
Resolving Cultural Ambiguity: Rethinking The Sustainable Development Goals For Global Inclusion

Safiha

Ph.D, Research Scholar, Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad

Email:samreensafiha@gmail.com

Pakeeza Khatoon

Ph.D, Research Scholar, Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad

Email: Pakeezahasan354@gmail.com

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17136177>

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 22-08-2025

Published: 10-09-2025

Keywords:

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Cultural Ambiguity, Global Inclusion, Cultural Diversity, Local Knowledge, Sustainable Development.

ABSTRACT

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are the goals embraced by the United Nations in 2015 with an aim of solving challenges facing the world, poverty, inequality, environmental sustainability, and peace. However, their implementation and interpretation often face challenges due to cultural ambiguities and local variations in social values, practices, and governance structures. The key to bridging such cultural differences and making sure that the SDGs help to encourage global inclusion is a subtle interpretation of cultural diversity and context. This essay examines how cultural ambiguities interact with the SDGs on the basis that a universal approach to the global development process will inevitably exclude certain groups of people and will not take into consideration local requirements and desires. The idea of cultural ambiguities emerges where the universal structures cannot explain the abundance of the local contexts, histories and values. Since the SDGs aim at establishing a common vision of sustainable development, they tend to be problematic in terms of fitting into the specifics of various cultural and socio-political situations. This disconnection may have unplanned effects like extraction of foreign



priorities that are in conflict with local bodies of knowledge and conventions. This cultural ambivalence has to be bridged so that the real cooperation of the world can be achieved and an inclusive progress can be made. The SDGs can be redefined to encourage truly global inclusion by using local expertise and customs and by embedding community-oriented methodologies. The current paper relies on the case studies in other cultural settings to demonstrate how the misalignment of cultures may influence the effects of SDGs and how the local adjustment to the circumstances can make development more sustainable and fair. In addition, the paper will evaluate how cultural dialogue, international cooperation, and respect toward cultural autonomy can be used to reframe the SDGs. Considering the world of globalization and growing interconnectedness, cultural ambiguity is not only a challenge, but also a chance to construct a global system of sustainable development that does not only glorify diversity, but also encourages shared development. The study presented in this paper is part of the current discourse on global development because it offers novel approaches to making SDGs more culturally sensitive, contextually mindful, and inclusive, which, in the end, will bring a more equitable and sustainable world.

INTRODUCTION

The sustainability is usually thought of as a three pillar paradigm: economic, environmental, and social. Nonetheless, the process of sustainable development has a cultural pillar that is founded on its worth as a tool of collective narration, its importance in community/network cohesion, and its diversity and difference view is core to sustainability. Culture is transformative and is a component that cannot be overlooked in the attainment of the dreams of a future that lives to sustain. This leads to the fact that Culture Action Europe (CAE) requires architecture that introduces culture as its own axis to the structure of sustainable development.

In 2015, the United Nations implemented the Sustainable Development Goals - in order to solve poverty, inequality, global warming, environmental destruction, and other relevant global issues (United Nations, 2015). However, culture poses uncertainties that deter the practical implementation of goals (Van Poeck



and Vandenabeele, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995). International frameworks that are implemented consistently can ignore the local cultural aspects. This tension is instigated by the uniformity of the development goal with the cultural values peculiar to different regions (UNESCO, 2015; CAE, 2021).

Misalignment of cultures can lead to the enhancement of inequities through the development of tensions, and the presence of marginalization of local and indigenous people with the traditional knowledge and practices that are oriented towards sustainability (UNESCO, 2019). Giving credit to different cultural complexities and considering them in Sustainable Development Goals strategies will be critical towards inclusive responsive context sensitive development.

Cultural ambiguity arises as a result of policies making assumptions about cultural homogeneity without taking into consideration the plurality of value system as well as traditions and knowledge systems that exist in respective localities. The ability to conceive and work towards an alternative of their actual state, or that of their community, which is known as the capacity to aspire, is a cultural process according to Appadurai (2004). When aspirations formed and inhabiting specific social space are overlooked as development frame, development strategies might serve to reproduce any historical marginalizations of the populations and settings to which they are aspiring to serve.

Western-centric views have dominated and influenced procedures that pursue sustainable development. Consequently, sustainable development agendas have been biased in trying to spread uniform solutions at the cost of indigenous knowledge regimes and traditional practices that have sustainably-mined the local environmental equilibrium over millennia (Throsby, 2008). The need to recast global agendas that bear various kinds of cultural experience and expression demands a decolonial posture of working with foundational ecological knowledge reliable, valid, and structurally present in decision-making (Pascual, 2016).

In addition, to tackle the issue of culture in order to promote sustainable development, there is a need to take a divergence. power dispersion in a significant fashion. UCLG (2015) describes how local governments can identify and safeguard cultural rights and facilitate community participation, which are all critical in the realization of inclusive types of sustainability. Similarly, UNDP (2016) suggests that the policy rooted in culture is one of the ways to address inequities and unobstructed development. The two agents are capable of cultivating, justifying, and produce leaders in an orientation and strategy founded on the provision of cultural rights. The paper will explore the relationship between cultures and SDG development and the possible ways of how cultural ambiguities can be successfully reduced or eradicated in order to inform a more inclusive world development agenda.



CULTURAL AMBIGUITY

One of the concepts in sociology is culture. It entails what people in a society believe in, the behaviours, what they share in terms of objects and others. Culture is not absolute, it evolves with time as societies evolve. Technological progress, economic changes and social movements are all contributing to alteration of culture.

The cultural ambiguity also has phases. There are occasions when it is stigmatized and other occasions when it is accepted. This ambiguity usually becomes evident when a dominant culture responds to the perceived threat of the minority cultures or when a subordinate culture is struggling to liberate itself of cultural oppression. The growing literature on postcolonialism and current debates in Europe and elsewhere on the topics of multiculturalism and multiculturalism point to this problem.

Cultural ambiguity arises as a result of policies making assumptions about cultural homogeneity without taking into consideration the plurality of value system as well as traditions and knowledge systems that exist in respective localities. The ability to conceive and work towards an alternative of their actual state, or that of their community, which is known as the capacity to aspire, is a cultural process according to Appadurai (2004). When aspirations formed and inhabiting specific social space are overlooked as development frame, development strategies might serve to reproduce any historical marginalizations of the populations and settings to which they are aspiring to serve.

Western-centric views have dominated and influenced procedures that pursue sustainable development. Consequently, sustainable development agendas have been biased in trying to spread uniform solutions at the cost of indigenous knowledge regimes and traditional practices that have sustainably-mined the local environmental equilibrium over millennia (Throsby, 2008). The need to recast global agendas that bear various kinds of cultural experience and expression demands a decolonial posture of working with foundational ecological knowledge reliable, valid, and structurally present in decision-making (Pascual, 2016).

Moreover, when attempting to address culture to advocacy the idea of sustainable development, there is a need to shift the perspectives that are dispersive of power in a meaningful sense. UCLG (2015) describes how local governments can identify and safeguard cultural rights and facilitate community participation, which are all critical in the realization of inclusive types of sustainability. Similarly, UNDP (2016) suggests that the policy rooted in culture is one of the ways to address inequities and unobstructed



development. The two agents are capable of cultivating, justifying, and produce leaders in an orientation and strategy founded on the provision of cultural rights.

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Cultural dimension of sustainable development has been in a serious momentum in recent years, especially following the integration of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the United Nations in 2015. The SDGs acknowledge the synergy between social, economic, and environmental sustainability, and their application has been criticized as failing to take into consideration the cultural aspect (UNESCO, 2015; CAE, 2021). This has resulted in the rise of cultural ambiguity, in which universal models of development come against local customs, principles and world-views.

Culture, although only briefly mentioned in the SDG framework (Goal 4: Quality Education and Goal 11: Sustainable Cities, Goal 12: Sustainable Consumption, and others), will nonetheless remain the marginal aspect. This neglect is criticized by Pascual (2016). Pascual (2016) noted that the global development policy tends to view cultural practices as just an instrument rather than a change agent. Appadurai (2004) believes that development programs fail to capture such a capacity to aspire that is created within cultural settings and mobilizes inequality.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

All the United Nations Member States have adopted the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development, which offers a development roadmap of 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), aimed at eliminating poverty, creating inclusive development, and safeguarding the environment on a global basis. Though it has a universal vision, the SDG framework has been subject to criticism due to its insensitivity to cultures and its irrelevance in contexts. The issue of culture ambiguity, which has been characterized as lack of the connection between global development agendas and the local cultural values has emerged as a major hindrance to successful realization of the SDGs within different cultures.

Culturally blind policy in the multicultural and postcolonial context tended to lead to the dislocation of development or the unwillingness of certain communities and a marginalization of the Indigenous epistemologies, frameworks and approaches. Though the SDGs do acknowledge culture in some of their goals including education (Goal 4), sustainable cities (Goal 11) and responsible consumption and production (Goal 12), it is not adequately addressed in enabling culture as a core principle of sustainability. Consequently, this research paper is critical in exploring the connection of the SDGs as a



barrier to cultural ambiguity as well as how cultural sensitivity can be a means to establishing a more inclusive, equitable and sustainable world.

OBJECTIVES

- 1.To examine the idea of cultural ambiguity and what it means for sustainable development in different socio-cultural contexts.
- 2.To analyze how culture and heritage are represented in the official Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) documents and policies.
- 3.To evaluate the importance of cultural sensitivity in the development, implementation, and localization of SDG policies.
- 4.To identify and discuss some of the main challenges with cultural ambiguity in global sustainability frameworks, especially around participation, governance, and digital equity.
- 5.To discuss directions for future work to incorporate local knowledge systems, cultural identities, and grassroots involvement in global sustainability frameworks

1.Concept of cultural ambiguity for sustainable development in different socio-cultural context

Cultural ambiguity occurs when global values like the SDGs fail to resonate with the culturally oriented world views, practices and identities of locals. It often occurs when development policies constructed through the concepts of universalism fail to take into account what different groups of people are going through in their lives. In such scenarios, the local communities will consider the objectives and targets of the world as alien, colonizing or unimportant. Ambiguity in cultures may reduce the capacity of communities to interact, delaying the introduction of policies, as well as increasing the suspicion of development organizations. Since the study aims to investigate cultural ambiguity, the role of competing conceptualizations of sustainability in explaining local buy-in and performance of SDG programs will be addressed, specifically, in multicultural or indigenous contexts, where cultural identity defines the existence and makes decisions. This concept is significant to understand in developing inclusive and contextually sensitive strategies of sustainable development.

Cultural ambiguity is the difficulty that comes about as a result of differences in values, traditions, languages, and social norms that affect international collaboration in sustainability projects. The major cultural ambiguities are:



- Different Conceptions of Sustainability: Other societies have different conceptions of sustainability and this influences the process of consensus-building.
- Resistance to change: Local traditions can lead to the resistance of innovative ideas and practices by the young people, ethnic minorities and rural communities. Scientists should be encouraged to preserve traditional approaches to conservation of genetic materials of nations such as genetic variety of their seeds and other related fair and fair heritage sharing benefits.
- Language and Communication Barriers: The inability to implement sustainability-related policies can have misinterpretation that will result in lack of effective implementation.
- Institutional Differences: The forms of governance vary among cultures and this affects the way sustainability policies are implemented.

2.SDG Text Containing “Culture” and “Heritage”

Despite the overall global picture of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) they can offer, there are not many direct mentions of culture and heritage. The few cases that mention it emphasize the need to implement the concept of cultural diversity, the need to support local customs and heritage in a larger development process.

The major examples are the following:

- ❖ Goal 4: Quality Education
 - Target 4.7: By 2030, make certain that every learner has developed the knowledge and skills that could advance sustainable development, respect of cultural diversity, global citizenship, human rights, gender equality, and propagation of a culture of peace and nonviolence.
 - Indicative 4.7.1: the degree to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education towards sustainable development are integrated into national education policy, curriculum, teacher education and student achievement.
- ❖ Goal 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth
 - Target 8.9: By 2030, develop and adopt policies that will encourage sustainable tourism, create jobs and uphold local culture and products.
 - 8.9.1 Indicator: The contribution of tourism to gross domestic product (GDP) and the rate of increase of this share to the economy.
- ❖ Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities



- Target 11.4: Reinforce the fight against the degradation and destruction of cultural and natural heritage in the world.
- 11.4.1: Expenditure on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage by type of source of financing (public, private), type of heritage (cultural or natural) and by level of government (national, regional, local).
- ❖ Goal 12: Responsible Consumption and Production
- Target 12.b: Prepare and deploy instruments to gauge sustainable development outcomes of sustainable tourism that encourage creation of jobs and the encouragement of local culture and products.
- 12.b.1: Expenditure on Standardized accounting tools can be implemented to determine the economic and environmental appeal of sustainable tourism.

These sources (UNDESA, 2022) testify to the fact that culture and heritage are recognised as part of SDG, but their contribution is mainly limited to particular objectives, instead of promoting them as a cross-cutting sustainability pillar. The narrow framing is dangerous because it would bring culture to the periphery of the discussion as an additional issue, instead of seeing it as a core of sustainable and inclusive development

3. Cultural sensitivity in the formulation, implementation, and localization of SDG policies

Stakeholders must be aware of cultural sensitivities for overcoming cultural ambiguity. For example,

- Culturally adaptable SDG policies through Inclusive policy frameworks. Cultural policy is to recognise and value cultural diversity and include the goals related to people's ability to produce, disseminate and create their own culture, placing a prioritisation on the most marginalised individuals and group (Caruson et al., 2020; Suárez, 2020). It is also about intercultural communication and cultural involvement in programs and policies dealing with internal displacement, migration, and refuge. Participation and Community engagement, where local people are involved in decision making processes that combine fundamental knowledge with sustainable action.
- Education and Awareness to advocate for intercultural understanding using education at highlighting the importance of the SDGs on a global level.
 - Adaptive Governance: Establishing adaptable governance frameworks that preserve sustainability goals while taking cultural variances into account.



- Combine cultural elements, the community knowledge, customs and belief of the people of different communities, into grassroot initiative on environmental sustainability. Promote traditional knowledge and practices to enable people to sustainably use natural resources.
- Develop a local initiative that links educational policy to cultural policy. Also ensure that there is an educational curriculum in primary and secondary education addressing cultural skills and knowledge, intercultural dialogue, diversity, tangible and intangible heritage, and cultural rights.
- Provide educational programs in cultural institutions (including those established as museums, theatres, libraries, and cultural centres), heritage buildings, archaeological sites and structures, as well as in programs (including festivals and cultural programs), for formal and informal learning.
- Cultural infrastructures providing fair and affordable access to cultural life and participation are part of the high-quality, reliable, and sustainable infrastructure that everyone deserves.
- Cultural participation is empowering and enabling the inclusion of everyone, regardless of age, gender, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic and/or other status. Artists and creative workers can participate in research, development, and innovation processes in diverse industrial areas (cultural events, festivals and so on).

4. Key challenges in addressing cultural ambiguity within global sustainability agendas, with particular emphasis on inclusivity, governance, and digital equity

Meeting the objective of cultural ambiguity is fraught with numerous layers of problematics, in particular, in terms of inclusive governance, equal representation, and the digital divide widening. This objective acknowledges numerous institutional and structural obstacles that exclude cultural elements in being actively incorporated into the sustainability agendas, which include the dominant discourse of Western influenced development, inadequate involvement of communities, failure to fund cultural projects, and nonexistence of minority point of view in decision making tables. As the use of digital infrastructure as the main means of communicating and learning increases, the digital exclusion has emerged as another way of cultural marginalization. Societies that lack digital capacity or capabilities to communicate using the global infrastructure are not taking part in the discussion of sustainability, which is affecting inequality. This aspect of the research factors in how all these disparities are contributing to hindering actual cultural inclusion as well as assessing capacity in the current governance frameworks that can be used to promote intercultural cooperation and representation.

To open the door to the contribution of culture to inclusive and equitable quality education and to enable opportunities of life long learning to all; we have to first wrestle with some of the interlocking key



challenges which lie beneath these areas. Altogether, we have outlined five key issues: (1) digital capacity, (2) cross-sectoral collaboration, (3) non-formal systems of learning, (4) access and representation and (5) policy regimes.

4.1 Digital capacity

- Competences, contents, access Digital capacity is the most pertinent contributory issue of culture and education. Digital capacity examines the digital infrastructure and access imbalances like the absence of captures like skills/competences required to comprehend and adopt digital means and tools of communicating, mediating, and creating content. This is not only a threat to the potential of Europe to put the UN 2030 Agenda in full effect but also beyond the culture and education sphere. The following points were underlined by the working group:
- The full potential of digital resources remains largely untapped: future and existing professionals in the culture sector need to be trained to create capacity in this area; • Full and equitable access requires high-quality digital content: although there is an increasing effort to digitise content, there is still much to be done; • Environmental impact of digital technology: It has not been sufficiently investigated. More research and awareness is also required concerning the repercussion on the user of the continuous use of digital environments. Science, arts and humanities can and must be used in raising the awareness of the implications of both to the public. Such areas can also serve to develop a more nuanced conception of the transformative power of digital technologies and of digital citizenship.
- Culture and education in Europe is crucially stratified: not only the absence of digital infrastructure (in rural areas) but also the fragility of the cultural infrastructure (in its capacity to reach citizens at risk of social exclusion) threatens to strengthen rather than combat such inequalities.

4.2. Absence of cross-sectoral practices

- The necessity of cross-sector approaches is acknowledged in the education and culture sectors, yet so far, these practices are not promoted, and knowledge and expertise remain created and stored in disciplinary silos. There must be increased collaboration at all levels to provide access to high-quality education to all citizens: educational institutions could not cope with this task on their own, without the involvement of other participants and stakeholders. We face quite a number of problems today in an attempt to have more structural cooperation:



- Cultural institutions sometimes cooperate with schools, researchers, and representatives of other fields. They are seeking to make collaborations with other organizations in Europe. Nonetheless, such attempts are ad hoc or short-lived, and they have difficulties in becoming a routine. The same occurs at the formal education level, where the implementation of STEAM approach (STEM plus the arts -humanities, language arts, dance, drama, music, visual arts, design and new media) is gradually taking shape, yet is yet to become a reality and practice at all levels of education.
- Education and cultural institutions have little to no communication: all of them theoretically have the same goals but the vocabulary, frameworks, processes and tools do not lend themselves easily to matching and integrating. What appears intuitively consistent in wider sets of objectives is so much more difficult to do in practice in concrete national and institutional forms.

4.3. Non-formal learning infrastructure

- In addition to the promotion of cross-sectoralism in formal education environments; minimal provision of non-formal learning infrastructure must be intensified and given an opportunity to give its full potential. Along with the formal education infrastructure encouraging intersectorism, informal learning infrastructure should be extended and given the opportunity to realize its potential. Informal education takes place in galleries, libraries, archives, museums (charisma) and arts. However, numerous barriers that impede the actual effectiveness of developing training systems during the lifespan exist. Glammers face the issue of delivery of educational resources, which are present and useful on the Internet. The cultural institutions of NGO and civil society are not thought of. Nevertheless, they have an important role in enhancing cultural involvement and enhancing life-long learning. They offer wide but disjointed access to infrastructure to culture and education, positive cultural contacts, proximity to the life experiences of its citizens, and dwell upon the expansion of rights and opportunities. Life long training and collaboration are also used to revitalize youth and volunteering as the key assets.
- It is not fair and unsatisfactory to solve access problems without representation problems. To deliver quality education which can lead to a sustainable and desirable future is to increase the rights and abilities of citizens.

4.4. Cultural diversity and representation



- It provides Europe with a wonderful opportunity to address the issues of European identity in the world arena. This balancing of the identity, diversity and integration is something that is particularly important to Europe since it is critical in fostering common values and culture diversity across the globe. Culture in itself might not be able to teach or communicate the idea of diversity as a value directly but it must be realized in concrete terms.
- The concept of accepting the mild and diverse notions of the cultural identity requires openness, talents, and consciousness. Not only is it necessary to the ordinary stakeholders but also to the entire citizens. The problem of cultural diversity and fairness of ideas is also threatened not only by cultural biases cited above but also by the absence of equitable access to resources.
- The fact that numerous EU cooperation programs dictate restrictions on third-party partners does not allow to share and investigate these perspectives within European cultural discourse. Finally, access to funding can be a very challenging endeavour not only to organisations that are not part of the EU but also to smaller European cultures. It is imperative to note the inclusion of civil society and NGOs as informal learning platforms which help improve the rights and competencies of citizens and in this regard we ought to be conscious of the restrictive self qualification requirement of 50% to programs such as Creative Europe. This tends to leave the little organizations behind but the interest is to employ fund systems that are not just formal but also truly inclusive.

4.5. Policy regimes

- Culture and education are the responsibility of the EU Member States and, regrettably, policy frameworks in such spheres can be very uneven among countries. Nevertheless, EU continues to be very important in promoting common values and setting the path ahead.
- Common and prospective assessment systems of evaluating and enhancing the role and performance of culture. These structures are required not just in the educational sector but would be significant to it, particularly in the context of the SDGs.
- Precarious working conditions in the cultural sectors is a reality prevalent in our continent. Unless we take them up in a systematic manner, artists and the cultural professionals will lack the minimum viable conditions to play their part in change-making within the European society.

5. Future work to incorporate local knowledge systems, cultural identities, and grassroots involvement in global sustainability frameworks



In order to produce indeed inclusive and fair results, to treat the SDGs as local and interactive, as opposed to prescriptive global templates, and not to produce the same global outcomes as before by the worked contexts, this research agenda concerns discovering how to make culture local in the sustainability strategies. It propagates an agenda, which entrench culture deeper into the future of the sustainability holistic frameworks by local empowerment of actors, the recognition of indigenous and traditional ecological knowledge, and the incorporation of cultural practices in policy making and policy monitoring. Some next steps to be taken are the creation of a culturally relevant SDG indicator, the development of community-based cultural infrastructure, partially through investing in education to prepare the successive generations, and promoting a co-creative process of knowledge generation between expertise and the locals. Moreover, this agenda takes into account the model of development that accepts and glorifies diversity, no longer a challenge but a source of novelty, sustainability and spiritual leadership. It is a paradigm where the global is reflective of the local, generates legitimacy; ownership processes and aspects of durability of change on the local society.

CONCLUSION

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer a global perspective of a fair, equitable and sustainable future, but the difference between having such a vision and implementing it meaningfully is that there is no way to really implement the vision without meaningfully incorporating cultural diversity and systems of local knowledge and community-based practice into development practices.

This paper has highlighted how cultural ambiguity or even a discrepancy between the specific or situated socio-cultural realities and the global policy frameworks that usually precede and predetermine them is a biggest limitation of the achievement of the SDGs especially in the post-colonial and multicultural practices. This paper presents an argument that a fourth pillar of the discourse on sustainability requires cultural inclusion by examining the constraints of the universalist approaches and by highlighting the silencing of cultural storytelling in developmental practices. The small and fragmented consideration of culture and heritage in SDGs is indicative of a greater systemic oversight that could lead to opposition to implementation at the ground-level, disconnect or even policy failure entirely. This cultural insensitivity in the implementation of SDGs prevents inclusiveness, equity, and ownership of the goals which are key principles shared by all development. The paper has also included how the policy-making, adaptive governance and participation processes can bridge the gap between global aspirations and local realities through culturally sensitive approaches. It has discussed the major issues of digital inequity, underrepresentation and disjointed cultural infrastructure that sustain inequitable, culturally inclusive



development conditions. Making the indigenous systems of knowledge, cultural heritage, and local voices converge is not an add-on, but a core condition of realizing the truly sustainable solutions. Development must change to come off-the-top prescriptions and into a participative knowledge/strategy construction model that honors the history, language, values and aspirations of the local population.

Finally, something challenging, and, to a certain degree, an opportunity, is to break the cultural ambiguity. It offers a chance to consider the SDGs as not the goals of inclusion, contextual and transformative policies to global development. When we put culture at the core of sustainable development, we will be able to develop more just, participatory and sustainable ways to go to the future where human diversity will have been embraced.

REFERENCES

1. CAE (Culture Action Europe). (2021). Culture and the Sustainable Development Goals: Challenges and opportunities. <https://cultureactioneurope.org>
2. European Commission. (2018). European framework for action on cultural heritage. <https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policies/selected-themes/cultural-heritage>
3. Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
4. UNESCO. (2015). Re|Shaping cultural policies: A decade promoting the diversity of cultural expressions for development. <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/publication/reshaping-cultural-policies-2015>
5. UNESCO. (2019). Culture 2030 indicators. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000371562>
6. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations General Assembly. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
7. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). (2022). SDG indicators metadata repository. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/>
8. Van Poeck, K., & Vandenabeele, J. (2012). Learning from sustainable development: Education in the light of public issues. *Environmental Education Research*, 18(4), 541–552. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2011.633162>



9. UNESCO & European Union. (2018). Culture for the 2030 Agenda.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000264681>

10. European Parliament. (2021). Creative Europe programme 2021–2027.

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/137/creative-europe-programme>