doi: 10.12957/childphilo.2024.85271

multicultural citizenship education and the community of philosophical inquiry

park, sang wook[1]
goun middle school, ulsan, south korea
orcid id: 0009-0005-2398-3921

abstract
Modern civic education in multicultural society faces two diametrically opposed challenges: universality and diversity. Those who emphasize universality argue that multicultural civic education should be based on universal values, goals, and concepts. However, those who emphasize diversity say that different concepts and ideals should be allowed and respected across cultures, genders, ethnicities, etc. Multicultural education aims to promote the coexistence of people from different cultural backgrounds within a nation. In this article, I seek a way between these two extremes by arguing that civic education in a multicultural society should have philosophical inquiry and dialogue as its pedagogical basis. Providing a path to objective meaning while honoring different cultural contexts and situations. Educational efforts to achieve objectivity while respecting diversity can offer important contributions to building democratic societies that allow people who share diverse interests to interact freely. I justify this middle way by drawing upon Robert B. Brandom's (1994, 2001) inferentialism, in which the objectivity of meaning is secured through a process of material inference that takes into account different cultural and social contexts. I conclude that the kind of dialogue Brandom has in mind is best realized through the community of philosophical inquiry, with its emphasis on reasonableness and self-correction. Ultimately, the community of philosophical inquiry is the pedagogy needed by multicultural citizenship education.

keywords: multicultural citizenship education; inferentialism; community of philosophical inquiry; dialogue; epistemology.

la educación para la ciudadanía multicultural y la comunidad de investigación filosófica

resumen
La educación cívica moderna en la sociedad multicultural se enfrenta a dos retos diametralmente opuestos: la universalidad y la diversidad. Los que hacen hincapié en la universalidad sostienen que la educación cívica multicultural debe basarse en valores, objetivos y conceptos universales. Sin embargo, los que hacen hincapié en la diversidad afirman que deben permitirse y respetarse conceptos e ideales diferentes entre culturas, géneros, etnias, etc. La educación multicultural pretende promover la coexistencia de personas de diferentes orígenes culturales dentro de una nación. En este artículo, busco un camino entre estos dos extremos argumentando que la educación cívica en una sociedad multicultural debería tener como base pedagógica la indagación filosófica y el diálogo. Esta vía proporciona un camino hacia el significado objetivo al tiempo que honra los diferentes contextos y situaciones culturales. Los esfuerzos educativos para lograr la objetividad respetando la diversidad pueden ofrecer importantes contribuciones a la construcción de sociedades democráticas que permitan a las personas que comparten intereses diversos interactuar

[1] E-mail: sangugbag2@gmail.com

libremente. Justifico esta vía intermedia basándome en el inferencialismo de Robert B. Brandom (1994, 2001), en el que la objetividad del significado se garantiza mediante un proceso de inferencia material que tiene en cuenta los diferentes contextos culturales y sociales. Concluyo que el tipo de diálogo que Brandom tiene en mente se realiza mejor a través de la comunidad de investigación filosófica, con su énfasis en la razonabilidad y la autocorrección. Proponiendo que la comunidad de investigación filosófica es la pedagogía que necesita la educación para la ciudadanía multicultural.

palabras clave: educación para la ciudadanía multicultural; inferencialismo; comunidad de investigación filosófica; diálogo; epistemología.

educação para a cidadania multicultural e a comunidade de investigação filosófica

resumo
A educação cívica moderna na sociedade multicultural enfrenta dois desafios diametralmente opostos: universalidade e diversidade. Aqueles que enfatizam a universalidade argumentam que a educação cívica multicultural deve se basear em valores, metas e conceitos universais. Entretanto, aqueles que enfatizam a diversidade dizem que conceitos e ideais diferentes devem ser permitidos e respeitados em todas as culturas, gêneros, etnias etc. A educação multicultural visa a promover a coexistência de pessoas de diferentes origens culturais em uma nação. Neste artigo, busco um caminho entre esses dois extremos, argumentando que a educação cívica em uma sociedade multicultural deve ter como base pedagógica a investigação filosófica e o diálogo. Esse caminho oferece uma via para o significado objetivo, ao mesmo tempo em que honra diferentes contextos e situações culturais. Os esforços educacionais para alcançar a objetividade e, ao mesmo tempo, respeitar a diversidade podem oferecer contribuições importantes para a construção de sociedades democráticas onde pessoas compartilhem interesses diversos e interajam livremente. Justifico esse meio-termo com base no inferencialismo de Robert B. Brandom (1994, 2001), no qual a objetividade do significado é garantida por meio de um processo de inferência material que leva em conta diferentes contextos culturais e sociais. Concluo que o tipo de diálogo que Brandom tem em mente é melhor realizado por meio da comunidade de investigação filosófica, com ênfase na razoabilidade e na autocorreção. Em última análise, a comunidade de investigação filosófica é a pedagogia necessária para a educação da cidadania multicultural.

palavras-chave: educação para a cidadania multicultural; inferencialismo; comunidade de investigação filosófica; diálogo; epistemologia.

multicultural citizenship education and the community of philosophical inquiry

introduction

Multicultural society is no longer a new societal phenomenon. Globalization has made culturally homogeneous nations unrealistic, forcing citizens to be more open to pluralism and diversity (Kymlicka, 1995). Meanwhile, COVID-19 has created important opportunities to expose deeper conflicts within multicultural societies. Along with national lockdowns, negative perceptions of certain countries, races, and cultures have increased significantly (The Bottom Line, 2020). UNESCO (2022) warns that the multicultural phenomenon caused by rapid globalization will continue advancing rapidly, leading to increased diversity, uncertainty, and conflict. Citizens are no longer committed to a country based on a specific identity; instead, new kinds of citizens are needed to live in multicultural societies. In response, Banks (2007) argues that a delicate balance of diversity and unity should be a central goal of democratic states. This requires a deep understanding through intercultural encounters and conversations, not just inclusion and recognition. Moreover, we need an epistemological foundation to justify this interculturalist perspective (Espinosa Zárate, 2023).

This study examines the epistemic foundation for multicultural citizenship education by means of Robert B, Brandom's inferentialism, which shows a way of achieving objectivity in different cultural contexts and unique situations. Brandom argues that objectivity can be achieved through the process of giving and receiving reasons, as is achieved through social practice (Brandom 2001). In short, Brandom's inferentialism attempts to achieve practical objectivity based on intersubjectivity, which can, in turn, form a basis for understanding and communication across different cultures. Donald Davidson likens conception of intersubjective objectivity to triangulation. The meaning of an object or concept is not something that can be determined alone, but rather it requires relations to other objects. What is achieved

intersubjectively is the construction of an objective world, namely a world in which each of us can believe. He writes:

> Our sense of objectivity is the consequence of another sort of triangulation, one that requires two creatures. Each interacts with an object, but what gives each the concept of the way things are objectively is the base line formed between the creatures by language. The fact that they share a concept of truth alone makes sense of the claim that they have beliefs, that they are able to assign objects a place in the public world. (Davidson, 1982, p. 327).

Davidson's triangulation metaphor well-explains the concept of objectivity as an intersubjectivity of Brandom. According to Davidson's principle of triangulation, objectivity should be understood mutually subjectively through language beyond the dichotomy of subjectivity and objectivity. In other words, without dialogue with others, we cannot have a notion of whether things are wrong or right (Davidson, 1999). Brandom demonstrates how one can achieve what one calls intersubjective objectivity in the course of concrete linguistic practice. In this article, the discussion of Brandom's inferentialism is centered on *Making It Explicit* (1994) and *Articulating Reasons* (2001). This is because in these two works, it was determined that Brandom completed the theory of inferentialism and did not publish more advanced works on inferentialism since then.

In the following, I will argue that a multicultural citizenship education based on Brandom's inferentialism can be best implemented through community of philosophical inquiry. Many have argued that the community of philosophical inquiry is a suitable pedagogy for multicultural education; those in philosophy for children state that it is the movement's pedagogy—the community of philosophical inquiry—that makes philosophy for children a necessary medium of multicultural education. Turgeon (2014) suggests that philosophical exploratory communities can provide a haven for encouraging and nurturing diversity and caring for one another. It is said that the essence of philosophy as a means of problem-solving includes a seed that fosters multiple perspectives. Gardner (2022) argues that in an era of diversity and complexity, the dialogue we need is not based on competition and persuasion, but on

a true understanding of each other. She expresses that this type of dialogue can be best implemented through a community of philosophical inquiry. Furthermore, Chen and Gardner (2020) suggest that philosophical dialogue has the potential for enrichment by focusing on values and relationships rather than erasing other cultures. Mayseless and Kizel (2022) advocate for philosophical inquiry communities and pluralism, arguing that children of minorities can help ask questions and justify their identity.

These studies demonstrate the relevance of communities of philosophical inquiry as a multicultural pedagogy in terms of their ability to facilitate the understanding and embracing of different perspectives. In this article, I argue that the community of philosophical inquiry is a pedagogical way of ensuring not only inclusivity and diversity but also objectivity. I believe that this can help build stronger philosophical roots for future multicultural citizenship education.

multiculturalism and civic education

the conflict between universality and diversity

Today, civic education in democratic nations faces two challenges. One is the need to foster patriotism, loyalty, democratic values, and universal morality as citizens of one nation; the other is the need to recognize diverse values, respect the diversity of minority cultures, and affirm individuality and identity. Multicultural societies respond to ethnic and religious diversity in various ways; some have recognized and accommodated cultural differences and group identities, while others have attempted to suppress group identity and promote assimilation (Baber, 2012). While assimilationism belongs to the position of universalism because it emphasizes the common elements of human experience, multiculturalism emphasizes cultural differences and is in a relativistic position (Portera &Milani, 2021). However, both of these positions present serious problems. Uniformity to the exclusion of diversity leads to cultural oppression and hegemony, as in the case of the Cultural Revolution in China in 1966–1976 and Hitler's Nazism in Germany in 1933-1945. And diversity without unity leads to sectarianism and fragmentation of the nation-state, as in the Iraq War in

the late 2000s, when sectarian conflict and division jeopardized the fragile state (Banks, 2008).

Moreover, each of these opposing positions has problems in their justification. For specificity, civic education that advocates universalism and assimilation runs the risk of perceiving human beings as homogeneous. The idea of precisely demarcating a group and uniting them under a single set of interests relies on an overly simplistic view of humanity (Jaggar, 1999). Humans are individuals who form their own identities within their own cultural contexts; they have different visions of what is good, beautiful, and right. For example, the understanding of values or concepts such as patriotism, justice, friendship, and love will differ between women and men, Muslims and Christians, adults and children, and Americans and Chinese. According to Taylor (1994, p. 38), a person's identity is not defined by a single facet, but is formed through an ongoing dialogue or struggle with meaningful others; it is not shaped by pre-existing social scripts. In addition, a single cultural mindset makes individuals think of their culture as a superior culture and homogenizes all other cultures, consequently ignoring the unique characteristics of each society and culture (Iuso & Marinaro, 2024).

Civic education that advocates universalism and assimilation also bears the burden of presenting a universal morality and sense of humanity that everyone should aspire to. This burden is more likely to generate resistance and resentment than universal and peaceful consensus among different cultures (Jaggar, 1999). Denial of one's own culture, identity, and traditions will draw on underlying resentment. For example, France has banned Muslim women from wearing the hijab, facing accusations that it further dehumanizes Muslim women, as well as offending Islam itself (Aziz, 2022). Not only can such bans seriously hurt others, but they can also cripple them psychologically, causing victims of that hurt to hate themselves (Taylor, 1994).

The advocacy of cultural pluralism also faces serious opposition; it leads to an extreme state of relativism and can seriously infringe on individual rights. Taylor (1994, pp. 38-39) emphasizes multiculturalism and argues for a shift from 'politics of equal

dignity' to 'politics of difference;' he says that the difference in cultural identity between groups should be recognized. However, by acknowledging the uniqueness and difference of each culture as it is, you can conclude that clearly immoral practices such as racism, misogyny, and class discrimination should also be allowed. Kymlicka (1995) writes:

> Ethnic groups may seek to use state power to limit their members' freedom in the name of collective solidarity. This increases the risk of personal oppression. In this sense, critics of 'collective rights' often evoke images of the divine right and patriarchal culture in which women are oppressed and religious orthodoxy is legally enforced as an example of what can happen when the claimed rights of groups take precedence over individual rights. (p. 36)

Above, Kymlicka (1995) says that allowing cultural pluralism can lead to another totalitarian situation within a culture. In this situation, individual rights are bound to be seriously violated. This is because multiculturalism does not provide a universal and moral standard because it only emphasizes diversity and relativity. That is why multiculturalism cannot have the potential to mediate conflicts between different cultures. For this reason, Cantle (2012) argues that multiculturalism does not help people from different cultural backgrounds live in solidarity. Furthermore, Portera and Milani (2021) say that "education should go beyond knowledge and respect for diversity. Good education should promote real interaction with the aim of changing what is considered wrong (e.g., violence, oppression, prejudice)" (p. 54). Accordingly, Portera (2020) proposes to use the word 'multicultural' as a predicate and proposes interculturalism as a specific educational method. Interculturalism refers to a direction in which we can deeply understand and unite with each other through meetings, conversations, and discussions between different cultures (Abdallah-Pretseille, 2006). Recently, cultural reciprocity has been discussed as an effective educational planning to cope with cultural diversity (Sanz-Leal et al., 2021; Sakamoto & Roger, 2022). This includes efforts to actively communicate and understand beyond simply recognizing and accepting various cultures. Dialogue and discussion between mutual cultures based on interculturalism are urgent for a multicultural society.

challenges to multicultural civic education

Following the assimilationist approach, multicultural civics education should aim to persuade and instill universal values and virtues for which all citizens should strive. Meanwhile, the multiculturalist approach calls for teaching attitudes of tolerance and recognition for different cultures. However, as we have seen, each of these approaches poses serious problems. Therefore, a new approach to multicultural citizenship education is needed that enables dialogue, understanding, and solidarity between various cultures. It should be able to secure objectivity and diversity while being based on interculturalism.

To this end, multicultural citizenship education must respond to two issues, the first of which is to present an epistemological basis that objective understanding can be reached through dialogue between various cultures. Traditional representationalism is not helpful here; according to representationalism, the criterion of truth and objectivity is the correspondence between external objects and consciousness. But multiculturalism says that we should recognize that people can look at the same object and take different meanings depending on their cultural context. In response, we need a non-correspondence theory of truth. For example, Rorty (1989) argues that the external world alone does not guarantee the truth of our beliefs. He argues that truth and meaning are created by communities of individuals (Rorty, 1989). But Rorty's later philosophy of radical constructivism is insufficient as an educational alternative. It is imperative that educators provide students with purpose, hope, and value during a fragmented, multicultural society. However, Rorty removes the purpose, value, and truth that we should pursue together because they were viewed as being more problematic than useful. Putnam criticizes Rorty for refusing to engage in any philosophical discussion and debate. Putnam believes that discussion is still warranted to find the truth beyond just conversation for therapeutic purposes and argues that through this, we can find objectivity of the truth that we must pursue together. In this respect, Putnam criticizes Rorty's philosophy as just another form of aggressive metaphysical illness (Putnam, 1992).

The second problem is the methodology of multicultural citizenship education. Simply arguing that an objective standard should be found between universality and pluralism is too abstract and only creates ambiguity for teachers. This is where we need to search for concrete methods of citizenship education based on a theory of truth like Brandom's inferentialism. Brandom's inferentialist position suggests that social practice is important for securing the objective meaning of concepts in different contexts (Brandom, 2001). For Brandom, social practice can be seen as a dialogical process of asking and giving for reasons; this is where the topic of dialogue as a concrete method is introduced. In the age of pluralism, dialogue is considered an important pedagogical tool. Arendt (1998) argued that to coexist with others under conditions of radical pluralism, one must enter the world through words and actions. Similarly, Biesta (2010) argues that education for a constantly constructed, dynamic and pluralistic identity is ultimately a response to the other, a dialogue. The difference in Brandom's approach compared with these other approaches to dialogue is that he shows how objectivity can be secured in diversity.

Thus, this paper argues that civic education for an uncertain multicultural society must be fundamentally dialogical as Brandom expresses. In other words, people in various cultural contexts should secure intersubjective objectivity through dialogue, and through this, they should be able to overcome division and hope for a mutual understanding. Therefore, based on Brandom's inferentialism, I propose a pedagogical dialogue for multicultural citizenship education and what remedial pedagogical measures can be taken for its implementation.

brandom's inferentialism as an epistemological foundation

inferentialism

Brandom's central questions are: 'How is the meaning of a concept determined?' and 'What does it mean to have a good grasp of the meaning of a concept?' Brandom (1994) rejects the representationalist understanding of concepts; he takes the pragmatist line that the meaning of a concept is determined by its practical use. And emphasizes

a constitutive, pragmatic understanding of concepts similar to Sellars (1953), who argues that to grasp a concept is to master the use of words.

We participate in various language activities as social practices in our daily lives; these linguistic activities form the basis of our lives and identities and are intricately organized into various cultural, ethnic, social, and historical contexts. Therefore, Brandom (2001) argues that the content of the concept we use is essentially linked to ourselves and our beliefs. Taylor (1994) emphasizes the importance of language in shaping our lives and identity; he says that by acquiring richly expressed languages, we can understand ourselves and define our identity. Such languages exist and are maintained only within certain language communities, and humans exist with certain languages and are partially composed of certain languages (Taylor, 1989). In other words, the language activities in which we engage are not explicitly visible, but fixed on certain community and cultural characteristics. In this sense, the basic form of a concept is propositional and the essence of conceptual use applies the concept to propositional arguments, beliefs, and ideas (Brandom, 2001). In the end, Brandom's inferentialism can be said to explicitly create an inferential relationship between many propositions underlying the use of the concept.

Taking an inferential perspective means that the various cultural and historical contexts and personal beliefs underneath the use of a concept can be explicitly identified and used appropriately. For example, what does it mean to understand the concept of friendship beyond just 'intimate feelings between friends?' When using the concept of friendship in real life, it is linked to answers to questions such as 'Should friendship help me?', 'Is friendship possible between men and women?', 'Should friendship be true?', 'Should friendship be true for a long time?', and 'Must friends actually meet?' The answer can depend on the asker's sociocultural context. Imagine that someone saw you lying to a friend and said: 'That's not friendship.' The speaker's notion of friendship is connected to an inference to the proposition that friends should always be truthful with one another. Alternately, imagine perceiving someone who only communicates via social media and saying: 'If you really want to make friends,

you have to meet them in person.' The idea of friendship the speaker describes is connected to an inference to the proposition that friendship is only possible when it is in person. As such, if we want to use the concept of friendship appropriately in context, we must have a good understanding of the inferential relationship related to it. Brandom (2001) writes:

> It follows immediately from such an inferential demarcation of the conceptual that in order to master any concepts, one must master many concepts. For grasp of one concept consists in mastery of at least some of its inferential relations to other concepts. Cognitively, grasp of just one concept is the sound of one hand clapping. Another consequence is that to be able to apply one concept noninferentially, one must be able to use others inferentially. (p. 49)

In summary, understanding a concept can be interpreted as not knowing its dictionary definition, but being able to use the concept appropriately in situations, which requires understanding the propositions that are reasonably related to the concept. In other words, the meaning of a concept is understood through inferences based on its context (cultural, historical, social, ethnic, etc.). This recognizes the complexity and richness of conceptual understanding. The inference that Brandom describes differs from that of Aristotle, which is based on syllogism. Brandom's inference refers to material inference rather than formal inference. Understanding Brandom's inferentialism requires examining material inference in detail.

material inference

I said earlier that a concept's meaning reflects the inferential relationship between the various propositional meanings behind its actual use. In this case, the meaning of inference is what Sellars (1953) calls 'material inference.' Brandom contrasts the meaning of material inference with the meaning of formal inference as we usually conceptualize it. In logic, deductive reasoning usually refers to the process of moving from premises to conclusions using a specific logical form. The criterion for evaluating the validity of an inference is its logical form. A valid logical form has a truth-preserving meaning; it ensures that the truth of the premise leads to the truth of the

conclusion. In the formalist approach to reasoning, the content of the reasoning is not an issue. For example:

> An omniscient person can do everything.
> John is omnipotent.
> Therefore, John can do everything.

Formally, this argument is valid. However, in practice, we do not know if this conclusion is correct. We do not know what John measn and we do not know exactly what it means to be omniscient. Omniscience is understood quite differently in different religious, academic, and cultural contexts, so Brandom considers formal inference based on certain propositions to be dogmatic. For an inference to be truly semantic, it must first be content-related in terms of propositional content, not logical form. Brandom (2001) gives the following example:

> 'Pittsburgh is west of Princeton'
> Therefore, 'Princeton is east of Pittsburgh'

The appropriateness of the above inferences derives from the substantive content of the concepts 'west,' 'east,' 'lightning,' and 'thunder,' not from their formal validity as implicit presuppositions. We make a judgment based on the content of the concepts we implicitly accept. In other words, the mastery of the use of concepts—aside from logical ability—makes this inference appropriate. Consider another example:

> 'Male and female are equal'
> 'Therefore female and male should not be discriminated against in career choices'

To determine the appropriateness of the above inference, we need to discuss the concepts of 'male' and 'female,' and whether the concept of 'equality' can be understood as the proposition 'women and men should not be discriminated against in job choices.' As such, the legitimacy of material inference is based on the concept's practical meaning, not on a logical form. According to Brandom (2001), personal use of concepts is normative and based on individual beliefs. Personal beliefs are implicitly constructed by cultural, social, political, and religious contexts.

Thus, how can we ensure the objectivity of conceptual use? This requires the explicit creation of implicit beliefs and norms inherent in the use of concepts. Here, Sellars' (1997) proposed 'logical space of reason' emerges. Sellars criticizes empiricism and sees that the materials accepted empirically can be conceptually recognized in the 'logical space of reason.' Brandom sees the 'logical space of reason' as a 'game of giving and asking for reasons.' In other words, the implicit meaning in the use of a concept is explicitly revealed through the process of giving and asking for reasons for the meaning of the concept as used by each person. In addition, the legitimacy of an explicit meaning is discussed through the process of giving and asking for reasons. For example, when two people use the concept of 'equality between men and women,' it becomes necessary to discuss whether it is justifiable to treat men and women alike or to discriminate in accordance with their characteristics. Through this process, we can acquire a better meaning for 'equality between men and women.' Therefore, Brandom (2001) argues that the representational dimension of propositional contents reflects the social structure of their inferential articulation in the game of giving and asking for reasons. In this sense, rational humans are subordinate to better reasoning after all (Brandom, 1994). Conceptual understanding relies on our normative judgment, which in turn relies on better reasons. Therefore, the social practice of giving and asking for reasons is very important for understanding concepts and material inference. Through this process, various subjective beliefs can be adjusted and mutual subjective objectivity can be secured. Here, I would like to closely examine the social practices of giving and asking for reasons.

docial practice

According to the inferentialist line of thought, the fundamental form of the conceptual is the propositional, and the core of concept use is applying concepts in propositionally contentful assertions, beliefs, and thoughts (Brandom, 2001). The representational content of claims and the beliefs they express reflect the social dimension of the game of giving and asking for reasons. In other words, understanding

concepts is a social practice. Furthermore, the legitimacy and objectivity of conceptual meanings based on individual beliefs can be secured through the process of social practice.

Examining this in greater detail, humans speak, think, and act based on certain tacit normativity, which may be ethnic traditions or social, cultural, or religious in nature. In any case, our everyday linguistic practices implicitly presuppose certain cultural, religious, social, and political norms. This is because, as Taylor holds, human identity is inseparable from the context of various social traditions and norms. Since these implicit norms must be justified through reason, rational human beings are bound to reason (Brandom, 1994). Brandom argues that if we use a concept in a particular sense and context, we also accept its implicit embedded norms. In Brandom's (2001) terms, we are endorsing that norm. For example:

'I don't eat beef.'

There can be various reasons for not eating beef including Hindu religious tradition, health reasons, or vegetarianism. Behind these reasons are the norms supported by the speaker such as 'I must keep my religious traditions,' 'my own health is more important than anything else,' and 'I must be vegetarian for animal rights.' These implicit norms that underlie our linguistic practice are not well-revealed, so Brandom said that implicit norms should be explicitly made through the social practice of 'game of giving and asking for reasons.' Without a proper understanding of the norms behind others' linguistic practices, it is impossible to grasp others' concepts accurately, which makes true cross-cultural communication difficult. If you do not accurately understand the implicit norms supported by another party, you evaluate them through your own preconceptions. Conflicts between cultures often arise from these misunderstandings. In this sense, Brandom (2001, p.70) emphasizes that in "Reason's fight against thought debased by prejudice and propaganda, the first rule is that potentially controversial material inferential commitments should be made explicit as claims, exposing them both as vulnerable to reasoned challenge and as in need of reasoned defense".

What makes us intelligent is that we can explicitly reveal the implicit norms to which we subscribe, give reasons, and engage in required social practices. Through this process of social practice, we are ultimately responsible for the norms we adopt. For Brandom (2001), rational beings are responsible for the normality of conceptual use, which includes the responsibility for various propositions that can be reasonably linked to the norms that we support. Reconsider the examples given earlier. Suppose that A does not eat beef based on the reason that they respect animal rights. What if A also abuses their dog? The norm that animal rights should be respected can be reasonably linked to the proposition that dogs should not be abused. Taking responsibility means being able to act in accordance with the norms you have accepted. If A abuses his dog, he is not complying with the norms he accepts. At this point, according to Brandom, A is not a rational being. To be responsible for the normality of one's linguistic practice, norms must first be justified. Justification means that one can acknowledge and accept a norm. The norms that an individual supports may be justified within their cultural context, but intercultural dialogue requires finding mutually acceptable norms. For example, suppose we face the problem of serving beef in a school cafeteria. Some people oppose this for religious reasons, while others may agree for different reasons. This is because implicit norms that support each other can be different. Therefore, we need to find norms that facilitate mutual agreement. Hence, objective justification is needed.

For this, Brandom (1994) introduces the social practices of commitment and entitlement and the 'model of scorekeepers.' As mentioned earlier, commitment means that one believes in and accepts the implicit norms associated with one's own use of a concept; while entitlement means that one can provide legitimacy to the norms in which one believes. In the game, the implicit norms that a person endorses are explicit and they go through a process of asking and answering questions about them and recognizing their legitimacy. By giving adequate reasoning for the norm a person is endorsing, other people give them permission to endorse it (Brandom, 1994). For this, Brandom uses the unique concept of 'model of scorekeepers.' Essentially, in the process

of giving and asking for reasons, we keep score by comparing each other's motions and authorizations. Thus, the appropriateness of a norm in the concept's propositional sense is not determined by individual judgments or attitudes, but rather by the structure of commitment and entitlement. If circumstances and contexts change, or participants in the game of giving and asking for reasons change, the scorecard may change. In other words, the appropriateness of propositional meaning is open to the community's reasoning practices (Brandom, 2001).

This has important implications for multicultural civic education. According to Brandom (2001), to think well is to use concepts well, which presupposes making judgments about the historical and normative nature of concepts. This also requires taking responsibility for our judgments, which is not unlike being a citizen in a multicultural society. An important factor for multicultural coexistence is not the creation of absolute normativity and standards, but rather the process of linguistic and social practices that explicitly reveal each other's beliefs and norms. In this process, each person's beliefs and norms must be open to the community's reasoned practice, meaning that people can argue for and defend the legitimacy of their beliefs and make rational self-corrections when they find them problematic. Furthermore, people should be held accountable for the norms they endorse. This process is what Brandom (2001) calls the Socratic method. Now, we turn to the topic of dialogue to explore practical methods of multicultural citizenship education based on inferentialism. This is because Brandom's social practice, the Socratic method, implies dialogue.

dialogic approaches to multicultural citizenship education

Education is fundamentally based on language and concepts. However, education based on inferentialism refuses to convey simple knowledge or concepts. To know the meaning of a concept is to understand its inferential relationships. This requires a logical space of reason to ask and answer why. In-depth dialogue should be the core of education. According to Derry (2013), education based on inferentialism provides an opportunity for learners to use concepts in the space of reason and, in

doing so, qualifies them as knowing ones. Teachers do not explore the connection between students' lives, cultures, and social practices, nor simply introduce knowledge. Hotta (2023) said that to resolve hate speech and conflicts in a multicultural society, an inferential understanding of the meaning of concepts must precede anything else. The intercultural dialogue emphasized in interculturalism should start by understanding the inferential relationship between the use of concepts of each other. Marabini (2022) also criticizes critical thinking education based on formal logic and argues that Brandom's inferentialism should be applied to critical thinking education. inferentialism emphasizes self-correction of beliefs through commitment and entitlement, which enables communication between various beliefs, values, and cultures. Marabini further emphasizes that fundamentally in order to learn concepts and expand knowledge, one must participate in critical dialogue. To this end, it refers to a Socratic method, and philosophy for children education was proposed as a concrete methodology to implement this in the educational field. In other words, according to her, Brandom's inferentialism enables flexible and expanded critical thinking education necessary in the multicultural era, which can be effectively applied through philosophy for children education.

Let us take a look at this aspect in more detail. The following section discusses what educational dialogue looks like for multicultural citizenship education based on Brandom's inferentialism. This is not simply an informational or rhetorical dialogue, nor is it a dialogue to persuade or impress another party; it is a dialogue to understand each other's cultural and intellectual contexts and find balance through self-correction. We can further examine the specifics.

First, multicultural civic dialogue is about understanding. As Brandom points out, many different cultural contexts underpin linguistic practices. It may be impossible to communicate with one another without understanding this; Bohm (1996) gives the following example:

> We organized a dialogue in Israel a number of years ago. At one stage the people were discussing politics, and somebody said, just in passing, 'Zionism is creating a great difficulty in good relations between Jews

> and Arabs. It is the principal barrier that's in the way.' He said it very quietly. Then suddenly somebody else couldn't contain himself and jumped up. He was full of emotion. His blood pressure was high and his eyes were popping out. He said, 'Without Zionism the country would fall to pieces!' (p. 8)

When a conversation like this takes place between people with different values and backgrounds, it becomes fundamentally uncomfortable (Schudson 2014), because it requires me to coexist with an uncertain entity that I do not understand. Therefore, in a multicultural society, we must first seek to understand others in a different cultural context. Understanding means recognizing the context and norms within which the other person is using concepts. To do this, we need to ask questions instead of assuming and categorizing the other person's ideas. In Brandom's terms, it is about entering the logical space of reason. For example, you might ask questions like the following:

> 'What is the meaning of …… to you?'
> 'Why did you use that concept?'
> 'Is this how you understand the concept?'

By asking these questions, you can compare your meaning of the concept with the other person's meaning and find similarities and differences. You can also get a sense of the context and intent of the other person's use of the concept. To understand the other person's linguistic practice is to understand his or her thinking and identity, because the other person's linguistic practice contains the person's targeted beliefs and norms. Therefore, we must first understand the ideals, beliefs, and norms that the other person aims for through dialogue and then understand the kind of person he or she is. This is the starting point of the dialogic practice of intercultural citizenship education.

Second, dialogue in multicultural citizenship education aims for self-correction. It is necessary to explicate the meaning of the concepts used by the other and the normativity hidden in the context and to question their legitimacy. According to Brandom (1994), human beings are intelligent because they submit to the power of better reasons. Therefore, if one's beliefs or convictions cannot be justified, they should always be open to self-correction. In this respect, Brandom opposes the formalist

approach to reasoning because formalism is concerned only with the validity of forms. The rightness or wrongness of the premises is not an issue in discussing the legitimacy of reasoning but as noted, it is relevant to accepting the truth of the conclusion. However, Brandom's inductivist approach emphasizes content-based reasoning. It is about the appropriateness of a concept or content in a specific situation or context. That is, if the content or concept is not appropriate, then it can always be modified according to the reasoning practices of the community. Thus, according to Brandom (2001), the objectivity of a proposition must always be open to the reasoning practices of the community. Along these lines, Gilbert Harman expanded the meaning of reasoning so that it is not simply a process of moving from premises to conclusions but a process of 'reasoned revision of beliefs and perspectives' (Marabini, 2022, pp. 14-15). Conversation is a process of linguistic practice that is embedded in a network of inferential relationships. Securing the legitimacy of meaning that changes according to the situation in this inferential network is a process of self-modification and dialogue.

Third, the dialogue of multicultural civic education aims for balance. Citizens in a multicultural society are constantly exposed to new issues. When they move from a homogeneous group to a heterogeneous group, things that were not problematic before become problematic. This extends to food, dress, speech, habits, morals, norms, and so on. Self-correcting thinking is essential to overcome these differences and find balance through dialogue. Dialogue does not just assert one's beliefs. It should be a process of revising one's beliefs through the other's perspective or reason. This is what is known as a problem-solving dialogue. Schudson (2014) emphasizes that the dialogue required in a democratic society is not a persuasive or rhetorical dialogue but a norm-compliant problem-solving dialogue. Problem-solving is not simply a matter of right and wrong and who wins; it is a matter of justification. For Brandom, justification is about intersubjective recognition rather than conforming to absolute norms or standards. Legitimization occurs in a situation when people play a game of 'giving and asking for reasons' and endorse a particular norm. In other words, it is about finding a balance between different cultural contexts. This is very similar to Dewey's idea. Many

of the problems we encounter in our lives are caused by a mismatch between the environment and the organism. Given a problem, people conduct a quest to solve it. The result of the quest is not some fixed goal but a balance between environment and organism, which is an aesthetic experience and growth (Dewey, 1934). Of course, since the environment is constantly changing and unpredictable, this balance can be disrupted at any time. When that happens, we have to explore again and find a new balance. This is what makes humans endlessly growing beings. Multicultural citizenship education should foster a sense of balance in different cultural contexts through dialogue.

So far, we have seen that understanding, self-correction, and balance are the goals of dialogue in multicultural citizenship education based on Brandom's inferentialism. To summarize, dialogue is an attempt to find balance through genuine understanding and openness to different cultural contexts. It is about finding shared meaning. According to Bohm (1996), creating shared meaning through dialogue is an essential task for maintaining a pluralistic society. We now need to look at pedagogical options to ensure that these conversations are fully realized in the classroom.

multicultural civic education and community of philosophical inquiry

Community of philosophical inquiry is the methodological framework of P4C that involves the conscious construction of a classroom event structure that is emergent, participative, dialogical, and egalitarian (Kennedy, 2007). Splitter (2011) stated that objectivity as intersubjectivity can be effectively achieved in a community of inquiry classroom. In addition, the community of philosophical inquiry provides the thoughts, skills, and attitudes necessary to elicit dialogue for understanding, self-correction, and balance in the classroom. Through this, children can develop the necessary attitudes and competencies to participate in dialogue in a multicultural society. This is discussed in detail below.

multidimensional thinking

Multidimensional thinking is the mental engine that drives conversations in the community of philosophical inquiry. Lipman (2003) categorizes multidimensional thinking into critical, creative, and caring thinking. These are not strictly distinct but rather represent three different dimensions of thinking for inquiry (Sutcliffe, 2017). Teachers should guide the dialogue so that these three types interact and are stimulated appropriately depending on the context of the inquiry. Lipman (2003) emphasizes that while traditional thinking skills education emphasizes logical and critical thinking, there is a need to promote creative and caring thinking through the community of inquiry. This can be linked to Brandom's critique of formal logical approaches to understanding meaning and his emphasis on cultural-historical approaches.

Critical thinking is concerned with reasons, considers specific contexts, and emphasizes self-correction; creative thinking generates new alternatives or hypotheses; and caring thinking is concerned with values and feelings (Lipman, 2003). The community of inquiry in which these three types of thinking interact seeks reflective balance, not absolute knowledge. Lipman (2003) illustrate this as follows:

> In each of the three cases, it will be assumed that the pedagogy will involve the community of inquiry, while the epistemology of that community will be that of the reflective equilibrium. This equilibrium should be understood in the fallibilistic sense that, in the classroom of the community of inquiry, the aim is not to find an absolute foundation of knowledge, like a bedrock. Instead, there is a constant remaking, improving, revising of all its failing parts in order to maintain the equilibrium. (p. 197)

In this respect, we can see that multidimensional thinking is essential to dialogue for understanding, self-correction, and balance. For Brandom, understanding is deeply connected to values and norms, including the cultural and historical context behind linguistic practices. Understanding the linguistic practices of others requires both critical thinking to provide reasons and caring thinking to understand and care deeply about who they are and what they think. Furthermore, self-corrective dialogue requires critical thinking to be operationalized in the sense that appropriate and reasonable

corrections must be made. Finally, creative thinking is required to create a new equilibrium through self-correction (Lipman, 2003).

The above discussion reveals that formal logical thinking and critical thinking are insufficient for multicultural citizenship education. Understanding and engaging with others who live in diverse cultural contexts requires multidimensional thinking, including critical, creative, and caring thinking, which can be appropriately fostered through a community of philosophical inquiry that emphasizes reflective balance.

philosophical dialogue

Often in the classroom, children talk about concepts only in terms of their surface meanings instead of asking about their presuppositions and implications. However, the philosophical dialogue emphasized by the community of philosophical inquiry addresses meaning, not just the dictionary definition of a concept. It goes beyond the understanding of knowledge to the understanding of meaning. Meaning is created in the intersection of our lives and the world, and it has much broader and deeper dimensions than knowledge. Therefore, unlike knowledge, meaning cannot be transmitted to children; it must be acquired (Lipman et al., 1980).

The fact that philosophical dialogue emphasizes a broader understanding of the relationships and contexts that surround language beyond its surface meaning is consistent with Brandom's notion of understanding. Brandom's (2001) understanding of meaning does not involve knowing the dictionary definition of a concept but rather the various norms and propositions that are inferentially connected to its linguistic practice; in other words, it is holistic, not atomic. In this sense, dialoguing for understanding requires the ability to grasp the context and broader perspectives of the concepts the other person is discussing. This is best cultivated through philosophical dialogue because philosophy itself is an inquiry into the great questions. Philosophy is constantly questioning hidden presuppositions by asking 'why?' Moreover, it is not restricted by rigid thinking; rather, it promotes a sense of wholeness by discovering connections between different bodies of knowledge (Lipman et al., 1980).

In addition, Brandom (2001) understands the importance of philosophical dialogue in inferentialist semantics. According to inferentialism, the meaning of a concept is not inherently prescribed. It must be engaged in rational discussion by making explicit the implicit norms that presuppose its use, so that it can be argued for and against. The correct meaning of a concept is justified by rational discussion. Brandom calls the process of making explicit the normativity of linguistic practices, giving and asking why, and gaining justification for them the Socratic method in the light of Sellars' idea.

> Formulating as an explicit claim the inferential commitment implicit in the content brings it out into the open as liable to challenges and demands for justification, just as with any assertion. In this way explicit expression plays an elucidating role, functioning to groom and improve our inferential commitments, and so our conceptual contents—a role, in short, in the practices of reflective rationality or 'Socratic method' (Brandom, 2001, p. 71).

In his model of philosophical dialogue, Socrates posed and responded to a series of questions about a concept. He sought to clarify and justify the meaning of the concept in different situations. In other words, he challenged the canon of concepts that we know as common sense. Through such conceptual exploration, Socrates sought to expand the horizons of his life beyond just knowing concepts. Children who are accustomed to philosophical dialogue like this try to understand the deeper meaning behind the other person's words rather than taking them at face value. In doing so, they deepen their perspective on the world and recognize its complexity. Philosophy pursues meaning in this complexity. As Splitter and Sharp (1995) emphasize, constructing meaning involves making connections and relations through the interweaving of thoughts, words, and actions, and philosophy helps us explore meaning through these connections and relationships. In this sense, the community of philosophical inquiry is a very important educational initiative to develop the philosophical attitudes, sensibilities, and abilities children need to live in a multicultural society.

reasonableness as a regulatory ideal

Lipman (2003) emphasizes democracy and reasonableness as the regulatory ideals of the philosophical community of inquiry. If democracy is the social structure of a community of philosophical inquiry, then reasonableness is the character structure. Democracy is a social environment in which diverse interests and values interact freely, and reasonableness is the pursuit of an appropriate balance between those diverse opinions. These two criteria represent the ideals that dialogic practices in intercultural civic education should strive to achieve.

First, dialogue in multicultural civic education should be premised on democratic structures because no dominant power or ideology should be allowed to operate if people are to freely ask and answer questions about each other's linguistic practices. In such a totalitarian structure, individual beliefs and convictions cannot be made explicit, and true communication and consensus are impossible. The community of philosophical inquiry therefore provides intellectual safe spaces where diverse opinions can be freely communicated (Splitter & Sharp, 1995). Anyone can have legitimate criticism, but that is criticism of an idea, not of a person. When students feel psychologically and intellectually safe, they make explicit their implicitly held beliefs and norms, which is essential for the self-correct emphasized earlier. Revising one's beliefs presupposes a social structure that can recognize such voluntary changes.

In addition, a regulatory ideal of reasonableness is necessary to move toward balance through dialogue. Lipman (2003) and Splitter (2023) distinguish between rationality and reasonableness. Reasonableness is an appropriateness, not a precise standard. In other words, appropriateness is not about conforming to a universal, rigid standard but rather about striking a balance that is appropriate to the situation. Mechanical equality cannot solve the problems of race, religion, gender, culture, and class that arise in a multicultural society. Think about issues like the following:

> 'Should boys and girls have equal access to playgrounds?'
> 'Should there be an equal number of religious buildings in each neighborhood?'
> 'Should all schools have the same racial representation?'

These issues are not just about a particular gender, race, or religion. They are connected to very complex historical, political, economic, and ethical issues. As such, there is no absolute standard by which these issues can be resolved. We need to find a balance of reasonableness and reflection in dialogue with each other. In school, therefore, children need to develop a sense of reasonableness alongside rational criteria, and a community of philosophical inquiry can provide an environment that fosters it.

conclusion

Globally, we continue to move toward ever-increasing multicultural diversity, and the pace of progress will only accelerate in the future. We have to learn to coexist with people from different cultural backgrounds. It is not about everyone following a single standard, nor is it about eliminating standards altogether. It is about co-creating standards according to the situation in which we find ourselves. This is where we need what Brandom calls the 'logical space of reason' to avoid descending into relativism. Rational questions and discussion need to take place. According to Brandom, dialogue alerts us to our cultural situatedness. A person's words carry the cultural and social context of his or her life. This is because concepts are embedded with cultural, religious, and social worldviews. Therefore, we should not engage in dialogue haphazardly. We should listen carefully to what others are saying and try to understand their meaning. Listening is not just about receiving information; it involves striving to grasp the speaker's intentions, experiences, and life context, and it also means recognizing and embracing the other person as a unique being (Haroutunian-Gordon & Laverty, 2011). Moreover, to understand exactly what the person is saying, the beliefs and norms behind the language must be explicit, and there must be a concerted effort to justify that belief by asking why. In this sense, Brandom's 'game of giving and asking for reasons' has two meanings: (1) to explicitly reveal the implicit cultural beliefs and norms behind the other person's verbal practice and (2) to determine the legitimacy of

the other party's cultural beliefs and norms. The social practice of Brandom includes both aspects.

Through this dialogue, we can discover the common ideals of a good life and society to pursue. Then, as things change over time and across locations, we must try again to find new ideals and balance. It is a competency required of citizens living in a multicultural society. Thus, challenging each other's beliefs and trying to find reflective balance through dialogue is very much like a community of philosophical inquiry. Philosophical inquiry community reveals the rules, reasons, and criteria hidden behind our language and thought and discusses their legitimacy. To this end, the community of philosophical inquiry raises questions, makes deductions, seeks alternatives, and provides a carefully organized educational environment for self-correction. In this context, children can experience and practice the lives of multicultural citizens in advance experiencing the community of philosophical inquiry in the classroom.

references

Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education, 17 (5)*, https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980601065764

Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Aziz, S. (2022). *France is on a dangerous collision course with its Muslim population*. CNN. https://www.cnn.com/2022/02/05/opinions/france-hijab-ban-sports-aziz/index.html.

Baber, H. E. (2012). Dilemmas of multiculturalism: an introduction. *The Monist*, *95(1),* 3–16. https://doi.org/10.5840/monist20129512

Banks, J. A. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. Columbia University, Teacher College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Pearson.

Biesta, G. (2010). How to exist politically and learn from it: Hannah Arendt and the problem of democratic education. *Teachers College Record*, *112(2),* 556–575. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811011200207

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. Routledge.

Brandom, R. B. (1994). *Making it explicit*. Harvard University Press.

Brandom, R. B. (2001). *Articulating reasons*. Harvard University Press.

Cantle, T. (2012). The 'failure'of multiculturalism. In T. Cantle (Ed.), *Interculturalism: The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity* (pp. 53–90). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Chen, J., & Gardner, S. T. (2020). Does philosophy kill culture? *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, *7(1),* 4–15. https://doi.org/10.46707/jps.v7i.106

Derry, J. (2013). Can inferentialism contribute to social epistemology? In B. Kotzee (Ed.), *Education and the growth of knowledge: Perspectives from social and virtue epistemology* (pp. 76–91). John Wiley & Sons.

Davidson, D. (1982). Rational animals. *Dialectica*, *36,* 317–327. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-8361.1982.tb01546.x

Davidson, D. (1999). The emergence of thought. In D. Davidson (Ed.), *Subjective, intersubjective, objective* (pp. 123–134). Clarendon Press.

Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. In J. A. Boyston (Ed.), *John Dewey, later works, 1925–1953* (pp. 7–353). Southern Illinois University Press.

Espinosa Zárate, Z. (2023). Epistemological Foundations of Intercultural Education: Contributions from Raimon Panikkar. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *42*(5), 501–517.

Gardner, S. T. (2022). Complexity, dialogue, and democracy: the educational implications. *Journal of Didactics of Philosophy*, *6,* 1–17. https://doi.org/10.46586/JDPh.2022.9866

Haroutunian-Gordon, S., & Laverty, M. (2011). Listening: an exploration of philosophical traditions. *Educational Theory*, *61*(2), 117–124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2011.00394.x

Hotta, Y. (2023). Hate speech, Inferentialism, and Complicity. Preprint.

Iuso, S., & Marinaro, P. (2024). Education and Culture: Pluralism in the Age of Globalization. Intersections between Philosophy, Epistemology and Empirical Perspectives. *Elementa*, *3*(1-2), 153–161.

Jaggar, A. M. (1999). Multicultural democracy. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 7(3), 308–329. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00079

Kennedy, N. S. (2007). From philosophical to mathematical inquiry in the classroom. *Childhood & Philosophy*, *3(6),* 289–311.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Clarendon Press.

Lipman, M., Sharp, A. M. & Oscanyan, F. S. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in education*. Cambridge University Press.

Mayseless, O., & Kizel, A. (2022). Preparing youth for participatory civil society: a call for spiritual, communal, and pluralistic humanism in education with a focus on community of philosophical inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *115,* 102015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102015

Marabini, A. (2022). *Critical Thinking and Epistemic Injustice* (Vol. 20). Springer International Publishing.

Portera, A., & Milani, M. (2021). Intercultural education and competences at school. Results of an exploratory study in Italy. Profesorado. *Revista de Currículum y Formación de Profesorado, 25*(3), 49–67. https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v25i3.21527

Portera, A. (2020). Has multiculturalism failed? Let's start the era of interculturalism for facing diversity issues. *Intercultural Education*, *31*(4), 390–406.

Putnam, H. (1992). *Realism with a human face*. Harvard University Press.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge University Press.

Sakamoto, F., & Roger, P. (2022). Global Competence and Foreign Language Education in Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *27*(5), 719–740. https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153221076905.

Sanz-Leal, M., Orozco-Gómez, M. L., & Toma, R. B. (2022). Conceptual construction of global competence in education. *Teoría de la Educación 34*(1), 83–103. https://doi.org/10.14201/teri. 25394

Schudson, M. (1997). Why conversation is not the soul of democracy? *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *14(4),* 297-309.

Sellars, W. (1953). Inference and meaning. *Mind*, *62*(247), 313–338. https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LXII.247.313

Sellars, W. (1997). *Empiricism and the philosophy of mind*. Harvard University Press.

Splitter, L. J. (2011). Agency, thought, and language: analytic philosophy goes to school. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *30,* 343–362. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-011-9236-9

Splitter, L. J. (2023). *Identity, reasonableness and being one among others: dialogue, community, education*. Springer Nature.

Splitter, L J., & Sharp, A. M. (1995). *Teaching for better thinking: the classroom community of inquiry*. ACER.

Sutcliffe, R. (2017). The difference between P4C and PwC. In S. Noji & R. Hashim (Eds.), *History, theory and practice of philosophy for children* (pp. 56–63). Routledge.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self*. Harvard University Press.

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism* (pp. 25–74). Princeton University Press Ltd.

Yu, E. (2020, April). *UCSB multicultural center hosts workshop on racism against Asian communities during COVID-19*. The Bottom Line UCSB. https://thebottomline.as.ucsb.edu/2020/04/feat-1-ucsb-multicultural-center-hosts-workshop-on-racism-against-asian-communities-during-covid-19. Accessed 25 August 2024.

Turgeon, W. (2014). Multiculturalism: politics of difference, education and philosophy for children. *Analytic Teaching*, *24(2),* 96–109.

UNESCO. (2022). *A new social contract for education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization.

submitted: 26.06.2024

approved: 26.08.2024