

Бежека Д. А. Средства профессиональной подготовки будущих преподавателей педагогического университета к формированию англоязычной фонетической компетентности у студентов иностранной филологии.

В работе использованы коммуникативно-ориентированные средства (требования, подходы, принципы, коммуникативно-ориентированные занятия и др.), а также традиционные методы формирования фонетической компетентности. Охарактеризованы важнейшие умения, критерии и показатели оценивания подготовленности исследуемых будущих преподавателей в обозначенном контексте. Установлено, что применение указанных средств и преподавание специализированного учебного курса повысило уровень подготовленности будущих преподавателей к формированию фонетической компетентности у студентов.

Ключевые слова: иностранная филология, будущий преподаватель, фонетическая компетентность, коммуникативно-ориентированные средства.

Beheka D. A. Means of professional training of future teaching assistants at pedagogical university to the formation of English phonetic competence to students – foreign language philologists.

The article deals with the usage of the communicative-oriented methods (requirements, approaches, principles, communicative-oriented classes, etc.) and traditional methods of formation of phonetic competence. Described essential skills, criteria and indicators for assessment of readiness of future teaching assistants in the indicated context. Using these methods and practicing the specialized training course has increased the level of preparedness of future teaching assistants to the formation of the phonetic competence to students – foreign language philologists.

Keywords: foreign philology, the future teaching assistant, phonetic competence, communicative-oriented methods.

УДК 378-057.875(73):316.722

Bezukh Y. S.

TEACHING STUDENTS WITHIN DIVERSE ENVIRONMENT IN US UNIVERSITIES

The research has proved that the diversity of a university's faculty, staff and students influences its strength, productivity, and intellectual personality. Diversity of experience, age, physical ability, religion, race, ethnicity, gender and many other attributes contributes to the richness of the environment for teaching. It has been found out that diversity is also needed in discipline, intellectual outlook, cognitive style, and personality to offer students the breadth of ideas that constitute a dynamic intellectual community.

Keywords: multicultural education, polyethnic education, diversity, curriculum.

The United States is a multinational, multicultural, relatively young country, distinguished from other countries by the history of its origin, development, and social relations characterized by a plurality of races, tribes, nations and cultures.

According to A. Tocqueville, a well-known American researcher, "The United States of America is the only country that allows us to trace the natural development of a society in which all events and influences are subjected to scientific analysis. As a result, America exhibits in a bright light the phenomenon of creation, which in other countries is hidden from researchers in the depths of ages" [20].

In particular, J. Gay's research shows that each person and group tend to pursue the same goal: a more equitable system of education for ethnically and culturally diverse students, a more democratic society, in which there would be far more equality, freedom and justice in all spheres of life [11].

The main document from which the definition of multicultural education in the United States was isolated in a separate concept in the 1970s and 1980s was the "NobodyIs A Model

American”, adopted in 1972 by the American Association of Teachers’ Colleges (AACTE). This document states that multicultural education involves targeting schools to the cultural enrichment of all children through programs that encourage the preservation of cultural uniqueness. Multicultural education recognizes cultural diversiveness as a reality of life in American society [1]. This statement – “No One Model American” has become a notion that scientists and students widely used in discussions on multicultural education.

At present, the National Association of Multicultural Education provides organizational leadership in conducting an annual conference, which involves over 1500 scientists; the publication of a peer-reviewed diary (“Multicultural perspective, practice”). In addition to this, the headquarters of the National Association for Multicultural Education provide opportunities for internships for young scholars and also serves as a base for those who wish to receive information on multicultural education. There are also a number of multicultural associations and cultural organizations in the United States, whose work is aimed at helping out multi-class and diverse education. Among them: the Center for Educational Pluralism (Center for Educational Pluralism); Center for Multilingual Multicultural Research (Center for Multilingual Multicultural Research); Center for Global and Multicultural Education (Global and Multicultural Education Center); National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), National Association for Ethnic Studies, National Information Center for Disabled Children and Youth, National Polytechnic Institute (National Multicultural Institute). In the United States, there are organizations representing the interests of representatives of different cultures, such as the United States Association of Immigrants, the Japan-American Association (Japan America Society), which has affiliates in different states, the Russian American Federation, the American Italian Heritage Association, etc. These organizations help students from other countries to adjust to the new environment, attract them to active activities in the multicultural community surrounding them, and provide social contacts with other students, immigrants and natives of the United States, representing different cultures [14].

As we can see, the country’s policy is aimed at the development of multicultural education and the creation of appropriate conditions for life, education, work of people irrespective of color, nationality and socio-economic status.

In the context of our research, an important aspect is also the definition of the essence and content of the concept of “multicultural education”, which US scholars use.

Researchers on the problem of multiculturalism in the US used different definitions for the concept of “multicultural education”, while a lack of clear definition caused misconceptions at both theoretical and practical levels.

At an early stage of its development, multicultural education suffered severe harassment. It was difficult to publish articles on multicultural education because of bias against arguments about equality and justice or through the leveling of assimilation ideology. Even subject to the publication of articles containing questions of multicultural education, the editors reviewed their content and prohibited the use of the term “multicultural education”, replacing it with the terms “ethnic learning” and “diversity”.

Multicultural education was included in the program of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1977. In this program, it was defined as “the process of preparing individuals for the social, political and economic realities that they will face in the future” [15]. This interpretation of Multicultural education was used by scientists for about two decades. Subsequently, in the 1980s, other terms related to multicultural education are found in scientific sources: multicultural education, ethnic studies, multicultural studies; multicultural education (education that is multicultural). Some definitions are similar in nature, but at the same time they have certain differences.

Multicultural education has been and remains one of the most commonly used terms in the United States. The founder of the term “Multicultural education” is G. Baptiste. By his definition, multicultural education is the transfer of the approval of a pluralistic society to the

system of education. At its highest level, multicultural education exists as a product, process and philosophical direction for all those engaged in educational activities [8, p. 44].

Multicultural education is the second most widely used term after multicultural education, whose adherents are D. Banks and J. Gay. J. Banks, provides a scientific interpretation of the concept of “polyethnic education” as an educational process that deals with the modification of the whole educational environment in order to reflect the ethnic diversiveness of American society and to ensure equal educational opportunities for all [6].

The term “multicultural learning” is found in the writings of D. Boyer. He emphasizes the content and process as the main elements of multicultural learning, taken from the historical and sociological heritage of various ethnic groups [10].

Also, in the American scientific literature one can find the concept of “multiracial education”, which, according to M. Sarap, is somewhat wider than multicultural education. She argues that, focusing only on cultures, multicultural education shifts away from confrontations, anger and guilt that are inherent in the problems of racism and injustice. In multiracial education, the main focus is on issues of discrimination, differences in the authority provision, access to resources that fully affect the lives of children and their families [18].

The term “education that is multicultural” is the creation of C. Grant, an early advocate of multicultural education. C. Grant refused to use the term “multicultural education” because he believed that the adjective “multicultural” limited the meaning of the concept. “Multicultural education” supports cultural diversiveness and individual differences in the population, penetrates into curricula and the school environment [2].

Proponents of multicultural education also argue that this is simply a “quality education” for students who live in an ethnically, culturally and racially pluralistic society. Concerning this opinion, B. Suzuki emphasizes that “the main task of multicultural education is to make harmonious educational practice with the dream of a better society”. Such education includes all the elements that form the principles of “qualitative pedagogy”, namely: relevance, evolutionary and substantive lawfulness, legality, importance of education and education of the child as a whole.

As “education for freedom”, multicultural education seeks to free people, groups and society from the shackles of oppression, exploitation, ethnocentrism, and hegemony [19].

An American researcher in the field of multicultural education B. Parekh sees the perspective of multicultural education in the intention to free the child from the ethnocentric circle and open her eyes to other cultures, societies and lifestyles, mentality. At the same time, he does not stress the complete oblivion of his native culture, on the contrary, everything goes about enriching the experience and outlook of children [17].

G. Baker, a well-known American scholar in the field of multicultural education, claims that ethnic diversity and racial minorities, religious groups, linguistic differences, sexual differences, physical and mental disabilities, and age groups. Consequently, multicultural education provides an opportunity for an individual to get acquainted and learn one or more cultures: the system of values that prevails in them, the way of life or the particularities of the speech of representatives of each ethnic group. In multicultural education, emphasis is placed on the personality as a representative of a certain nationality and the preservation of its cultural identity [5].

Like a three dimensional the concept, “multicultural education” is emphasized by J. Banks, namely: an idea or concept; educational reform and process.

As an idea, multicultural education promotes the fact that all students, regardless of their sexual, social, ethnic, racial and cultural characteristics, should have equal educational opportunities.

As educational reform, multicultural education is intended to introduce appropriate changes in schools and other educational institutions and provide opportunities for students from all social classes, sexual, racial and cultural groups to obtain equal conditions for education.

As a process, multicultural education is marked by continuity, the goal of this process is equality in education and increased student performance. At the same time, John Banks believes that these goals will never be realized because they are too ideal [7, p. 3-4].

In American scholarly opinion, C. Bennett's view of multicultural education is a way of education and training based on democratic values and beliefs and endorses cultural pluralism within the limits of cultural diverse societies and the independent world. [9, p. 11].

This idea is developed by P. Tayedt, who argues that multicultural education is an educational process that encourages children to develop their own dignity, to show sympathy for people of different cultural backgrounds and to take advantage of equal opportunities to achieve full success [20, p. 18].

S. Nieto notes that multicultural education is a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. It denies and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and in society, and encourages pluralism (ethnic, linguistic, religious, economic, gender), of which there are students, communities and teachers. Multiculture education penetrates the curricula and teaching methods used in schools, and also enhances the interaction between teachers, students and parents, promotes democratic principles of social justice. S. Nieto mentions seven main features of multicultural education:

- multicultural education is anti-racial education;
- multicultural education is basic;
- multicultural education is important for all students;
- multicultural education is a widespread education;
- multicultural education is a process;
- multicultural education is a critical pedagogy [16, p. 307-308].

Consequently, the analysis of different interpretations by American scientists makes it possible to conclude that multicultural education is an integral part of the current system of education in the United States, whose main task is to ensure equal opportunities for children to receive proper education and upbringing. It is based on the premise that the main goal of public education is to promote the growth of intellectual, social and personal potential in virtually all students.

The ideas of multicultural education in the United States have evolved and have become a significant contribution to understanding the difficulties associated with racism, low socioeconomic status of immigrants, sexism, and so on.

Consequently, multicultural education is constantly in a transforming process, the pace, content and form of which are influenced by historical, economic, political and social factors of the United States.

Multicultural education is the formation of a new generation whose main task is to involve all children in quality education, help in adapting to life in a multicultural society, cultivating a sense of respect, tolerance to cultural values, regardless of individual characteristics and origin.

Let us focus on the multicultural education of the university students in the USA, its pros and cons.

The recent research presented multi-dimensional aspect of the term in higher education preparation.

Our attention is firstly paid to the first formal adoption of a diversity requirement in the general education core occurred at Denison University in Ohio in 1979. By 1992, however, a survey conducted by researchers Richard Light and Jeanette Cureton reported that 34 percent of colleges and universities had multicultural general education requirements, 12 percent of which were on domestic diversity; 29 percent on global diversity; and 57 percent addressing both. Of those colleges queried, one-third offered course work in ethnic and women's studies, while a far greater number—54 percent—had introduced multiculturalism into their departmental course offerings. It is not surprising that there is more activity at departmental levels than at general education levels, since, in most cases, general education needs majority support from the faculty

to secure approval. But departmental activity is unevenly dispersed and some departments and divisions have almost no multicultural courses or requirements [12, p. 24-29].

A more encompassing term, diversity is meant to represent all perspectives from groups that have traditionally been excluded from or insufficiently examined in the curriculum. The term also takes into account the external forces that influence how academic institutions meet their educational objectives. The legal struggle over affirmative action in admissions, for example, no longer rests on moral grounds of remedy for past discrimination, but on the compelling interest of the state in the educational value of having a diverse student body.

Since the end of World War II, U. S. colleges and universities have become increasingly more diverse (by social class, race, gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, and people with disabilities), even though some of these changes have often been fiercely resisted. Some demographic changes occurred not simply because of federal troops but also because of federal legislation. In the 1940s the G. I. Bill made college affordable for vast numbers of working-class men. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 opened the door of academia to African Americans and other people of color, while the Immigration Act of 1965 opened U.S. borders to new sections of the globe. Title IX radically altered how women fared on campuses, just as the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 removed barriers that previously barred many aspiring students. Other demographic shifts were fueled by policy changes or new programs, such as the establishment of community college systems, the creation of programs of continuing education for women, and the creation of the Equal Opportunities Commission. By the end of the twentieth century higher education had actually come close to fulfilling democracy's highest goal of an educated citizenry. In 2000 nearly 75 percent of high school graduates went on to some college experience within two years of graduating. The student profile in the late 1990s was 55 percent female and 28 percent students of color. Forty-three percent of students were over 25 years old, and nearly that same percentage were first generation college students [13, p. 3-9].

Calls for inclusion stem from the argument that a singular, Eurocentric perspective has had negative consequences for individual students and for the larger society. Proponents of diversity in higher education argue that excluding diverse perspectives in the curriculum has truncated students' learning, leaving them ill-prepared to function in an increasingly diverse democracy. The very purpose of higher education – to deepen students' understanding of what is known, how it has come to be known, and how to build on previous knowledge to create new knowledge – is thus undermined by eliminating the voices of those whose experiences differ from those traditionally represented. Such exclusions reveal an inconsistency between the rhetoric and the practice of democracy. Correcting this inconsistency eventually became the cornerstone of the civil rights, women's rights, and other movements that have pushed the higher education community to offer a more inclusive curriculum.

Conversely, opponents of diversity in the curriculum argue against including African American, Latina/Latino, Chicano, Asian American, women's, and gay and lesbian studies in the higher education curriculum, claiming that these issues are more appropriately discussed and debated in the political arena rather than in academia. They contend that institutions of higher education should be reserved for the pursuit of objective knowledge and truth through rigorous disciplinary study. Critics of diversity education claim that the focus on differences, which is often a characteristic of general-education diversity requirements, weakens national unity and has only a limited (if any) role in institutions of higher learning. They contend that the curriculum of higher education should be the basis for inquiry, discovery, and dissemination of knowledge, open to students capable of contributing to its development, and devoid of social politics. Initially, diversity in the 1960s and 1970s was located primarily in newly established special departments and programs, usually organized around a single group, such as Asian-American studies, women's studies, or African-American studies. By emerging new multicultural curricula these specialized areas of knowledge eventually spawned hundreds of programs at colleges and universities in what came to be called mainstreaming, integrating, or

transforming the curriculum. Such programs sought to incorporate new knowledge into existing courses, some of which were within a major course of study, others of which were in general education courses.

Eventually, the research on multicultural education began to lay out a compelling case that being attentive to diverse voices provides lenses through which richer conceptions of social, political, economic, and natural phenomenon could be revealed, underscoring that there are many ways of knowing. While a general education requirement alone is insufficient in and of itself to prepare students for the complexity of the diverse societies they will work and live in, it is a solid and significant start.

Before examining the emerging contours of twenty-first-century diversity requirements, it is important to recognize their context within general education as a whole. Some institutions, such as Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Bloomfield College in New Jersey, and Brookdale Community College in New Jersey, have invested significant institutional funds over many years in what they argue is a more pervasive strategy of infusion across the curriculum, rather than relying on a single required diversity course in general education. Nonetheless, because students take a prescribed number of general education courses, lodging diversity within core requirements is one visible indicator of an institution's commitment to diversity. While it is not the only measure, or even a sufficient measure, embedding diversity within general education makes a clear statement that knowledge about diversity is viewed as an essential component of a college education.

Light and Cureton also found that four-year colleges are more active than two-year colleges in integrating multiculturalism into the curriculum, despite the greater diversity of the student body in community colleges. While demographics clearly drive the push for diversity requirements and courses, they are, it seems, not the only factor. Public institutions exceed private colleges in the number of multicultural indicators, just as research universities have more comprehensive multicultural efforts than either comprehensives or liberal arts colleges. Not surprisingly, geographical regions varied significantly in the amount of multicultural programming, with the Mid-Atlantic states and the West outpacing New England and the South [12].

Nowadays a majority (58 percent) of institutions with such requirements demand that students take one course; while 42 percent require two or more courses. Not surprisingly, the most common model, surfacing at 68 percent of the AAC&U survey respondents, asks students to take one diversity course among many offerings. Typically these courses examine attitudes and cultures that are different from the dominant culture. At the University of Arizona, students can take a class that focuses on gender, race, class, or ethnicity, while the requirement at the University of Maryland focuses on all those plus non-Western culture as well.

Some institutions include several courses, but more restrictively define their purpose. At the University of Michigan, for instance, while there are many different courses to choose from, each course needs to pay attention to (1) race, racism, and ethnicity; (2) intolerance and resulting inequality; and (3) comparisons across race, religion, ethnicity, religion, social class, or gender.

The advantage of a more flexible diversity requirement is that it creates fewer turf battles between departments, is more easily approved by curriculum committees, and often needs less faculty development because the people who already have the expertise in a given area submit their existing courses as possible choices for the diversity requirement. These broad diversity requirements typically involve people across disciplines. When paired with faculty development opportunities, as it is at the University of Maryland, they can be a significant source for change in the curriculum overall, since newly acquired faculty expertise and perspectives will extend beyond the approved general-education diversity courses. The disadvantage of this approach is that without more tightly defined learning goals for the students, it is not always clear exactly what knowledge the institutions want students to acquire from taking such wide-ranging diversity courses. Students taking a course in twelfth-century Chinese art, for example, will learn very different things than those taking a course on the U.S. civil rights movement.

By contrast, only 17 percent of respondents in AAC&U's survey require all students to take a single diversity course that is part of a more tightly defined core curriculum. The great advantage of required cores is that every student is introduced to diversity issues, regardless of their major. Implementing a core curriculum, especially a newly designed one, typically calls for offering faculty development opportunities, which will, as a by-product, result in widespread influence on the content and pedagogy of many other courses outside the core.

Having a required core curriculum seems to work more easily and effectively at smaller institutions, for obvious staffing reason, but there are examples of large research universities implementing core curricula as well. The State University of New York at Buffalo, with approximately 16,000 under-graduate students, has such a core curriculum. After careful piloting and faculty development workshops, it instituted a well-thought-out required core course called "American Pluralism and the Search for Equality". While a variety of different courses meet the curriculum requirement, all such approved courses are united by their commitment to a common set of learning goals for students. Buffalo's American Pluralism Subcommittee included specifically defined learning goals for students, such as: (1) to develop within students a sense of informed, active citizenship by focusing on contemporary and historical issues of race, ethnicity, gender, social class, and religious sectarianism in American life; (2) to provide students with an intellectual awareness of the causes and effects of structured inequality and prejudicial exclusion in American society; (3) to provide students with increased self-awareness of what it means in our culture to be a person of their own gender, race, class, ethnicity, and religion as well as an understanding of how these categories affect those who are different from themselves; (4) to expand students' ability to think critically, and with an open mind, about controversial contemporary issues; and (5) to provide students with an intellectual awareness of diverse visions of the future as well as processes leading to a more equitable society [3].

A much smaller institution, St. Edward's University in Texas (approximately 3,300 undergraduates), adopted a fifty-seven-hour core that includes two first-year courses, "The American Experience" and "American Dilemmas". They have also adopted a vertical core that extends from freshman through senior year, thus allowing students opportunities to develop advanced analytical skills and revisit issues over time. By their senior year, students are asked to use insights acquired through their major to solve a pressing social problem as part of their senior culminating education requirement.

Yet another example of an interesting approach to a core diversity requirement is the regionally focused one adopted by the University of Memphis, where the general-education core requirement, "Cultural Confrontations", focuses on the relationships among the three major populations in the mid-South: European Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans. Parallel comparative courses that analyze power and justice can be found in the expanding number of general education courses focused on world cultures.

A newly developing approach to diversity that is located both in general-education diversity courses and in electives and majors focuses on what is called service learning, or, less frequently, community-based learning. Such credit-bearing courses teach students new intellectual knowledge about diversity, while also providing hands-on experiences that help them become more informed and skilled in creating more just societies. At Rutgers University in New Jersey, the Civic Education and Community Service Program combines community service with academic investigations about how to work alongside people with diverse backgrounds, while also teaching students more about what is needed to sustain an egalitarian, pluralist democracy. Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Connecticut created more than seventeen courses within two years' time that integrated service learning into academic courses that sought to expand students' capacities to be nation builders through a commitment to justice. Wagner College, located on Staten Island in New York, adopted a new curriculum in 1998 that integrates service learning as a thread woven through all four years as part of the general education requirement.

Whatever model is chosen for diversity requirements, courses across all these designs are

more frequently organized through a comparative approach between groups, rather than by focusing on a single group alone. Conceptually, more courses also use an integrative analysis by helping students learn how to analyze multiple kinds of intersecting differences, either within a single group (studying gender or ethnic differences within Latinos/Latinas) or across several groups (studying class and religious differences across European Americans, African Americans, and Asian Americans). Diversity courses within general education also more typically explore moral and ethical questions, and are more likely to analyze systems of injustice, intolerance, inequality, and discrimination—as exemplified in Oregon State University’s general education course, “Diversity, Power, and Discrimination” [4].

Another emerging characteristic of diversity courses in general education is their interdisciplinary approach and the reliance on collaborative, student-centered pedagogies where intergroup dialogue and engagement are deliberately cultivated. In addition, there are also growing examples of innovative couplings between curricular and co-curricular activities, often but not exclusively incorporating living/learning residential dimensions to enrich classroom experiences. In an effort to escape the too prevalent option of choosing either a course on U.S. diversity or a course on world cultures, there is some evidence that more institutions are seeking ways to explore the interconnections between global and domestic diversity, sometimes by teaching U.S. diversity within a global context.

Higher education is therefore precious mediating public space where, unlike most of American society, different groups live, study, and think side by side. As such, it offers the genuinely authentic daily experience of a multicultural, pluralist, democratic environment. If higher education can seize the rich educational and societal benefits inherent in such a mix, it promises to have far-reaching consequences on the quality of the nation’s, and the world’s, communal life.

Research has conclusively shown that a racially and ethnically diverse student body has far-ranging and significant benefits for all students. Students learn better in such an environment and are better prepared to become active participants in a pluralistic, democratic society once they leave school. Patterns of racial segregation can be broken by diversity experiences in institutions of higher education.

Of course, general education courses cannot carry the intellectual and moral weight of accomplishing all this in one required course, or even in a sequenced series of courses. Each institution needs to take a holistic look at the entire curriculum, the interrelationship between general education and the major, the cumulative kinds of developmental experiences a student might have in progressing towards a degree, and the increasingly complex and demanding questions students are able to pose and answer as they are challenged to use their new knowledge and civic, intercultural capacities to address real-world problems. If students graduate with the ability to think critically, act responsibly, and negotiate borders that might otherwise divide, then higher education will come closer to meeting its historic mission of not only advancing knowledge, but contributing to stable, more equitable democratic societies.

R e f e r e n c e s :

1. AACTE (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education). No One Model American: A Statement on multicultural education // *Journal of Teacher education*. – 1973. – № 24. – 264 p.
2. *An Educator’s Guide to Diversity in the Classroom* (Houghton Mifflin Guide) / Grant C., Cooper J., H. Mifflin. – New York : Teacher College Press, 2002. – 47 p.
3. Association of American Colleges and University. *American Pluralism and the College Curriculum: Higher Education in a Diverse Democracy*. – Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1995.
4. Association of American Colleges and University. *Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community*. – Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1995.
5. *Baker G. C. Planning and Organizing for Multicultural Instruction* / G. C. Baker. – USA : Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994. – 363 p.

6. *Banks J. A.* Introduction to multicultural education / J. A. Banks. – Boston, MA : Allyn & Bacon, 1999. – 164 p.
7. *Banks J.* Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives / J. Banks, C. Banks. – Hoboken, NJ : John Wiley and Sons, 2004. – 464 p.
8. *Baptiste M. L.* Competencies toward multiculturalism / H. P. Baptiste, M. L. Baptiste (Eds.) // Multicultural teacher education: Preparing educators to provide educational equity. – Washington, DC : American Association of Colleges for teacher Education, 1980. – P. 44-72.
9. *Bennett C. I.* Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice / C. I. Bennett. – Needham Heights, MA : Allyn and Bacon, 1995. – 466 p.
10. *Boyer J. B.* Multicultural education: Product or process? / J. B. Boyer. – Kansas City, KS : Kansas Urban Education Centre, 1985. – 22 p.
11. *Gay G.* Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice / G. Gey. – New York : Teacher College Press, 2000. – 339 p.
12. *L. Richard.* The Quiet Revolution: Eleven Facts About Multiculturalism and the Curriculum / Light Richard, Cureton Jeannette. – Change 24 (1):, 1992. – P. 24-29.
13. *M. Manning.* Diversity and Democracy in Higher Education / Marable Manning. – Race and Reason 3, 1997. – P. 3-91.
14. Multicultural Curriculum Matrices [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : www.palmbeachschools.org/multicultural/MulticulturalCurriculum/index.as.
15. NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) // Standards for the accreditation of teacher education. – Washington, DC : Author, 1977. – 67 p.
16. *Nieto S.* Affirming diversity / S. Nieto. – New York, NY : Longman, 1992. – 213 p.
17. *Parakh B.* The Concept of Multi-Cultural Education / B. Parakh // Multicultural Education. – 1986. – P. 19-31.
18. *Sarap M.* The politics of multicultural education / M. Sarap. – London, UK : Routledge and Kegan, 1986. – 325 p.
19. *Swick J.* Multicultural Learning through Family Involvement / J. Swick, G. Boutte, I. Scoy // Dimensions. – 1994. – V. 22. – No 4. – P. 17-21.
20. *Tosqueville A.* Democracy in America [Volumes I, II] / A. Tocqueville. – N.-Y. : Bantam Classic Book, 2000. – 943 p.

Безух Ю. С. Навчання студентів у диверсифікованому середовищі в університетах США.

Проведене дослідження дало підстави ствержувати, що диверсифікованість факультету університету, співробітників та студентів впливає на силу, продуктивність та інтелектуальний розвиток особистості. Саме диверсифікованість в розумінні досвіду, віку, фізичних здібностей, віросповідання, раси, етнічності, статі слугує вагомим ґрунтом для всебічного розвитку студента як особистості. З'ясовано, що інтегрування диверсифікованості як необхідної складової у навчальні дисципліни є необхідною константою, що сприяє формуванню інтелектуального світогляду, пізнавального стилю; та озброїти майбутнього випусника арсеналом знань та навичок необхідних для функціонування в динамічній інтелектуальній спільноті.

Ключові слова: полікультурна освіта, поліетнічна освіта, диверсифікованість, навчальна програма.

Безух Ю. С. Обучение студентов в диверсифицированной среде в университетах США.

Проведенное исследование дало основания утверждать, что диверсифицированность факультета университета, сотрудников и студентов влияет на силу, производительность и интеллектуальное развитие личности. Именно диверсифицированность в понимании опыта, возраста, физических способностей, вероисповедания, расы, этничности, пола служит весомой почвой для всестороннего развития студента как личности. Выяснено, что интегрирование диверсифицированности как необходимой составляющей в учебные дисциплины является необходимой константой, способствует формированию интеллектуального мировоззрения, познавательного стиля; и вооружит будущего выпускника арсеналом знаний и навыков необходимых для функционирования в динамическом интеллектуальном сообществе.

Ключевые слова: поликультурное образование, полиэтничное образование, диверсифицированность, учебная программа.