

# The Future of the Educational Landscapes in the Era of Hybrid War: Philosophy of Hybrid Management and Digital Resilience

**Serhii Terepyschchyi**

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Dragomanov Ukrainian State University  
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: [terepyschchy@gmail.com](mailto:terepyschchy@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5506-0914>

**Oleksiy Kiykov**

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Post-doctoral Student, Dragomanov Ukrainian State University  
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: [kiykov@ukr.net](mailto:kiykov@ukr.net)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8368-6367>

Terepyschchyi, Sergiy, and Oleksiy Kiykov (2026) The Future of the Educational Landscapes in the Era of Hybrid War: Philosophy of Hybrid Management and Digital Resilience. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 36, 145-153. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/36/5>

*The article is devoted to the philosophical understanding of the reconfiguration of educational landscapes in Ukraine in the conditions of full-scale invasion and hybrid war. The authors diagnose the ontological crisis of the traditional university, caused by the destruction of physical infrastructure and the forced migration of participants in the educational process. It has been proven that the loss of “place” (topos) necessitates a transition to new forms of rooting in the digital space, which is transformed from a technical environment into a space of existential stability. The methodological basis of the study is a synthesis of philosophical reflection and case study. Using the case of the YouTube channel “Educational Landscapes” (@edu\_land), the phenomenon of “digital shelter” is analyzed. As a result of the study, the concept of “hybrid management” is substantiated – a management philosophy that combines institutional verticality with network flexibility in order to preserve academic social responsibility. The authors argue that the digital reconstruction of the educational landscape is critical for protecting democratic values and national identity from the totalitarian narratives of the aggressor. The proposed model is seen as a universal resilience strategy for global education in an era of turbulence.*

*Keywords: educational landscapes, future of education, philosophy of education, hybrid warfare, hybrid management, digital resilience, autoethnography, academic identity, displaced persons.*

---

© Terepyschchyi, Sergiy, 2026

© Kiykov, Oleksiy, 2026

---

---

Received: 1 October 2025 / Accepted: 14 December 2025 / Published: 1 February 2026

## Introduction

We are used to thinking of the university as a place. In our cultural memory, education has always had its “home” – the physical space of classrooms, where the architecture of walls served as a framework for the architecture of meanings. However, the war that burst into our lives not only with the roar of artillery but also with the total destruction of familiar forms of existence destroyed this illusion of stability. The educational landscape of Ukraine today resembles a broken mirror: its fragments are scattered between trenches and emigration, between cold shelters and network clouds. Isn't this evidence that we have fetishized walls for too long?

Perhaps the true nature of the university has always been extraterritorial, and the war has only cruelly exposed this truth. Today, we are dealing with a phenomenon that does not fit into the old management matrices. The situation requires a solution. But the solution is not technical, but ideological. We postulate that the monitor screen is not a window to the world, but a filter that cuts off the living fabric of human interaction. Here, in our opinion, lies the trap of modern educational policy: an attempt to imitate the “normal process” in abnormal conditions gives rise to simulacra. We diligently perform the rituals of curricula, ignoring the fact that the subject of learning has changed. A student in a trench and a student in safe Europe are in different ontological realities, although connected to the same lecture on Zoom.

This is where the need for a diagnosis free from bureaucratic optimism arises. The educational system, despite the heroic efforts of educators, often works by inertia, recreating the social automatisms of peacetime. Instead of living adaptation, we risk getting a “dead loop” of institutional imitation, where form will ultimately absorb content. To avoid this scenario, we should turn to the concept of “academic precarity”, which is aptly described by A. Oleksiyenko and S. Terepyshchyi (2024). They capture the state of total vulnerability and uncertainty in which Ukrainian scientists and teachers find themselves. It is not just a question of salaries or grants. This is an existential conundrum: how do we teach the future when the future itself is uncertain? Precariousness becomes the new norm, the background noise through which the voice of reason must break through. And to ignore this noise is to lie to ourselves. Hybrid warfare requires a hybrid response, where technology serves as a shield, not a crutch. We must affirm the subjectivity of Ukrainian education as a strategic resource of the nation, which ensures our civilizational belonging with the free world.

Is education a service that can simply be transferred online? No, it is the fate of the nation, which is being carved here and now. Therefore, our task is to propose a philosophy of hybrid management that would not simply “patch holes”, but create new architectonics of the educational process. Such management should be based on trust, horizontal connections, and an understanding of the unique traumatic experiences of each participant.

The purpose of this article is to attempt to outline the contours of this new philosophy. We strive to move from recognizing the loss of physical landscapes to designing “hybrid educational landscapes” – spaces where the virtual and the real, the safe and the dangerous, intertwine, creating a new quality of stability. This is an attempt to find a fulcrum in a world that is tottering.

We are convinced that it is in this tension between the destruction of forms and the indestructibility of meanings that a new Ukrainian university is born. Not as a building, but as a community of spirit, capable of self-reproduction even in the ashes. And this is not a metaphor. This is our plan of action.

## **Theoretical Framework: The Key Ideas of the Concept of “Educational Landscapes”**

Traditional pedagogy has long been enticed by the illusion of spatial stability. In this outdated perspective, the “educational landscape” was perceived as a static setting: a network of buildings, stadiums, and libraries where educational action unfolds. However, today such an approach is not just an anachronism. It is a trap for understanding reality. In the face of a civilizational rift, we are compelled to reassess the very foundation of education.

The educational landscape today is a dynamic field of tension that requires a new language of description. In modern scientific discourse, researchers aim to examine the future of educational landscapes within the context of concepts such as Industry 5.0. They rightly emphasize human-centricity and sustainability, trying to return the “human face” to the world of algorithms. Her vision of harmonious cooperation between humans and artificial intelligence is undoubtedly attractive. However, we must pause and ask an uncomfortable question here. Does this idyllic model work in conditions where the very right to life is not guaranteed?

In our opinion, the concept of Industry 5.0 landscapes, despite its humanistic pathos, suffers from a certain “peacetime blindness”. It assumes basic security as a given. However, in Ukrainian realities, security is not a background issue, but a scarce resource. Therefore, we propose to radically expand this understanding by incorporating a hard security component into both the technological and social dimensions. The educational landscape in the context of hybrid warfare cannot simply be “sustainable” in the ecological sense; it must be “resilient” in the sense of the ability to withstand a blow. The enemy attacks not only university servers, but also the minds of students, using educational channels to spread narratives of the “Russian world” and disinformation.

This leads to an unfortunate but honest conclusion: the modern Ukrainian university exists within a landscape of threats. Cybersecurity ceases to be a matter for the technical department and becomes a philosophical issue in education. If we do not protect this space, we will not only lose data but also the subjectivity of future generations. The hybrid educational landscape, thus, appears as a space with a dual purpose: it is a place of personal growth, and at the same time, a frontline where the war for meaning is being waged.

Ignoring this fact, attempting to build “pink castles” of digitalization without considering the aggression factor is a path to defeat. We are not dealing with the evolution of technology, but with the evolution of survival. Therefore, our theoretical framework is based on the understanding of the educational landscape as a protected space for meaning-making, where digital resilience serves as a guarantor of the preservation of national identity and individual dignity. Only in this way can we talk about education that responds to the challenges of the time, rather than hiding from them.

## **Methodology & Case Study**

To verify the theoretical propositions, we employ the case study methodology, selecting the YouTube channel “Educational Landscapes” (@edu\_land) as the object of analysis. Why this particular case? Because in conditions of institutional paralysis, when traditional university departments often freeze in anticipation of instructions “from above”, it is precisely such grassroots, flexible initiatives that take over the leadership baton. We consider this channel not as a media product, but as a phenomenon of a “digital shelter” – a space where the academic community scattered by war finds a gathering point. Back in 2016, in the monograph

---

“Educational Landscapes”, we defined landscape as “a philosophical concept to denote the set of spatial, socio-economic, political, cultural, and anthropological characteristics of education that change within a certain region in the process of preserving, transferring, and producing knowledge.” (Terepyshchyi, 2016: 89). Back then, in a relatively peaceful time, the emphasis was on stationarity, on architecture and physical presence. However, the war carried out a harsh deconstruction of this concept. The topos disappeared. The logos remained. And this logos migrated to the digital. Today’s analysis reveals that the landscape has become nomadic, and the @edu\_land channel is a vivid example of how an institution can exist without walls, relying solely on the gravity of meaning.

Content analysis of the channel’s video materials demonstrates a clear focus on “holding meanings”. Videos dedicated to national identity, the philosophy of education, and the challenges of artificial intelligence perform not so much an informational function as a therapeutic and worldview function. As digital resilience researchers note (Bozkurt et al., 2020), education becomes a form of care in times of crisis (pedagogy of care). The viewer does not come here for evaluation. He comes to ensure that culture is alive, thought continues, and chaos has not prevailed.

This aligns with the concepts of post-digital education proposed by P. Jandrić (Jandrić et al., 2024). He argues that the line between “online” and “offline” has completely blurred. For a Ukrainian student or teacher watching a lecture in a bomb shelter, the smartphone screen becomes the only window into normality. The channel becomes a meeting place that cannot be bombed. And this is not a metaphor. This is a new ontology of presence.

The content block dedicated to artificial intelligence attracts particular attention. Unlike techno-optimists, the channel offers a critical view of AI, consonant with the warnings expressed by S. Popenici and S. Kerr (Popenici & Kerr, 2017). The discussion of ChatGPT in education here is not in the key of “how to write off”, but in the context of preserving subjectivity: will there be a place for Humans in an automated world? This formulation of the question transforms YouTube comments into a branch of a philosophical seminar, where what we call “collective thinking” occurs.

Here, we arrive at the key thesis that the @edu\_land channel is a micro-institution. It operates according to the principles of hybrid management, which are still unattainable for sluggish state structures. The speed of response to challenges here is measured in hours, not months of approvals. As D. Vlachopoulos aptly notes, traditional management in education collapsed during the pandemic and wars precisely because of its hierarchical nature (Vlachopoulos, 2021). Instead, micro-institutions offer 24/7 availability and instant feedback. This is the “agility” that management theorists write about, but which, in our conditions, becomes a condition for survival.

A skeptic will say: Can one channel replace a university? This is a false statement of the question. We are not talking about replacement. We are talking about compensation for institutional failures. When the official system is stalling, immersed in bureaucratic rituals and imitation of reforms, such platforms take on the function of “social glue”. They sew up the torn fabric of the educational space.

Moreover, audience analysis (geography of views, comments) indicates the formation of a specific community. Researchers who view YouTube as an educational environment refer to this as “participatory culture” (Moghavvemi et al., 2018). But in the Ukrainian context, it is something more. This is a virtual Res Publica – a common cause. People scattered around the world gather under the video not just to consume content, but to feel a sense of belonging to a common field of values.

This is a perilous path for the old system, which has been used to monopolize the right to truth. After all, it turns out that the authority of a teacher now depends not on the position but on the ability to generate living meanings in real time. The @edu\_land channel demonstrates that in the era of hybrid warfare, true education becomes “guerrilla” – it is mobile, decentralized, and elusive for the enemy. We are dealing with a new type of subjectivity. The author of the channel, who is both a researcher and a moderator, acts as a “hybrid manager”: he manages not a staff of subordinates, but flows of attention and trust.

Summarizing this case, it is worth noting that we are witnessing the emergence of a new morphology of education. It does not abolish the physical university, but it deprives it of its monopoly on “place”. Education takes place in an environment where lively dialogue is present.

## **Hybrid Management as a Philosophy of Action**

The word “management” in the academic environment often evokes strong reactions. When vertical management structures freeze in the face of chaos, it is management, as the ability to organize action here and now, that becomes the key to survival. But what kind of management are we talking about?

The old hierarchical model, built on long-term planning and strict control, has proven ineffective in the conditions of air alarms. An order that comes “from above” for weeks loses its meaning even before it is signed. This is a dead end. On the other hand, the complete anarchy of network structures threatens to disintegrate the institution into atoms. The solution lies in the middle. We propose the concept of hybrid management – not as a compromise, but as a new philosophy of action. The essence of the hybrid approach is to decentralize decision-making while maintaining a single core of values. And here we turn to the concept of “social creativity”. In conditions of war, the university ceases to be simply a “provider of educational services”. This is false, even criminal logic. The university is becoming an institution responsible for preserving the social fabric. Today, a teacher is not a transmitter of information, but, if you like, a social therapist who “stitches” broken ties between people scattered around the world.

In this context, hybrid management acts as a tool for implementing this responsibility. It allows you to act above barriers.

A vivid example is the situation with internally displaced persons (IDPs). A student who has lost his home often drops out of the traditional educational process. One cannot come to the classroom. One does not have stable internet for synchronous lectures. The hierarchical system puts him “n/b” (was not there). The hybrid system is looking for a way out. Here, asynchronous digital content emerges, filling gaps in time and space.

R. Nørgård et al. (Nørgård, 2021) describe the phenomenon of “hyper-hybridity”, where learning takes place at the intersection of many realities. For our refugee student, watching a lecture on YouTube at a convenient time, and the opportunity to write to the teacher on Telegram at 2 a.m. – these are the “threads” that keep him connected to the space of Ukrainian culture. This is not a violation of subordination. This is an act of salvation.

At the same time, such an approach requires extraordinary courage from educational leaders. It is necessary to admit that formal indicators (hours of attendance) no longer work. Instead, the results and emotional state of the participants come to the fore. J. Holloway and L. Parcerisa rightly note that in an era of instability, the teacher’s agency becomes more important than the curriculum (Holloway & Parcerisa, 2025). We must give the teacher the autonomy to decide how to achieve the educational goal in extreme conditions. Of course, this

---



---

carries risks. Risks of loss of quality, risks of imitation. But as S. Bayne et al. argue in their “Manifesto for Online Teaching” digital education is not an “inferior” copy of face-to-face education; it is a different mode of being. Hybrid management should legitimize this mode (Bayne et al., 2020).

### **Democratic Values and Peace Education for the Future**

Talking about peace to the accompaniment of air raid sirens is, at first glance, the height of absurdity. As M. Zembylas (2025) rightly notes, education that focuses exclusively on trauma and hatred risks locking the nation into “emotional hegemony”, from which there is no way out into the future. Today, this thesis necessitates a radical reevaluation of the concept of “education for peace” in the Ukrainian context. It is about what G. Giroux calls “pedagogy of resistance” (Giroux, 2022). If we abandon democratic values in education for the sake of wartime “efficiency,” we lose the war of meanings, even if we win the war on the battlefield. This is where the hybrid educational landscape reveals its unexpected potential. Unlike the physical space of occupation, where a monolith of hostile propaganda reigns, the possibility of dialogue persists in the university’s cloud storage. E. Sant (2021) argues that in an era of polarization, it is online spaces that can become “new agoras” if they are moderated on the basis of mutual respect. For us, this means that the Zoom conference becomes a place where a student learns to argue, doubt, and appreciate skills that are completely unnecessary for a totalitarian society, but critical for us.

The enemy is betting on indoctrination. A student who can deconstruct fake news is as much a defender of the state as a soldier who shoots down a drone, and the hybrid landscape allows us to maintain this balance. It creates safe “pockets” for difficult conversations. Conversations about historical memory, about guilt and responsibility, about the image of the enemy and the image of the self. But without it, we risk becoming a community of traumatized avengers rather than creators. S. Dryden-Peterson (2022), in her studies of refugee education, emphasizes that hope for the future is constructed precisely in classrooms, even if these classrooms are virtual.

We argue: preserving the democratic spirit in education during war is an act of supreme courage. It is a declaration that we have not become like those who came to destroy us. Hybrid management here works to ensure inclusivity: everyone’s voice must be heard, even if it comes from abroad or from the trenches.

So, education for peace today is a technology for designing post-war Ukraine. It is an investment in our institutional capacity to be part of the free world. We are fighting so that our children can live in a society where the force of argument outweighs the force of argument. And this lesson does not begin tomorrow. It continues now, in every connection to the network, in every saved file, in every “How are you?” at the beginning of a lecture.

### **Displaced Learners in the New Landscape**

The most dramatic figure in the modern educational landscape is that of the Displaced Person – a student or pupil, uprooted by war from their usual location, which appears to be an ontological catastrophe. The loss of topos often leads to a loss of self-identification coordinates. A person finds himself in an “existential abyss”, where old social ties are severed, and new ones have not yet been formed. In this situation, the digital educational space acquires a completely new status. It ceases to be simply a tool for transferring knowledge and becomes a surrogate for home. When the physical walls of the school are destroyed or inaccessible,

the gadget screen becomes the only stable plane on which one can rely. They are physically “there”, in foreign classrooms, but mentally remain “here”, in the Ukrainian information field. This creates a unique phenomenon known as “bilocation,” where an individual is present in two worlds simultaneously.

It is in this context that a YouTube channel such as @edu\_land reveals its hidden therapeutic function. Watching a video in Ukrainian, with the familiar intonations of the lecturer discussing understandable problems, all this serves as a grounding mechanism. This is not just information consumption. It is a ritual of returning to oneself. When there are foreign languages and unfamiliar rules around, the familiar interface of the channel creates the illusion of safety and control over the world.

A student who writes a comment under a video, receives a like or a reply, feels, “I exist. I am heard. I am not alone”. In a world where you are perceived only as a statistical unit (“refugee”), this confirmation of subjectivity is critically important for mental health. At the same time, we should not idealize this process. Digital shelter has its limitations. S. Sirin and L. Rogers-Sirin warn about the risk of a “digital ghetto”, when immersion in the online world hinders real integration into a new society (Sirin & Rogers-Sirin, 2015). However, in the Ukrainian case, the situation is different. We are dealing with a temporary, forced displacement, where the strategic goal is to return (physical or mental). Therefore, the digital landscape here serves not to isolate, but to preserve identity until better times.

For a Ukrainian student, educational content becomes the building material for this mobile home. A lecture on Skovoroda’s philosophy, watched in the Berlin subway or a Warsaw hostel, structures the chaos of a foreign city, superimposing a grid of native meanings on it. And the task of hybrid management is to ensure the continuity of this connection. Because if we lose them in this digital ether, we risk losing them forever. And the channel we’re talking about becomes that digital hearth around which souls warm themselves. And that’s perhaps more important than any academic credits.

## **Discussion & Conclusions**

As we conclude our journey through the complexities of hybrid warfare, we are compelled to rise above the level of empiricism and view the situation from a cosmological perspective. What we described as the “reconfiguration of educational landscapes” is, in fact, a manifestation of deeper, planetary processes. We are witnessing an evolutionary leap, which V. Vernadsky wrote about. It is about the formation of the Noosphere – the sphere of mind. The digital educational landscape today is the materialized Noosphere, where “intelligent matter” self-organizes to confront the entropy and chaos of war. When the physical world collapses, the mind migrates into the digital shell, creating new structures of order there. The Ukrainian case proves that a network of universities connected by fiber optics and a shared will to survive is not just about communication. It is the collective brain of a nation that continues to function even when the country’s body is covered in wounds.

Here we enter into a polemic with those who consider the digitalization of education a necessary evil or a temporary surrogate. These are not crutches. This is an exoskeleton. M. Peters et al. (2023), in their work on bio-information capitalism, warn against technocracy, but at the same time recognize that in conditions of global crises, digital networks are becoming the only mechanism for preserving collective intelligence. Hybrid management, which we have substantiated, is nothing more than a way of managing this new reality. This is a rejection of the mechanistic management model in favor of an ecological one. We learn to

---



---

manage education in the same way nature manages ecosystems: through adaptation, diversity, and mutual assistance.

R. Barnett (2018) proposes the concept of an “ecological university”, which does not close in on itself but actively interacts with the surrounding world, even if this world is hostile. Ukraine today has become a laboratory for this concept. We have shown that a University can exist without walls, but it cannot exist without values. Hybrid landscapes have allowed us to preserve the “idea of the university” in its pure form, free from bureaucratic clutter and property ties. What conclusions can we draw from a global philosophy of education?

First, the security of educational space is no longer a given. It is a constant process of struggle. J. Knox (2025) points out that the “post-digital” era requires us to understand technologies not as neutral tools, but as battlefields. Hybrid management is the strategy for this battle, where flexibility becomes armor.

Second, we are witnessing a change in subjectivity. From a passive consumer of knowledge, the student is transformed into a co-creator of the security landscape. Everyone who connects to a lecture from shelter-in-place is performing an act of civic courage.

And finally, this war will end, but educational landscapes will never be the same again. We will not return to the old world, because we have outgrown it. The model of hybrid resilience, forged in the crucible of Ukrainian resistance, should become a prototype for global education in an era of turbulence. The world is becoming fragile. The Ukrainian experience demonstrates that, in this fragile world, it is possible not only to survive but also to think, create, and overcome darkness with the light of reason.

This is our mission in the Universe. Isn't education about *holding the sky*?

## References

- Barnett, R. (2018) *The Ecological University: A Feasible Utopia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315194899>
- Bayne, S., Evans, P., Ewins, R., Knox, J., Lamb, J., Macleod, H., O’Shea, C., Ross, J., Sheail, P., & Sinclair, C. (2020) *The Manifesto for Teaching Online*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11840.001.0001>
- Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., Egorov, G., ... & Paskevicius, M. (2020) A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1-126. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3878572>
- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2022) *Right Where We Belong: How Refugees, Teachers, and Students Are Changing the Future of Education*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674276376>
- Floridi, L. (2022) The green and the blue: a new political ontology for a mature information society. In *The Green and the Blue* (pp. 9–52). Verlag Karl Alber.
- Giannopoulos, G., Smith, H., & Theocharidou, M. (Eds.) (2021) *The landscape of hybrid threats: a conceptual model*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Giroux, H. A. (2022) *Pedagogy of resistance*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Holloway, J., & Parcerisa, L. (2025) Teacher collaboration: how conditions of accountability shape teachers’ autonomy, responsibilities, and relationships. *Teachers and Teaching*, 31(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2024.2436028>
- Ivanova, O., Kit, N., & Storozhyk, M. (2024) Philosophy of education in the context of digital transformation of public life. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 15(1), 141–148. [https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog15\(1\).2024.141-148](https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog15(1).2024.141-148)

- Jandrić, P., Peters, M. A., Besley, T., Green, B. J., & Kamenarac, O. (2024) Postdigital educational geopolitics. *Postdigital science and education*, 6(4), 1017-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00472-6>
- Knox, J. (2025) Educational Development in the Postdigital Era. In *The Geopolitics of Postdigital Educational Development* (pp. 21-40). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Moghavvemi, S., Sulaiman, A., Jaafar, N. I., & Kasem, N. (2018) Social media as a complementary learning tool for teaching and learning: The case of YouTube. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 16(1), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.12.001>
- Nørgård, R. T. (2021) Theorising hybrid lifelong learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1709–1723. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13121>
- Oleksiyenko, A., & Terepyschchy, S. (2024) “Hope despite all odds”: Academic precarity in embattled Ukraine. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 29(3), 741-755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2263744>
- Peters, M. A., Jandrić, P., & Hayes, S. (2023) Postdigital-biodigital: An emerging configuration. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1867108>
- Popenici, S. A., & Kerr, S. (2017) Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8>
- Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L., & Koole, M. (2021) Balancing technology, pedagogy and the new normal: Post-pandemic challenges for higher education. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 3(3), 715-742. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00249-1>
- Sant, E. (2021) Democracy and Political Education. In *Political Education in Times of Populism: Towards a Radical Democratic Education* (pp. 15-35). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Sirin, S. R., & Rogers-Sirin, L. (2015) *The educational and mental health needs of Syrian refugee children*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Terepyschchy, S. (2016) *Contemporary Educational Landscapes: Monograph*. Kyiv: Fenix [In Ukrainian].
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2021) Organizational Change Management in Higher Education through the Lens of Executive Coaches. *Education Sciences*, 11(6), 269. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060269>
- Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C., & Goodall, J. (2021) COVID-19 and digital disruption in UK universities: Afflictions and affordances of emergency online migration. *Higher Education*, 81(3), 623-641. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00561-y>
- Zembylas, M. (2025) Beyond teacher impartiality: addressing epistemic-affective injustice in times of political polarization. *Ethics and Education*, 20(4), 424-437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2025.2565034>