Reprint from

Reflective Practice Research

Edited by

Prof. Michael Noah Weiss
(University of South-Eastern Norway)

and

Prof. Guro Hansen Helskog
(University of South-Eastern Norway)

Volume 4

LIT

Reflective Practice Research in International Collaboration

Developing Teacher Education in Togetherness

Edited by

Guro Hansen Helskog
Ingrid R. Christensen
Åsmund Aamaas

LIT

Cover image: Amberpress by Gosia Warrink

The book is funded by the University of South-Eastern Norway (USN) and the Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and Skills (HK-dir).

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at https://dnb.dnb.de.

ISBN 978-3-643-91235-0 (pb)
ISBN 978-3-643-96235-5 (PDF)
ISBN 978-3-643-96877-7 (Open Access)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.52038/9783643912350

© LIT VERLAG GmbH & Co. KG Wien,
Zweigniederlassung Zürich 2025
Flössergasse 10
CH-8001 Zürich
Tel. +41 (0) 78-307 91 24
E-Mail: zuerich@lit-verlag.ch https://www.lit-verlag.ch
Distribution:
In the UK: Global Book Marketing, e-mail: mo@centralbooks.com
In Germany: LIT Verlag Fresnostr. 2, D-48159 Münster
Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-620 32 22, Fax +49 (0) 2 51-922 60 99, e-mail: vertrieb@lit-verlag.de

Contents

Foreword 1
Petter Aasen

Chapter 1: Developing education through international collaboration 3
Guro Hansen Helskog, Ingrid Reite Christensen and Åsmund Aamaas

Chapter 2: The Dao of reflective Practice Research 21
Finn Thorbjørn Hansen

Chapter 3: Success or Failure? Establishing communication In International Collaboration 51
Ingrid Reite Christensen

Chapter 4: Philosophising – a Way Towards Safe Space 75
Olena Beskorsa

Chapter 5: Philosophising – a Fruit of International Collaboration 97
Olha Lukianchenko

Chapter 6: Becoming rocked: a Palestinian – Norwegian Partnership 123
Ingrid Reite Christensen, Øyvind Wistrøm, and Sami Adwan

Chapter 7: International Collaboration and Workplace Friendships 143
Åsmund Aamaas and Vaibhav Jadhav

Chapter 8: Ways of Understanding Coincidences 161
Guro Hansen Helskog, Michael Noah Weiss and Christian Stokke

Chapter 9: Exploring our Cultural-Historical Embeddedness 185
Guro Hansen Helskog and Vaibhav Jadhav

Chapter 10: On compassionate teacher-student relationships 205
Guro Hansen Helskog, Dipali Mehakarkar and Chaitali Ghosh Sinha

Chapter 11: Shifting understandings of Inclusive education 227
Audrey Paradis, Jarno Slendebroek, Leandra Ve Saskia Romey, Marianne Reuse, Md Abu Nayeem, Laurel Seppälä, Albina Marchenko and Elizabeth Harlow

Chapter 12. A Horse called Hitler: Reflections on the German guilt 247
Kerstin Bornholdt

Chapter 13: From Geopolitics to Rare Earths in Teacher Education 267
Erlend Bendik Myhre

Chapter 14: Existential Encounters – Epistemological Diversity 303
Kristin Gregers Eriksen

Presentation of authors in alphabetical order 321

10.52038/9783643912350-5

Chapter 5: Philosophising – a Fruit of International Collaboration

Olha Lukianchenko[1]

Abstract

This essay highlights Ukrainian researcher-educators' self-understanding of the need for change and enhancement of approaches and methods in teacher training in Ukraine. In line with a reflective practice research approach, the essay takes its point of departure in the concrete experience of trying out philosophical dialogue with teacher students in accordance with the Dialogos approach. The philosophical dialogue process seemed to increase the tolerance of the teacher students. Through a critical and theoretical reflection upon this experience, the author delves into the theme of tolerance formation in a pedagogical perspective by focusing on humanistic values, social and communicative competence, and reflexive abilities.

Key words:

tolerance, philosophical dialogue, internationalisation, training of future primary school teachers.

Introduction

The idea of writing this article arose because of studying the possibilities of the potential of a democratic approach and philosophical dialogue in the educational system at all levels (from primary education to higher education) in the process of the implementation of internationalisation of education in Ukraine. Importantly, the emergence of this need has been made possible by the desire of the Ukrainian education system to change, to move away from the old dogmatic, authoritarian methods of teaching and interaction between all participants in the educational process. Of course, the Ukrainian education system implements Ukraine's overall strategy of striving to join the European Union. Historically, the Ukrainian nation has an in-

herent desire to educate the younger generation on European values, based on freedom of choice and responsibility for one's choice, equality of all before the law, tolerance, etc. This predilection for democratic values is linked to historical and geographical aspects.

The internationalisation context

Working as a lecturer at the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, I had a great opportunity to participate in several trainings and projects organised by foreign colleagues from countries with developed democracies and a high level of development of education on democratic bases. These events became significant in my pedagogical career and allowed me to be convinced of the importance of the internationalisation of education, particularly pedagogical education. This experience will be presented and analysed in this article.

Teichler (1999) considered the internationalisation of education as a key policy vector for the development of education in the post-industrial society in Europe and around the world. Teichler (1999) identifies main trends, such as the international mobility of students and teachers, the teaching and learning of foreign languages, cooperative research and research in a particular area of knowledge, and the universalisation, globalisation, and internationalisation of the content and functions of higher education and the improvement of its quality.

Many academic studies by Teichler (2004), Yemini (2014), Haigh (2014), de Jong & Teekens (2003), and Daniels (2013) point out that the focus of internationalisation has now shifted from individual initiatives to institutionalisation through the introduction of international links into the educational process of universities. This is due to the awareness of the need to create a unified educational space, the development of a truly international and intercultural academic community, the formation of a global mindset in university graduates, tolerance of the norms and values of other cultures, and the development of intercultural communication skills.

De Jong & Thickens (2003) assert that the increasing internationalisation of education is often seen as a positive factor for the development of students' tolerance. They describe efforts to overcome students' cultural differences and balance national interests at the University of Twente (UT) in the Netherlands.

Developing tolerance through internationalisation

Firstly, intercultural learning should be achieved by creating intercultural environments (intercultural workshops, cultural festivals, language partnerships) where pupils can meet, socialise, and learn about each other and other cultures.

Secondly, international student exchange programmes allow students to get to know other cultures and countries, to enrich their experiences and perspectives, and to develop tolerance and mutual understanding, respect for cultural differences, and the ability to balance national interests.

Thirdly, to support multimodal communication using different languages, communication technologies, and tools that promote understanding and collaboration between pupils (de Jong & Teekens, 2003).

Fourthly, to include specific activities to build intercultural competence, awareness, and skills to adapt to new cultures, traditions, and living conditions through new activities in the language course of the international mobility programme for students or researchers. (Experience of the University of Barcelona) (Panadés, 2022).

The internalisation of education prevents the emergence of dangerous phenomena such as cultural and ideological radicalisation. The University of Siena, through the FORWARD project, offers tools to promote integration in multi-ethnic communities:

a) the collaborative construction of a network composed of experts, researchers, and professionals, coming from international contexts, to facilitate the circulation of multi-methodological perspectives on the different experiences of pluralism, theoretical frameworks, and repertoires of well-established and promising innovative practices;
b) the co-design and implementation of training courses addressed to professionals to provide them with work in multiethnic contexts;
c) the development of an institutional curriculum for the three-year degree in Education Sciences at the University of Siena with professional teaching modules including Pedagogy of Deradicalisation, Psychology of Radicalism, Sociology of Migration, Psychology of Multicultural Processes, and European Immigration Law, among others. (Romano & Orefice, 2022:35)

Concrete reflection: My experiences

My experience in the internationalization of teacher education, as an Associate Professor at the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, has developed through participation in numerous international trainings and workshops over the past decade, from 2018 to the present.

The opportunity to attend and actively participate in international workshops made me think about finding ways to implement democratic approaches and principles into the organisation of the training process of future teachers at the New Ukrainian School. It should be noted that all changes (transformations) in a school always begin with teachers, with changing approaches to their training. That is why it is so important to build the process of teacher training on the principles of partnership, dialogue based on tolerance, active participation in pedagogical situations, living professional cases, and changing the content of pedagogical education.

It is necessary to justify the choice of the subject of this article in order to determine the direction of the research. Therefore, it is worthwhile to describe the main problem of further research related to the need for a deeper study of important facts from my teaching practice, which is conditioned by the problem of tolerance in education based on philosophical dialogues.

Experience 1

The impetus for introducing democratic practices in teacher training was my first participation in the international Swiss-Ukrainian DOCCU project for teachers, in March-May 2018. It was here that I gained my first experience of methods and techniques for building a rights-based and organised education for democratic citizenship.

Here I saw for the first time the implementation of the activity approach based on the tolerant attitude of the participants in the organisation of communication and interaction of teachers from pedagogical universities from different cities of Ukraine, who did not know each other. The applied forms and methods of interaction were simple, accessible, interactive, and exciting, on the one hand, and on the other, helped to understand the essence of the presented competences of the culture of democracy through own experience.

The main principle of this training in the culture of democracy was implemented through the following formula:

'What? (What is democracy, its basic concepts, knowledge of human rights and understanding of what documents enshrine them);

Though? (opportunity to participate and acquire life experience in the school, which is a model of a microsociety where human rights are upheld, freedom and equality of students, peaceful regulation of conflicts, and mutual respect);

For which? (awareness of how students can realise their human rights and participate in civic life and have a sense of responsibility for themselves and other members of their society)' (Gollob, Krapf, & Weidinger, 2010: 8).

The experience of my first participation in an international project was described in the chapter with my colleague (Vasiutina & Lukianchenko, 2021). As a result of the participation in the international training, the educators realised the need to develop tolerance in future teachers through recognition of the value of human dignity and human rights; acceptance of cultural diversity; recognition of the value of tolerance, justice, and equality; openness to cultural otherness, beliefs, and world views; and respect for others.

Experience 2

I then continued to study the implementation of democratic foundations in education and had the opportunity to join the project (2017–2021) titled "Developing Democracy Education in Ukraine, Norway, and Palestine."[2] I was in the section 'Implementation of Democracy in Communication in the Educational Space' (moderated by Guro Hansen Helskog) and discussed ways to implement the ideas of democracy in the process of training future teachers.

This experience of participating in an international project with Norwegian academics has allowed me to understand more deeply, to live the experience of taking part in philosophical dialogues, to analyse our own feelings and emotions that arose in the interaction with strangers with whom we happened to work in a group, in a team, to reflect and listen to others, and to express my agreement or another point of view.

The experience of the workshop with Professor Helskog gave me a philosophical view of the universe, of the self in it, and of the importance of a critical attitude towards oneself and others, and an understanding and awareness that empathy and tolerance play an important role in the construction of philosophical dialogues, especially in the teaching process. Helskog focused on the practices of constructing philosophical dialogues

and on the emotional side of conducting them, analysing one's feelings, both positive and negative, and what actions they can prompt one to take.

It was a very important experience of learning and practically mastering democratic principles of the construction of the learning process, which I wanted to immediately implement in my pedagogical activity in the training of future primary school teachers.

So, based on my professional duties, I thought about which disciplines could successfully implement philosophical dialogues in education. Thus, my experience of implementing philosophical dialogues directly in the courses at the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University for full-time students majoring in 'Primary Education' at the bachelor's level.

The gradual incorporation of philosophical dialogues into the training of primary school teachers, where justified where necessary, has brought the issue of tolerance more clearly to the foreground.

The choice of focus for the study was also supported by the analysis of students' experiences in which they described pedagogical situations during practice at school, when there was a need for tolerance both in the activities of the teacher (especially in the process of assessing students' learning achievements) and in the interaction of children among themselves in the children's community. For example, in a modern Ukrainian school, tolerant behaviour among younger pupils was necessary when preparing for the celebration of events with a religious context, in classmates' relations with pupils of other nationalities (especially Muslims and Oriental peoples), in the interaction of pupils from families with different levels of material wealth and social status in society, and in other situations.

Experience 3

The decisive factor for the further theoretical substantiation of the problem of the necessity of forming tolerance in the educational system (since the school is a small model of society in which it is possible to learn to model reasonable, tolerant interaction of all participants of the educational process) was the successful case of my participation in an international workshop after a break of several years.

Thus, in February 2023, I participated in the workshop on philosophical dialogues hosted by Guro Hansen Helskog for Indian teachers from Savitribai Phule Pune University (Mr. Mahes Mali, Mrs. Nayana Borse, Dr. Poonam Sonawane, and Dipali). The workshop discussed ways to create philosophical dialogues in the educational system.

Once again, a key issue in the rules of dialogue was the need to explore the topic of tolerance. The discussions took place in alternating groups. The composition of the groups changed constantly. This provided an opportunity to hear the views of all participants. During the discussion, the need for prerequisites for philosophical dialogues was raised. What can be considered a philosophical question? How do you create a situation for philosophical dialogue? What human qualities are formed in philosophical dialogues? What emotions motivate people to philosophize?

It was important that during the conversation we found out the inseparability of the following attributes of dialogue, such as empathy, tolerance, logic, respect for the thoughts of other interlocutors through statements in support of this opinion or vice versa of their differences, etc. Dialogue helps to build bridges between people. We have seen that dialogue is impossible without respect for the principles of tolerance.

Critical reflection

Through the data collected in the process of personal experience of participation in international projects, workshops, and their reflexive analyses, it was possible to identify the issue of tolerance. I have been convinced that the issue of tolerance is very important in the system of education and in building a society based on democratic values.

As a result of the conversations and analysis of the sessions described above, an academic elective course for future primary school teachers was developed, titled "Teaching Tolerance for Primary School Students." This course included the following range of issues, such as the definition of the essence of the concept of tolerance; axiological and existential approaches as the basis of tolerance; pedagogical tolerance; how to promote a tolerant attitude; how the education system can foster a tolerant personality; prejudices and barriers to tolerance; the danger of low-level tolerance formation for a democratic society; and others.

It should be noted that the dominant method of studying this course was the method of philosophical dialogues. Thus, the sequence of activities and the algorithm of the course deserve attention. At the beginning of the course, key philosophical questions were formulated, such as 'What is the meaning of tolerance? On purpose, students were asked to explore a particular normative document, such as the 'Declaration of Principles on Tolerance 1995 by UNESCO'. As an effective method of examining docu-

ments, I suggested the use of the exercise proposed by Helskog, 'Interpretation, Understanding and Interpersonal Relations' (Helskog, 2019:197). This activity involves reflecting on problematic issues, during which students have to try learning normative documents. Thus, the students, by performing tasks according to the exercise, read aloud the articles of normative documents, emphasised the most important phrases and keywords, and explained the meaning of a particular article in one laconic sentence. Later, a creative task was offered – to depict thoughtfully an emblem that would embody the essence of the notion of 'tolerance'.

Students focused on exploring this concept from different angles, such as tolerance at the state level, social dimensions, and the role of education in promoting tolerance. As a result of the reflection, the students showed a deeper and more thoughtful understanding of theoretical concepts, demonstrated teamwork skills, built partnerships and were able to creatively present the acquired understanding of the nature of normative postulates. Emphasising rights and fundamental freedoms for all, regardless of race, gender, language, national origin, religion or disability, and combating intolerance.

I posed problematic issues for students to reflect on in the next class: 'Are there limits to tolerance?', 'Is it possible to be tolerant of intolerant behaviour?', and 'Can an intolerant teacher successfully develop a person-centred interaction with all participants of the education process?'.

The next stage of the course for future teachers was to identify and select weekly topics in the primary curriculum where it would be appropriate (to some extent) to focus the attention of primary pupils on aspects of the need for tolerant behaviour.

Also, the students of for full-time students majoring in 'Primary Education' at the bachelor's level gained interesting experience in the process of staging, theatricalisation in pantomime of life situations on overcoming stereotypes of behaviour in society in relation to differences in cultural traditions, religious preferences, membership of a particular subculture, race, and others. The exercises were conducted in mini groups of 3–4 students. Each group acted out a situation, which potentially contained a story that demanded tolerant behaviour. The groups took turns in presenting their work while the others had to guess which situation was being portrayed by the opposing group. The essence of the reflection on the exercise described above was the analysis of the emotions and feelings experienced by the actors in situations of intolerant behaviour. It was also used to analyse the actions that might have been triggered by these emotions.

On the one hand, such exercises generated great interest among students, as well as satisfaction in presenting and justifying their choice of examples. On the other hand, their implementation required a thorough understanding of the theoretical foundations of the pedagogy of tolerance and the ability to relate these principles to students' own experiences of engaging with works of art.

At the end of the special course, an anonymous survey was conducted through the Google form, which showed a real interest in the results of the course and a change in attitudes and perceptions of basic democratic values. So, the students were asked to answer a number of questions, including:

– Was it important for you to study the special course 'Teaching Tolerance for Primary School Students'?
– Does your understanding of the concept of 'tolerance' in the present time coincide with what it was before you studied the special course? How has it changed? (explain)
– How has your attitude to the concept of 'pedagogical tolerance' changed?
– Is it possible to teach tolerance at school?
– What do you think is an effective approach to fostering tolerance in future primary school teachers? (Choose 3 answers among: theoretical analysis of Council of Europe documents; philosophical dialogues about the researched aspect; projection of pedagogical situations; solving pedagogical problems on the basis of tolerance; studying the rules of tolerance; using the 'Do as I do' technique);
– Tolerant attitude of teachers to children in secondary schools: overestimates students' self-esteem; creates conditions for the formation of their own personality; educates humanity; reduces the quality of education; creates conditions for permissiveness;
– Are there limits to a tolerant attitude towards people's behaviour in society?
– Which of the special course topics has been the focus of your thinking?
– Which task or topic was most interesting for you?
– What does it mean to have a successful dialogue in terms of tolerance?
– How do you feel when you encounter intolerant behaviour of educators?
– How does the intolerant behaviour of teachers influence your actions?
– Are there dangers in a tolerant environment? Which exactly?

Thus, the use of methods and tools (philosophical Socratic dialogues, debates, tasks in groups based on partnership, self-analysis of emotional states and factors of their occurrence) provides understanding and perception of

the principles of equality and non-discrimination, tolerance, and social justice.

Theoretical reflection. The concept of tolerance approached in literature?

The reflexive practice described above required a broader reflection on the justification of some patterns of events in my professional life, namely, why during the last 7 years of teaching practice the issue of the need for tolerant interaction with both students and colleagues has arisen in one way or another. Why has this been particularly pronounced during my participation in international training and seminars? In other words, what is the role of internationalisation in teacher education, and what is the pedagogical significance of tolerance?

The search for answers to the research questions requires a deeper understanding of the nature of the concept of tolerance at the philosophical level. Focusing on the philosophical direction of the research, we concretise the definition of 'tolerance' that has been selected as the basic concept. The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy interprets tolerance as:

'[The] term 'toleration' – from the Latin *tolerare*: to put up with, countenance or suffer – generally refers to the conditional acceptance of or non-interference with beliefs, actions or practices that one considers to be wrong but still 'tolerable', such that they should not be prohibited or constrained. There are many contexts in which we speak of a person or an institution as being tolerant. Thus, for any analysis of the motives and reasons for toleration, the relevant contexts need to be taken into account. (Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2017)

Understanding the concept of 'tolerance' and its interpretation in the modern context provides a general understanding of the development of this phenomenon from antiquity to the present. Human society and its progressive representatives have thought about it in different contexts, mainly religious rather than secular.

The works of many philosophers of the past form the basis of the modern understanding of the concept of 'tolerance'. So, the works of Enlightenment philosophers such as Locke, Voltaire, and Kant are an important springboard for the modern understanding of tolerance. The great thinkers explained the concept of tolerance as a basis for personal inviolability and

security of people of other views and other religions and sought its implementation in real life.

In 'Letter Concerning Toleration' (1686), the manifestation of tolerance according to Locke can be traced through his call for tolerance, in particular, religious tolerance in general and mutual tolerance between Christians. By 'mutual tolerance', Locke meant much more than the position of meek patience associated with *tolerantia*. Rather, the duty of toleration designated a demanding and complex combination of virtues – including civility – on the part of private individuals as indispensable ethical supports for a public policy of toleration.

Toleration was not itself the *cause* of differences in religious opinions or sectarian affiliation; it simply made pre-existing divisions public. Nevertheless, the open acknowledgement and expression of these differences – particularly through evangelical competition – would become a source of contention and conflict (Locke, 1824, p. 239).

Based on research by contemporary scholars Eveleth (2007) and Bejan (2016) on the works of Enlightenment philosophers, we can state that at that time, tolerance was considered a common value and a basis for peace and harmony between religions, nations, and different social groups. Therefore, their works are basic for many modern philosophers in interpreting tolerance as a value of a democratic society and thus for the educational space as its component.

There is a need to refer to contemporary philosophical thought in order to realise the importance of tolerance in teachers and the necessity of fostering it for their successful future interaction with people belonging to different religious and social groups and representatives of different cultures in the current educational environment.

Also, the need to address contemporary philosophers on the interpretation of the essence of tolerance is caused by the fact that some participants of the educational process (teachers, parents, students, and pupils) do not have a clear understanding of the goals, principles, and necessity of tolerance education in the modern world with numerous challenges of political, economic, and mental nature. Such facts are also characteristic, for example, of the Romanian education system, which is confirmed by the studies of Albu & Cojocariu (2015) and Ţurcan (2015).

So, what is the interpretation of the concept of 'tolerance' among contemporary philosophers?

In our research, we rely on the interpretation of tolerance according to Forst (2013), which the contemporary philosopher outlined in his mono-

graph 'Tolerance in Conflict: The Past and the Present'. As Horton (2013) states, this is the most significant study to date, devoted to tolerance and written by a prominent political philosopher of our time. Forst's book explores four philosophical concepts of toleration: the permission conception, the coexistence conception, the respect conception (which admits of two forms – formal equality and qualitative equality) and the esteem conception. Each of these concepts represents a different approach to understanding toleration and its place in society. Forst (2013) examines the concept of tolerance from both historical and contemporary perspectives. In Forst's view, a historical understanding of tolerance can be useful for contemporary debates on issues such as multiculturalism and the accommodation of religious minorities.

Forst (2013) argues that tolerance should not be seen as mere acceptance of diversity but rather as a process of negotiation and conflict resolution in situations of social and political disagreement. The contemporary philosopher stresses the importance of distinguishing between tolerance and indifference or mere tolerance and emphasises that true tolerance involves accepting and respecting the views of the other, even if they are not shared. He also advocates that tolerance should not be limited to respect for other cultures and opinions but should also include respect for human rights and the principles of justice and equality.

Forst argues that toleration is not simply a matter of peaceful coexistence or a willingness to put up with something we dislike, but rather a complex and multifaceted political concept that requires careful analysis.

In the context of our study, the views of another contemporary American philosopher and theologian, Philip Quinn, on the definition of the essence of tolerance are of interest. In his article 'On Religious Diversity and Tolerance', Quinn (2001) explores the relationship between religious diversity and tolerance from an existentialist perspective. Quinn argues that tolerance is not just about accepting differences or being indifferent to them, but that it requires a deeper understanding of the different ways in which people experience and make sense of the world.

Quinn (2001) notes that from an existentialist perspective, meaning in life is not something that is given to us by tradition or authority but is something that we must create for ourselves through our choices and actions. This means that different people and cultures may have very different ways in which they understand the world and find meaning in it. According to Quinn (2001), true tolerance requires us to appreciate these different ways of understanding the world, even if we do not agree with them or do not

share them ourselves. It means recognising that our own perspective is not the only true one and that other people may have equally valid reasons for their beliefs and practices.

Quinn (2001) also points out that tolerance is not a matter of moral relativism or subjectivism, but that it requires recognition of certain universal values, such as human dignity and respect for others. This means that while we can appreciate and tolerate different ways of understanding the world, we must also be willing to defend these universal values and condemn practices that violate them, such as discrimination or violence against others.

When considering the essence of the phenomenon 'tolerance', it is necessary to analyse how we can consider tolerance as a quality of a personality and what personality can be called tolerant from the position of modern philosophical thought. This understanding is important for us to find its pedagogical meaning, namely, the possibilities of the education system to bring up such a quality of personality.

Turning to Forst (2013), we find his description of the tolerant person. He argues that a tolerant person is one who acknowledges and accepts the legitimacy of different views and perspectives, even if he or she does not personally agree with them. The philosopher stresses the importance of openness and empathy for a tolerant person who is willing to listen and interact with others, even if they hold opposing views, and can put himself in others' shoes to better understand their perspectives. A tolerant person, in his view, recognises the limitations of their own knowledge and understanding, is willing to challenge their own assumptions and beliefs, and engages in constructive dialogue with others to broaden their understanding of the world.

The importance of a tolerant person's empathy is also pointed out by Quinn (2001). Gasser (2022), a researcher of the philosopher's views, also describes Quinn's focus on the emotional and cognitive aspects of tolerance. Quinn believes that tolerance requires people to have empathy and the ability to see things from the perspective of others, to confront their own prejudices and biases, and to engage in self-criticism and self-reflection. Emphasising the role of emotions in tolerance, Quinn argues that emotional reactions can facilitate or hinder the development of tolerance. For example, anger and fear can lead to hostility towards others, while empathy and compassion can promote understanding and acceptance.

The presence of empathy as a predictor of tolerance in the speech and action dimension is confirmed by Butrus and Witenberg (2013). At the

same time, openness and agreeableness are predictors of tolerance in the belief dimension.

Developing tolerance in the education system

It should be emphasised that it is important for our research to find the justification of ways and methods of forming tolerance both in future teachers (especially in primary schools) and their pupils as an important part of society, which in many respects determines the vector of development of society and its mood. Reflecting on the qualities of a tolerant personality, one realises that such personalities are essential for building a tolerant society, to which all civilised societies, including Ukraine, aspire. In this connection, the problem is how and on what basis a tolerant society can be built, and what the role of teacher education is in the development of tolerance. The fact that a school, a class, or any other pupil group is a model of a microsociety creates a unique opportunity, a condition for the favourable formation of tolerance in each member of the group, as well as for tolerant interaction in the group itself. Directly, these aspects have been the focus of my pedagogical work in recent years. It is through my own pedagogical experience that I have found confirmation of the philosophical reflections described by Forst on the qualities of a tolerant person and her role in building a tolerant society.

According to Forst (2013), a tolerant society is one in which individuals and groups can coexist and interact despite their differences. It is not simply a society in which people can freely express their opinions without fear of persecution, but rather a society in which people are willing to engage in dialogue and debate with those who hold different views. In a tolerant society, individuals and groups can recognise and respect the rights of others, even if they disagree with their views. This follows from Forst's preferred respect conception of tolerance, according to which it proceeds from a morally grounded form of mutual respect on the part of the individuals or groups who exercise tolerance. The tolerating parties respect one another as autonomous persons or as equally entitled members of a political community constituted under the rule of law' (Forst, 2013, p. 29).

Forst stresses the importance of reciprocity in a tolerant society. He argues that people should be willing to be tolerant of others, even if they do not agree with their views. This requires a willingness to listen and interact with others, rather than simply rejecting their views.

Forst also notes that a tolerant society requires a commitment to social and political equality. He argues that a society characterised by inequality and injustice is unlikely to be truly tolerant because marginalised or oppressed people and groups do not have the same opportunities to engage in dialogue and debate.

The key element of a tolerant society, according to Forst, is the respect and recognition of the equal rights and values of every member of society, regardless of their cultural, religious, or ideological characteristics. This creates the conditions for interaction and cooperation between different groups, promoting peaceful and harmonious coexistence. Thus, tolerance is a prerequisite for a just and democratic society, as it allows for the peaceful coexistence of diverse and contradictory views.

Quinn's thinking is close to Forst's. As Gasser (2022), a researcher of Quinn's views, notes, Quinn (2001) emphasised the importance of recognising and valuing the existential diversity of human experience as well as defending universal values and fighting against injustice and oppression when considering a tolerant society. In Quinn's view, the values of mutual respect and equality are important for tolerance. The philosopher believes that people should respect each other's differences and recognise that no one has the truth or a monopoly on the correctness of matters of faith and morality. Quinn also stresses the importance of justice and democratic processes to ensure that minority rights are protected.

According to Quinn (2001), democratic values such as freedom of expression, equality and individual autonomy are essential for creating a society that tolerates diversity and are essential to the concept of tolerance. In his view, democracy provides a framework for balancing the interests and needs of different groups and individuals and for resolving conflicts between them peacefully; it encourages people to engage in open and respectful dialogue with each other; and it creates opportunities for individuals and groups to participate in the political process and to express their views.

Analysing the views of contemporary philosophers on tolerance and projecting them onto the realities of today's global world and the interaction of people of different nations, cultures, and social statuses, the question arises as to whether there are limits to tolerance and whether it is possible to be tolerant of intolerant manifestations. These were the kinds of problematic issues that arose for my students in the process of teaching the special course on developing tolerance in future teachers that I described in the previous section.

In searching for answers to the questions posed, we turn to the views of Forst (2013) and Quinn (2001), who share the general idea of the limits of tolerance but have some differences in their approaches. Forst (2013) acknowledges that there are limits to tolerance, namely through limiting violence and unacceptable speech. He emphasises that tolerance does not have to be unconditional and that intolerant views that are contrary to democratic principles and human rights can be restricted. 'The limits of toleration are reached when others are denied their basic right to justification in general, or, alternatively, this right is flouted in cases' (Forst, 2013, p. 455). He argues that tolerance should have its limits when it comes to violence, suppression, or violation of the rights of others, i.e., in cases where intolerance turns into violence or unacceptable speech, society should limit these expressions in order to protect the rights and security of all citizens.

Quinn (2001) also recognises the limits of tolerance. He argued that democracy should be tolerant but should not tolerate intolerant attitudes that threaten democracy itself or the rights of other citizens. He believed that a restriction of intolerant views may be justified when they undermine the basic principles and values of a democratic society and the rights of others.

Thus, both Forst and Quinn recognise that there are boundaries to tolerance, especially when intolerant views threaten the democratic principles, rights and security of others. However, the exact boundaries and how these boundaries are defined may vary according to the specific context and circumstances. The question of the limit of tolerance is also a subject of reflection in academia by Williams & Waldron (2008) in 'Toleration and Its Limits' and Russell (2017).

So, I think that tolerance is expressed in respecting the opinions of others, trust and honesty in relationships, humanity, peacefulness, and the ability to minimise misunderstandings through dialogue and agreement. In this regard, the limit of tolerance can be defined as a balance between acceptable norms of behaviour and the freedom to express one's thoughts and behaviour without critical consequences for the subjects of interaction.

The interesting experience of other researchers who shed light on the pedagogical aspect of tolerance should be mentioned, such as Albu & Cojocariu, 2015; Boghian, 2016; Cherednyk, 2019; Kuzmenko, 2020; Kremen, 2011; Tourinan, 2008; Thompson, 2014; and Mamlok, 2023. According to Mamlok (2023), tolerance is understood as a means of confronting hostility, raising awareness of cultural differences, mitigating violence, and upholding liberal and democratic values. Mamlok further argues that fostering a

sense of tolerance in students, particularly in divisive communities, requires the educational system to move beyond purely discursive interpretations of tolerance. Instead, it should promote a pragmatic understanding of tolerance through an agonistic lens, as suggested by Dewey (2008), which encourages a more flexible and humane approach to resolving conflicts of various origins.

> Developing a pragmatic sense of tolerance through an agonistic lens in education involves the arrangement of school life in a way that would offer students experiences that would encourage them constantly to consider their attitudes and assumptions towards the other. Inter alia, nurturing intellectual attitudes and flexible habits is necessary for supporting students' engagement in a pluralistic society. I have argued that, in addition to cultivating a Deweyan understanding of habit among students, it is important to help students grapple with disagreements and conflicts in an agonistic way. I contend that the amalgam of a pragmatic understanding of habit through an agonistic perspective can help students to embody a sense of tolerance, despite distinct disagreements and conflicts. Yet the conditions needed for such an approach cannot be based on laws (such as Bill 21) that, in the guise of neutrality attempt to erase not only the visible differences among social groups, but also the underlying cultural, political, and discursive cleavages. (Mamlok, 2023:67)

At the same time, based on my personal experience of participating in the international trainings and workshops described above, I can state that philosophical dialogues are one of the effective methods and ways of forming tolerance.

The rationale for the effectiveness of using dialogues to promote tolerance among all participants in the educational process is that only through open and constructive dialogue can mutual understanding and respect between people with different views and perspectives be achieved. Dialogue should be open to different cultures, opinions, and perspectives, and its participants should seek to understand each other, not to communicate their own rightness. Only through such dialogue can a deep understanding of different cultures and beliefs be achieved and the basis for a tolerant and harmonious society be created (Forst, 2013).

According to Forst (2013), the conduct of a dialogue should be based on the following rules: 1. Mutual respect and equality between dialogue participants. Openness and willingness to listen to the points of view of other participants without prejudice and a desire to dominate others. Recognition of the legitimacy of different views and perspectives, even if they do not coincide with one's own beliefs. 2. Focusing on shared values and interests.

3. Bringing a problem or issue to the table and exploring different aspects of the problem from different perspectives. 4. Finding possible solutions or compromises that will satisfy all participants in the dialogue. 5. Adherence to logical and ethical norms during the dialogue.

Thus, for Forst, dialogue is an important tool for building tolerance and a way to achieve peace and justice in society.

The dialogue, when conducted systematically, not only fosters tolerance in individuals but also creates the conditions for the development of a tolerant society. The ability of people to better understand each other, exchange ideas, and respect different points of view are attributes of the democratic process that contribute to a more tolerant society (Quin, 2001). Hence, I have been suggesting that the views of contemporary philosophers on the usefulness of dialogue for fostering tolerance within the education system should be used.

It is worth noting that my own teaching experience has confirmed the effectiveness of dialogical philosophising according to the Dialogos approach (Helskog, 2015; 2017) in the process of educating future primary school teachers in tolerance. I can claim to have successfully applied philosophical dialogues according to Helskog's approach. Although this dialogue approach was developed by a scholar to search for the nature of wisdom and, at the same time, to develop the personal and relational wisdom of students, it is universal in that it incorporates reflection on the nature of tolerance into the educational process and, at the same time, builds tolerance in its participants. Thus, by using appropriate philosophical methods in practice, I became convinced that such trusting dialogues, with respect to the interlocutor, with a willingness to perceive another's point of view, with tolerance for inconsistencies, and with a willingness to show empathy, are only possible with interlocutors who possess the quality of tolerance.

On the other hand, the systematic application of philosophy in the educational process creates favourable conditions for fostering tolerance in those participants in the educational process who have a low level of this personal quality, which is important for a democratic society. This, in turn, requires a person to work on his or her behaviour, a certain will and intellectual effort, and attempts to move away from stable stereotypes to perceive information critically. It is the need for such work on oneself, on the regulation and control of one's feelings and emotions, that coincides with the vision of the problem of fostering tolerance in students in accordance with Mamlok (2023).

A closer look at the phases and ways of philosophising according to the approach of Helskog (2015; 2017), which I managed to implement in the process of studying the special course 'Education of Tolerance in Future Teachers' at the Pedagogical University in Kiev (Ukraine), deserves attention. Thus, of the three justified Helskog phases, which define the process of 'Dialogos' development and represent the didactic structure of the 'Dialogos' curriculum, I managed to successfully implement only the first two. Namely, the humanistic-educational and the ethical-philosophical phases. The students were not yet ready for the third phase of Dialogos, existential-spiritual, due to insufficient time of immersion in the special course and mental unreadiness to make qualitative changes in their personal beliefs at the existential level. Let us focus on the essence of the stages of Dialogos development according to Helskog (2015; 2017).

Humanistic-Pedagogical Phase: This phase focuses on a humanistic and pedagogical approach to philosophical practice. Participants engage in discussions that promote critical thinking, analysis and conceptualisation. They are encouraged to problematise their own thinking and the thinking of others in a more abstract way.

Ethical-philosophical phase: The second phase emphasises ethical and philosophical enquiry. Participants delve into ethical questions, dilemmas, and moral considerations. Phenomenological approaches may be used in the discussion, encouraging participants to explore their life experiences and perspectives, seeking a deeper understanding of ethical issues.

Existential-Spiritual Phase: The final phase focuses on the existential and spiritual aspects of philosophical practice. Participants may engage in contemplative and introspective discussions addressing questions of meaning, purpose, and the spiritual dimensions of life.

According to Helskog (2017), throughout all three stages, different ways of philosophising are encouraged:

> The modes of philosophising can be labelled abstract-analytical modes, phenomenological-hermeneutical modes, and spiritual-contemplative modes. By 'abstract-analytical modes of philosophising', I mean facilitating in a way that makes students analyse, conceptualize, and problematise in an abstract way, both their own thinking and the thinking of others. Through this, they learn how to pay close attention to what is said or written, and they learn to reflect upon their own thoughts as well as the thoughts of others.
>
> By 'phenomenological-hermeneutical modes of philosophizing', I mean a mode of philosophizing that relates to the outer world with an attitude of openness and willingness to let the Other (whether fellow students, a concept, a

> text, a movie, or an image) speak to us, with the risk of being existentially changed or transformed by the Other.
>
> By the 'spiritual-contemplative mode of philosophizing', I mean a mode of philosophizing in which we have moved Dialogos (through reason, words, and speech) to a state of being beyond or underneath logos: to pure Being. Dialogue in this phase involves being together on a deeper level, in which ideas are allowed to float in a freer way. (Helskog 2017: 6)

Focusing on the results of the practical application of different ways of philosophising according to the Helskog approach in the process of education of tolerance in future primary school teachers, we can assert the effectiveness of this method. After all, the very process of dialogue by its very nature is impossible without the presence of tolerance in interlocutors. It implies respect for the interlocutor and readiness to understand him/her without any stereotypes. And the very process of dialogical philosophising is an effective method of tolerance education.

Hence, the common feature of the approaches described in terms of the interpretation of tolerance in the pedagogical aspect is the assumption that, regardless of the focus of consideration of the phenomenon of 'tolerance', whether as a quality of personality or as a principle of the educational process, tolerance can be developed and implemented only through dialogical interaction.

Final remarks

In this essay, I have studied effective methods and ways of promoting tolerance among future primary school teachers during their training at a pedagogical university in Ukraine.

First of all, I paid attention to the fact that my interest in the problem of tolerance in the pedagogical aspect arose due to the possibility of personal participation in international trainings and workshops in which teachers from countries with a developed level of democracy in society participated, including in the educational process, in the pre-war years in Ukraine. I saw the role of internationalisation in education in a qualitative personal change, which manifested itself in a change in the choice of approaches and teaching methods in the training of future teachers. As a result of my participation in international educational projects, my pedagogical arsenal changed from reproductive teaching methods to interactive methods based

on dialogue, active interaction of all participants in the pedagogical process based on trust, and respect for the rights of students, imbued with empathy.

Secondly, I present my personal pedagogical experience, highlighting my teaching practice and employing critical reflection as a research method. In this way, according to Helskog and Weiss (2023), I developed a self-understanding of my professional practice. My experience focused on the use of philosophical dialogues, following Helskog's framework (2015, 2017). 'Dialogos' approach to reflect on the nature of the phenomenon of tolerance and the importance of its presence as a necessary personality quality for a modern democratic teacher. In order to theoretically underpin the effectiveness of using philosophical dialogues to teach tolerance, the views of contemporary philosophers such as Forst and Quine were analysed. Their views on tolerance are united by the fact that they declare that the essence of tolerance is not just a matter of peaceful coexistence or a willingness to put up with what we do not like, but above all a recognition of respect for the views of the other, even if they are not shared (Forst, 2013). At the same time, tolerance should not be limited to respect for other cultures and opinions but should be based on democratic values such as freedom of expression, equality and recognition of individual autonomy (Quinn, 2001); principles of justice, respect and recognition of the rights and values of every member of human society, regardless of cultural, religious and ideological differences (Forst, 2013).

Thirdly, in the process of working on the issue of tolerance, the aspect of the limit of tolerance and its boundaries came to the surface. This aspect became especially relevant in wartime, when the feelings of social justice in the global context, loss of the human right to life and its security, and extermination of the Ukrainian nation only because Ukrainians want to determine their own way of development became more acute. The martial law has aggravated the issues of tolerance within Ukraine itself. Thus, public opinion in Ukraine increasingly supports feelings of national identity, dignity, and subjectivity in the global space.

The realities of today emphasise the need to place tolerance and the limits of its boundaries. While a tolerant society involves the ability to appreciate and tolerate different ways of understanding the world, it also involves a willingness to defend universal values of the existential diversity of human experience and to condemn practices that violate them, such as discrimination or violence against others (Quin, 2001).

Fourthly, all these tendencies are reflected in the educational process, which strongly updates the importance of education in the development of tolerance in all its participants.

In the course of the study, it became clear that tolerance is the most important guideline of modern European educational policy. On the one hand, tolerance is manifested among the moral values of humanism and becomes the basis of modern education, which transmits the norms of human relations and is the basis for the humanisation of knowledge in the field of cultural dialogue. On the other hand, it is a principle of life organisation that determines a person's attitude to the world and behaviour in interaction with others, and a necessary personal quality of a teacher.

I define tolerance as a professionally significant integrative quality of a teacher, which ensures his/her ability to establish dialogue relations with all participants of the pedagogical process (students, their parents, teachers, school administration) on the basis of respect for their opinions, values and other personal differences. A teacher's tolerance implies his/her ability to show trust and openness in relationships, which is ensured by the presence of formed structural components of readiness for tolerant education of students, namely humanistic values, emotional intelligence, social and communicative competence and reflective abilities.

Finally, I presented my experience in testing the assumption of how philosophising according to the 'Dialogos' approach (Helskog, 2015; 2017) can help student teachers to become tolerant. As a result of the successful implementation of the humanistic-pedagogical and ethical-philosophical phases of philosophising, I can observe positive qualitative personal changes in the students with regard to the formation of tolerance, as evidenced by the results of reflections and questionnaires at the end of the special course. This is confirmed by the students' opinions that, as a result of studying the special course 'Education of Tolerance in Future Teachers' on the basis of philosophical dialogues, they were able to perceive and understand the point of view of other people which differs from their own, to perceive interlocutors as they are, and to show patience with what seems new and incomprehensible at first sight.

Notes

[1] Olha Lukianchenko holds a PhD and is an Associate Professor of Pedagogy at the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Her experience includes a postdoctoral research fellowship on the project 'Music in the Intercultural School: Uncovering Spaces

for Agency and Belonging' (MUSPACE 2023–2024) at Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick, funded by the Irish Research Council. Her research interests include primary school teacher training (music and intercultural aspects), enhancing tolerance through education, migration and music, as well as contemporary views on the implementation of the activity-based approach in primary schools.

[2] The project was led by Øyvind Wistrøm and Ingrid Reite Christensen from the University of South-Eastern Norway. Ingrid facilitated the third day of the first of the two three-day workshops.

References

Albu, G. & Cojocariu, V.-M. (2015) Intercultural education. Tensions and prospects case study. The approach of the 1st-year students from the pedagogy of primary and pre-school education. Procedia. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 209, 53–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.254

Bekh, I. (2008). *Education of personality.* Lybid [in Ukrainian].

Bejan, T (2012) John Locke on toleration, (In)civility, and the quest for concord. *History of Political Thought*, 37, 556–587.

Butrus, N., Witenberg, R. (2013) Some personality predictors of tolerance to human diversity: The roles of openness, agreeableness, and empathy. *Australian Psychologist*, 48(4), 290–298. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742--9544.2012.00081.x

Boghian, I. (2016) Teachers' perspectives on tolerance education. A literature review. *Journal of Innovation in Psychology, Education and Didactics, 20*(2), 189–203. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=584156

Cherednyk, L. (2019) Psychological and pedagogical aspects of education of tolerance in elementary school. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Pedagogy and Psychology, 7*(79), 15–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.31174/send-pp2019--197vii79--03.

Daniels, J. (2013). Internationalisation, higher education and educators' perceptions of their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18*(3), 236–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.719158

Dewey, J. (2008). *Democracy and education. Radford*, VA: Wilder Publications. (Original work published 1916).

veleth, L. (2007). Locke and the problem of toleration. *Contemporary Philosophy, 28*(1), 17–30. https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_staff_pub/5

Forst, R. (2013). *Toleration in Conflict: Past and Present.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139051200

Gasser, G. (2022). Pluralism is not enough for tolerance: Philosophical and psychological reflections on pluralism and tolerance. *Roczniki Filozoficzne. Annales de Philosophie, 70*(4), 395–414. https://doi.org/10.18290/rf2204.14

Gollob, R., Krapf, P., & Weidinger, W. (2010). *Educating for democracy: Background materials on democratic citizenship and human rights education for*

teachers (Vol. 1). Council of Europe Publishing. https://doccu.in.ua/tom-i-z-odhopl-navchaiemo-demokratii/

Haigh, M. (2014). From internationalization to education for global citizenship: A multi-layered history. *Higher Education Quarterly, 68*(1), 6–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12032

Helskog, G. H. (2015). Re-imagining 'Bildung zur Humanität': How I developed the Dialogos approach to practical philosophy through action inquiry research. *Educational Action Research, 23*(3), 416–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2015.1013048

Helskog, G. H. (2017). Searching for wisdom the Dialogos Way. In L. Amir (Ed.), *New Frontiers in Philosophical Practice*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing Ltd.

Helskog, G. H. (2019). *Philosophising the Dialogos Way towards Wisdom in Education*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Philosophising-the-Dialogos-Way-towards-Wisdom-in-Education-Perspectives/Helskog/p/book/9781138490994

Helskog, G. H., & Weiss, M. N. (2023). Reflective practice research and kaleidoscopic epistemology. In M. N. Weiss & G. H. Helskog (Eds.), *Reflective Practice Research in Higher Education Pedagogies* (pp. 1–35). LIT Verlag. https://doi.org/10.52038/9783643912299

Horton, J. (2013). Rainer Forst, *Toleration in Conflict: Past and Present*. Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews. de Jong, H., & Teekens, H. (2003). The case of the University of Twente: Internationalisation as education policy. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 41–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315302250179

Kremen, V. (2011). Tolerance as an imperative: National identity in the age of globalization. *Political Management, 2*, 14–32. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PoMe_2011_2_4

Khamitov, N., Krylova, S., & Mineva, S. (2009). *Ethics and Aesthetics: Dictionary of key terms*. CST.

Kuzmenko, R. (2020). Tolerance as the basis of education. *Research Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Sciences, 1*, 9–12. http://rjepss.ro/index.php/rjepss/article/view/6/5

Locke, J. (1824). *A Third Letter for Toleration*. In *The Works of John Locke* (Vol. 5). London.

Mamlok, D. (2023). Bill 21 as an exemplar of the fragility of tolerance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 45*(1), 58–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2023.2227107

Panadés, N. (2022). Making intercultural competence meaningful in the classroom and in international mobility programmes. In L. Keim, S. Khan, A. Pinyana, & A. Raluy (Eds.), *Internationalization and Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Quality and Innovation* (pp. 107–121). Octaedro. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361331853

Quinn, P. (2001). On religious diversity and tolerance. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion, 50*, 57–80. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012058201981

Romano, A., & Orefice, C. (2022). Internationalization as strategic leverage for innovation in higher education. In L. Keim, S. Khan, A. Pinyana, & A. Raluy (Eds.), *Internationalization and Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Quality and Innovation* (pp. 33–47). Octaedro. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361331853

Russell, B. (2017). The limits of tolerance. *Aeon*. https://aeon.co/essays/why-religious-identities-are-not-immune-to-robust-criticism

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2017). *Toleration*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/toleration/

Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a challenge for higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education & Management, 5*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018736718422

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 48*, 5–26. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000033771.69078.41

Thompson, Jr. (2014). *Beyond Reason and Tolerance: The Purpose of Higher Education*. Oxford University Press.

Tourinan, L., & Familia, J. M. (2008). *Escuela y sociedal civil: Agentes de educacion intercultural*. Nebbiolo.

Ţurcan, L. (2015). *Formarea cadrelor didactice prin valorile toleranţei* [Teacher training by the values of tolerance]. Tipogr. UPSC 'Ion Creangă'.

UNESCO. (1994). *Tolerance: The threshold of peace; a teaching/learning guide for peace, human rights and democracy*. http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/34_57.pdf

UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001518/151830eo.pdf

Vasiutina, T., & Lukianchenko, O. (2021). Directions of tolerance formation in future teachers of the new Ukrainian primary school. In *New Impetus for the Advancement of Pedagogical and Psychological Sciences in Ukraine and EU Countries: Research Matters: Collective Monograph* (Vol. 1, pp. 134–149). Baltija Publishing. https://doi.org/10.30525/978--9934--26--032--2-9

Williams, M., & Waldron, J. (2008). *Toleration and Its Limits*. New York University Press.

Yemini, M. (2014). Internationalisation discourse: What remains to be said? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 18*(2), 66–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2014.888019