to employ the six-step framework proposed by Braun and Clarke [15]. There were several stages in this process: familiarization with the data via continuous reading of transcripts, initial coding of meaningful words, grouping codes into categories, and the development of main themes. First, the researcher familiarized themselves with the data by reading the transcripts thoroughly. Second, the researcher generated initial codes to identify meaningful patterns in participants' responses. Third, similar codes were then grouped into broader categories. Fourth, these categories were examined and refined into meaningful themes. These themes were used to reflect students' perceptions of effectiveness, fairness, and the overall impact of Socratic Seminars as an assessment instrument. Fifth, themes were defined and named. To enhance trustworthiness, emerging themes were compared across participants and ensured that interpretations were grounded in the data. Finally, the findings were structured and interpreted in relation to the research questions and existing literature.

Examples of potential themes included perceptions of assessment authenticity, opportunities for student voice, transparency of assessment criteria, anxiety associated with speaking, and the development of critical thinking and argumentation skills.

Prior to data collection, ethical approval was acquired. Participation was absolutely voluntary, and informed consent was procured from all participants. Participants were aware of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly kept by giving pseudonyms and deleting any identifying information from the transcripts and final report.

Furthermore, the researcher informed the participants about the purpose of the study, how the data would be used, and how confidentiality would be protected. Audio recordings and interview transcripts were stored securely, and only the researcher would have access to it. All data were used solely for academic purposes and were deleted after the completion of the study in accordance with institutional research guidelines.

Results and Discussion

The thematic analysis of interview data revealed four major themes related to students' perceptions of Socratic Seminars as a tool for assessing spoken argumentation skills. These themes were: (1) adjustment to a new assessment format, (2) development of collaborative argumentation skills, (3) understanding of assessment criteria and fairness, and (4) recognition of the real-life value of communication skills. The themes and their descriptions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 - Summary of Themes Identified in Student Interviews

Theme	Description
Adjustment to a New Assessment Format	Students initially found the seminar unfamiliar but became more comfortable over time.
Development of Collaborative Argumentation Skills	Students learned to listen, respond, and build arguments collaboratively.
Understanding Assessment Criteria and Fairness	Peer assessment increased transparency and awareness of rubrics.
Relevance to Authentic Communication	Students connected seminar skills to real-life communication situations.

Theme 1: Adjustment to a New Assessment Format

One of the strongest themes that emerged from the interviews was students' adjustment to a new type of assessment. Before the introduction of Socratic Seminars, students were mainly assessed through traditional speaking tasks. These assessments usually involved answering questions from the teacher based on a picture, card, or speaking prompt. Therefore, many students were not familiar with the idea of discussing a topic with several classmates while being assessed at the same time.

Although a formative Socratic Seminar was conducted before the summative assessment, many participants reported that they still found the first seminar difficult. Students explained that they were unsure about the discussion procedures and did not fully understand how participation would be evaluated. Some participants were uncertain about when to speak, how often to contribute, and how to react to the opinions of others.

As a result, the first seminar was described as somewhat disorganized. Several students noted that they focused mainly on speaking as much as possible rather than participating in a meaningful discussion. However, after experiencing the first seminar, students became more familiar with the expectations and structure of the activity. During the second assessment, they reported feeling more confident and prepared.

This finding supports the ideas of Black and Wiliam [4], who suggest that students often need time to adapt to assessment methods that require active participation. The findings indicate that students' initial difficulties were related more to unfamiliarity with the format than to the assessment itself.

Theme 2: Development of Collaborative Argumentation Skills

The second theme focused on how students perceived the development of their speaking and argumentation skills during Socratic Seminars. Many participants explained that the seminars helped them understand that effective communication involves more than simply expressing personal opinions.

During the first seminar, some students observed that more confident and talkative participants tended to dominate the discussion. As a result, quieter students sometimes had fewer opportunities to contribute. This occasionally created frustration among participants and led to misunderstandings within groups.

However, students reported that their understanding of successful participation changed over time. They gradually realized that the purpose of the seminar was not to speak the most but to contribute meaningfully to the discussion. Participants emphasized the importance of listening carefully, responding to others' arguments, asking follow-up questions, and supporting opinions with evidence and reasoning.

Many students believed that Socratic Seminars provided a better opportunity to demonstrate argumentation skills than traditional speaking assessments. Unlike teacher-led interviews, the seminars required students to think quickly, react to different viewpoints, and defend their ideas in real time. Students also reported that they became more aware of the importance of respectful disagreement and constructive discussion.

These findings are consistent with Adler's [6] view of Socratic dialogue as a collaborative process of knowledge construction. Similarly, Billings and Fitzgerald [7] argue that structured discussions can improve students' confidence, communication, and critical thinking skills. The experiences described by participants suggest that Socratic Seminars helped students develop a broader understanding of spoken argumentation as a cooperative rather than individual activity.

Theme 3: Understanding Assessment Criteria and Fairness

Another important theme was students' perceptions of assessment criteria and fairness. Participants frequently mentioned the role of the outer-circle students, who were responsible for assessing the discussion using a rubric.

Many students explained that acting as assessors helped them understand the assessment criteria more clearly. Because they needed to evaluate their classmates' performance, they paid closer attention to the rubric descriptors and became more aware of what was expected in a successful discussion. Students reported that this process encouraged them to read the criteria carefully and think critically about speaking performance.

Interestingly, participants stated that most students took the assessor role seriously and tried to evaluate their peers fairly. As a result, many interviewees viewed the assessment process as transparent and understandable. Unlike traditional speaking assessments, where only the teacher assigns marks, students felt that they had a clearer understanding of how scores were awarded.

This finding supports Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick's [5] argument that involving learners in assessment can increase assessment literacy and help students better understand quality performance. Similarly, Black and Wiliam [4] emphasize that transparent assessment practices can improve students' engagement with learning.

Despite these positive perceptions, students also identified several challenges associated with Socratic Seminar assessment. These challenges are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 - Challenges Reported by Students

Challenge	Description
Unfamiliar format	Students initially struggled to understand the seminar procedures and expectations.
Dominant participants	More confident students sometimes limited opportunities for others to contribute.
Speaking anxiety	Some students felt nervous expressing opinions in front of peers.
Time pressure	Limited discussion time occasionally prevented full development of arguments.
Active listening demands	Students found it challenging to listen, evaluate ideas, and prepare responses simultaneously.

Although these challenges were mentioned, most participants reported that they became less significant during the second seminar as students gained experience and became more familiar with the format.

Theme 4: Relevance to Authentic Communication

The final theme concerned students' perceptions of the real-world value of Socratic Seminars. Many participants stated that the activity changed their understanding of speaking in English. Previously, they often viewed speaking assessment as a conversation between a student and a teacher. After participating in the seminars, they began to see communication as a more interactive and collaborative process.

Students explained that real-life situations often require people to discuss ideas, defend opinions, persuade others, and respond respectfully to disagreement. Therefore, many participants believed that the skills practiced during Socratic Seminars would be useful beyond the classroom. They particularly highlighted active listening, persuasion, argument development, and respectful communication as important skills for future academic and professional contexts.

These findings are similar to those reported by Swain [9], who emphasizes the role of collaborative dialogue in language development. They also support the work of Nussbaum et al. [3], who argue that structured argumentation promotes deeper engagement with ideas and strengthens critical thinking.

Overall, students viewed Socratic Seminars not only as an assessment tool but also as a meaningful learning experience that prepares them for authentic communication situations. While the assessment format initially presented some challenges, participants generally reported positive perceptions after gaining experience with the process.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore how students perceive Socratic Seminars as a tool for assessing spoken argumentation skills. The findings suggest that students generally viewed this form of assessment positively, although many experienced difficulties when participating in a Socratic Seminar for the first time.

One of the main findings was that students needed time to adapt to a discussion-based assessment format. Unlike traditional speaking assessments, which usually involve interaction between a student and a teacher, Socratic Seminars required participants to engage with their peers, respond to different viewpoints, and develop arguments collaboratively. While this initially caused some confusion, students reported becoming more confident and comfortable after gaining experience with the format.

The study also found that students perceived Socratic Seminars as an effective way to demonstrate spoken argumentation skills. Participants highlighted the importance of active

listening, responding to others' ideas, providing evidence, and expressing agreement or disagreement respectfully. Many students felt that these skills were demonstrated more naturally during a discussion than in traditional speaking assessments.

Another important finding was related to assessment transparency. The use of peer assessment helped students become more familiar with the assessment criteria and better understand what was expected from them. As a result, many participants considered the assessment process fair and clear. Although some challenges remained, such as speaking anxiety and unequal participation, students reported that these issues became less significant as they became more familiar with the seminar structure.

Finally, students viewed the skills developed during Socratic Seminars as valuable beyond the classroom. They recognised that communication in real-life situations often involves discussion, persuasion, collaboration, and respectful disagreement. For this reason, many participants saw the seminars not only as an assessment activity but also as preparation for future academic, professional, and social interactions.

The findings of this study suggest that Socratic Seminars can be a useful alternative to more traditional speaking assessments. They provide opportunities for students to demonstrate argumentation skills in a collaborative environment while also developing a deeper understanding of communication and assessment processes. Future research could explore how students' perceptions change over a longer period of time or examine the use of Socratic Seminars in different educational contexts and subject areas.

References

1. Kuhn D. The skills of argument. – Cambridge University Press, 1991. – <https://doi.org/10.1010/CBO9780511571350>
2. Osborne J. Arguing to learn in science: The role of collaborative, critical discourse // Science. – 2010. – Vol. 328, №5977. – P. 463-466. – <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183944>
3. Nussbaum E. M., Dove I. J., Putney L. G. Bridging dialogic pedagogy and argumentation theory through critical questions // Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal. – 2023. – Vol. 11. – P. A7-A25. – <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2023.548>
4. Black P., Wiliam D. Developing the theory of formative assessment // Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability. – 2009. – Vol. 21, №1. – P. 5-31. – <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
5. Nicol D. J., Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice // Studies in Higher Education. – 2006. – Vol. 31, № 2. – P. 199-218. – <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
6. Adler M. J. The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. – Macmillan, 1982.
7. Billings L., Fitzgerald J. Dialogic discussion and the Socratic seminar // American Educational Research Journal. – 2002. – Vol. 39, №4. – P. 907-941. – <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312039004905>
8. Copeland M. Socratic circles: Fostering critical and creative thinking in middle and high school. – Routledge, 2023. – <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032682396>
9. Swain M. Language, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency // Advanced language proficiency: A sociocultural perspective / ed. H. Byrnes. – Georgetown University Press, 2006. – P. 95-108.
10. Driver R., Newton P., Osborne J. Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms // Science Education. – 2000. – Vol. 84, №3. – P. 287-312. – [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-237X\(200005\)84:3%3C287::AID-SCE1%3E3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(200005)84:3%3C287::AID-SCE1%3E3.0.CO;2-A)
11. Nystrand M. Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the literacy classroom. – Teachers College Press, 2003.
12. Topping K. J. Peer assessment // Theory Into Practice. – 2009. – Vol. 48, №1. – P. 20-27. – <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>
13. Mercer N., Littleton K. Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach. – Routledge, 2007. – <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203946657>

14. Socializing intelligence through academic talk and dialogue / eds. L. B. Resnick, C. S. Asterhan, S. N. Clarke. – American Educational Research Association, 2018. – <https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-43-1>
15. Braun V., Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology // Qualitative Research in Psychology. – 2006. – Vol. 3, № 2. – P. 77-101. – <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

ОҚУШЫЛАРДЫҢ АУЫЗША ДӘЛЕЛДЕУ ДАҒДЫЛАРЫН БАҒАЛАУ ҚҰРАЛЫ РЕТІНДЕ СОКРАТТЫҚ СЕМИНАРДЫ ҚАБЫЛДАУЫ

Бұл зерттеу оқушылардың ауызша дәлелдеу дағдыларын бағалау құралы ретіндегі Сократтық семинарларға қатысты көзқарастарын зерттеуге бағытталды. Ауызша дәлелдеу сыни ойлау, қарым-қатынас жасау және академиялық жетістіктің маңызды құрамдас бөлігі ретінде барған сайын мойындалып отырғандықтан, оқушылардың дәлелдерді құрастыру, негіздеу және жеткізу қабілеттерін шынайы бағалай алатын бағалау әдістеріне қажеттілік артып келеді. Назарбаев Зияткерлік мектебінде ағылшын тілін шет тілі ретінде оқыту жағдайында өткізілген Сократтық семинарларға қатысқан оқушылардың тәжірибесін зерттеу үшін сапалық кейс-стади зерттеу дизайны қолданылды. Деректер бағаланатын Сократтық семинарларға қатысқан 10-сыныптың 96 оқушысымен жүргізілген жартылай құрылымданған сұхбаттар арқылы жиналды. Деректерді талдау Браун мен Кларктың алты кезеңнен тұратын үлгісіне негізделген тақырыптық талдау әдісі арқылы жүзеге асырылды. Зерттеу нәтижесінде төрт негізгі тақырып анықталды: жаңа бағалау форматына бейімделу, бірлескен дәлелдеу дағдыларын дамыту, бағалау критерийлері мен әділдігін түсіну және коммуникациялық дағдылардың өмірлік маңыздылығын мойындау. Бастапқыда оқушылар белгісіздік пен қобалжуды сезінгеннен, уақыт өте келе олар өздеріне деген сенімділікті арттырып, Сократтық семинарларды ауызша дәлелдеу дағдыларын көрсетудің тиімді әрі шынайы тәсілі ретінде қабылдады. Сонымен қатар қатысушылар өзара бағалаудың бағалау үдерісінің ашықтығы мен әділдігін арттыратынын атап өтті. Жалпы алғанда, зерттеу нәтижелері Сократтық семинарлардың ауызша сөйлеуді бағалаудың дәстүрлі түрлеріне тиімді балама бола алатынын және сонымен қатар мағыналы коммуникация мен сыни ойлау дағдыларын дамытуға ықпал ететінін көрсетеді.

Түйін сөздер: Сократтық семинар, ауызша дәлелдеу, оқушылардың көзқарастары, шынайы бағалау, диалогтік оқыту.

ВОСПРИЯТИЕ УЧАЩИМИСЯ СОКРАТОВСКОГО СЕМИНАРА КАК ИНСТРУМЕНТА ОЦЕНИВАНИЯ НАВЫКОВ УСТНОЙ АРГУМЕНТАЦИИ

Данное исследование направлено на изучение восприятия учащимися сократовских семинаров как инструмента оценивания навыков устной аргументации. Поскольку устная аргументация все чаще рассматривается как важнейший компонент критического мышления, коммуникации и академической успешности, возникает необходимость в методах оценивания, которые позволяют достоверно оценить способность учащихся формулировать, обосновывать и представлять аргументы. Для изучения опыта учащихся, участвовавших в сократовских семинарах в условиях обучения английскому языку как иностранному в одной из Назарбаев Интеллектуальной школ, была использована качественная методология в формате кейс-стади. Данные были собраны посредством полуструктурированных интервью с 96 учащимися 10-х классов, принимавшими участие в оцениваемых сократовских семинарах. Анализ данных проводился методом тематического анализа в соответствии с шестишаговой моделью Браун и Кларк. Результаты исследования можно разделить на четыре основные темы: адаптация к новому формату оценивания, развитие навыков совместной аргументации, понимание критериев оценивания и справедливости оценки, а также осознание практической ценности коммуникативных навыков. Несмотря на то, что на начальном этапе учащиеся испытывали неуверенность и тревожность, со временем они становились более уверенными и рассматривали сократовские семинары как эффективный и аутентичный способ демонстрации навыков устной аргументации. Участники также отмечали, что взаимооценивание способствует повышению прозрачности и справедливости оценивания. В целом результаты исследования свидетельствуют о том, что сократовские семинары могут служить эффективной альтернативой

традиционным формам оценивания устной речи, одновременно способствуя развитию содержательной коммуникации и критического мышления.

Ключевые слова: сократовские семинары, устная аргументация, восприятие учащихся, аутентичное оценивание, диалогическое обучение.

References

1. Kuhn, D. (1991). *The skills of argument*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1010/CBO9780511571350>
2. Osborne, J. (2010). Arguing to learn in science: The role of collaborative, critical discourse. *Science*, 328(5977), 463-466. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183944>
3. Nussbaum, E. M., Dove, I. J., & Putney, L. G. (2023). Bridging dialogic pedagogy and argumentation theory through critical questions. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 11, A7-A25. <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2023.548>
4. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
5. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
6. Adler, M. J. (1982). *The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. Macmillan.
7. Billings, L., & Fitzgerald, J. (2002). Dialogic discussion and the Socratic seminar. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 907-941. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312039004905>
8. Copeland, M. (2023). *Socratic circles: Fostering critical and creative thinking in middle and high school*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032682396>
9. Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language proficiency: A sociocultural perspective* (pp. 95-108). Georgetown University Press.
10. Driver, R., Newton, P., & Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *Science Education*, 84(3), 287-312. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-237X\(200005\)84:3%3C287::AID-SCE1%3E3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(200005)84:3%3C287::AID-SCE1%3E3.0.CO;2-A)
11. Nystrand, M. (2003). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the literacy classroom*. Teachers College Press.
12. Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>
13. Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203946657>
14. Resnick, L. B., Asterhan, C. S., & Clarke, S. N. (Eds.). (2018). *Socializing intelligence through academic talk and dialogue*. American Educational Research Association. <https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-43-1>
15. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>

Information about authors:

Artamonova Xeniya (corresponding author) - English Teacher, Nazarbayev Intellectual School of Science and Mathematics in Karaganda City, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan, e-mail: Artamonova_K@krg.nis.edu.kz

Aliyeva Feruza - English Teacher, Nazarbayev Intellectual School of Science and Mathematics in Karaganda City, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan, e-mail: Aliyeva_F@krg.nis.edu.kz

Kulzhbekova Aigerim - English Teacher, Nazarbayev Intellectual School of Science and Mathematics in Karaganda City, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan, e-mail: Kulzhbekova_A@krg.nis.edu.kz

Suleimanova Makpal - English Teacher, Nazarbayev Intellectual School, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan, e-mail: Suleimanova_M@krg.nis.edu.kz

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Артамонова Ксения Сергеевна (автор-корреспондент) - ағылшын тілі мұғалімі, Қарағанды қаласындағы физика-математика бағытындағы Назарбаев Зияткерлік мектебі, Қарағанды, Қазақстан Республикасы, e-mail: Artamonova_K@krg.nis.edu.kz

Алиева Феруза Кайруллаевна - ағылшын тілі мұғалімі, Қарағанды қаласындағы физика-математика бағытындағы Назарбаев Зияткерлік мектебі, Қарағанды, Қазақстан Республикасы, e-mail: Aliyeva_F@krg.nis.edu.kz

Кульжабекова Айгерим Азизовна - ағылшын тілі мұғалімі, Қарағанды қаласындағы физика-математика бағытындағы Назарбаев Зияткерлік мектебі, Қарағанды, Қазақстан Республикасы, e-mail: Kulzhabekova_A@krg.nis.edu.kz

Сүлейманова Макпал Төлевбековна - ағылшын тілі мұғалімі, Қарағанды қаласындағы физика-математика бағытындағы Назарбаев Зияткерлік мектебі Қарағанды, Қазақстан Республикасы, e-mail: Suleimanova_M@krg.nis.edu.kz

Сведения об авторах:

Артамонова Ксения Сергеевна (автор-корреспондент) - учитель английского языка, Назарбаев Интеллектуальная школа естественно-математического направления Караганды, г. Караганды, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: Artamonova_K@krg.nis.edu.kz

Алиева Феруза Кайруллаевна - учитель английского языка, Назарбаев Интеллектуальная школа естественно-математического направления г. Караганды, Караганды, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: Aliyeva_F@krg.nis.edu.kz

Кульжабекова Айгерим Азизовна - учитель английского языка, Назарбаев Интеллектуальная школа естественно-математического направления г. Караганды, Караганды, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: Kulzhabekova_A@krg.nis.edu.kz

Сүлейманова Макпал Төлевбековна - учитель английского языка, Назарбаев Интеллектуальная школа естественно-математического направления г. Караганды, Караганды, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: Suleimanova_M@krg.nis.edu.kz