

# Socratic Seminar Manual

Westminster Christian School  
2008-2009

*The right questions, not answers, are the driving force in right thinking.*

# Overview of Socratic Seminar

Socratic method places the value of thinking at a higher premium than merely the acquisition of many pieces of information. Socrates was born in 469 B.C. and was put to death in Athens in 399 B.C. His main areas of content study were epistemology (study of knowledge) and ethics. Many believe that Socrates' teacher and colleague Protagoras invented the method, while Plato formalized it.

Socrates believed that the best way to grasp and retain knowledge was through regular and disciplined conversation. This conversational method is called 'dialectic'. Dialectic is defined as the practice of examining opinions and ideas in a logical format, most often by a method of questions and answers to determine the validity of the opinions and ideas.

Socrates began dialogues with an overview of the obvious problems inherent in the question and through dialogue, all parties were required to clarify their position, until finally the outcome of the conversation was a clear statement of what was meant. While it sounds simple on the surface, it is intensely rigorous. Socrates believed that the rigorous process of clarification (application of critical thinking skills), forced the human brain to recognize and solve internal contradictions. Many dialogues ended inconclusively to give time for mental digestion only to be taken up another day.

A good experience in Socratic seminar is characterized by knowledge creation through the synthesis of information rather than the mastery of particular pieces of information. Socratic method is most effectively used after practical activities and direct instruction, allowing for reflection and dialogue that responds to what has been experienced.

**For our purposes at WCS, Socratic Seminar is a method to drive students to understand information by creating an in-class dialogue based on a specific text(s). The participants are driven to seek deeper and broader understanding of complex ideas and interrelationships through rigorous and thoughtful dialogue rather than merely memorizing many bits of information or meeting arbitrary demands for 'coverage'.**

## **Benefits of the Socratic Seminar**

1. Develops strategies for increasing success for **all** students.
2. Potential for creating a positive learning environment for **all** students.
3. Provides opportunities for critical reading of a wide variety of texts.
4. Teaches respect for diverse ideas, people and practices.
5. Greatly enhances student knowledge and research base.
6. Creates a community of open inquiry.
7. Develops strategies for critical thinking skills, builds confidence and improves problem-solving skills.
8. Provides quality time to engage in in-depth dialogues, problem solving and clarification of one's ideas, ethics and values.
9. Builds a strong, collaborative work culture.
10. Puts the student in the center of learning as an active and engaged participant.

# Elements of Socratic Method

An effective Socratic seminar has four main parts:

## The Text

Socratic texts are chosen for their deep and rich content, appropriate to the content area and age of students. Texts can be chosen from readings in any discipline. Texts chosen across disciplines are particularly effective when objectives are targeting broad synthesis. Questions will rise automatically out of a good text, or be very easily derived. The questions prompted by the text should not have an immediate right or wrong answer but rather lead to additional questions. A successful text selection will cause participants to leave with more questions than they started with.

## The Question

A Socratic dialogue is comprised of either an open or closed line of questioning or some combination thereof. In a completely closed dialogue, all the questions are posited by the leader. In a completely open dialogue, all the questions are posited by the participants. In either case the questions are not viewed, (at least for the sake of the dialogue), as having a right or wrong answer. The dialogue and the questions must be approached with a genuine sense of curiosity and a mind that is open to follow a wide range of paths. Good questions will lead participants back to the text to speculate, evaluate, clarify, define, etc. and responses to questions should generate new questions from either the leader or participants. These new questions in turn generate new and/or deeper lines of inquiry.

In a religious environment, the question is the most difficult element to craft. In an effort to control the conclusions, the leader narrows the scope of questioning. While this fear is understandable, it is unnecessary. If the truth is true, it will have out. Absolute truth has its own power and is self-evident.

## The Leader

The leader functions in two roles, as leader and participant. The role of leader may be characterized in three areas: conscious, disciplined exploration of ideas and texts; focused guidance of dialogue; patient redirection of output.

### Exploration of Ideas and Texts

- requires leader to be involved in on-going, wide reading
- requires leader to know the text and related texts well
- requires leader to anticipate varied interpretations and recognize possibilities in each

### Focused Guidance of Dialogue

- actively engages dialogue
- crafts questions that are of interest
- demonstrates patience as understanding progresses (at differing rates)
- demonstrates willingness to explore non-traditional insights *at the students speed*

- demonstrates willingness to explore unexpected interpretations without judgment
- sets aside **personal** understanding and bias to allow for student discovery
- provides summary of ideas and suggests additional questions

**Patient Redirection and/or Adherence to Output**

- clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth, logic, fairness
- \*see Output of Socratic dialogue

# Guarding the Output of Socratic Seminar

If participants and leaders are not consciously seeking to adhere to principles of critical thought, the dialogue has little or no value. The universal intellectual standards listed and defined below must be applied to our thinking and dialogue in order to ensure the quality of thinking. These traits must be **explicitly** taught with the ultimate goal that they would become an integral part of the thinking process for our students.

In the process of ensuring redirection and/or adherence to critical thinking skills, the teacher is explicitly teaching the skills. When content-driven, direct instruction is followed by question-driven discussion, students learn to think! In time, thinking becomes dominant over emoting, allowing them to synthesize learned information in a rational, logical and unified sequence.

## **Clarity**

Clarity is an imperative skill for good dialogue. If a statement or question is unclear, there is no way to determine the accuracy or relevance of the statement and any following dialogue becomes questionable. Ex. Should people donate \$1 to save the children? or The educational system in America is very poor.

## **Accuracy**

A statement may be clear, but inaccurate. Ex. Most dogs are over 300 pounds in weight.

## **Precision**

A statement may be clear, accurate but imprecise. Ex. Mr. Stimpy is old.

## **Relevance**

A statement may be clear, accurate, precise and have absolutely nothing to do with the point. For example, many students, (and even teachers) believe that effort should comprise all or a portion of their grade in a course. However, effort does not measure the quality, quantity, or reality of what a student has learned and is therefore irrelevant to their appropriate grade.

## **Depth**

A statement may be clear, accurate, precise, relevant and superficial. For example, the statement, 'Just say no' is used to discourage students from drug use. It is clear, accurate, precise and relevant but lacks depth because it treat a complex and pervasive problem superficially, failing to deal with the complex issue.

## **Breadth**

A statement may be clear, accurate, precise, relevant, deep, and lack breadth. For example this is often the case in arguments from either a conservative or liberal standpoint which go deeply into an issue but only recognize the insights from one side of the question.

**Logic**

Thinking requires that we bring a variety of thoughts together in some order. When a combination of thoughts is mutually supporting and made sense in combination, the thinking is said to be logical. When the combination is not mutually supporting, is contradictory in some sense, or does not 'make sense', the combination is not logical.

**Fairness**

We naturally think from our own perspective, from a point of view that tends to privilege our position. Fairness implies that we treat all points relevant to the questions as if we had never considered or hear them before. This is integral, most often because we are prone to see things the way we want to and desire to have our own way, but also because bringing a vested interest into the dialogue creates an environment where trust is absent or diminished. When this happens, dialogue dies.

## Choosing the Text for Socratic Seminar

Choosing the text is an important part of the Socratic Seminar. Since great dialogue is based on resolving epistemological conflict, it is best to choose text that conflicts, contradicts or challenges the content material that is being introduced. Below are basic guidelines for text selection:

1. Choose relatively short texts. (Assess that students have read **and** annotated the material.)
2. Choose from a variety of subjects, do not limit yourself to your subject matter. Art, poetry, religion, theology, fiction, non-fiction, cartoon, satire, editorial, etc. etc.
3. Text should be complex enough to allow for a variety of perspectives and/or reactions appropriate for grade level. Multiple viewpoints create rich dialogue. You may choose to use multiple, conflicting texts.
4. Texts should have relevance to the student and the unit of study.
5. Text should be at independent reading level for majority of students. In cases where the text is more challenging, teachers should use reading strategies to scaffold interactions with the text. (If you don't know how to do this – don't pretend – **ASK**).
6. Internet is an easy way to search for short, thematically relevant texts. And its free! Proquest may also allow searches by theme.

# Opening Questions

## Opening Questions: (sometimes also called Essential Question)

- should arise from curiosity, connectedness and challenge
- should be approached as if it has no 'right' answer
- be framed to generate discussion leading to greater understanding of text and related ideas
- rises out of the text (either explicit or implicit)
- resist a simple or single answer
- deliberately thought-provoking, counterintuitive, and/or controversial
- require students to draw on knowledge and personal experience
- can be revisited throughout a unit or course
- lead to other essential questions
- be rich in presupposition and implication

## Questions that Facilitate Dialogue that Develops Critical Thinking Skills

Stem questions are important for the leader and participant(s). A list of these should be posted or handed out so that students and leader can refer to them as dialogue ensues. At first it may feel artificial, but soon will become more comfortable and automatic for student and leader. **These questions are directly related to the development, accountability and assessment of the mastery of critical thinking skills.**

<b>Clarity</b>	Could you elaborate further? Could you give me an example?
<b>Accuracy</b>	Could you illustrate what you mean? How could we check on that? How could we find out if that is true?
<b>Precision</b>	How could we verify or test that? Could you be more specific? Could you give me more details?
<b>Relevance</b>	Could you be more exact? How does that relate to the problem? How does that bear on the question?
<b>Depth</b>	How does that help us with the issue? What factors make this a difficulty problem? What are some of the complexities of this question?

- What are some of the difficulties we need to deal with?
- Breadth** Do we need to look at this from another perspective?  
Do we need to consider another point of view?  
Do we need to look at this in other ways?
- Logic** Does all this make sense together?  
Does your first statement fit with your last one?  
Does what you say follow from the evidence?
- Significance** Is this the most important problem to consider?  
Is this the central idea to focus on?  
Which of these facts are most important?
- Fairness** Do I have any vested interest in this issue?  
Am I sympathetically representing the viewpoints of others?  
Do I remember when I had a poorly constructed point of view?

### Questions to Facilitate and Sustain Dialogue

- Agree/Disagree** Has any else had a similar...?  
Who has a different...?
- Clarification** I'm not sure I understand...?  
Tell me more about....  
Do you see the gaps in my reasoning?  
Are you taking into account something I have not considered?
- Support Questions** Can you give us an example of ..?  
Where in the story...?  
What would be a good reason for...?  
What is some evidence for...?
- Cause and Effect** Why do you think that happened?  
How could that have been prevented?  
Do you think that would happen that way again? Why?  
What are some reasons people...?
- Compare/Contrast** How are \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ alike? Different?  
What is that similar to?  
Can you think why this feels different than...?  
How does this (poem, book, incident, et.) remind you of....?
- Benefits/Burdens** What are some of the reasons this wouldn't/would be a good idea?  
Would anyone like to speak to the opposite side?  
Those are some reasons this would work: what might not work?
- Point of View/Perspective**  
How might she/he have felt...?  
What do you think he/she was thinking when...?  
You might not like that, but can you think of someone who would?  
\_\_\_\_\_ expressed a differing opinion. Are there others?  
Do you have a different interpretation?  
Do you have different conclusions?  
How do you arrive at your view?
- Structure/Function** If that was the \_\_\_\_\_, what do you think about \_\_\_\_\_?  
Why was that happening? What do you think of that approach?  
What might be better choices in that situation?

**Counterexample** What rules would we need to make sure...?  
Would that still happen if...?  
What might have made the difference?

**Different Situation** Can you describe a situation that would...?  
Suppose 'X'. Would that still be true? Why or why not?

**Solicit Questions** What are some things you wonder about?  
What would you like to know about?  
Are there questions we should remember now?

**Personal Experience** What would you do in that situation?  
Has anything like that ever happened to you?  
In what way are you alike or different from...?

## **Responsibilities of the Leader**

1. Read the selected text or material carefully. Focus on formulating provocative questions while reading. Select short passages.
2. Start with a few brief contextual comments, but remember this is not an opportunity to deliver a lecture.
3. Engage all students as much as possible. Do not allow a debate between leader and student(s) to develop.
4. Choose the introductory question in advance.
5. Listen carefully so you can follow with clarifying or sustaining questions.
6. Stick to the subject and call students back to the text to support ideas if necessary. Do not allow either wandering or pontificating.
7. Do not praise or demean any ideas or comments. Stress participation, clarity and amplification of ideas.
8. Insist on standard of intellectual rigor. A good seminar is not a 'bull session'. (intellectual standards)
9. Remember your role is co-learner and facilitator, not the authority on all 'correct' thinking.
10. Assign an observer and record keeper at each seminar. Ask this individual to sum up. Give the group time for clarification or additions.
11. Allow the group time to process the dialogue; gather feedback to guide future seminars.
12. Design a reflective assignment for each seminar you facilitate. (Sample included in booklet, can be modified for content area and grade level)
13. End with, "that's a good place to stop". Not "seminar is over" or "we have to end", etc. A small thing but indicates that the dialogue will go on and on.

## **Responsibilities: Participants**

It is important to communicate clearly to the students when expressing their role(s) as a participant in a Socratic seminar.

1. Refer to the text, this is not a memory test. In the seminar you are not “learning a subject”; your goal is to understand ideas, issues, and values reflected in the text.
2. It is ok to ‘pass’ if you don’t have something to say. Listening and thinking is a contribution.
3. Do not participate if you are not prepared. You waste peoples time.
4. Never stay confused; ask for clarification.
5. Talk to participants, not just the leader.
6. Stick to the point; make notes about ideas you want to return to.
7. Don’t raise your hand; take turns speaking.
8. Listen carefully and respectfully.
9. Speak up so everyone can hear you.
10. Discuss ideas rather than each other’s opinions (or your own).
11. You are responsible for the seminar whether you know it, acknowledge it or admit it or not.

These guidelines should be reinforced occasionally so that students internalize the principles of good dialogue.

## **Common Student Concerns**

1. Is there really a ‘right’ answer, or am I just second-guessing what the teacher thinks?
2. How will I be evaluated? Are the criteria going to be apparent, or will the teacher just “give me a grade”?
3. Will I be judged for my ideas based on race, religion, class, gender, etc. that will preclude my idea from being accepted?
4. How safe is the environment for me to say what is really on my mind?
5. May I express the ‘dark side’ of the picture?
6. How will my peer’s view me if I participate? don’t participate?
7. Will I get a chance to talk if I listen first?
8. Is there an answer to the questions raised? Will I be able to hold on to any answers for certain?

## Dialogue, Debate and Discussion

<b>Dialogue</b>	<b>Debate and/or Discussion</b>
Dialogue is collaborative; cooperative; multiple sides work toward a shared understanding	Debate is competitive or oppositional; sides try to prove each other wrong; discussion can move this way as well.
In dialogue, one listens to understand, to make meaning, and to find common ground	In debate, (and sometimes discussion) one listens to find flaws, spot differences, and counter arguments
enlarges and possibly changes a point of view	defends assumptions as truth; participants “dig in”
creates an open-minded attitude; open to being wrong and to change	creates closed mind, determination to be right
submits to best thinking, expecting that the thinking of others will help thinking rather than threaten it	submits own thinking and defends it against challenge to show that it is right
calls for temporarily suspending of one’s personal beliefs (suspension of disbelief)	calls for investing whole heart in one’s beliefs
searches for strengths in all positions	searches for weaknesses in other positions
respects participants and seeks not to alienate or offend	rebutts and may belittle or deprecate others;
assumes that many people have pieces of answers and that cooperation can lead to greater understanding	assumes a single right answer that somebody already has
remains open-ended	demands a conclusion
is mutual inquiry; collective knowledge dialogue is divergent	individual opinion; individual knowledge convergent

Differences in dialogue, debate and discussion should not imply that one is ‘good’ and the others are ‘bad’. For purposes of instruction, dialogue is an invaluable tool. The chart simply articulates the difference so that we recognize when we have gone off track.

## Facilitating Thoughtful Dialogue

For successful Socratic seminars, we must create an dialogic environment. Recent history has been monologic – in the educational community at large and at WCS.

<b>Monologic Classrooms</b>	<b>Dialogic Classrooms</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*teacher hold the knowledge</li> <li>*teacher poses all or most questions</li> <li>*students respond to teacher</li> <li>*teacher evaluates student response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*teacher/student construct new knowledge based on study of existing knowledge</li> <li>*teacher/student pose questions</li> <li>*students respond to eachother</li> <li>*class evaluates ideas and reaches consensus</li> </ul>

Questioning techniques resist simple formulas, some strategies my help to encourage thoughtful dialogue and the growth of questioning techniques:

1. open-ended questions that resist obvious, simple, or “already-known” answers.
2. wait for replies, time is required to think
3. encourage ‘uptake’ by responding to or building on the idea of the previous speaker
4. help facilitation by:

<b>Explore the Reply or</b>	<b>Move on...</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*ask the last speaker to clarify or explain</li> <li>*ask other students to build upon last idea</li> <li>*ask for support or evidence from text, experience or ‘old’ knowledge</li> <li>*deepen discussion by asking students to consider:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cause and effect</li> <li>compare/contrast</li> <li>benefits/burdens</li> <li>take a differing view</li> <li>react to counter example</li> <li>apply to different situation</li> <li>relate to personal experience</li> </ul> </li> <li>*invite new ideas</li> <li>*solicit questions for the group to consider or be considered later</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*ask a different question on new content</li> <li>*consolidate ideas</li> <li>*summarize discussion</li> <li>*reintroduce an idea posed earlier</li> <li>*shift to a discussion of group process</li> </ul>

## Dealing with Absolutes

A Socratic seminar is sometimes difficult for people of faith. It is also difficult for fanatics, for the same reason. Fear. The fear is that if I allow open dialogue, the foundation of my belief (Christianity) or my fanaticism (everyone else) won't be understood. Or maybe I'll turn out to be wrong. Or my position won't be the center of attention. Or my idea won't be predominant. Or, or, or....

A Christian **knows** that God's Word is absolute and sufficient to answer, **definitively**, every question that may arise. Leading a Socratic seminar, suspending one's own belief, is an act of humility that allows students the opportunity to arrive at a conclusion by practicing critical thinking skills in a guided environment. Human depravity does not allow for the possibility that critical thinking will develop on its' own.

Weave Truth into every text consideration and enter the dialogue as leader, with open heart and mind. Trust that the Truth is powered by the Sovereign will of an omnipotent God. Know that God will do exactly the work He intends. Think kindly of your students as you remember the evolution of your thoughts as God drew you toward Himself. Were any of the 'crooked roads' of your intellectual development unnecessary in His plan for you? They aren't for your students either.

## **Sample Socratic Seminar Process**

1. find a text, event, experience that will provide opportunity for rich dialogue in connection with current content instruction.
2. plan direct instruction content
3. assign Socratic seminar material (with assessment)
4. write objectives for learning
5. have Socratic seminar (use assessment from assignment, assign scribe, class reflection/response)
6. summarize (scribe or leader)
7. preserve conclusions, new questions, met objectives in writing, make test questions

### **Group Assignment:**

Write a simple process example at any each program level.

# Group Project

**History Class, High School**

**Unit: Western Europe, period of King Henry VIII**

**Student Assignment: review lecture notes on King Henry VIII**

**read article attached**

**read Matthew 27 excerpt below**

**read Psalm 2 below**

**Opening Question:**

**How do the kingships of King Henry VIII and Christ differ? How are they similar?**

**Groups Assignment:**

- 1. evaluate whether this is a good opening question. why or why not. how would you change it?**
- 2. make a list of presuppositions (if any) in this question?**
- 3. make a list of implications (if any) in this question?**
- 4. make a list of objectives to guide the leader in shaping this dialogue**
- 5. make a list of questions that you imagine could be put on a test to assess the new knowledge gained in the discussion?**

**Matthew 27: 26** Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified. **27** Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, <sup>EB3</sup> and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. **28** And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. **29** And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! **30** And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. **31** And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him. **32** And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross.

**33** And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, **34** They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. **35** And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots. **36** And sitting down they watched him there; **37** And set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS. **38** Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left. **39** And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, **40** And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. **41** Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, **42** He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. **43** He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. **44** The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. **45** Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. **46** And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

**Psalm 2 - [Study This Chapter](#)**

**1** Why do the heathen rage, <sup>E3</sup> and the people imagine a vain thing? **2** The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, **3** Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. **4** He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. **5** Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex <sup>E4</sup> them in his sore displeasure. **6** Yet have I set <sup>E5</sup> my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

**7** I will declare the decree: <sup>E6</sup> the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. **8** Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. **9** Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

**10** Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. **11** Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. **12** Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

## Elementary 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>

In class preparation:

- Read James 3:1-12 below
- learn latin phrase and meaning below
- give context Merchant Marine Academy

Dialogue on the following:

What does the Latin phrase have in common with the Bible verses? What is different?

Learning Objectives:

1. students will define actions
2. students will define words
3. students will memorize latin phrase
4. students will differentiate congruity from incongruity
5. students will decide a personal course of action

Assessment:

- guided response through 2 cartoon strips entry of words, one demonstrating congruity and one demonstrating incongruity
- written record of points to remember

<b>acta non verba</b>	"actions, not words"	Motto of the <a href="#">United States Merchant Marine Academy</a> .
-----------------------	----------------------	--

**18 And many that believed came, and confessed, and shewed their deeds. 19** Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. **20** So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed.

**Psalms 15:1-5**

**1** LORD, who shall abide [F36](#) in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? **2** He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. **3 He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour. 4** In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoureth them that fear the LORD. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. **5** He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

# Group Project

Articulate a general idea for a Socratic seminar in each of the following:

elementary bible:

high school programming:

5<sup>th</sup> grade science:

middle school choir:

high school ceramics:

3<sup>rd</sup> grade history:

your choice:

## Bibliography

[www.greece.k12](http://www.greece.k12)

Dr. Richard Paul, Dr. Linda Elder: The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking: Concepts and Tools.

[www.criticalthinking.org](http://www.criticalthinking.org)