

I. Sikorska

**RETHINKING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION:
CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FOR UKRAINE**

The aim of the paper is to explore the reasoning for enhancing multicultural education and intercultural learning in higher education across the world as a perspective of interdisciplinary and complex approach in the tertiary education. The study is guided by the historical overview on various concepts and approaches toward multicultural education in the United States and Europe through last decades. The author has emphasized the official views on developments of intercultural learning, and how it relates to internationalization efforts of higher education institutions in regards to upbringing intercultural awareness and competences. The specifics perspectives and importance of multicultural education and its implementation in higher education in Ukraine have been emphasized. The study concludes that Ukrainian universities should consider enormous opportunities for multicultural education under conditions of war, displacement, and societal transformation, as it can be a critical instrument for strengthening social cohesion and postwar recovery.

Keywords. *multicultural education, intercultural awareness, intercultural competences, internationalization of higher education, globalized world, multicultural education for Ukraine in wartime*

DOI 10.34079/2518-1343-2026-16-31-203-214

Це стаття відкритого доступу за ліцензією CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.uk>

Introduction. Multicultural education (ME) is an approach to teaching and learning grounded in democratic values that affirm cultural pluralism within increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. In contemporary scholarship, ME is no longer restricted to national frameworks but is understood as a global and relational process shaped by migration, and transnational mobility. While earlier debates in the United States were structured around two dominant perspectives—the assimilation or “melting-pot” model and the pluralist or “global” model (Altbach, 2004; Banks, 1993, 1999; Chen, 2007; Clark & Gorski, 2002; Cushner, McClelland, & Stafford, 2000; Duhon-Boudreau, 1998; Gollnick & Chinn, 2002; Hill, 2007; Modood 2001; Parekh, 1988; Shulman & Mesa-Bains, 1993; Silverman, Welty, & Lyon, 1994; Twitty, & Mesaric, 2002) - recent research, particularly in European contexts, has expanded this dichotomy by emphasizing intercultural dialogue, social cohesion, and inclusive citizenship (Banks, 2019; Portera, 2011).

Early advocates of ME, including American scholar James A. Banks and his colleagues, identified several long-term benefits of adopting a global and pluralist perspective. These insights remain highly relevant today but have been further substantiated by contemporary empirical studies conducted by influential institutions and organizations across Europe and beyond (Council of Europe, 2018; European Commission, 2020; UNESCO, 2013).

Among the most widely acknowledged benefits are the following.

First, ME enhances cognitive complexity and productivity by enabling individuals to draw upon diverse cultural contexts and epistemologies when approaching tasks. International

scholarship's research on intercultural competence (IC) (Barrett, 2013; Byram, 1997, 2006; Childress, 2009; Deardorff, 2006) confirms that exposure to diversity fosters critical thinking and moral reasoning, particularly in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Second, it strengthens creative problem-solving capacities. Diverse cultural perspectives encourage the exploration of alternative solutions and promote innovation, a finding increasingly supported by studies on internationalized learning environments and culturally diverse academic settings across the European Higher Education Area.

Third, ME contributes to the development of constructive social relationships. Through shared goals and collaborative learning, students and educators cultivate mutual respect, empathy, and commitment to democratic values. European frameworks such as the Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (2018) highlight the centrality of these outcomes for sustaining democratic societies.

Fourth, it reduces stereotyping and prejudice by facilitating meaningful interaction among individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Contemporary studies on intercultural dialogue (Elias, & Mansouri, 2020; Lahdesmaki, Koistinen, & Ylönen, 2020; Woodin, Lundgren, & Castro, 2011) within European societies demonstrate that structured engagement can significantly decrease bias and foster social inclusion.

Fifth, ME revitalizes societies by focusing on the cultural richness of their members. It promotes a broader, more nuanced worldview and supports the development of inclusive identities that integrate local, national, and global dimensions. This aligns with current European discourses on "unity in diversity" and the construction of shared yet plural identities.

Historically, the assimilation or "melting-pot" approach strongly influenced policy and practice, especially in the United States. In this model, minority groups were expected to give up or hide their cultural identities in order to adapt to the dominant culture. Although assimilation was presented as a way to promote unity, it often marginalized cultural differences and limited linguistic, behavioral, and value diversity.

Scholars have criticized this approach because it treats cultural distinctiveness as a possible threat to social cohesion. As a result, it tends to value uniformity more than diversity and may make the contributions of minority groups less visible. While assimilation aimed to create a shared national identity, it often failed to reflect the real diversity of modern societies and weakened the idea of inclusive democracy.

Contemporary developments in both the United States and Europe reveal the limitations of this approach. Increasing cultural diversity, driven by migration and globalization, has made it evident that assimilation alone cannot ensure social cohesion or equality. Instead, it may aggravate social divisions and hinder the full participation of diverse groups in public life. For these reasons, there has been observed a growing recognition of the need to move beyond assimilationist frameworks toward a more comprehensive global perspective of ME. This perspective acknowledges cultural pluralism as a normative and desirable condition of democratic societies. It also emphasizes the interconnectedness of global challenges, including climate change, migration, security, and human rights, all of which require intercultural understanding and cooperation.

The global perspective of ME thus extends beyond equity pedagogy to encompass broader dimensions of human development, including ethical responsibility, IC, and global citizenship (OECD, 2021; Oxley & Morris, 2013; UNESCO, 2015). It promotes not only equality among cultural groups but also active engagement with diversity as a resource for societal development. In the European context, this shift is reflected in policy initiatives related to inclusive education, internationalization, and responsible global engagement.

Ultimately, the global perspective enables individuals to develop respect for cultural diversity while recognizing shared human values. It supports the formation of inclusive

identities capable of navigating complex, multicultural environments. In doing so, ME becomes a key instrument for fostering democratic and cohesive societies in a progressively interdependent world.

Conceptual Framework of the Global View of Multicultural Education

The conceptual framework of the global perspective of ME is commonly understood as comprising four interrelated and dynamic dimensions: IC, equity pedagogy, curriculum reform, and teaching for social justice. Contemporary research, particularly within European educational discourse, emphasizes that these dimensions should not be treated as isolated components but rather as mutually reinforcing processes embedded in broader agendas of internationalization, inclusion, and democratic citizenship (Council of Europe, 2018; European Commission, 2020).

Multicultural competence (Blair, 2003) refers to the ongoing process through which individuals develop the ability to understand, interpret, and engage with multiple cultural frameworks. It involves acquiring competencies in diverse ways of perceiving, evaluating, believing, and solving problems. In recent European scholarship, this concept is closely aligned with IC and global competence, highlighting reflexivity, empathy, and dialogical skills as key elements. The objective is not only to recognize cultural diversity but also to actively negotiate it - both within and across national contexts - by developing awareness of one's own cultural positioning alongside a critical understanding of others' perspectives. Such competence forms the foundation for meaningful intercultural interaction and responsible participation in increasingly diverse societies.

Secondly, curriculum reform remains a central pillar of the global perspective. It involves the systematic inclusion of diverse cultural narratives, critical historical inquiry, and multiple epistemologies in educational content. Contemporary approaches go beyond the mere addition of multicultural elements to existing curricula; instead, they advocate for a transformation of knowledge production itself. European debates on decolonizing the curriculum and promoting justice underscore the importance of identifying and challenging biases embedded in textbooks, media, and institutional knowledge structures. This reform requires educators and institutions to engage in active inquiry and to reconstruct curricula in ways that reflect both historical and contemporary contributions of diverse cultural groups to various academic disciplines. As a result, the curriculum becomes a space for critical reflection, inclusivity, and global awareness.

Equity pedagogy constitutes another essential dimension of this framework. It focuses on ensuring fair and inclusive educational opportunities for all learners, particularly those from historically marginalized or underrepresented groups. In contemporary contexts, equity pedagogy is increasingly linked to inclusive education policies and the recognition of diversity in learning needs, socio-economic backgrounds, and cultural experiences. It seeks to transform not only instructional practices but also the broader educational environment, reflected in teacher expectations, assessment practices, and institutional norms.

A key component of equity pedagogy is the recognition that students' learning styles and educational experiences are shaped by their cultural backgrounds. Therefore, educators are encouraged to adopt flexible and adaptive teaching strategies that respond to this diversity. This requires the development of pedagogical knowledge, intercultural sensitivity, and professional reflexivity. In European higher education, such approaches are often embedded within internationalization strategies and quality assurance frameworks that prioritize student-centered learning and inclusive teaching practices. Ultimately, equity pedagogy aims to ensure that all students can achieve high academic standards while feeling recognized and valued within the educational system.

Finally, teaching for social justice represents a critical and transformative dimension of ME. It requires educators to engage with issues of power, inequality, and representation in both local and global contexts. This includes developing an informed understanding of student demographics, cultural dynamics, and the role of media and popular culture in shaping perceptions of identity. Contemporary approaches to social justice education emphasize not only awareness but also action - encouraging students to develop the skills necessary to challenge injustice and contribute to more equitable societies.

Teaching for social justice also involves critically examining and deconstructing stereotypes and myths related to race, gender, age, and other social categories. It promotes an understanding of the historical and structural roots of discrimination, including phenomena such as systemic racism, sexism, and socio-economic inequality. European frameworks on democratic citizenship education as stated above similarly highlight the importance of fostering critical thinking, ethical responsibility, and civic engagement. In this sense, ME becomes a platform for empowering learners to participate actively in democratic life and to advocate for social change.

Taken together, these four dimensions form a comprehensive and evolving framework that reflects the complexity of contemporary multicultural societies. By integrating multicultural competence, curriculum reform, equity pedagogy, and social justice education, the global perspective of ME provides a robust foundation for fostering inclusive, democratic, and resilient educational environments in an interconnected world.

Goals of Multicultural Education within the Global View

The global perspective of ME extends beyond the traditional focus on equity in education and aims to cultivate a comprehensive set of values, competencies, and forms of awareness that are essential in an interrelated and rapidly changing world. Contemporary research, particularly within European policy and academic frameworks, highlights that ME should contribute not only to inclusion within national systems but also to the development of globally responsible, critically aware, and socially engaged individuals (Council of Europe, 2018; European Commission, 2020). The goals of the global perspective of ME can be conceptualized through several interconnected goals.

Goal 1: Core Values

A central objective is the development of fundamental human values that support coexistence and sustainability. These include a sense of responsibility toward the global community, an ethical commitment to environmental sustainability, and an informed acceptance and appreciation of cultural diversity. In recent international academic and political, these values are closely linked to the concept of global citizenship education, which emphasizes solidarity, human rights, and ecological awareness as integral components of education in the 21st century.

Goal 2: Development of Multiple Historical Perspectives

Another key goal is to foster the ability to understand and interpret history from multiple perspectives. This involves moving beyond singular, often dominant narratives and recognizing the diverse experiences and contributions of different cultural groups. European scholarship, particularly in the context of memory studies and history education, stresses the importance of multi-perspective approach as a means of promoting critical thinking, reconciliation, and democratic dialogue in plural societies.

Goal 3: Strengthening Cultural Consciousness and Intercultural Awareness

The global perspective also aims to deepen individuals' cultural self-awareness while enhancing their capacity to engage effectively across cultural boundaries. This includes cultivating respect for human dignity and recognizing the intrinsic value of all cultural identities. Intercultural awareness (Baker, 2011; Chen, 2007; Kramsch, 2009) as widely discussed in European education frameworks, encompasses not only knowledge and skills but also attitudes such as openness, curiosity, and respect. Intercultural awareness also enables inclusion, tolerance and empathy as well as intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding among the representatives of different cultures (Sikorska, 2021). These qualities are essential for navigating culturally diverse environments and for fostering meaningful intercultural interactions.

Goal 4: Opposing Discrimination and Developing Social Action Skills

A further objective is to challenge and reduce racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination. This goal extends beyond awareness-raising to include the development of social action skills that enable individuals to respond to injustice in informed and constructive ways. Contemporary approaches to ME emphasize empowerment, encouraging learners to critically analyze social inequalities and to participate actively in promoting equity and inclusion within their communities.

Goal 5: Increasing Awareness of Global Dynamics and Planetary Challenges

Finally, the global perspective seeks to enhance awareness of the broader conditions shaping life on the planet. This includes understanding global interdependence, environmental challenges, migration processes, and socio-political transformations. European educational initiatives increasingly integrate sustainability and global awareness into curricula, reflecting the recognition that education must prepare individuals to address complex global issues collaboratively and responsibly.

Taken together, these goals emphasize the development of multiple perspectives, intercultural awareness, and a commitment to reducing all forms of discrimination. Rather than promoting a single dominant worldview or cultural model, the global perspective of ME encourages respect for diverse ways of life and fosters an understanding of cultural interdependence. It supports the cultivation of core human values that enable individuals to appreciate diversity while upholding the dignity of all people.

Through continuous interaction among individuals from different cultural backgrounds, this approach contributes to the strengthening of IC and the formation of inclusive identities. At the same time, it enhances awareness of global dynamics and the state of the planet, preparing individuals to engage thoughtfully and responsibly with the challenges of contemporary society. In this sense, ME becomes a key mechanism for fostering not only inclusive national communities but also a more just and sustainable global society.

Role of Higher Education Institutions

HEIs today across the world, have always been characterized by increasingly diverse student bodies and academia. Such processes as internationalization of higher education (Knight, & de Wit, 2018) mobility, migration, and digital connectivity have transformed universities into multicultural environments where individuals from different cultural, linguistic, and socio-

economic backgrounds interact on a daily basis. This growing cultural pluralism positions HEIs as small-scale version or “microcosm” of contemporary societies and, consequently, as important spaces for fostering pluralistic democracy and intercultural dialogue (European Commission, 2022).

Within this context, the application of the core principles of the global perspective of ME in teaching and learning practices has become more relevant than ever. Universities are no longer solely sites for knowledge transmission, instead they are also spaces where values are negotiated, identities are shaped, and social relations are constructed. European and international research increasingly highlights the role of higher education in promoting IC, democratic engagement, and social responsibility among students and staff. This aligns with broader policy agendas related to inclusive education, responsible internationalization, and the civic mission of universities (European University Association, 2021).

Moreover, many HEIs have evolved into reflections of the communities in which they are embedded, while also acting as drivers of social change within those communities. They serve as key platforms for knowledge exchange, innovation, and public engagement, reinforcing their role as pillars of academic excellence. At the same time, universities are increasingly expected to model multicultural competence in practice by creating inclusive environments that value diversity and ensure equitable participation for all members of the academic community.

In this regard, HEIs function not only as centers of learning but also as laboratories for intercultural interaction and cooperation. They provide opportunities for students and faculty to engage with diverse perspectives, challenge stereotypes, and develop the skills necessary for living and working in the globalized world. European initiatives related to the internationalization of higher education and the development of European Universities Alliances further emphasize collaboration across borders and cultures as a key objective.

Finally, universities are uniquely positioned to promote equity and democratic values through both formal curricula and informal learning environments. By embedding the principles of ME into institutional strategies, teaching practices, and campus life, HEIs can contribute to the development of more inclusive, just, and cohesive societies. In this sense, they serve not only as models of pluralistic democracy but also as active agents in shaping its future in an increasingly interconnected global context.

Universities as Models for Multicultural Societies

In contemporary societies that are founded on the principles of equal rights, social inclusion, and human dignity, one of the primary responsibilities of HEIs is to promote the academic, social, and civic success of all students. This responsibility has become even more significant in recent decades as demographic transformations, migration processes, and widening access to education have led to increasingly diverse student and staff populations. While earlier projections in the United States anticipated substantial growth in minority populations, similar trends are now evident across Europe, where universities reflect the multicultural composition of their societies (European Commission, 2022; OECD, 2021).

This growing diversity underscores the urgent need to ensure that all groups are meaningfully included in educational, economic, and social life. HEIs thus play a crucial role in facilitating this inclusion by providing equitable access to learning opportunities and by fostering environments in which diversity is recognized as an asset rather than a challenge. The increasing presence of culturally diverse students and faculty on university campuses makes these institutions particularly important sites for the development of inclusive practices and policies. In this sense, universities not only mirror societal diversity but also actively shape how diversity is experienced and managed within broader social contexts. Students,

faculty, and staff frequently come from a wide range of countries and cultural backgrounds, bringing with them diverse perspectives, experiences, and knowledge systems. International mobility, transnational partnerships, and digital learning environments have further intensified these interactions, making intercultural engagement an integral part of academic life.

As a result, HEIs are expected to create supportive and inclusive environments that respect diversity and promote participation for all members of the academic community. This expectation is reflected in contemporary European and global higher education policies that emphasize inclusion, internationalization, and social responsibility. Universities are encouraged not only to diversify their populations but also to ensure that institutional cultures, curricula, and support systems are responsive to this diversity. For university administrators and academic staff, this requires a deep understanding of cultural differences and the ability to design and implement equitable practices. Intercultural awareness becomes a professional competence, enabling educators to provide fair access to resources, adapt teaching methods, and foster meaningful engagement among students from diverse backgrounds. In this way, universities function as models of an interdependent world, where cooperation across cultural boundaries is both necessary and valued.

Universities as Models for Democratic Values

Research on university environments consistently demonstrates that student performance, peer interactions, and faculty-student relationships are influenced not only by individual abilities but also by institutional cultures, expectations, and values embedded within curricula and teaching practices. These elements collectively shape the educational experience and play a critical role in either reinforcing or challenging inequalities.

In recent years, universities have progressively recognized the importance of actively promoting diversity and inclusion as core institutional values. European initiatives and international discussions on higher education policy emphasize the need to develop inclusive programs that support all students, regardless of their cultural, social, or economic background. Such approaches align with broader frameworks of democratic citizenship education, which stress participation, equality, and respect for human rights (Council of Europe, 2018).

While the transition toward a global and pluralistic model of ME may generate uncertainty or resistance among educators and administrators, particularly those accustomed to more traditional or assimilationist approaches, the long-term benefits are widely acknowledged. Developing a comprehensive understanding of cultural diversity and its implications for teaching and learning enables institutions to foster more positive relationships among members of the academic community and to create genuinely inclusive educational environments.

Ultimately, institutions of higher education serve as critical spaces for modelling democratic human values in practice. By integrating the principles of ME into their structures, policies, and everyday interactions, universities can contribute to the formation of individuals who are not only academically competent but also socially responsible, culturally aware, and capable of engaging constructively in diverse and democratic societies.

The Value of Multicultural Education for Ukraine in the Contemporary Context

The current situation in the Ukrainian society has amplified significantly the cultural diversity and has called for definite political measures towards reducing social tension and increasing social cohesion. There is a need for an alternative educational strategy which would serve as a means of social and personal transformation and would allow creation of a democratic and

free society (Sikorska, & Nykyforenko, 2017). The relevance of ME acquires particular significance in the context of Ukraine, especially under the conditions of ongoing war, large-scale displacement, and societal transformation. Ukrainian society today is experiencing profound challenges that simultaneously intensify the need for social cohesion and highlight the importance of recognizing and valuing diversity. In this environment, ME becomes not only an educational approach but also a strategic tool for resilience, reconstruction, and democratic development.

First, ME plays a crucial role in strengthening social cohesion in a society affected by war. Ukraine has faced unprecedented internal displacement, with millions of citizens relocating across regions, as well as significant migration flows abroad. These processes have brought together individuals from diverse regional, linguistic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds in new social and educational settings. ME provides the framework for fostering mutual understanding, reducing potential tensions, and building inclusive communities based on respect and shared values rather than division.

Second, it contributes to the development of democratic citizenship and European integration. Ukraine's strategic orientation toward the European Union is not only political and economic but also value-based. In this regard, ME supports Ukraine's alignment with these values by promoting intercultural competence, critical thinking, and active civic engagement among students. It prepares individuals to participate effectively in democratic processes and to contribute to the development of a pluralistic and open society.

Third, ME is essential for addressing the consequences of collective trauma and for fostering resilience. The ongoing war has deeply affected individuals and communities, shaping identities, perceptions, and social relations. Educational environments that acknowledge diversity of experiences—including those of internally displaced persons, veterans, and affected communities—can create spaces for dialogue, empathy, and healing. By encouraging understanding of different perspectives and lived realities, ME supports the development of psychological and social resilience.

Fourth, it enhances the internationalization of Ukrainian higher education. Ukrainian universities, many of which have been displaced or significantly transformed since 2022, are increasingly integrated into global academic networks. In this context, ME strengthens the capacity of institutions to engage in international partnerships, support diverse student populations, and implement inclusive and globally oriented curricula. It also reinforces the role of universities as actors of soft power and cultural diplomacy, representing Ukraine within the international academic community.

Finally, ME contributes to post-war recovery and long-term societal development. Reconstruction is not only about infrastructure but also about rebuilding social trust, institutions, and shared identities. A multicultural approach to education enables the formation of inclusive national narratives that recognize diversity as a strength rather than a source of division. It supports the development of a society that is both cohesive and open, capable of integrating different cultural experiences while maintaining a strong commitment to democratic values and human dignity. In this sense, the value of ME for Ukraine extends far beyond the educational sphere. It becomes a key instrument for navigating current challenges and shaping the future of the country.

Conclusion

ME, as conceptualized within a global perspective, has evolved from a predominantly national and often assimilation-oriented framework into a multidimensional and dynamic approach that reflects the realities of a modern globalized interconnected world. The shift from the “melting-pot” paradigm toward cultural pluralism and global interdependence

underscores a broader transformation in how diversity is understood—not as a challenge to be managed, but as a resource to be cultivated.

The analysis of its conceptual framework demonstrates that ME is not limited to a single dimension of educational practice. Rather, it integrates multicultural competence, curriculum reform, equity pedagogy, and teaching for social justice into a coherent system that addresses both individual development and structural inequalities. These dimensions collectively contribute to the formation of learners who are capable of critical reflection, intercultural engagement, and responsible participation in democratic societies.

The goals of the global perspective further reinforce this transformative potential. By promoting core human values, plurality of perspectives, intercultural awareness, and social action skills, ME supports the development of inclusive identities and fosters respect for human dignity. At the same time, it enhances awareness of global dynamics and encourages engagement with complex challenges that transcend national boundaries, including environmental sustainability, migration, and social justice.

Institutions of higher education play a central role in operationalizing these principles. As microcosms of multicultural societies and as actors within an interdependent global system, universities are uniquely positioned to model inclusive practices, democratic values, and intercultural dialogue. Their responsibility extends beyond academic instruction to shaping social relations, fostering civic engagement, and preparing individuals for participation in diverse and evolving societies. In this regard, HEIs function as both reflective and transformative spaces, where the principles of ME can be translated into practice.

The importance of this approach becomes particularly evident in the context of Ukraine. Under conditions of war, displacement, and societal transformation, ME can emerge as a critical instrument for strengthening social cohesion, supporting democratic development, and fostering resilience. It enables the integration of diverse experiences and identities into a shared yet pluralistic national framework, while also facilitating alignment with European values and educational standards. Furthermore, it contributes to the internationalization of Ukrainian higher education and to the broader process of post-war recovery, where rebuilding social trust and inclusive institutions is as important as physical reconstruction.

References

- Altbach, P. G. 2004. 'Globalization and the university: myths and realities in an unequal world'. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), pp. 3–25.
- Baker, W. 2011. 'From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT'. *ELT Journal*, 66, pp. 62–70. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccr017.
- Banks, J. A. 2019. *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. 6th ed. Pearson.
- Banks, J. A. and Banks, C. A. M. 1999. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A., Banks, C. A. M. and McGee, C. 1993. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Barrett, M. 2013. 'Intercultural competence: A distinctive hallmark of interculturalism?' In: Barrett, M. (ed.) *Interculturalism and Multiculturalism: Similarities and Differences*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 147–168.
- Bennett, C. 2003. *Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. Allyn & Bacon.
- Blair, T. 2003. 'Educating for multicultural competence'. *Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), pp. 145–168.
- Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Byram, M. 2006. *Language Teaching for Intercultural Citizenship: The European Situation*. Paper presented at the NZALT Conference, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Chen, G. 2007. 'A review of the concept of intercultural effectiveness'. *Human Communication*, 1, pp. 1–16.
- Childress, L. 2009. 'Internationalization plans for higher education institutions'. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(3), pp. 289–309.
- Clark, C. and Gorski, P. 2002. 'Multicultural education and the digital divide: Focus on socioeconomic class background'. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 4(3), pp. 25–36.
- Council of Europe 2011. *Intercultural Experience and Awareness: European Language Portfolio Templates and Resources Language Biography*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe 2018. *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of European Union 2008. *Council Conclusion of 22 May 2008 on Intercultural Competences*, 2008/C 141/09. Available at: [EUR-Lex](http://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- Deardorff, D. 2006. *Intercultural Competence: The Key Competence in the 21st Century?* Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Duhon-Boudreau, G. 1998. *An Interdisciplinary Approach to Issues and Practices in Teacher Education*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin-Mellen Press.
- Elias, A. and Mansouri, F. 2020. 'A systematic review of studies on interculturalism and intercultural dialogue'. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 41(4), pp. 490–523.
- European Commission 2020. *Achieving the European Education Area by 2025*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission 2022. *European Strategy for Universities*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- European University Association 2021. *Universities without Walls: A Vision for 2030*. Brussels: European University Association.
- Gollnick, D. and Chinn, P. 2002. *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*. 6th ed. Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Green, M. F. 1989. *American Council on Education Reports on Diversity in Higher Education*. American Council on Education.
- Hill, I. 2007. 'Multicultural and International Education: Never the Twain Shall Meet?' *International Review of Education*, 53(3), pp. 245–264.
- Knight, J. and de Wit, H. 2018. 'Internationalization of higher education: Past and future'. *International Higher Education*, 95, pp. 2–4. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.95.10679>.
- Kramsch, C. 2009. 'Third culture and language education'. In: Cook, V. and Wei, L. (eds.) *Contemporary Applied Linguistics*. London: Continuum, pp. 233–254.
- Lahdesmaki, T., Koistinen, A.-K. and Ylonen, S. C. 2020. *Intercultural Dialogue in the European Education Policies: A Conceptual Approach*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leask, B. 2015. *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leask, B. 2016. 'Internationalizing curriculum and learning for all students'. In: Jones, E., Coelen, R., Beelen, J. and de Wit, H. (eds.) *Global and Local Internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 49–53.
- McNergney, R. and Hebert, J. 2001. *Foundations of Education: The Challenge of Professional Practice*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Modood, T. and May, S. 2001. 'Multiculturalism and education in Britain: An internally contested debate'. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(3), pp. 305–317.
- Nieto, S. 1996. *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. Longman.

- OECD 2021. *Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Oxley, L. and Morris, P. 2013. 'Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), pp. 301–325.
- Pang, V. 2001. *Multicultural Education: A Caring-Centered, Reflective Approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Parekh, B. 1988. 'Some thoughts on multicultural education'. In: Taylor, B. (ed.) *"Better to Light a Candle..." More Multicultural Education*. Perspectives 39. School of Education, University of Exeter.
- Portera, A. 2011. 'Intercultural and multicultural education: Epistemological and semantic aspects'. In: Grant, C. A. and Portera, A. (eds.) *Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Enhancing Global Interconnectedness*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 12–30.
- Schulman, J. and Mesa-Bains, A. 1993. 'Diversity and higher education'. *Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 7(3), pp. 233–247.
- Sikorska, I. 2017. 'Intercultural education policies across Europe as responses to cultural diversity (2006–2016)'. *Working Papers del Centro Studi Europei*, 17(04). Available at: [Centro Studi Europei Working Papers](#).
- Sikorskaya, I. 2017. 'Internationalization of higher education: Intercultural dimensions'. *Scientific Journal Innovative Solutions in Modern Science*, 6(15), pp. 39–47. Available at: [Innovative Solutions in Modern Science](#).
- Sikorska, I. 2021. 'Intercultural awareness as one of the learning outcomes under internationalization of higher education'. In: *European Values in Ukrainian Education: Collective Volume*. Lviv–Toruń: Liha-Pres, pp. 22–30.
- Sikorska, I. and Nykyforenko, N. 2020. 'The inquiry for intercultural learning in higher education in Ukraine'. *IAIE Conference Proceedings: "Another Brick in the Wall: Rethinking Education"*, Amsterdam, November 16–18, 2019. Available at: IAIE Proceedings.
- Twitty, D. and Mesaric, M. 2002. 'Multicultural affairs in higher education'. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Multicultural Affairs*.
- UNESCO 2013. *Intercultural Competences: Conceptual and Operational Framework*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2015. *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wiles, J. and Bondi, J. 2002. *Curriculum Development: A Guide to Practice*. 6th ed. Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Woodin, J., Lundgren, U. and Castro, P. 2011. 'Tracking the traces of intercultural dialogue in internationalization policies of three EU universities: Towards a framework'. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 1(2–3), pp. 119–134.
- Дата першого надходження статті: 08.04.2026 р.
- Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 28.04.2026 р.
- Дата публікації: 29.04.2026 р.

I. Сікорська

ПЕРЕОСМИСЛЕННЯ МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНОЇ ОСВІТИ: СУЧАСНІ ПІДХОДИ ТА ЗНАЧЕННЯ ДЛЯ УКРАЇНИ

Метою статті є обґрунтування необхідності посилення мультикультурної освіти та міжкультурного навчання у вищій освіті різних країн світу як перспективного напрямку міждисциплінарного й комплексного підходу в системі

третинної освіти. Дослідження ґрунтується на історичному огляді основних концепцій і підходів до мультикультурної освіти у Сполучених Штатах Америки та Європі протягом останніх десятиліть. У статті коротко розглянуто хронологію становлення мультикультурної освіти, окреслено внесок ключових авторів у розвиток цієї теорії та представлено основні цілі її впровадження в освітньому середовищі. Особливу увагу приділено ролі закладів вищої освіти як моделей мультикультурного суспільства, у яких формуються й відтворюються демократичні цінності, культура діалогу, повага до різноманіття та принципи інклюзивності. У дослідженні також розкрито глобальний вимір мультикультурної освіти в сучасних умовах, зокрема в контексті зростання академічної мобільності, міжнародної співпраці, міграційних процесів і трансформації освітніх середовищ. Автором акцентовано увагу на офіційних підходах до розвитку мультикультурної освіти та міжкультурного навчання, а також на їхньому зв'язку з процесами інтернаціоналізації вищої освіти, насамперед у контексті формування міжкультурної обізнаності, міжкультурних компетентностей і здатності до конструктивної взаємодії в різноманітних соціокультурних середовищах. Окрему увагу приділено значенню та особливостям упровадження мультикультурної освіти у вищій освіті України. В умовах повномасштабної війни, вимушеного переміщення, внутрішньої та зовнішньої міграції, а також активізації європейської інтеграції України мультикультурна освіта набуває особливої актуальності. Вона може сприяти не лише розвитку міжкультурної чутливості студентів і викладачів, а й формуванню більш відкритого, солідарного та стійкого академічного середовища. У статті зроблено висновок, що українські університети мають враховувати значний потенціал мультикультурної освіти в умовах війни та суспільної трансформації, оскільки вона може стати важливим інструментом зміцнення соціальної згуртованості, підтримки демократичних цінностей, подолання наслідків травматичного досвіду та повоєнного відновлення України.

Ключові слова: мультикультурна освіта; міжкультурне навчання; міжкультурна обізнаність; міжкультурні компетентності; інтернаціоналізація вищої освіти; глобальне громадянство; глобалізований світ; вища освіта в Україні; Україна в умовах війни.