religions

MDPI

Article

Intercultural Dialogue in Diverse Classrooms: Debating the Socratic Dialogue Method from a Postcolonial Perspective

Thor-André Skrefsrud

Faculty of Education, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, 2318 Hamar, Norway; thor.skrefsrud@inn.no

Abstract: This article provides a critical examination of the Socratic Dialogue method, exploring its potential benefits and pitfalls in fostering intercultural and interreligious understanding in the classroom. Drawing on postcolonial theoretical perspectives, the analysis delves into the method's capacity to amplify marginalized student voices while acknowledging the risk of unintentional silencing. Emphasizing the importance of teachers' attentiveness to diverse experiences, this article underscores the need for a nuanced approach that avoids othering opinions and rationales that are different from the mainstream. The study calls for an academic challenge to the idealization of dialogue, urging deeper reflection to identify blind spots and ensure an inclusive intercultural dialogue.

Keywords: intercultural dialogue; the Socratic Dialogue method; postcolonial perspectives; voice; multicultural classrooms

1. Introduction

In this paper, I explore the possibilities and barriers to intercultural classroom dialogues by critically discussing the Socratic Dialogue method as a well-established technique used in schools to enhance understanding in diverse classrooms. Drawing attention to how such an approach to creating understanding in diverse classrooms may be viewed from a postcolonial theoretical perspective (Rosello 2001; Said 2003; Spivak 1988, 1996; Young 2016), the research question for this paper is as follows: What are the prospects and pitfalls of the Socratic Dialogue method for creating intercultural understanding in classroom contexts characterized by a diverse student population?

In classrooms around the world, dialogical initiatives are made by teachers to provide students with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to participate and navigate in a diverse and democratically governed society (Aneas and Vilà 2023; Council of Europe 2018; Skrefsrud 2016). Such initiatives may span from dialogical and cooperative projects within different school subjects and interdisciplinary whole-school arrangements, to the development and implications of specific methods of intercultural and interreligious dialogue, including the Socratic Dialogue method. By engaging in dialogue-oriented learning activities, students are given the chance to exchange personal experiences and viewpoints with their peers while simultaneously exploring the underlying reasons for their perspectives. Therefore, initiatives aimed at increased dialogue and understanding in the classroom encompass a multifaceted process. They not only nurture self-reflection among students but also facilitate the exchange of diverse viewpoints.

The emphasis on dialogical initiatives in education aligns with the efforts of international organizations, such as the United Nations (UN), the Organization of Economic and Social Development (OECD), and the Council of Europe (CoE), underlining the critical role of education in optimizing the social and academic achievement of students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, or cultural, religious, and ethnic backgrounds. For instance, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development—unanimously endorsed by all UN member states in 2015—underscores the fundamental role of education in achieving a sustainable

check for updates

Citation: Skrefsrud, Thor-André. 2024. Intercultural Dialogue in Diverse Classrooms: Debating the Socratic Dialogue Method from a Postcolonial Perspective. *Religions* 15: 98. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15010098

Academic Editor: Ruth Vilà

Received: 29 November 2023
Revised: 3 January 2024
Accepted: 7 January 2024
Published: 12 January 2024

Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

future and emphasizes the importance of creating educational systems that "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations 2015, p. 1). In a similar vein, the OECD (2009) has proposed a way to organize 21st-century skills where interpersonal skills are seen as a central competency. Here, interpersonal skills include the ability to engage in creative teamwork, convey ideas clearly, cooperate effectively, adjust to change, demonstrate cultural sensitivity, and interact proficiently with people from diverse backgrounds (OECD 2009). As such, these global agendas call on educational institutions to explore methods for improving positive interpersonal connections among students and establishing an inclusive school community that broadens opportunities for all students to achieve success, both in their social interactions and academic pursuits.

Nevertheless, scholars such as Dervin and Tan (2022), Heimbrock (2009), McConachy et al. (2022), and others have called for reflection, highlighting the need for a critical examination of the tendency to idealize dialogue in public discourse. As emphasized by Dervin and Tan (2022), it is ironic that the forms of dialogue that are most transparent in articulating their underlying assumptions and implicit commitments may paradoxically become the most resilient to critique and the most resistant to critical examination. Consequently, the idealization of dialogical initiatives carries the risk of disregarding perspectives and practices that fundamentally deviate from dialogical ideals, such as openness, communication, interaction, reciprocity, and respect, when examined at a deeper level. Heimbrock (2009) also noted that to "agree to the inevitability of dialogue, and to start educational projects, does not lead automatically to successful and continuous dialogues" (p. 84). Moreover, "enthusiastic efforts do not carry always suitable means of dialogue, nor do they provide a sufficient reflection on the basis and the goals of dialogue" (Heimbrock 2009, p. 84).

Given this background, there is a compelling need to subject dialogical initiatives—including methods such as the Socratic Dialogue—to rigorous academic scrutiny, thereby critically discussing premises, practices, and possible implications. In the following discussion, I delve into the Socratic Dialogue method, examining its capacity to encourage both critical and creative elements within intercultural dialogue. However, I also explore this method's possible shortcomings concerning its ability to accommodate and amplify student voices.

2. The Socratic Dialogue Method

The Socratic Dialogue method is a shared and structured dialogue between the teacher and the students, in which both parties are responsible for bringing the conversation forward through questioning and answering. The teacher, who is often the dialogue leader, asks questions to expose and critically examine the beliefs, values, ideologies, and viewpoints that frame and underwrite the thoughts and statements within a certain debate. It is not the intention that students should reveal their personal opinions and perspectives in an inquiry. Nevertheless, the participants are free to—and encouraged to—express their personal viewpoints and contribute to a democratic and critical examination of arguments conducted in an open and safe space.

In this way, the Socratic Dialogue differs significantly from conventional approaches to learning, which are characterized by a one-dimensional transmission of knowledge from the teacher, who knows, to students, who do not know. As noted by Biesta (2015, 2019), Haug (2017), and others, traditional schooling has often been associated with instructional approaches in which teachers typically deliver information to students who are expected to passively receive and subsequently reproduce it. Within this framework, education is often likened to a process in which teachers essentially deposit knowledge into the minds of students, with a predetermined curriculum in place, and students are expected to conform to it (Freire 2005). Not surprisingly, such an approach to education has raised significant concerns, as it relegates the teacher to the role of the active subject in the learning process while students assume a passive object status. According to this perspective, students

are viewed as empty vessels, akin to *tabula rasa*, awaiting that their minds be filled with information through the teacher's deposit of content and knowledge.

While a conventional approach to teaching and learning continues to prevail in many classrooms despite its shortcomings, there is, nevertheless, a widespread consensus within the field of education regarding the fundamental importance of activity, reflection, and collaboration in processes of teaching and learning. Educational pioneers, such as Vygotsky (1962, 1978), Piaget (1936), and Dewey (1963), all emphasized that children acquire knowledge most effectively when actively engaging with content in collaborative learning environments. One could even argue that the Greek philosopher Socrates' (469 BC–399 BC) dialogues, which have inspired the development of the modern Socratic Dialogue method, fundamentally acknowledged the need for activity, participation, and engagement when enhancing critical understanding and self-reflection. Built on the idea of active learning, the Socratic Dialogue method thus encourages educators to consider collaboration and critical engagement as integral components of teaching and learning. Rather than viewing this method as supplementary to traditional lectures, it contains a pedagogical understanding that would help teachers improve their teaching. As such, the Socratic Dialogue method holds the potential to be applied and integrated within a number of school subjects in different geographical contexts, including Religious Education (RE).

Historically, the Socratic Dialogue method has drawn on material from several traditions. The method can thus be seen as part of a broad international educational movement with proponents in many countries, including the European context. In its modern version, however, two approaches to philosophical conversations have played a particularly major role in developing the approach for schools: the Socratic Dialogue in the German tradition of Leonard Nelson (2004) and Gustav Heckmann (2004) and the American Philosophy for Children program (P4C) developed by Matthew Lipman during the 1980s (Lipman 1993; Lipman et al. 1980). In the Nordic context, scholars such as Bo Malmhester and Beate Børresen (Børresen 2019, 2023; Børresen and Malmhester 2003) have further developed the method, making it a useful tool to examine and explore the foundation of students' opinions, worldviews, and meaning-making (see also, Skrefsrud 2016).

A common thread for the many variations of the Socratic Dialogue method is the practical approach to philosophical conversations in the classroom. A typical exercise would start with the teacher making a claim or posing a moral dilemma to the students, e.g., "Mobile phones should be forbidden in schools", "Western democracy is the best political form of government", or "What would you do if the cashier gave you back more money than you should have received? Would you keep it or give it back? Explain the reasons for your choice". The teacher then ensures that everyone has a clear understanding of the problem by letting the students rephrase the claim or dilemma. The students are given time to reflect on the possible answers they will give and then present their arguments to the rest of the group. Participation thus requires listening and active engagement, and the participants must always be open to learning from others' arguments.

As part of the testing and critical examination of the different arguments in plenary, the teacher must make sure that everyone in the class understands what is being said and meant. According to Heckmann (2004, p. 110), the teacher should take an active role by asking questions such as "How did you understand this argument?", "Have you been understood correctly?", and "I haven't yet grasped that point, can someone help me to understand what it means?" Heckmann (2004) argued that "the participants' clarity and deepening of thought is nurtured by insisting on precise and shared understanding between them" (p. 110). Throughout the dialogue, the participants should aim to increase the level of abstraction, allowing for the integration of their experiences to illuminate the discussion. When the dialogue encounters conflicting arguments or arrives at its core solution, it is recommended to document this in writing, e.g., on a whiteboard or a flip-over. This type of practice facilitates a better understanding of the underlying premises of different viewpoints, leading to a gradual exploration of the problem (Børresen 2019; Heckmann 2004). Subsequently, the group of students engages in a meta-dialogue,

providing all participants with an opportunity to reflect on the dialogue process itself. This reflection encompasses aspects such as the roles of participants and facilitators, as well as considerations regarding the methodological and structural aspects of the dialogue.

As such, the aim of the Socratic Dialogue method is that "students in conversation should see that personal opinions are strengthened or weakened through being connected to something common in the form of knowledge or reason" (Børresen 2023, p. 54). To achieve this aim, the students first need to demonstrate a willingness to articulate their thoughts clearly by presenting, explaining, and justifying their arguments in language that is generally accessible. Second, they should maintain openness to the arguments put forth by others, striving for a comprehensive understanding without compromising a critical evaluation of their own arguments or those of their peers. Third, honesty is imperative in both reflections and statements. For instance, participants in the dialogue should refrain from defending viewpoints they cannot genuinely endorse or from promoting concepts they do not think are true (Børresen 2019, 2023; Heckmann 2004). In this way, the Socratic Dialogue method is believed to help students examine their own premises by clearly articulating the values that guide their lives. Furthermore, the method is said to enhance students' critical awareness, becoming more aware of how their values and beliefs can withstand scrutiny in a diverse society. Participating in the structured dialogue, students' values, principles, and beliefs are examined by revealing the motivations and assumptions on which the students lead their lives.

3. A Postcolonial Perspective

Facilitating intercultural and interreligious understanding in classrooms is closely related to issues of voice, power, and the understanding of otherness, which makes a postcolonial theoretical perspective particularly relevant as a lens for discussing the Socratic dialogue and its ambition to foster understanding within diverse educational settings.

Postcolonialism is a multidisciplinary field of inquiry that draws upon diverse theoretical frameworks encompassing literary studies, anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies (Donaldson and Pui-lan 2002; Young 2016). As an academic paradigm, it is rooted in the recognition that the consequences of colonial histories persist beyond the formal end of colonial rule, thus shaping contemporary political, economic, social, and cultural landscapes. The decolonization processes of the 20th century and the dismantling of formal empires did not signify the eradication of colonial influences. Instead, colonial histories continue to shape collective and individual identities. As noted by Spivak (1996), Rosello (2001), and others, postcolonialism therefore functions as a critical lens that helps scholars examine the enduring legacies and repercussions of colonialism on societies and cultures globally. Not only does postcolonialism open a space for deconstructing dominant narratives and unveiling marginalized voices, but it also allows for an examination of power dynamics and the various forms of resistance that emerge within postcolonial contexts. As an academic discipline, it seeks to reveal how former colonial powers continue to exert influence on today's societies and communities, albeit through different mechanisms (Said 2003).

A central concern of postcolonial studies is the examination of voice, seen as "the capacity to make oneself understood in one's own terms, to produce meanings under the conditions of empowerment" (Blommaert 2009, p. 271). Blommaert's view reflects a tendency to see the concept of voice as a powerful metaphor for addressing agency and authorship within both education and the broader society. In this context, enhancing agency and authorship would mean paying attention to the narratives of individuals, groups, and communities that, for different reasons, have been marginalized and distorted by oppressive cultural and educational structures. For example, when teachers build on minoritized students' wide cultural and linguistic repertoires in their classroom teaching, they contribute to counteracting a pedagogy that is targeted for the mainstream and monolingual classrooms (Gitz-Johansen 2009; Sharma and Lazar 2014). Consequently, students are empowered to express their suppressed knowledge and skills. As such, giving

voice to marginalized students is believed to dismantle a culture of silence and oppose unequal and often hidden power dynamics in the classroom and beyond.

However, the concept of voice has also been critically challenged within the postcolonial field of research. As highlighted by Young (2016), Spivak (1996), Said (2003), and others, efforts to amplify and lift the voices of marginalized people may unintentionally perpetuate the privileges of the majority. In education, for example, initiatives aimed at fostering dialogue and recognizing differences may unintentionally grant dominant groups access to the cultures and lifeworlds of others. Often, such initiatives are framed not as an invitation for diverse voices to speak but as a call for these voices to be heard. The absence and silence of marginalized voices in mainstream discourse is perceived as problematic, as it denies the powerful majority the opportunity to understand the experiences of the marginalized. As Young (2016) observed, the narrative space of minoritized individuals is colonized in the sense that those in power exercise control over narratives by gaining access to the experiences of how oppression is felt, enabling them to adjust accordingly. Hence, from a postcolonial perspective, the act of giving space to voices from the margins poses inherent risks, potentially leading to the misrepresentation, victimization, and continuous marginalization of individuals, groups, and communities.

As noted by Spivak (1996), "dialogue is supposed to be 'unpremeditated' (although theories of subject-effect or the abstract determination of the concrete would find this a dubious claim)" (p. 224). On this basis, the author problematized the risk of controlling voices from the margins by delving into the question of whether the marginalized can speak for themselves or are primarily represented by others who speak for them (Spivak 1988). Minoritized people face a predicament in expressing their voices when others, particularly those in positions of power, speak on their behalf without genuinely understanding their experiences. Moreover, the monopolization of emancipatory platforms by those in power leads to lost opportunities for marginalized individuals to advocate for themselves. Furthermore, even if minoritized individuals, groups, or communities attempt to articulate their perspectives, they are likely to go unheard due to the inherent structures of knowledge dissemination (Spivak 1988). In this sense, from a postcolonial theoretical lens, the concept of voice should always be seen as inscribed and read in terms of the dominant codes of colonial imperialism.

4. Discussion

The Socratic Dialogue method is renowned for its efficacy in fostering understanding within diverse educational settings. As noted by Børresen (2023), Nelson (2004), Heckmann (2004), and others, it allows for a democratic and critical discussion of arguments. When applied to the classroom, the Socratic method gives students the opportunity to formulate their own opinions at the same time as they are being challenged intellectually by their peers and teachers. According to Børresen (2023), when students "have to explain and work with justifying standpoints, they will experience that knowledge strengthens their opinions, while at the same time becoming more aware of differences and connections between believing something and knowing something" (p. 55). In this way, it could be argued that the method contributes to cultivating and fortifying students' critical thinking abilities while enhancing their skills to systematically scrutinize worldviews, opinions, and beliefs.

A first observation that supports such an understanding of the Socratic Dialogue method is the oscillation between concrete experiences and a more generalized reflection of these. As such, the Socratic Dialogue method accords significant importance to the individual's lifeworld by not only encouraging participants to bring their personal experiences into the dialogue but also in the underlying premise that the dialogue process itself should be rooted in these experiences. When participating in a Socratic dialogue, students are not compelled to set aside their cultural or religious backgrounds but are actively encouraged to incorporate these aspects instead. As other participants subsequently share their experiences in relation to the preceding expressions, this creates a foundation for an

experience-based relationship with the potential to explore the limits of understanding. Hence, in the Socratic dialogue, cultural differences are perceived as a valuable resource for discourse rather than something to be overcome or disregarded.

As highlighted by Gitz-Johansen (2009), Sharma and Lazar (2014), and others, education tends to reinforce the colonial discourse that individuals from cultural and linguistic minorities are socially and linguistically disadvantaged and considered inferior, requiring intervention or improvement. In this way, the Socratic Dialogue method implies an opportunity for teachers to recognize the linguistic, cultural, and religious repertoire that students bring with them to school, seeing differences as a resource rather than a barrier to learning.

Furthermore, I believe that the Socratic Dialogue method holds the potential for enhanced understanding by insisting on the reformulation of others' opinions throughout the dialogue. For students participating in this method, rephrasing others' statements involves expressing their ideas in one's own words. Within the framework of the Socratic dialogue, this goes beyond the mere repetition of an argument and entails an active and autonomous interpretation of the argument that is then presented back to the dialogue partner. For instance, a student or teacher might seek clarification by paraphrasing what they have understood from the presentation of an argument or belief, ensuring accurate comprehension. Accordingly, when the beliefs and opinions of participants are articulated by others, it compels them to engage in reformulation and interpretation of their own points of view, as well.

As noted by Young (2016), an important task of postcolonial studies is to critically analyze and deconstruct established dichotomies, such as colonizer versus colonized, developed versus underdeveloped, and privileged versus underprivileged. Such a critical approach includes the investigation of the complex processes of cultural hybridization that characterize dialogical-oriented encounters where people meet across languages, cultures, religions, and beliefs (Rosello 2001). As students are encouraged to take the other's perspective through the Socratic dialogue, they practice seeing the world through the lens of others, thereby considering different beliefs, opinions, and worldviews. Learning together through reformulation, rephrasing, and interpretation may thus open spaces where students can explore the dynamic formation of identities.

A third point is that the specific structure of the Socratic method may provide space for students whose voices are seldom heard in the classroom. For example, finding techniques that enable students to alternate speaking turns may create an environment where those who frequently participate in class are prompted to make space for others, while those who seldom contribute find the motivation to express themselves. The practice of writing key ideas or questions on the whiteboard, using Post-it notes, or summarizing the conversation through a roll of paper to capture collaborative contributions to a theme can create a space for beliefs and opinions that, for various reasons, might otherwise be silenced in the classroom.

As noted above, postcolonial studies encourage a wider range of voices in public discourse (Rosello 2001; Spivak 1996; Young 2016). From a postcolonial lens, embracing a variety of beliefs, opinions, and perspectives is crucial for counteracting a culture of silence and challenging existing power dynamics in schools and elsewhere in society. Hence, applying a method that allows for diverse perspectives to be developed and discussed can contribute to cultivating culturally creative classroom practices in which the power of untold narratives enriches the overall classroom community.

Nevertheless, while the Socratic Dialogue method clearly offers advantages in fostering intercultural understanding in the classroom, it also presents certain challenges. As shown above, the Socratic dialogue aims at more than simply reproducing arguments for tolerance or questioning the logic of abstract concepts. By participating in a Socratic inquiry, the students are obliged to clarify their thoughts, beliefs, and actions. Through questioning and answering, students' motivations and assumptions are tested critically. The students thus experience being supported in their beliefs but are also challenged. As noted by

Børresen (2023), "Being criticized and having to state a position or change one's opinion is not embarrassing or humiliating, but can, on the contrary, be an expression of courage and growth" (p. 54). As such, the Socratic Dialogue method presupposes that students should and would effortlessly share their personal experiences in class.

For students whose beliefs and opinions differ significantly from those of the majority, stating and legitimizing their position in the classroom will require not only bravery but also the willingness to risk social isolation or even exclusion. For example, in cases where students advocate marginal life-stances or controversial political views—positions that clearly deviate from those of their peers or teachers—they are exposed in a particularly vulnerable way. Some students find articulating and defending their beliefs unproblematic, and negotiating the tension of having discordant views from the mainstream can create self-confidence and self-esteem. For others, however, the fear of raising their voices in class could lead to self-silencing. In both cases, the students run the risk of being stereotyped, defined, and even judged. If students choose to speak, they can easily be ridiculed and ostracized by classmates and teachers. The burden of expressing dissenting viewpoints can lead to categorizations in which students are held responsible for certain positions and ensuing practices. If the students are reluctant to participate in the dialogue, then they run the risk of being labeled as quiet, shy, mysterious, and alienated from the rest of the class. Hence, the Socratic free speech, where every participant should "practice having their own opinion" (Børresen 2023, p. 54), seems to be illusory as it puts some students at higher risk than others. Minoritized experiences are exposed in a way that makes them particularly visible in the classroom.

The visibility of otherness through the Socratic Dialogue method also becomes problematic in light of Young's (2016) critique of the colonized narrative space. When students choose to share their beliefs and explain their positions, their arguments should be investigated to diagnose whether there are any misconceptions and misunderstandings of what has been said. Throughout this process, the majority of students gradually gain access to mindsets, arguments, and perspectives from the minoritized, a type of knowledge that can potentially be misused to control, label, and uphold unequal power relations that exist in the classroom and society. As noted by Spivak (1988), the process of rearticulating opinions and beliefs implies that those in power take the initial steps to speak on behalf of someone whose experiences they may never truly comprehend.

For Spivak (1988), expressing one's voice becomes even more challenging, since so-called emancipatory platforms are primarily offered by the majority and designed based on the cultural majority's premises, bringing me to my final point. In the Socratic Dialogue method, the participants aim to identify and defend the moral intuitions that underpin their lifestyles. However, the methodological examination of arguments seems to presuppose that beliefs and worldviews can and should be explained and understood rationally within the classroom setting. Ultimately, however, I believe that students can find it difficult to share their beliefs due to a lack of willingness on their part or because familiarity with a cultural or religious practice or belief does not necessarily translate into the ability to explain its background and details. Favoring a strictly philosophical method of inquiry runs the risk of overlooking the fact that religious traditions and experiences are more than what can be explained in words within a secular and public space like the classroom. In line with the critique of Habermas' reintroduction of religion in public discourse (Dreyer and Pieterse 2010), one could ask if the semantic content and moral truths of a particular religion can always be translated into a generally accessible language that everyone can follow. If the answer turns out to be negative, teachers need to be aware that the Socratic Dialogue method should be conducted in a way where students are not made into spokespeople or representatives of certain traditions and worldviews. Facilitating an inclusive and understanding-oriented classroom dialogue means acknowledging that a rational inquiry of worldviews, morals, and life-stances has its shortcomings and that not everything can or should be shared in a dialogue.

5. Conclusions

A fundamental objective in an intercultural-oriented educational framework is to instill in students the awareness that they are integral to the unfolding historical context. As noted by Biesta (2019), Dervin and Tan (2022), Spivak (1996), and others, education is inherently non-neutral, often acting as a conduit for the transmission of dominant cultural norms and contributing to the perpetuation of societal power dynamics and hierarchies. Consequently, it becomes paramount for students to cultivate a profound understanding of their own positionalities, recognizing how cultural elements and personal lived experiences shape their perspectives. As such, the Socratic Dialogue method holds the potential to enable students to critically engage with reality, equipping them with the tools necessary to participate in dismantling the oft-obscured mechanisms that solidify social inequalities.

Notably, the cultivation of such competencies is not confined to students alone but holds significant relevance for all educators, including teachers. For the latter, however, it is crucial to develop a critical reflection on the methods used to enhance intercultural understanding in the classroom. As emphasized in this article, a postcolonial perspective can be helpful in this regard. Although the Socratic dialogue has clear advantages as a classroom method for the democratic and critical examination of arguments, it necessitates that the students express perspectives and viewpoints shaped by their upbringing or articulated within their homes or religious communities, potentially putting some students at greater risk than others. Based on this premise, my thesis posits that the Socratic Dialogue method risks losing the motivational and explorative force it aims to capture.

However, it is important to underline that critically investigating the Socratic Dialogue method from a postcolonial perspective is not uncomplicated in itself. A mistake would be to view minoritized students' experiences as a single category, whereas in reality, they encompass rich diversity. In doing so, one risks reinforcing a distinction between minority and majority that fortifies an "us versus them" mentality. Moreover, critiquing the rational analysis of beliefs, opinions, and worldviews, and acknowledging that some students may feel intimidated sharing their cultural or religious backgrounds in class, does not imply that the categorization of voices from the margins is incompatible with rational thinking. As noted by Anievas and Nişancıoğlu (2017)—illustrating how universal categories are, themselves, particular and provincial—postcolonial theories have sometimes been accused of undermining and denying universal values. However, asserting that religious and secular philosophical beliefs and worldviews are incommensurable seems highly inaccurate. Religious and secular discourses are intricately intertwined, both historically and in contemporary life experiences. Therefore, when examining intercultural dialogue methods through a postcolonial perspective, it is crucial to acknowledge that classroom dialogues are feasible but may differ from what the Socratic Dialogue method envisions. Future research should delve into how the framework of postcolonial theory can further contribute to a constructive reconsideration of intercultural dialogue methods, all the while recognizing that religious and philosophical discourses are not mutually exclusive.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Data are contained within the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Aneas, Assumpta, and Ruth Vilà. 2023. Evaluation of Intercultural and Interreligious Dialogue Competencies. Identification of Factors Related with Its Performance among Adolescents in the City of Barcelona. *Religion & Education* 50: 191–208. [CrossRef]

Anievas, Alexander, and Kerem Nişancıoğlu. 2017. Limits of the Universal: The Promises and Pitfalls of Postcolonial Theory and Its Critique. *Historical Materialism* 25: 36–75. [CrossRef]

Biesta, Gert. 2015. Freeing Teaching from Learning: Opening up Existential Possibilities in Educational Relationships. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 34: 229–43. [CrossRef]
Biesta, Gert. 2019. *Obstinate Education. Reconnecting School and Society*. Leiden: Brill.
Blommaert, Jan. 2009. Ethnography and Democracy: Hymes's Political Theory of Language. *Text & Talk* 29: 257–76. [CrossRef]
Børresen, Beate. 2019. *Samtaler i klasserommet*. Oslo: Pedlex.
Børresen, Beate. 2023. Hva jeg vet, og hva jeg tror. Kritisk tenkning rundt kunnskap og meninger. *Bedre Skole* 15: 52–55.
Børresen, Beate, and Bo Malmhester. 2003. *La barna filosofere. Den filosofiske samtale i skolen*. Kristiansand: Høgskoleforlaget.
Council of Europe. 2018. *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 1. Context, Concepts and Model*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
Dervin, Fred, and Huiyu Tan. 2022. *Supercriticality and Intercultural Dialogue*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Dewey, John. 1963. *Experience and Education*. London: Collier MacMillian Publisher.
Donaldson, Laura E, and Kwok Pui-lan. 2002. *Postcolonialism, Feminism, and Religious Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
Dreyer, Jaco S., and Hennie J. C. Pieterse. 2010. Religion in the Public Sphere: What can Public Theology Learn from Habermas's Latest Work? *HTS Theological Studies* 66: 1–7. Available online: http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0259-94222010000100038&nrm=iso (accessed on 1 October 2023). [CrossRef]
Freire, Paulo. 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
Gitz-Johansen, Thomas. 2009. Muligheder og barrierer i den flerkulturelle skole—om holdninger, modstand, pædagogik og anerkendelse. In *Teacher Diversity in Diverse Schools—Challenges and Opportunities for Teacher Education*. Edited by Ole Kolbjørn Kjørven, Bjørg Karin Ringen and Antoinette Gagné. Vallset: Oplandske Bokforlag, pp. 391–410.
Haug, Peder. 2017. Understanding Inclusive Education: Ideals and Reality. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 19: 206–17. [CrossRef]
Heckmann, Gustav. 2004. Six Pedagogical Measures and Socratic Facilitation. In *Enquiring Minds. Socratic Dialogue in Education*. Edited by Rene Saran and Barbara Neisser. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 107–20.
Heimbrock, Hans-Günter. 2009. Encounter as Model for Dialogue in Religious Education. In *Religious Education as Encounter. A Tribute to John M Hull*. Edited by Siebren Miedema. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 83–97.
Lipman, Matthew. 1993. *Thinking Children and Education*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
Lipman, Matthew, Ann Margaret Sharp, and Frederic S. Oscanyan. 1980. *Philosophy in the Classroom*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
McConachy, Troy, Irina Golubeva, and Manuela Wagner. 2022. *Intercultural Learning in Language Education and Beyond: Evolving Concepts, Perspectives and Practices*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Nelson, Leonard. 2004. The Socratic Method. In *Enquiring Minds. Socratic Dialogue in Education*. Edited by Rene Saran and Barbara Neisser. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 126–65.
OECD. 2009. *21st Century Skills and Competences for New Millennium Learners in OECD Countries. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 41*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
Piaget, Jean. 1936. *Origins of Intelligence in the Child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Rosello, Mireille. 2001. *Postcolonial Hospitality. The Immigrant as Guest*. Standford: Stanford University Press.
Said, Edward W. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Sharma, Suniti, and Althier Lazar. 2014. Pedagogies of Discomfort: Shifting Preservice Teachers' Deficit Orientations Toward Language and Literacy Resources of Emergent Bilingual students. In *Research on Preparing Preservice Teachers to Work Effectively with Emergent Bilinguals*. Edited by Yvonne Freeman and David Freeman. Bingley: Emerald, pp. 3–30.
Skrefsrud, Thor-André. 2016. *The Intercultural Dialogue. Preparing Teachers for Diversity*. Münster: Waxmann.
Spivak, Gayatri C. 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271–313.
Spivak, Gayatri C. 1996. Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography. In *The Spivak Reader. Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. Edited by Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean. London: Routledge, pp. 203–35.
United Nations. 2015. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Available online: https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda (accessed on 1 January 2024).
Vygotsky, Lev. 1962. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Vygotsky, Lev. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Young, Robert J. C. 2016. *Postcolonialism. An Historical Introduction*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.