



Research Article

A Philosophical Discourse on the Systemic Category of “Holistic Integrity” in Education Management

Vasyl Kryzhko , Oleh Balaban* , Yuliia Kondratenko

Faculty of Psychological, Pedagogical Education and Arts, Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

Abstract

Within systemic and integrative approaches, the category of holistic integrity in the governance of contemporary education in Ukraine is examined at the theoretical and methodological level. The fundamental interrelationships of holistic integrity in governance are identified from systemic and synergetic perspectives. The managerial priorities for developing university holistic integrity are outlined with due consideration of transformational changes under martial law and in the context of post-war reconstruction. Drawing on the resources and experience of relocated educational institutions operating in territories under the control of the Ukrainian government, new organizational and managerial forms (nooforms) have been explored to strengthen the resilience characteristics of institutional holistic integrity. These include preserving academic staff and student populations; consolidating institutions with similar educational profiles; providing accreditation-related incentives; fostering proactive management; establishing secure information platforms; developing “underground schools”; and creating organizational and legal frameworks for implementing the “school without walls” concept. An important aspect of preserving the holistic integrity of an educational institution is organizational management aimed at countering occupation-created “clones” of schools and universities. To strengthen institutional integrity, foster the unity of educational institutions, and ensure sustained support from local authorities in host communities, Community Hubs are being established. An original governance model has been developed and implemented as a four-circuit, synergetic cluster-integrative system designed to ensure the educational institution’s state of antifragility. This foresight-based technology enables an institution to anticipate potential risks and develop adequate responses to challenges that have not yet emerged. The key positions of pragmatic scientific and managerial discourse concerning state policy aimed at safeguarding the holistic integrity of the national education system have been reconstructed.

Keywords

Holistic Integrity, Integrative Approach, Antifragility of an Educational Institution, Anti-management, Educational Institution Without Walls, Emergence

1. Introduction

The transition from the twentieth to the twenty-first century, together with the emergence of artificial intelligence and its remarkable discontinuity, has become saturated with acronyms

reflecting the seemingly hopeless nature of phantom worlds: VUCA, BANI, DEST. Social systems have begun to operate

*Correspondence: Oleh Balaban (bcdut@ukr.net)

Received: 17 September 2026; **Accepted:** 27 September 2026; **Published:** 28 October 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

with concepts that are, essentially, characteristic of the disturbing realities of the present: instability, uncertainty, anxiety, fragility, unintelligibility, turbulence, chaos, unpredictability, and so forth. A growing conviction has emerged that the world cannot always be subjected to analysis and forecasting, since many events within it are nonlinear and unpredictable.

Taking into account the “black swans” that have increasingly “nested” in Ukraine since 2019, during the period of the VUCA-world and the COVID-19 pandemic, the authors decided to reconsider some of their positions concerning the systemic approach formulated in 2014 [19]. We do not seek to revise the fundamental philosophical and methodological foundations of systems theory. Our objective is to configure the dispositions of the category of holistic integrity of an educational institution under conditions of uncertainty and fragility. The military aggression of the northern neighbour since 2024 has become a tectonic rupture, almost a catastrophic fluctuation, for the national education system, which had already begun to experience the first outcomes of European integration on the platform of the Bologna Process.

During the first quarter of the twenty-first century, humanity had already come to recognize that we had entered a state of a “full world” (*Herman Daly's* theory), with highly uncertain prospects for a genuine crisis. At the same time, today's crisis “is not cyclical but intensifying. It is not limited to the natural environment around us but encompasses social, political, cultural, and moral crises, as well as crises of democracy, ideologies, and political systems” [11].

Ernst Ulrich von Weizsäcker and Anders Wijkman were among the first to articulate the need to replace a systemic vision of reality with integral thinking. They point out that learning systems thinking is insufficient because “systems thinking still tends to view reality in relatively mechanistic terms that fail to capture its organic integrality. The limitations of systems thinking necessitate a shift from mechanistic to more organic conceptions of reality”. The natural theoretical environment for systems analysis is Ilya Prigogine's concept of nonequilibrium, which became the foundation for a family of theories, including complexity theory, catastrophe theory, synergetics, and others. From a cognitive perspective, this means that humanity has encountered systems that are more complex than itself for the first time, making the systemic approach an unacceptable simplification for examining its evolution.

This approach has certain limitations. In forecasting, it is generally quantitative in nature and does not allow qualitative transformations of the world to be predicted. At the same time, the accuracy of quantitative forecasting is relatively low. Integral thinking (Ken Wilber, Jean Gebser, Stanislav Grof), in contrast, is able to perceive, organize, reconcile and reunite the component elements and arrive at a truer understanding of the underlying reality - it goes beyond systems thinking in the same manner that integration goes beyond aggregation. It differs from systems thinking in the same way that integration differs from aggregation [11].

American futurist Jamais Cascio describes the world as fragile, anxious, nonlinear, and incomprehensible, emphasizing the growing unpredictability and the impossibility of controlling events. J. Cascio explains: “Fragile systems require resilience, that is, the ability of a system, organization, or individual to withstand sudden shocks and remain flexible rather than fragile” [2].

The purpose of this article is to actualize the problem of holistic integrity of the national education system under martial law and in response to the challenges of uncertainty and the actual infrastructural losses caused by the aggression of the northern neighbour; to investigate fluctuations that lead to the loss of holistic integrity of educational systems and identify contemporary management technologies capable of mitigating the impact of these factors and promoting institutional development.

2. Presentation of the Main Material

The most significant and defining attribute of any social system is its holistic integrity. The holistic integrity of a social system constitutes a factor of its progress, since genetic integrity ensures the preservation of the identity of the socio-system, while structural and component integrity contributes to the successful formulation of societal development goals and constitutes a condition for the realization of the established social ideal.

Philosophers orient humanity toward the paradigm of a holistic worldview: humanistic yet free from anthropocentrism, open to development while valuing sustainability and caring for the future [9].

Psychologist Stanislav Grof, one of the advocates of the holistic theory, developed a methodology of integral consciousness and thinking. In his view, understanding such an approach makes it possible to create new mechanisms for the formation of personality and citizenship in educational institutions and families [10].

Holistic integrity constitutes a defining condition for the sustainable “metabolism” of an academic institution. This implies the presence of an integrative, synergetic, or emergent effect resulting from the interaction of system elements, which is not equivalent to the simple sum of the actions of these elements considered separately. Ukrainian researcher V. Averyanov argues that in public administration studies it is appropriate to define a system as an integral formation possessing new integrative qualities that are not inherent in its individual components but emerge through their interaction within the system [12].

The category of the whole is a subject of philosophical knowledge, while the holistic approach represents the most general and comprehensive way of encompassing phenomena that are subject to cognition. Institutional accreditation criteria include the holistic nature of an institution, its objectives, planning, and effectiveness.

The holistic integrity of an educational institution under

conditions of uncertainty may be regarded as the foundation of its “independence”, uniqueness, and prospects for development.

A significant contribution to the development of the holistic approach and general systems theory has been made by the scholarly works of Karl Ludwig von Bertalanffy, A. Bogdanov, W. Ashby, D. Gvishiani, R. Ackoff, C. Barnard, D. Dickson, R. Johnson, D. Cleland, W. King, J. Clear, E. Koontz, O. Lange, E. Laszlo, S. Optner, R. Rosenweig, H. Simon, J. Forrester, F. Emery, S. Young, and many others.

John Henry Newman, the author of *The Idea of a University*, understood that the holistic unity of knowledge cannot be achieved by engaging exclusively in one particular field of science; rather, there is a real need to study specialized disciplines as well [15].

According to Immanuel Kant, the essence of holistic integrity is expressed through the unity of antinomies — irreconcilable contradictions. The first antinomy states that the whole is the sum of its parts, while the whole is also a substance whose essence is greater than the sum of its parts. The second antinomy concerns the temporal and logical precedence of parts and the whole: the parts precede the whole, while the whole precedes the parts. The third antinomy asserts that the whole is everything and the part is nothing, while the part is everything and the whole is nothing. These antinomies of the whole reveal its significance for cognition and necessitate reliance on the dialectical synthesis of the whole in understanding complex systems. The essence of the dialectical synthesis of the whole lies in combining the holistic approach with the idea of synthesizing knowledge that has been acquired and empirically tested in practice [16].

The holistic integrity of a system is characterized by the fundamental irreducibility of the system's properties to the sum of the properties of its constituent elements (the effect of emergence). It cannot be derived merely from the properties of its components. Each element, its properties, and its relationships within the system depend on its position and functions within the whole. Dynamically, this means that an intervention affecting one element of the system necessarily generates a response or transformation in other elements. Thus, holistic integrity is expressed through the dependence of each system element, its properties, and its relationships on its position and functions within the whole. Holistic integrity is not a static characteristic of a system but rather a state of dynamic equilibrium. Such equilibrium is achieved through the action of multiple forces and consequently constitutes their resultant. Understanding an organization as an open and developing system implies the need to examine two vectors—the vector of change and the vector of stabilization [7].

The holistic approach belongs to the philosophical level of cognition and is oriented toward understanding an object as an entity that behaves, in relation to a certain class of actions, as an elementary object. Its point of reference is the definition of holistic integrity as a property of an object consisting in its differentiation from the environment and its internal unity. A

holistic object is specifically studied as a system in the unity of its constituent elements, structure (the relationships among them) and functions (the role of each element within the respective system). However, the hierarchical relationship among the categories of “holistic integrity” — “systemicity” — “integrativity,” and correspondingly among holistic, systemic, and integrative approaches, constitutes, according to V. Bykov, a special holistic object within meta-methodological analysis [13].

Philosopher V. Shynkaruk identifies the characteristic features of the whole as the “emergence of new integrative qualities that are not inherent in individual components constituting the system”; the existence of an “organic relationship among components”; and the influence of the nature of the whole on the development of each component. Holistic integrity is the internal unity and interconnectedness of all parts of something that constitute a unified whole. Performing a methodological function, the concept of “holistic integrity” functions as a property, a characteristic, and a principle. Its specific meaning depends on how it is employed by the researcher. The essence of the concept lies in the significant irreducibility of the qualities of a phenomenon to the sum of the qualities of its constituent elements [26].

Holistic integrity is not a static characteristic of a particular aggregate but a state of dynamic equilibrium. Such equilibrium results from the action of numerous forces and consequently becomes their resultant. Understanding an organization as an open, developing system requires, above all, the introduction of two vectors — the vector of change and the vector of stabilization, or preservation of the status-quo.

Thus, it may be concluded that resilience differs from the concepts considered above through the comprehensive embodiment of an integrated set of qualities. It constitutes a systemic category characterized by the following features: preservation of equilibrium under the influence of external and internal disturbances; preservation of equilibrium in interaction with the environment; the possibility of assessing the maintenance of equilibrium; preservation of equilibrium from both static and dynamic perspectives; and the ability to modify properties and create a new equilibrium state.

As a characteristic of a mature dynamic educational system achieved through self-organization, the holistic integrity of educational institution management is a subject of the systemic-synergetic approach. From this perspective, management as a holistic system is characterized by the following propositions: management is a self-organizing system that develops under the influence of internal self-governance; management objectives function as attractors for educational institutions; rather than exercising rigid control over every step, attractor-based management creates conditions, values, and incentives that themselves guide employee behaviour and institutional development; the synergy of managerial interaction strengthens the holistic integrity of the management system; and the combination of corporate and interinstitutional relationships contributes to the system's holistic integrity and

openness.

Methodological foundations determine approaches to studying education management as a holistic entity (the systemic-synergetic approach and the dialectical synthesis of the whole) and define its conceptual provisions and practical orientations. Through these methodological orientations, education management acquires the property of holistic integrity in actual practice. In practice, the holistic integrity of management, in accordance with the first antinomy of holistic integrity and the property of synergy, is characterized by the qualitative difference between holistic management and the sum of individual managerial actions, as well as by a qualitatively new level of managerial resolution of the mission of national education structures [21].

English researcher Jon Wiggins attributes holistic integrity to an implicit characteristic of an education management system. In his view, the holistic integrity of management manifests itself as the commonality of competencies among educational actors; as the unity of internal and external management, management and self-governance; and as cooperation among stakeholders [6].

The holistic integrity of management manifests itself through the commonality of competencies among educational actors; the unity of internal and external management, management and self-governance; and cooperation among stakeholders. It should be noted that the number of supervisory and expert bodies and other actors controlling educational resources is increasing. Unfortunately, these experts do not demonstrate advisory competencies.

The general competencies of education management actors include the performance of managerial functions such as organization, motivation and control. Some manifestations of these managerial actions are visible on the surface (external management). Others are latent, yet internally motivate teachers or learners to engage in activity (internal management). Accordingly, the management of educational institutions is conventionally characterized on internal and external planes (Y. Pavlyutenkov, Y. Khrykov, V. Pikelna, V. Luhovyi). External management (adaptation) is oriented toward interaction with markets, competitors, state institutions, and consumers. Internal management — self-regulation, self-control, self-organization, and self-stimulation — is the existential essence of educational actors and their inherent qualities and competencies. The internal basis of managerial interaction is constituted by the interaction of the selves of management participants, whether individual or collective. The internal motives, goals, needs, desires, and emotions of all management participants are regulated by social demand, common objectives, the management concept and trends, and the norms of managerial activity. Mutual coordination of the internal needs and orientations of management actors is implemented through the external plane of management. The unity of internal and external management constitutes the second manifestation of managerial holistic integrity.

The next manifestation of holistic integrity is the unity of

management and educational self-governance. A management subject — collective or individual — manages itself and its own activities through self-governance or manages the activities of other actors within an academic institution. Management actors (administrators, teachers, learners, and stakeholders) interact with one another while exercising management and self-governance, implementing management decisions, and performing executive functions. L. Karamushka identifies three types of integrative interaction: cooperation, domination, and competition. For the holistic integrity of management, the only viable form of interaction is cooperation. Cooperation is an interaction in which people contribute to satisfying one another's interests while maintaining an exemplary degree of parity [17]. Emotionally, such interaction is accompanied by mutual trust, respect, affinity, and friendly feelings, which characterize corporate culture, or what may be referred to as *doxa*. Cooperation may occur both within groups and between groups.

Consequently, the substantive characteristics of holistic integrity need to be considerably deepened through an understanding of the additional integrative effect generated by the interaction of all elements of the management apparatus. This is possible only when the performance of the management apparatus is evaluated in terms of its effective provision for the common needs of the surrounding environment. The environments in which an educational institution operates include the educational, economic, sociocultural, political-legal, scientific-technological, innovative, and security environments.

Orientation toward the internal needs of the management apparatus has only an auxiliary significance, since it affects its state of self-organization, self-regulation, and self-improvement.

Scientific discussions concerning the formation of the direction of anti-management are intensifying. K. Korsak proposes introducing the methodology of contemporary “noo-management”, the essence of which consists of wise actions of any scale and purpose based on knowledge gaps and nootechnologies, including artificial intelligence, smart technologies, and nanotechnologies [18].

A contemporary variant of this type of management is the pluralistic management model. It presupposes freedom of choice regarding preferences and activities, respect for alternative ways of thinking, and related principles.

We are witnessing the fact that management principles developed within established management paradigms have, in a number of ways of implementing managerial activity, not only ceased to produce the desired results but, in some cases, have begun to generate negative consequences. Success is increasingly associated with those who act according to the principles of “anti-management” — a practice of behaviour and activity that opposes or is deliberately oriented against the interests and objectives of established traditional management [3].

Lex Donaldson argues that the field of management can be reintegrated through “anti-management” by adopting contin-

gency theory as its principal theoretical foundation and supplementing it with selected propositions from emerging paradigms, including the diversity of managerial decisions and successful technologies [4].

Many researchers, including Anthony Giddens, John R. Gribbin, Jim Collins, Mark Edward Henson, Martin Burlingame, Fred Coombs, William Paul Thurston, William G. Cunningham, and Jeannette Vos, cultivate the idea that anti-management should acquire the form of an anti-entropic organizational structure (an antifragile organization capable of resisting chaos) both structurally and functionally, thereby overcoming uncertainty and unpredictability. Entropy, essentially, represents the degree of irreversibility, the measure of dissipation, and the measure of inflation or devaluation of managerial activity in terms of its effective performance outcomes.

Among the neo-forms of education management that ensure the holistic integrity of educational systems and landscapes are hybrid management, a new management culture, an operational model of administrative management, emotional-intellectual management, reengineering and others [23].

Further research remains inexhaustible and unpredictable in its outcomes. At the same time, a new management agent has emerged — artificial intelligence. Artificial intelligence systems are capable of and intended to establish meaningful order within educational Big Data, which should constitute the foundation for further research into managerial effectiveness under conditions of “black swans” and inevitable reconstruction. For this purpose, it is necessary to consolidate and utilize existing digital structures of schools, universities, institutes, and academies, treating them as knowledge repositories.

Under conditions of uncertainty and unpredictable fragility, the problem of institutional holistic integrity and development is addressed through IT resources. All indicators and characteristics of each structural component of an institution should be digitized. The more realities we are able to digitize and the more management technologies become available, the more valuable the data become under conditions of wartime threats. Digitalization tools have enabled us to inventory and preserve the intangible managerial assets of educational institution leaders and transform them into mathematical variables within our model.

Drawing on the resources of Management 4.0, we developed an original management model as a four-loop system designed to ensure the antifragility of an educational institution. The synergetic cluster-integrative model of proactive management is not accidental. Every word in its title represents a meaningful scientific code.

Synergetic: the model incorporates the effects of both predicted and unexpected variations and utilizes phenomena of nonlinear amplification. The integration of scientific support and leadership charisma produces an outcome significantly exceeding the sum of its parts.

Cluster-integrative: we integrate the value-based, communicative, volitional, and innovative clusters identified by us into a unified functional field.

Proactive: this is management “ahead of the curve”. Based on foresight technologies, the model enables an institution to prepare responses to challenges that have not yet emerged. The management effectiveness formula Em includes:

$$Em(t) = P \left[\int_{t_0}^t \sum_{i=1}^4 (l_t^i \cdot \omega^i \cdot S_c^i) dt \right] + \Delta R \cdot e^{\gamma t}$$

L_t — the level of guiding qualities assessed through cluster evaluation, S_c — the intensity and quality of scientific-methodological support, ΔR — the baseline level of system resilience, ω^i — the weighting coefficient of cluster priority, $e^{\gamma t}$ — the factor of innovation self-acceleration. Our position is that, under conditions of synergistic integration of guiding clusters L_t and intensive scientific-methodological support S_c , management effectiveness Em will demonstrate exponential growth even under critical conditions ΔR .

Managerial support in such dimensions’ functions not as supervision but as an “intellectual service” that automatically activates when the management effectiveness parameter begins to fluctuate.

A vivid confirmation of the holistic orientation and mission of education management is the development of the situational idea of an “educational institution without walls”. This metaphor of a managerial phenomenon refers to the functioning of an educational institution in the absence of physical infrastructure due to occupation, bombardment, or evacuation, while its institutional identity, teaching staff, and educational mission are preserved and continue to be implemented, thereby maintaining the institution’s holistic integrity [25].

The metaphor of an “educational institution without walls” constitutes a radical response to the realities of wartime Ukraine. The phrase “school without walls” represents a contemporary philosophy of education (the concept of alternative schools, an approach originating in Reggio Emilia in northern Italy) which transcends the traditional boundaries of learning and encourages exploration and the acquisition of new experiences. This approach emphasizes that learning can occur anywhere, facilitated by technologies that make education more dynamic, flexible, and relevant. The theorist of the “school without walls” and the concept of space as the “third teacher” was Italian educator Loris Malaguzzi, who drew upon the ideas of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Maria Montessori, and others [5].

The idea acquired particular relevance with the beginning of full-scale aggression against Ukraine and the temporary occupation of its territories. Conceptually, the “educational institution without walls” constitutes an applied embodiment of the idea of boundary-crossing organizations, a concept developed within organizational theory and subsequently elaborated in the educational context [1]. According to this concept, the most resilient and innovative organizations are those capable of transcending their own institutional boundaries and forming “external neurons” — stable connections with other systems. For educational institution management, this means

creating a networked management architecture: the leader becomes not a “guardian of the building” but an “architect of the network”, connecting the institution with community, business, cultural, and other educational resources.

A central element here is the construction of the “educational institution without walls”, in which a managerial decision emerges not as a bureaucratic act but as an act of will that confirms the continuity of the educational process in exile. The technologization of this process includes the creation of cloud-based management platforms for coordinating a dispersed workforce; preservation of institutional traditions in the online environment; and the use of an “existential coaching” methodology for educators aimed at overcoming apathy and preserving professional identity. The leader’s will function here as a “gravitational field” that keeps learners and teachers within a unified semantic space despite their geographical dispersion.

To strengthen institutional holistic integrity, unity among educational institutions, and the support provided by local authorities in places of relocation, “Community Hubs” are established, enabling urgent controversies and challenges to be addressed operationally.

War, as an extreme form of social crisis, creates a specific space of educational transformation in which traditional institutional models are destroyed while new forms of learning organization emerge simultaneously. Under conditions of instability, education performs not merely the function of knowledge transmission but also becomes a space for survival, social integration, and psychological support.

In wartime, an educational institution functions as a complex dynamic system operating in a state of continuous adaptation. Its antifragility is manifested primarily in its ability to rapidly restructure the educational process, moving between online, blended, and offline learning formats, implementing digital platforms, and ensuring continuity of educational activity even when infrastructure is destroyed.

The antifragility of education under conditions of digitalization and global competition fundamentally transforms the philosophy of education management, shifting the emphasis from control toward supporting the dynamic evolution of the system. Educational antifragility begins where the educator transforms crisis into a resource for development. The antifragility of an educational institution is manifested in its ability not merely to survive shocks but to strengthen its institutional capacity. Antifragility means that an institution does not return to its previous state after a disruption but develops new forms of functioning that make it stronger, more flexible, and capable of self-development [14].

Antifragility creates a new culture of interaction in which errors, uncertainty, and complexity are regarded not as threats but as resources for intellectual and spiritual growth. In the philosophy of education, antifragility signifies the ability of an educational system not simply to withstand or adapt to crises but to transform crisis experience into a source of devel-

opment, renewal, and self-strengthening. In this context, education ceases to be a closed institutional structure and acquires the characteristics of a dynamic, nonlinear, self-organizing system capable of continuous self-creation [8].

Management of an educational institution based on the systemic approach is aimed at preserving internal holistic integrity. It must ensure the capacity of the academic system for adaptive change, through which nonequilibrium processes lead to the formation of a qualitatively new institutional structure, or alternatively, to the restoration of parameters at a level sufficient to ensure functioning within the former traditional structure.

The education system, with each of its “fragments” self-organizing during its functioning and adapting to new uncertain conditions, seeks to preserve its holistic integrity and qualitative identity, which manifests itself as the system’s striving toward resilience. In turn, resilience and antifragility are associated with the capacity of educational institution management for adaptive change and development, whereby the basic characteristics, composition, and structure of system elements may change, as well as with the capacity to restore previous functional parameters.

From the perspective of the synergetic approach, within the holistic, self-organizing, nonlinear system of an “educational institution,” which exists in a state of nonequilibrium, a dissipative transition to a new qualitative state becomes possible through objective procedures for correcting managerial actions, which falls within the conceptual domain of development [24].

Holistic integrity is a guarantee and foundation of the structural diversity of educational institutions.

The formation of a new holistic integrity and a new systemic configuration is necessary with regard to the organizational and functional models of national education proposed today. We proceed from the premise that education is not merely general culture or cognitive competencies combined with professionalism; it is also a spiritual value that underlies all forms of social practice. Attempts to characterize the parameters of educational attainment must inevitably be oriented toward the methodological holistic integrity of approaches. Awareness of this epistemological situation places the researcher before the necessity of studying the developmental trends of contemporary education (the VUCA and BANI worlds, the period of war against a powerful adversary) their nature and potential, and their comprehensive analysis as a socio-educational phenomenon. This involves seeking ways to formulate conceptual principles for a holistic model of contemporary education, the specificity of which is embedded in its practical orientation. Researchers are oriented toward project-based solutions to the aforementioned problems, which will make it possible to formulate new strategic guidelines for the national education system [20].

From the perspective of contemporary understanding of holistic integrity, systemicity is understood not only as diversity and completeness in representing the particular within the

general, the aggregate and coherence of parts, and their complementarity, but also as their capacity to exert a person-forming influence on education.

The holistic integrity of the educational space is determined by the purpose of education, the totality of its meanings, and the tasks associated with their implementation. Education will become genuinely purposeful for a citizen of Ukraine only when they perceive personal meaning in it and set themselves the goal not merely of “obtaining an education” but of “becoming an educated person”. Consequently, the educational space is not objectively a whole in itself; rather, it appears as a holistic entity to a conscious learner only when it is internally “accepted” by that learner and personally “centered” and organized around them. Therefore, the defining criterion of the holistic integrity of the educational space is not one or another of its “external” characteristics but its “internal” quality — the learner’s orientation toward it and the internal architecture created by that learner. Thus, the holistic integrity of the educational space constitutes, from the learner’s perspective, a characteristic of the totality of educational circumstances transformed by the individual into their own, assimilated, personally meaningful, systematically organized, and “functioning” in response to their own “challenge”. The main structural components of this holistic integrity are, on the one hand, educational classes—mandatory and elective courses with their information content.

On the other hand, the structural components of the holistic educational space include the resources of the New Ukrainian School. Teachers also function as components of the educational space, acting as sources of information actualized in the learner’s consciousness, as do professional practitioners working in the respective field [22].

3. Conclusion

The problem of the security-related holistic integrity of an educational institution has become a fundamental, existential category of institutional existence. This space, the campus, classrooms, and grounds, must protect and safeguard the health and lives of learners. This mission is addressed through hybrid distance education, the availability of shelters, and the construction of underground schools, of which there are already nearly twenty in the Zaporizhzhia region.

It is necessary to comprehend the social context of an educational institution and collectively “discover” it as a holistic entity, understanding which makes it possible to establish multifaceted and purposeful relationships with it. Therefore, it is necessary to construct an optimal system of interaction between the educational institution and its social, professional, and cultural environment. Such interaction should encompass areas including scientific research, participation in social initiatives, acts of compassion, professional practice, a culture of creativity, and others.

Ukrainian education legislation is radically transforming

the external and internal factors governing the activities of domestic educational institutions at all levels. Their holistic integrity, resilience, and development remain enduring categories. The mental principles of national education are undergoing transformation, among which the systemic category of holistic integrity requires further research within the parameters of martial law and subsequent post-war reconstruction.

Abbreviations

VUCA	Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity
BANI	Brittle, Anxious, Nonlinear, Incomprehensible
DEST	Dynamic, Exponential, Systemic, Turbulent

Author Contributions

Vasyl Kryzhko: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing

Oleh Balaban: Data curation, Investigation

Yuliia Kondratenko: Resources, Writing – original draft

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. Boundary Crossing and Boundary Objects. *Review of Educational Research*. 2011. 81(2), 132–169. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311404435>
- [2] Cascio, J. *Navigating the Age of Chaos: A Sense-Making Guide to a BANI World That Doesn’t Make Sense*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers; 2025, 256 p.
- [3] Cloke, K., & Goldsmith, J. *The End of Management and the Rise of Organizational Democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers; 2002, 303 p.
- [4] Donaldson, L. *American Anti-Management Theories of Organization: A Critique of Paradigm Proliferation*. Cambridge University Press; 1995, 263 p.
- [5] Hay, P. *School Without Walls: Breaking Down the Walls of Schools and Cultural Centres*. Bath: The Egg Theatre; 2012.
- [6] Wiggins, J. Integrity of the Entire System – Practical Steps. Available from: <https://ua.linkedin.com/pulse/whole-system-integrity-practical-steps-jon-wiggins-4xake?tl=uk> (accessed 2 September 2026).
- [7] von Bertalanffy, L. *Perspectives on General System Theory: Scientific-Philosophical Studies*. George Braziller. 1975, 183 p.
- [8] Taleb, N. N. *Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder*. Random House Publishing Group; 2012, 544 p.

- [9] Grof, Stanislav. *Psychology of the Future: Lessons from Modern Consciousness Research*. State University of New York Press; 2000, 361 p.
- [10] Grof, S., & Bennett, H. Z. *The Holotropic Mind: The Three Levels of Human Consciousness and How They Shape Our Lives*. 1993, 256 p.
- [11] von Weizsäcker, E. U., Wijkman, A. *Come On! Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet: A Report to the Club of Rome*. New York, NY; 2018, 232 p. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-7419-1>
- [12] Averyanov, V. B. *Organization of Public Administration: Structural and Functional Aspect*. Kyiv; 1985, 146 p.
- [13] Bykov, V. *Models of Organizational Systems of Open Education: Monograph*. Kyiv: Ataka; 2009, 684 p.
- [14] Voronkova, V., Shylo, H., Nikitenko, V. *Antifragility as a New Paradigm of Education under Conditions of Global Instability: Conceptualization, Relevance, and Synergetic Transformational Potential*. In *The Philosophical Code of Victory: Education of New Meanings*. Collective monograph, ed. V. Voronkova & V. Kryzhko. Kyiv: FOP Samchenko A. M.; 2026, 346 p.
- [15] Zubrytska, M. (Ed.). *The Idea of a University: Anthology*. Lviv: Litopys; 2002, 304 p.
- [16] Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated from German by Ihor Burkovskiy. Kyiv: Univers; 2000, 504 p.
- [17] Karamushka, L. M. *Psychology of Educational Management*. Kyiv: Lybid; 2004, 424 p.
- [18] Korsak, K. V., Korsak, Yu. K. *Nooglossary as a Means of Positivizing the Future and New Goals of Higher Education*. Higher Education of Ukraine. 2014, 2, 42–48.
- [19] Kryzhko, V. *The Theoretical Foundation of the Systemic Category of “Holistic Integrity” in University Management*. Higher Education of Ukraine. 2014, 3, 82–85.
- [20] Meshchaninov, O. P. *Contemporary Models of University Education Development in Ukraine: Monograph*. Mykolaiv: Petro Mohyla State University Publishing House; 2015, 456 p.
- [21] Robul, O. *Synergetics as an Innovative Methodology of Pedagogical Education*. *Philosophy of Education*, 2006, 3(1), 35–42.
- [22] Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. Resolution No. 988-r of December 14, 2016, “On Approval of the Concept for the Implementation of State Policy in the Reform of General Secondary Education ‘New Ukrainian School’ for the Period until 2029.” Kyiv, 2016.
- [23] Sahuichenko, V., Volokitina, N. *New Ukrainian School: Current Issues of Management Culture and Educational Management*. *Public Administration Aspects*, 2020, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.15421/152015>
- [24] *Synergetics and Education: Monograph*. Ed. V. H. Kremen. Kyiv: Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine; 2014, 348 p.
- [25] Khvatova, O. *Educational Proposals of Contemporary Alternative Schools*. *Bulletin of the Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education*. Series: Philosophy. Pedagogy. 2022, 1, 57–61.
- [26] Shynkaruk, V. *Selected Works in Three Volumes*. Vol. 3, Part 2. Kyiv: Ukrainian Center for Spiritual Culture; Vovk, A. S. *Holistic Integrity of Philosophical Thinking and Worldview in the Theoretical System of Volodymyr Shynkaruk*. *Educational Discourse: Collection of Scholarly Papers*, 2021, 38(11–12), 25–36. [https://doi.org/10.33930/ed.2019.5007.38\(11-12\)-6](https://doi.org/10.33930/ed.2019.5007.38(11-12)-6)