Conceptual Article

Received: 19 July 2026
Accepted: 11 November 2026
Published: 19 November 2026

Fostering the Sociocultural Activity of Students Through Culture-Creating Technologies

Nataliia Maksymovska
Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A. S. Makarenko, Sumy, Ukraine; maksymovska@gmail.com

Iryna Koriakina
Oleksandr Dovzhenko Hlukhiv National Pedagogical University, Hlukhiv, Ukraine

Olena Honcharenko
Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A. S. Makarenko, Sumy, Ukraine

Anzhela Polianychko
Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A. S. Makarenko, Sumy, Ukraine

Olena Sydorenko
Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A. S. Makarenko, Sumy, Ukraine

Cite this article:

N. Maksymovska et al. (2026). Fostering the Sociocultural Activity of Students Through Culture-Creating Technologies. Revista Cultura Científica, (24), pp. 2669–2680. https://doi.org/10.70517/revcc2624214

2026 © The Author(s). Published by Revista Cultura Científica. This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract

This study examines the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies for fostering sociocultural activity among higher education students, with particular attention to contemporary Ukrainian universities. It conceptualises sociocultural activity as students' active participation in cultural production, creative expression, social interaction, and community engagement. Drawing on complementary sociocultural, activity-based, student-centred, systemic, and competency-based approaches, the research employs theoretical analysis, synthesis, comparison, normative analysis, and pedagogical modelling. The analysis identifies the pedagogical resources of culture-creating technologies, including opportunities for self-realisation, collaborative creativity, cultural identification, communication, and socially responsible initiative. A four-component conceptual model is proposed, integrating methodological principles, organisational forms and technologies, areas of sociocultural activity, and evaluation criteria. The model emphasises meaningful student agency, inclusive participation, and the deliberate alignment of institutional support with students' individual interests. Its relevance is discussed in light of Ukrainian educational legislation, digital transformation, and the disruptions caused by Russia's war against Ukraine. The study contributes a theoretically grounded framework for designing culturally responsive university environments and proposes dimensions for future assessment of student motivation, creative initiative, cultural participation, and collaboration. As a conceptual investigation, it does not establish empirical effectiveness; subsequent research should test the model through appropriately designed studies in diverse institutional settings, using mixed-methods approaches to investigate longer-term educational outcomes.

Keywords: sociocultural activity; culture-creating technologies; higher education; student agency; creative self-realisation; cultural participation; pedagogical innovation; Ukraine.

1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions are increasingly expected to fulfil a mission that extends beyond the transmission of professional knowledge and the development of occupational competencies. In contemporary societies characterised by rapid digital transformation, cultural diversity, social uncertainty, and changing patterns of civic participation, universities play a significant role in shaping students' identities, values, creative capacities, and ability to engage meaningfully in social and cultural life. Accordingly, fostering students' sociocultural activity has become an increasingly important developmental dimension of higher education, closely associated with personal development, social responsibility, cultural participation, and the formation of active citizenship.

One of the persistent challenges facing higher education is the discrepancy between institutional approaches to curricular and extracurricular activities and students' evolving sociocultural needs, interests, and aspirations. Traditional forms of educational work, particularly those based on the passive transmission of established cultural values, may fail to provide sufficient opportunities for independent initiative, creative expression, collaborative decision-making, and meaningful participation. Such a discrepancy may weaken students' engagement with university life, restrict opportunities for self-realisation, and limit their capacity to develop a sense of belonging to academic and wider social communities. Addressing this challenge requires a transition from institutionally prescribed cultural activities towards participatory educational environments in which students act not merely as recipients of cultural experiences but also as active creators, interpreters, and transmitters of cultural meanings.

In the Ukrainian context, this transformation is supported by the national legal and policy framework governing education and youth participation. The Law of Ukraine on Education (No. 2145-VIII, 2017) [1], particularly Article 6, establishes human-centred education, equal access, inclusiveness, academic freedom, and respect for cultural diversity among the fundamental principles of educational policy. The Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (No. 1556-VII, 2014) [2] provides the institutional foundations for students' personal and professional development, creative activities, and participation in university governance. Furthermore, the Law of Ukraine on the Basic Principles of Youth Policy (No. 1414-IX, 2021) [3], particularly Articles 3–5, emphasises youth participation in cultural and public life, the development of individual potential, and the creation of conditions for self-realisation. These legislative provisions establish a normative basis for considering students' sociocultural activity not as an optional component of extracurricular provision but as an important element of a student-centred and socially responsive higher education environment.

The relevance of this approach is further reinforced by the Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2022–2032 [4], approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine through Order No. 286-r of 23 February 2022. The Strategy provides a policy framework for modernising higher education, improving educational quality, strengthening institutional capacity, and responding to contemporary societal challenges. Within this broader strategic context, culture-creating educational practices can contribute to the development of inclusive university communities, the integration of formal and non-formal learning, and stronger relationships between higher education institutions and society.

The importance of students' sociocultural engagement has become particularly evident since Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, which has profoundly disrupted educational and community life. War-related displacement, disruption of educational processes, psychological insecurity, and the transformation of everyday social relations have created additional challenges for students and higher education institutions. At the same time, students' participation in volunteering, cultural initiatives, community projects, heritage preservation, and digital communication has revealed the potential of sociocultural activity as a means of strengthening solidarity, civic responsibility, and cultural continuity. Under these circumstances, universities are called upon not only to preserve access to education but also to create supportive environments in which students can maintain social connections, express their cultural identities, and contribute to the resilience and recovery of their communities.

Digital transformation introduces an additional dimension to this issue. Digital storytelling, collaborative media production, virtual exhibitions, online creative communities, and other technology-mediated practices offer new possibilities for cultural expression and participation that extend beyond traditional university spaces. However, the educational value of such practices depends not simply on the availability of digital tools but on the pedagogical approaches through which students are encouraged to collaborate, reflect critically, generate cultural content, and participate in socially meaningful activities. This highlights the importance of culture-creating technologies understood as systematically organised pedagogical methods, participatory practices, and creative tools that enable students to produce, reinterpret, communicate, and share cultural meanings through individual and collective activity.

From this perspective, students' sociocultural activity may be conceptualised as a multidimensional process encompassing cultural participation, creative self-expression, social interaction, civic engagement, and the practical application of cultural knowledge and values. Culture-creating technologies can serve as complementary pedagogical mechanisms that connect these dimensions by facilitating project-based learning, collaborative creativity, intercultural dialogue, student-led initiatives, and community-oriented cultural practices. Their potential is particularly significant in the preparation of

future educators and professionals in creative disciplines, whose developing professional competencies require not only specialised subject knowledge but also cultural awareness, communication skills, creativity, and the ability to organise socially meaningful activities.

Despite the recognised importance of student engagement, creativity, and participatory learning, a conceptual and methodological challenge remains in explaining how culture-creating technologies can be systematically integrated into university educational environments to foster sociocultural activity. In particular, further clarification is needed regarding the pedagogical conditions, organisational forms, and mechanisms through which cultural participation can develop into sustained student initiative, creative agency, and socially responsible action. This challenge also requires consideration of the relationship between institutional educational objectives, students' individual interests, and the broader sociocultural transformations affecting contemporary Ukrainian society.

The aim of this study is to examine the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies in fostering the sociocultural activity of higher education students and to identify the organisational and pedagogical conditions that facilitate their effective implementation within the university educational environment.

The study seeks to conceptualise students' sociocultural activity, analyse the educational functions of culture-creating technologies, and explore their potential to promote student agency, creative self-realisation, cultural identity, and civic engagement. Particular attention is paid to the Ukrainian higher education context, including its current legislative framework, digital transformation, and the sociocultural challenges arising from wartime conditions.

The present conceptual research contributes to contemporary discussions on student-centred higher education by treating culture-creating technologies not merely as instruments for organising extracurricular activities but as an integrated pedagogical approach through which students become active participants in cultural production, social interaction, and community development.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of students' sociocultural activity is closely connected with contemporary academic discussions concerning student engagement, personal agency, participatory learning, cultural identity, and the social functions of higher education. Although these concepts have been examined from different theoretical perspectives, their conceptual interrelationships provide an important foundation for understanding how university educational environments can stimulate students' creative initiative and meaningful participation in cultural and social life.

Kahu [5] proposed an influential conceptual framework distinguishing behavioural, psychological, sociocultural, and holistic perspectives on student engagement. The author emphasised the need to differentiate engagement itself from its antecedents and consequences, demonstrating that students' participation cannot be adequately explained solely through observable educational behaviour. Particularly relevant to the present research is the sociocultural perspective, which recognises the influence of institutional practices, social relations, and broader contextual factors on students' educational experiences. Developing this discussion, Kahn [6] highlighted the importance of students' own contributions to the educational process. This approach shifts scholarly attention from engagement understood solely as an institutionally managed outcome towards the active, agentic role of students in shaping their learning experiences. Such a perspective is particularly significant for examining sociocultural activity, since cultural participation involves not only engagement in established activities but also the capacity to initiate, interpret, transform, and communicate cultural practices.

Accordingly, students' sociocultural activity should be distinguished from general academic engagement. Whereas academic engagement is commonly associated with participation in learning, cognitive investment, and educational achievement, sociocultural activity encompasses a broader range of practices involving cultural expression, interpersonal communication, civic participation, collective creativity, and interaction with local and wider communities. In this study, sociocultural activity is understood as a multidimensional manifestation of student agency through which individuals participate in the creation, interpretation, preservation, and transformation of cultural meanings and socially significant practices.

The transition from traditional teacher-centred educational models towards participatory approaches has generated growing academic interest in students as active and responsible partners in educational processes. Healey et al. [7] developed the concept of students as partners by examining the possibilities of collaborative relationships between students and academic staff. Their approach demonstrates the importance of shared responsibility, dialogue, and collaborative inquiry in transforming educational experiences. Rather than treating students exclusively as passive recipients of institutional educational services, the partnership model recognises their capacity to contribute to educational development and institutional practices.

Bovill [8] further advanced this discussion by examining co-creation in higher education and advocating a whole-class approach. The study highlights the importance of broadening opportunities for participation beyond small groups of selected students. This perspective is valuable for developing inclusive culture-creating practices, since sociocultural activity should not be restricted to individuals already demonstrating high levels of creative or organisational competence. These

contributions suggest that participatory pedagogies can provide a conceptual foundation for culture-creating technologies. However, educational co-creation and cultural co-creation are not entirely equivalent. The former primarily concerns students' involvement in learning and teaching processes, whereas the latter additionally involves the production of cultural expressions, the reinterpretation of collective experiences, and participation in the cultural life of communities.

Consequently, the educational potential of culture-creating technologies extends beyond collaborative classroom practices. Such technologies may encompass student-led cultural projects, artistic initiatives, community-based activities, intercultural communication, volunteering, and collaborative cultural production. Their defining pedagogical characteristic is the transformation of students from passive participants in institutionally organised activities into active subjects of cultural and social development.

The digital transformation of higher education has considerably expanded the possibilities for student participation, creative expression, and interaction within and beyond university environments. Bond et al. [9], in a systematic evidence map covering 243 studies, demonstrated the multidimensional relationship between educational technology and student engagement. Their analysis identified behavioural, affective, and cognitive dimensions of engagement, while also revealing limitations in the theoretical conceptualisation of the relationship between digital technologies and students' educational experiences. The findings indicate that the introduction of technological tools does not automatically provide a comprehensive explanation of how meaningful engagement develops.

Similarly, Bedenlier et al. [10], in a systematic review focusing on arts and humanities education, examined the ways educational technologies may facilitate student engagement in disciplines characterised by communication, interpretation, and cultural interaction. Their findings reinforce the importance of considering disciplinary context and pedagogical objectives when evaluating technology-supported participation. These studies provide an important basis for distinguishing digital educational technologies from culture-creating technologies. Digital tools may facilitate communication, collaboration, and access to information, but their culture-creating potential depends on the activities organised through them and the meanings generated by participants.

For example, digital storytelling, collaborative audiovisual production, virtual cultural exhibitions, student media initiatives, and digital heritage projects can become culture-creating practices when students actively interpret cultural experiences, develop original content, engage in collective reflection, and communicate their work to broader audiences. In this sense, digitalisation should be conceptualised not merely as a technological transformation of educational delivery but also as an opportunity to develop new forms of cultural agency and social participation. Nevertheless, digital participation may also reproduce existing inequalities where students have unequal access to technological resources, digital competencies, or opportunities to influence collaborative decisions. Therefore, the implementation of culture-creating technologies requires attention to accessibility, inclusion, student autonomy, and the pedagogical quality of interaction.

The Ukrainian higher education context introduces additional dimensions to the study of sociocultural activity, particularly in relation to cultural identity, social cohesion, educational resilience, and the consequences of Russia's full-scale invasion. Błaszczyk et al. [11], examining resilience mechanisms among students at Lviv University, contribute to understanding how university communities respond to educational and social disruptions under wartime conditions. This perspective is relevant to the development of culture-creating technologies because students' opportunities for participation are influenced not only by their individual motivation but also by the ability of higher education institutions to maintain supportive communities and meaningful forms of interaction under conditions of uncertainty.

The Ukrainian legislative framework provides an additional normative dimension. The Law of Ukraine on Education (2017) [1], the Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (2014) [2], and the Law of Ukraine on the Basic Principles of Youth Policy (2021) [3] establish principles relating to personal development, student participation, academic freedom, cultural diversity, and opportunities for youth self-realisation. These principles can support the development of participatory cultural practices as an integral component of a student-centred university environment. Furthermore, the Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2022–2032 [4] identifies broader priorities for educational modernisation and institutional development, within which innovative pedagogical approaches and student participation acquire particular relevance.

From an international perspective, the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005) [12] recognises cultural expression, creativity, intercultural dialogue, and access to diverse forms of cultural participation as essential dimensions of cultural development. Although the Convention does not prescribe particular pedagogical technologies, its principles provide a relevant normative framework for understanding universities as environments that enable individuals and groups to create, communicate, and share cultural meanings.

Within the Ukrainian context, culture-creating technologies may therefore perform several interconnected educational and social functions: supporting students' cultural self-identification, encouraging participation in community-oriented initiatives, facilitating dialogue across diverse social groups, and providing opportunities for creative contribution to cultural continuity and societal recovery. However, these potential functions should not be interpreted as automatically resulting from participation in cultural activities. Their realisation depends on pedagogical design, institutional support,

inclusiveness, and students' capacity to exercise meaningful agency in the organisation and implementation of sociocultural initiatives.

The reviewed literature provides substantial theoretical foundations for examining student engagement, educational participation, co-creation, and digital learning environments. Nevertheless, these research strands approach student activity from different conceptual perspectives. Studies of student engagement primarily focus on the conditions, manifestations, and consequences of participation in educational processes. Research on students as partners and co-creation emphasises collaborative relationships and shared responsibility in teaching and learning. Investigations of educational technologies examine how digital tools influence various dimensions of engagement. Research addressing Ukrainian higher education during wartime contributes an understanding of educational continuity, adaptation, and institutional resilience.

Taken together, these approaches offer important insights but do not, by themselves, constitute an integrated pedagogical framework specifically explaining how culture-creating technologies may foster students' sociocultural activity. The research gap is therefore formulated as the need to clarify the conceptual relationship between sociocultural activity, student agency, cultural co-creation, and the pedagogical mechanisms through which these dimensions can be developed within higher education institutions.

On this basis, culture-creating technologies are conceptualised as an interconnected system of pedagogical methods, collaborative procedures, creative practices, and organisational instruments that enable students to participate actively in producing, interpreting, preserving, and transforming cultural meanings. The present research adopts the theoretical position that the effectiveness of such technologies depends on the interaction of three dimensions: student agency, expressed through initiative and autonomous participation; collaborative cultural production, manifested through shared creative and socially meaningful activities; and institutional enabling conditions, encompassing pedagogical support, inclusiveness, resources, and opportunities for participation.

This deliberately integrative perspective provides a theoretical foundation for examining the organisational and pedagogical conditions under which culture-creating technologies may contribute to the sustainable development of sociocultural activity among higher education students, particularly in the context of contemporary transformations affecting Ukrainian higher education.

3. METHODS

The present study adopts a theoretical and conceptual research design aimed at examining the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies in fostering the sociocultural activity of higher education students. The methodological framework integrates sociocultural, student-centred, activity-based, systemic, and competency-based approaches to understanding students' participation in cultural and educational processes. Particular attention is given to the Ukrainian higher education context, where the development of students' creative capacities, cultural identity, civic responsibility, and opportunities for self-realisation is closely connected with the transformation of educational practices and the additional challenges arising from wartime conditions.

The object of the research is the sociocultural activity of higher education students facilitated through culture-creating technologies. The subject of the research is the pedagogical resources, organisational mechanisms, and educational conditions that enable the integration of culture-creating technologies into the system of university sociocultural activities.

The primary aim of the study is to provide a clear theoretical and methodological justification for the application of culture-creating technologies as instruments for promoting students' self-realisation, creative development, cultural participation, and social engagement. To achieve this aim, the research focuses on conceptualising culture-creating technologies, identifying their pedagogical potential, developing an integrated model of their implementation, and establishing criteria for assessing their potential contribution to students' sociocultural development.

The methodological foundation of the research is informed by the sociocultural approach, which considers students' personal development in relation to cultural practices, social interactions, and historically situated educational environments. The student-centred approach recognises students as active participants in educational processes and emphasises their autonomy, individual interests, and opportunities for creative self-expression. The activity-based approach conceptualises sociocultural development as a process arising through meaningful participation in creative, communicative, and socially significant activities. The systemic approach provides the analytical basis for examining culture-creating technologies as interconnected components of the university educational environment, while the competency-based approach facilitates the identification of educational outcomes associated with creativity, communication, collaboration, and civic participation.

The research employs theoretical analysis, synthesis, comparison, conceptual generalisation, and pedagogical modelling. Theoretical analysis is used to examine the relationship between sociocultural activity, student agency, cultural participation, and educational co-creation. Comparative analysis enables the identification of conceptual similarities and differences among traditional extracurricular practices, participatory pedagogical approaches, and culture-creating tech-

nologies. Synthesis and conceptual generalisation provide the basis for identifying the pedagogical resources of culture-creating technologies, while pedagogical modelling is employed to construct an integrated framework describing the conditions and mechanisms through which these technologies may support students' sociocultural activity.

The Ukrainian regulatory framework is incorporated through a normative and contextual analysis of the Law of Ukraine on Education (2017) [1], the Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (2014) [2], the Law of Ukraine on the Basic Principles of Youth Policy (2021) [3], and the Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2022–2032 [4]. These instruments are examined in relation to the principles of student-centred education, creative development, youth participation, academic freedom, cultural diversity, and institutional responsibility. The legal analysis is intended to establish the compatibility of the proposed pedagogical framework with the fundamental principles of Ukrainian educational policy rather than to assess the legal compliance of individual institutions.

The central research proposition is that the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies can be strengthened when their implementation is based on three interconnected conditions. First, culture-creating technologies should be designed as coherent, purposeful, sequential, and adaptable pedagogical processes that encourage students to develop cultural awareness, socially responsible attitudes, emotional responsiveness, interpersonal communication, and creative capacities. Their implementation should provide opportunities for students to identify individual interests, exercise initiative, and undertake meaningful creative activities rather than merely reproduce predetermined cultural practices.

Second, the pedagogical resources of culture-creating technologies should be directed towards developing students' capacity for self-realisation, social interaction, cultural expression, and independent creative problem-solving. These resources include opportunities for collaborative cultural production, participation in socially meaningful initiatives, reflection on personal and collective experiences, development of cultural identity, and interaction beyond the boundaries of narrowly defined professional specialisations. Such practices are expected to facilitate connections between students' individual interests, academic learning, and broader social and cultural environments.

Third, culture-creating technologies should be integrated into a coherent system of university sociocultural activity rather than implemented as isolated educational interventions. For analytical purposes, the proposed system consists of four interrelated components: a methodological component encompassing theoretical approaches, educational principles, and pedagogical assumptions; an organisational and technological component comprising the forms, methods, resources, and instruments of sociocultural activity; a content component defining the principal areas of cultural, creative, communicative, and community-oriented participation; and an evaluative component establishing criteria, indicators, and potential diagnostic instruments for assessing students' sociocultural development.

The proposed conceptual model assumes dynamic interaction among these components. The methodological component establishes the theoretical orientation of educational activities, the organisational and technological component translates educational objectives into participatory practices, the content component determines the sociocultural significance of these practices, and the evaluative component provides a basis for analysing the extent to which the intended educational outcomes are achieved. Feedback between the components is considered essential for adapting culture-creating technologies to students' needs, institutional circumstances, and changing social conditions.

To operationalise the proposed model, four analytical dimensions of students' sociocultural activity are distinguished: motivational and value-oriented, cognitive and cultural, creative and behavioural, and communicative and social. The motivational and value-oriented dimension concerns students' interest in cultural participation, their awareness of cultural values, and their willingness to initiate socially meaningful activities. The cognitive and cultural dimension encompasses cultural knowledge, critical interpretation, and the ability to engage with diverse cultural expressions. The creative and behavioural dimension concerns initiative, creative problem-solving, participation in cultural projects, and the production of original cultural content. The communicative and social dimension addresses collaboration, intercultural dialogue, social responsibility, and participation in university and community activities.

These dimensions provide the conceptual basis for identifying potential assessment indicators, including students' motivation to participate in cultural initiatives, frequency and diversity of participation, degree of autonomy in project implementation, demonstrated creative contributions, collaborative competencies, and reflective evaluation of personal development. Depending on the institutional setting and available research resources, the proposed indicators could subsequently be examined through questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, observation, student portfolios, reflective journals, or analysis of completed cultural projects.

Importantly, the study does not treat these proposed indicators as empirically validated measures or as observed outcomes. Rather, they constitute an initial analytical framework intended to guide subsequent empirical investigation. The methodological contribution of the present research therefore lies in the systematic conceptualisation of culture-creating technologies and the development of an integrated pedagogical model that can be operationalised and evaluated in future studies.

The proposed framework also takes into consideration the specific conditions of contemporary Ukrainian higher education, including digital and blended learning environments, student displacement, unequal access to educational resources,

and the importance of cultural continuity and community resilience. Accordingly, the implementation of culture-creating technologies is conceptualised as a flexible and inclusive process that can accommodate different forms of student participation while promoting meaningful cultural engagement, creative agency, and socially responsible action.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The theoretical analysis and pedagogical modelling undertaken in this study yielded an integrated conceptual framework for fostering students' sociocultural activity through culture-creating technologies. The findings are explicitly conceptual and interpretive rather than experimental: they clarify the content, pedagogical resources, organisational architecture, and potential assessment dimensions of the proposed approach. No intervention, original student survey, or pre- and post-intervention assessment was conducted as part of the present analysis; consequently, the proposed model should not be interpreted as evidence of measured effectiveness.

The first result concerns the conceptualisation of sociocultural activity. Viewed through complementary sociocultural and activity-based approaches, such activity cannot be reduced to extracurricular attendance or to the transmission of established cultural norms. It represents the interaction of social relationships and cultural meaning-making through which students engage with collective experiences while developing their own capacities for interpretation, initiative, and creative action. The sociocultural approach situates these processes within the institutional and wider social environment; the activity-based approach explains why participation in concrete practices is central to the development of agency. Their combination makes it possible to analyse not only the context in which students act, but also the activities through which they create social and cultural value.

On this basis, the study identifies several interconnected directions of university sociocultural activity: educational and intellectual initiatives; cultural and artistic production; heritage preservation and public cultural communication; scientific and technological creativity; community service and volunteering; intercultural dialogue; and recreational and wellbeing-oriented participation. These directions may be implemented through student clubs, creative laboratories, workshops, research societies, cultural festivals, exhibitions, digital storytelling projects, collaborative media production, and partnerships with local communities. The proposed classification is intended as an analytical guide rather than an exhaustive classification: its practical composition will depend on institutional resources, accessibility, students' interests, and relevant community needs.

A second result is the refinement of the concept of culture-creating technologies. In the proposed framework, these technologies are understood as purposeful, sequential, adaptable, and potentially reproducible configurations of pedagogical actions, organisational forms, and creative instruments that enable students to generate, interpret, preserve, or transform cultural meanings. The term 'technology' thus refers to the systematic design of educational practice, not exclusively to digital devices or software. While digital platforms can expand participation, cultural co-creation may equally occur through theatre, performance, community arts, workshops, heritage initiatives, and collaborative projects conducted in physical settings.

The principal pedagogical resources identified through conceptual analysis are opportunities for self-expression and creative experimentation; the experience of initiating and completing socially meaningful projects; collaboration and intercultural communication; reflection on personal identity and collective experience; and the transfer of learning beyond narrowly defined professional specialisations. These resources may support self-understanding, confidence, social adaptation, and the ability to respond creatively to unfamiliar situations. Nevertheless, such outcomes are contingent rather than automatic. Participation can be tokenistic or exclusionary where students have little decision-making power, receive inadequate support, or encounter barriers arising from disability, displacement, economic circumstances, or limited digital access.

The framework accordingly positions student agency as a necessary condition of meaningful culture-creating activity. Students should be able to propose themes, select formats, negotiate roles, develop cultural products, reflect on their work, and participate in evaluating outcomes. Lecturers and university staff retain an enabling role through mentoring, facilitation, safeguarding, and the provision of material and organisational resources. This allocation of responsibility is consistent with student-centred educational principles and avoids treating cultural participation as a compulsory instrument for producing predetermined attitudes or identities.

The third result is a four-component model integrating the methodological, organisational and technological, content-related, and evaluative dimensions of sociocultural activity (Table 1). These components are interdependent rather than successive stages. Methodological principles inform the selection of practices; organisational resources create opportunities for participation; content gives activities cultural and social relevance; and evaluation generates feedback for adapting design. This iterative structure is particularly important for universities operating in changing conditions, including blended learning arrangements, wartime disruption, and student mobility.

Table 1. *Conceptual Model for Implementing Culture-Creating Technologies in University Sociocultural Activity*

Component	Core elements	Function and illustrative indicators
Methodological	Sociocultural, activity-based, student-centred and systemic approaches; principles of inclusiveness, continuity, variability, autonomy, creative participation and psychological safety.	Provides pedagogical rationale; indicators: opportunities for student choice, accessibility of participation and alignment with student needs.
Organisational and technological	Creative laboratories, student clubs, workshops, research societies, festivals, exhibitions, volunteering and digital cultural projects; mentoring, facilities, partnerships and digital tools.	Converts principles into participatory practice; indicators: diversity of formats, access to resources, student initiative and sustained involvement.
Content-related	Educational, cultural and artistic, heritage-related, information and media, scientific and technical, community-oriented, intercultural, recreational and wellbeing activities.	Connects cultural production with social meaning; indicators: relevance to student/community interests, quality of outputs and variety of participation.
Evaluative	Motivational/value, cognitive/cultural, creative/behavioural and communicative/social dimensions; reflective portfolios, observation, interviews and questionnaires for future validation.	Supports formative assessment and revision; potential indicators: self-reported engagement, demonstrated contributions, collaborative activity and reflective learning.

A fourth result is the articulation of an assessment logic for the model. Four analytical dimensions are proposed: motivational and value-oriented (interest in cultural participation and perceived relevance); cognitive and cultural (interpretive knowledge and understanding of cultural expressions); creative and behavioural (initiative, original contributions, project completion and reflective problem-solving); and communicative and social (collaboration, dialogue and community engagement). Satisfaction with university opportunities and perceived personal or professional growth may offer supplementary information, but neither constitutes a sufficient measure of sociocultural development in isolation. A future evaluation should triangulate self-reports with observation, student-produced artefacts, reflective portfolios and, where feasible, comparisons over time.

The evaluative component should also be understood as a means of improving the design of educational practice rather than as a claim that the model has already produced measurable gains. In future institutional applications, the proposed indicators could be refined collaboratively with students and academic staff before being subjected to formal validation. Such collaboration would help establish whether indicators are culturally meaningful, accessible to students with different participation opportunities, and sensitive to variations in programme type and local community context. It would also allow evaluative feedback to inform practical changes in mentoring, resources, and project organisation while preserving students' agency in defining worthwhile cultural outcomes.

The model's prospective application within Ukrainian higher education has distinct contextual implications. Russia's full-scale invasion has heightened the importance of flexible and accessible forms of student participation, including initiatives that connect displaced learners, support community solidarity, and engage critically with cultural heritage and collective memory. These priorities do not imply that every cultural project should address wartime themes. Rather, students should retain autonomy to engage with diverse cultural expressions, while institutions provide psychologically safe opportunities for voluntary participation. The normative principles articulated in Ukraine's Laws 'On Education' [1], 'On Higher Education' [2], and 'On the Basic Principles of Youth Policy' [3], together with the Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2022–2032 [4], support a broader orientation towards participation, personal development and responsiveness to societal needs.

The conceptual findings also extend existing discussions of student engagement and co-creation. Whereas engagement models frequently emphasise students' relationships with learning environments [5], and partnership approaches focus on collaborative educational decision-making [7, 8], the present framework foregrounds the creation and public communication of cultural meanings as a distinct form of student activity. Its proposed contribution is not the assertion that cultural projects invariably increase engagement, but a specification of the mechanisms and institutional conditions through which such an effect might occur. Similarly, research on educational technologies demonstrates the need to distinguish the availability of tools from the quality of students' engagement [9, 10]. The present model makes pedagogical design and agency, rather than technological novelty, the principal explanatory elements.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. The four-component model and its assessment dimensions have been

developed through theoretical synthesis; their completeness, clarity and explanatory power require testing with students and educators in different institutional and disciplinary contexts. Future studies could employ participatory action research or mixed methods, combining co-designed cultural interventions with interviews, portfolios and longitudinal measures of participation. Comparisons across disciplines and between in-person, blended and digital formats would help establish which mechanisms are transferable and which remain context-dependent. In addition, any empirical study involving student data should follow applicable ethical requirements and Ukrainian personal data protection rules.

Overall, the results support the conceptual coherence of treating culture-creating technologies as an integrated approach to university sociocultural activity. Their anticipated value lies in linking students' creative initiative, collaborative cultural production, institutional support and reflective evaluation. Claims regarding actual improvements in self-realisation, creativity or social adaptation remain hypotheses for subsequent empirical investigation rather than demonstrated outcomes of the present study.

5. CONCLUSION

The present study has examined the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies in fostering the sociocultural activity of higher education students, with particular attention to the transformation of educational practices, the development of student agency, and the contemporary challenges facing Ukrainian higher education. The theoretical analysis suggests that students' sociocultural activity should be understood not merely as participation in extracurricular events but as a multidimensional process encompassing creative self-expression, cultural participation, social interaction, civic engagement, and personal development.

The study has provided a conceptual justification for considering culture-creating technologies as an integrated system of purposeful, sequential, and adaptable pedagogical methods and practices designed to facilitate students' participation in the creation, interpretation, preservation, and transformation of cultural meanings. Unlike conventional approaches that primarily emphasise the transmission of established cultural values, culture-creating technologies recognise students as active participants in cultural production and as individuals capable of initiating socially meaningful activities. This understanding broadens the educational functions of universities by connecting academic learning with creative agency, cultural identity, and community engagement.

The analysis has identified several interconnected pedagogical resources of culture-creating technologies, including their potential to support individual creativity, promote socialisation and adaptation, encourage independent decision-making, strengthen interpersonal communication, and facilitate professional and personal self-realisation. Particular significance is attributed to the capacity of these technologies to create opportunities for students to explore their individual interests, develop original cultural initiatives, and engage in collaborative activities extending beyond the boundaries of their academic specialisations. The educational value of such practices lies not only in the cultural products generated but also in the processes of reflection, cooperation, communication, and personal development associated with their implementation.

A central theoretical contribution of the study is the development of an integrated conceptual model comprising four interrelated components: methodological, organisational and technological, content-related, and evaluative. The methodological component establishes the theoretical principles and pedagogical conditions for fostering sociocultural activity. The organisational and technological component encompasses participatory educational practices, creative workshops, student associations, cultural projects, and digital platforms. The content-related component defines the principal areas of educational, cultural, scientific, civic, and recreational participation. The evaluative component provides a conceptual basis for assessing motivation, cultural awareness, creative initiative, collaborative competencies, and the extent of students' participation in sociocultural activities.

The proposed model suggests that the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies depends on their systematic integration into the university educational environment, the availability of meaningful opportunities for student initiative, and the establishment of supportive and inclusive conditions for creative participation. Isolated cultural events or technologically mediated activities cannot, by themselves, ensure sustained sociocultural engagement. Instead, the development of such engagement requires coherence between educational objectives, students' interests, institutional resources, and mechanisms for reflection and evaluation.

In the Ukrainian context, the proposed approach is consistent with the principles of student-centred education, personal development, academic freedom, youth participation, and cultural diversity established by national educational legislation. Its relevance is particularly evident under the conditions of Russia's ongoing war against Ukraine, which has intensified the need to preserve cultural identity, strengthen university communities, support students affected by displacement and educational disruption, and create opportunities for meaningful participation in social and cultural reconstruction. Culture-creating technologies may contribute to these objectives by facilitating collaborative cultural practices, digital creativity, volunteering, intercultural dialogue, and community-oriented initiatives.

The findings also highlight the importance of distinguishing the pedagogical potential of culture-creating technologies

from their empirically demonstrated effectiveness. As the present research is primarily theoretical and conceptual, the proposed model and assessment dimensions have not been subjected to empirical validation. Consequently, the study does not establish a causal relationship between the implementation of culture-creating technologies and measurable improvements in students' sociocultural activity. Its contribution consists in providing a theoretically grounded framework that can guide the design, implementation, and subsequent evaluation of such pedagogical interventions.

Future research should focus on the empirical assessment of the proposed model in different types of Ukrainian higher education institutions, particularly those preparing future educators and professionals in creative disciplines. Longitudinal and mixed-methods research designs could be employed to examine changes in students' motivation, creative agency, cultural participation, communication skills, and civic engagement. Comparative studies involving different institutional environments and forms of educational delivery would also help clarify the conditions under which culture-creating technologies produce sustainable educational and sociocultural outcomes.

Overall, the study advances the understanding of culture-creating technologies as a theoretically promising pedagogical approach to strengthening the sociocultural dimension of higher education. By positioning students as active creators of cultural meanings and participants in socially significant practices, the proposed framework offers a conceptual foundation for developing more inclusive, participatory, and culturally responsive university environments. Its further empirical examination may contribute to the improvement of educational strategies aimed at fostering students' creativity, self-realisation, cultural identity, and social responsibility in Ukraine and beyond.

Author Contributions

All five authors contributed to the conceptual development, preparation, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version and accept responsibility for the work.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no competing interests relevant to this article.

Funding

The authors received no external funding for this study.

Data Availability

No primary empirical data were generated or analysed.

REFERENCES

[1] Ukraine. Verkhovna Rada. *On Education*. Law no. 2145-VIII, 5 Sept. 2017. *Legislation of Ukraine*, https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19.

[2] Ukraine. Verkhovna Rada. *On Higher Education*. Law no. 1556-VII, 1 July 2014. *Legislation of Ukraine*, https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18.

[3] Ukraine. Verkhovna Rada. *On the Basic Principles of Youth Policy*. Law no. 1414-IX, 27 Apr. 2021. *Legislation of Ukraine*, https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1414-20.

[4] Ukraine. Cabinet of Ministers. *Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine for 2022–2032*. Approved by Order no. 286-r, 23 Feb. 2022, as amended. *Legislation of Ukraine*, https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/286-2022-%D1%80.

[5] Kahu, Ella R. "Framing Student Engagement in Higher Education." *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 38, no. 5, 2013, pp. 758–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505.

[6] Kahn, Peter E. "Theorising Student Engagement in Higher Education." *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 40, no. 6, 2014, pp. 1005–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3121.

[7] Healey, Mick, et al. "Students as Partners: Reflections on a Conceptual Model." *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2016, pp. 8–20. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.2.3.

[8] Bovill, Catherine. "Co-creation in Learning and Teaching: The Case for a Whole-Class Approach in Higher Education." *Higher Education*, vol. 79, no. 6, 2020, pp. 1023–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00453-w.

[9] Bond, Melissa, et al. "Mapping Research in Student Engagement and Educational Technology in Higher Education: A Systematic Evidence Map." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 17, 2020, article 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8.

[10] Bedenlier, Svenja, et al. "Facilitating Student Engagement through Educational Technology in Higher Education: A Systematic Review in the Field of Arts and Humanities." *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2020, pp. 126–50. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.5477.

[11] Błaszczyk, Mateusz, et al. "Coping with Adversity: Mechanisms of Resilience in Ukrainian Universities during the Russian-Ukrainian War—A Perspective from Lviv University Students." *Higher Education*, vol. 91, 2026, pp. 1991–2010. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01506-z.

[12] *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. UNESCO, 20 Oct. 2005, https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-protection-and-promotion-diversity-cultural-expressions.