

1.4. MORAL, ETHICAL, AND ACADEMIC CULTURE OF FUTURE TEACHERS UNDER THE WAR IN UKRAINE AND DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION: AN ANALYTICAL REVIEW THROUGH THE LENS OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Olena Semenikhina

Abstract. *This paper offers an analytical synthesis of scholarly approaches to understanding the moral, ethical, and academic culture of future teachers in higher education under the conditions of the war in Ukraine. The review is framed through citizenship education as the normative and value-based foundation of teacher preparation. Central to the discussion is how citizenship education in higher education connects to the formation of a teacher's triadic culture: moral culture (value orientation and accountability for decisions and the consequences of pedagogical action), ethical culture (norms of interaction, work with conflict, and the prevention of dehumanization and discrimination), and academic culture (honesty, evidence-based reasoning, fairness of assessment procedures, and trust in knowledge). The analysis shows that under the crisis conditions of war and sustained informational pressure, these dimensions cannot be treated in isolation. They either reinforce or undermine one another depending on how a university organizes communication, classroom discussions, academic rules, and support mechanisms for instructors and learners. The paper highlights that teaching in situations of war and social conflict requires pedagogically guided, dialogic practices and deliberate work with biases to avoid stereotyping and destructive societal polarization. The review also examines the impact of digitalization, including control technologies and the rise of generative AI, which reshape the criteria of learner autonomy, authorship, and "legitimate assistance", intensifying the tension between control and trust in educational practice. It is argued that sustaining academic integrity cannot be reduced to technological solutions alone; rather, it requires a combination of transparent norms, pedagogical innovation, and the development of civic responsibility as a professional quality among teachers. Finally, the paper summarizes research gaps related to the limited integration of these three cultural dimensions in empirical studies and outlines directions for further inquiry relevant to teacher education programs in higher education under wartime conditions.*

Keywords: *teachers' moral culture; ethical culture; academic culture; citizenship education; teacher education; higher education; war in Ukraine; academic integrity; educational digitalization; generative AI.*

Introduction

Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine has exposed fragilities in the educational space that were often discussed separately: citizenship education as a value foundation of democracy, teachers' moral and ethical culture as a regulator of everyday interaction, and academic culture as a means of sustaining trust in knowledge and assessment. In higher education, this triad carries particular weight because universities both prepare future teachers and shape learners' civic positions through curricula, assessment practices, and institutional norms.

In scholarly approaches to global citizenship education (GCE/GCED), emphasis is placed on social cohesion, mutual respect, acceptance of difference, and the pursuit of more just, inclusive, and peaceful societies. These orientations are directly relevant to teacher education: teachers do not merely transmit knowledge. They establish the moral boundaries of discussion, protect the dignity of participants in the educational process, and demonstrate what responsibility entails in contexts of social polarization.

Two developments make this problem especially acute in higher education. The first concerns the reconfiguration of citizenship education in the post-pandemic period and the growth of international online practices. Research in higher education suggests that "virtual exchanges" and online dialogues can foster active listening, careful engagement with others' experiences, and openness to diverse positions. This matters not only as an educational technology but also as an ethical practice: communication with "the other" within structured learning settings becomes training in civic restraint, argumentation, and accountability for one's words.

The second development relates to the digitalization of assessment and communication, and, more recently, the widespread adoption of generative models in artificial intelligence. Within the academic integrity discourse, increasing attention is

paid to the fact that technological solutions, including digital proctoring, may strengthen control while creating ethical risks: intrusions into privacy, unequal conditions, potential discrimination, and a shift in the climate of trust between instructors and learners. At the same time, scholars argue for a rethinking of integrity “in the ChatGPT era”, where the issue is not limited to detecting violations but also includes establishing clear and workable norms for permitted and prohibited uses of AI in learning and assessment.

Teachers’ moral and ethical culture is often discussed through the idea of the teacher as a moral agent and a role model who embodies ethical conduct and influences the formation of values and moral orientations. This perspective is productive for a literature review because it connects citizenship education with academic culture not at the level of declarations, but through the mechanism of professional example and everyday decisions: how to structure a discussion about war, how to safeguard dignity, how to balance high expectations with support, and how to separate critical analysis from propaganda and hate speech.

Academic culture in higher education is often conceptualized as the value base of the educational environment, where principles such as legality, human dignity, professionalism, honesty, and transparency sustain educational quality and provide a foundation for cultivating critically minded citizens. In this sense, academic integrity becomes a civic practice: it builds a habit of acting honestly even when violating a rule might seem advantageous, and it develops responsibility for one’s claims and data.

The war in Ukraine adds another layer to this agenda: the need to teach sensitive topics and to sustain democratic resilience. Scholars emphasize that pedagogical approaches to teaching about war through citizenship education necessitate systematic reconsideration, and that the knowledge base of citizenship education can serve as a valuable resource for protecting democracy. For teacher education, this implies a shift away from “knowledge about institutions” towards the ability to argue responsibly, distinguish fact from evaluation, withstand moral dilemmas, and act ethically under conditions of heightened emotional strain.

This review is limited to higher education and teacher education (including pre-service teachers). It aims to address the following research question: How does contemporary scholarship describe the relationship between citizenship education (including global citizenship education) and the formation of the moral, ethical, and academic culture of future teachers in higher education under the conditions of the war in Ukraine and digital transformation (including the diffusion of generative AI), and which pedagogical and institutional mechanisms are considered most relevant for sustaining this culture?

This question intentionally integrates three domains. The first concerns the value framework of global citizenship education and its embedding in university programs and practices of international and online dialogue. The second concerns teachers' professional morality as an ethical resource of the educational environment and a precondition for civic maturity. The third focuses on academic culture and integrity in a digitalized university, where control technologies and AI tools simultaneously offer solutions and generate ethical tensions.

The review proceeds from conceptual foundations of citizenship/global citizenship education in higher education to an analysis of how moral and ethical norms of the profession are formed within teacher education, and how academic culture and integrity function in a digital learning environment. The war in Ukraine is treated not as a discrete "topic" but as a condition that intensifies demands on pedagogical ethics, the quality of argumentation, and responsible engagement with information.

Methodology of the Literature Review

This section is designed as an integrative literature review with a thematic synthesis, aimed at bringing together three clusters of problems: (a) citizenship education and global citizenship education in higher education; (b) the moral and ethical culture of future teachers as a professional dimension of citizenship education; and (c) academic culture and academic integrity in a digitalized university, particularly under conditions of the expanding use of generative AI (Perkins, 2023; Ilchenko, 2024). Unlike narrowly scoped systematic reviews that focus on a

single phenomenon (for example, digital proctoring in higher education as the object of systematic analysis), this design enables the connection of pedagogical, ethical, and institutional strands, allowing for a description of how they interact within teacher education (Han et al., 2023).

The source base was constructed using a combined search strategy. The initial body of publications was collected from the Web of Science and Scopus databases using thematic clusters of keywords corresponding to the three analytic strands of the review (including global citizenship education, teacher education/teacher ethics, academic integrity, digital proctoring, and generative AI). Following the initial retrieval, the corpus was refined through abstract screening and thematic relevance to the stated problem clusters, and through purposive selection of works that either conceptually structure the field or describe technological solutions and ethical risks in digital environments (including NLP-based examination question generation, blockchain-based certificate verification, and ethical concerns related to online surveillance) (Abdulhadi et al., 2025; Sultana et al., 2023; Coghlan et al., 2021). A separate subgroup comprised studies on teachers' moral, ethical, and academic culture that served as conceptual anchors for interpreting the teacher as an ethical role model and for examining the heightened demands placed on professional culture in crisis conditions associated with war, including the development of capacities for de-escalation, support, and professional self-regulation under stress. The final sample included 62 works, providing a sufficiently broad bibliographic horizon for coding and conducting the thematic synthesis.

The inclusion criteria for this review were as follows:

- a focus on higher education and/or pre-service teacher education, including university-based interventions in citizenship/global citizenship education (Helm et al., 2024; O'Toole & O'Flaherty, 2022);
- the presence of at least one of the three substantive nodes in the publication: citizenship education (or global citizenship education), moral and ethical dimensions of pedagogy, or academic culture/academic integrity in higher education (Ilchenko, 2024; Matto, 2024);

- the availability of an abstract and a methods description in the table, enabling the source to be assigned to a thematic cluster (for example, thematic analysis in studies of GCE in higher education, or mixed-methods designs in research on international seminars and experiences of global citizenship).

The exclusion criteria for this review were:

- sources not related to higher education or teacher education (for example, studies focused on other educational levels without a clear link to teacher education);
- items with incomplete bibliographic information or without a traceable identifier via the table link (in such cases, a source could be retained only as a “signal” reference, rather than used as a core basis for argumentation).

The analytic procedure involved constructing the table through four sequential steps. For each entry, the following information was recorded: topic focus (e.g., GCE/GCED, teacher education, academic integrity), educational level (higher education, teacher education), study design (qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, review), key findings, and cautions/limitations. Methodological “markers” were drawn from the wording of abstracts, for instance, references to thematic analysis and focus groups in studies of GCE in higher education (Coelho et al., 2022), or to the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches in research on virtual exchanges (Helm et al., 2024).

Coding was guided by the following framework:

- the teacher’s moral and ethical role and practices of justice, biased reflection, and moral leadership in crisis;
- academic culture/academic integrity as an institutional and personal norm, including digital solutions and ethical risks (privacy, fairness, discrimination);
- citizenship education and global citizenship education as a value framework (peace, social cohesion, mutual respect) (UNESCO, 2018).

After the initial coding, more specific subcodes were introduced for themes that recurred regularly across the sources in the table: emotions and epistemic sensitivity in GCE for future teachers (O'Toole & O'Flaherty, 2022), empathy as a cognitive–epistemic capacity in GCE (Risberg, 2022), and risks of “exclusive nationalism” for GCE in universities (Hungwe, 2022).

On the basis of the coding, the following thematic clusters were developed:

- GCE/GCED in higher education and its transformative potential;
- teacher education as a space for moral and ethical formation;
- academic culture and academic integrity in the digitalised university;
- the war in Ukraine as a condition that intensifies demands for civic and ethical capacity (Matto, 2024).

The trustworthiness of the review was supported through three decisions. First, coding relied on conceptual axes, reducing the risk of arbitrary interpretation. Second, methodological characteristics were recorded to the extent permitted by the abstracts, with particular attention to studies of teacher education and to review papers in which subthemes had already been systematically organized (Han et al., 2023). Third, where salient tensions emerged within the corpus (for example, between the technological “strengthening of control” and the values of dignity and fairness), the review did not smooth them over. Instead, these tensions are made explicit and carried forward into subsequent sections as analytic nodes (Coghlan et al., 2021).

The main limitation of the study is that some entries in the table are presented as concise annotations; consequently, conclusions about a source’s design or theoretical framing can, in some cases, be drawn only from brief descriptions. A second limitation concerns the heterogeneity of the corpus: alongside robust empirical studies in higher education, it includes materials of different genres (practice-oriented reports, conceptual papers, and reviews), which requires cautious comparison across findings.

Results

Conceptual Foundations of Citizenship Education and Global Citizenship Education

Definitions and the core aim of global citizenship

In contemporary scholarship, citizenship education is increasingly framed not as a self-contained content block but as a value- and norm-based framework that shapes what university education should look like and how responsibility is distributed among learners, instructors, and the institution as a whole. Closely related is global citizenship education, which international approaches associate with social cohesion, mutual respect, tolerance of difference, and the building of more just and peaceful societies (UNESCO, 2018).

Within the source corpus analyzed here, GCE/GCED is presented as a response to the interdependence of today's world and to political and humanitarian challenges that have become part of university life. On the one hand, citizenship is understood as belonging to a wider community, where "global citizenship" is primarily seen as a sense of belonging and shared humanity, rather than as a legal status (UNESCO, 2018). On the other hand, within higher education, it takes pedagogical form through dialogic practices, learning through encounters with "the other," collaborative projects, and educational interventions that can reshape learners' ways of thinking and acting (Helm et al., 2024).

For the purposes of this review, it is important that global citizenship education is linked not only to "knowledge about the world" but also to norms of interaction, an ethical vocabulary, and civic responsibility. This is why the analysis that follows connects GCE with the moral, ethical, and academic culture of future teachers: these domains share a common foundation in expectations of justice, respect, responsible judgment, readiness for difficult conversations, and the capacity to act without humiliating the other (Veugelers, 2024).

One methodologically significant strand in the corpus concerns how citizenship should be defined when policy and practice coexist with competing understandings of its boundaries and its subject. In work examining the relationship between global

and intercultural citizenship education, it is argued that under conditions of growing cultural diversity, citizenship can no longer be justified solely through membership in the nation-state. Instead, a conceptualization is needed that can accommodate multiple identities while supporting dialogue and interaction among diverse groups of learners (Portera, 2023).

This position is particularly salient for teacher education because teachers operate at the intersection of local civic loyalty, human rights, cultural memory, and the lived experience of trauma and war. Under such conditions, the educational process requires a framework capable of holding a value tension: acknowledging the reality of conflict without reproducing the language of hatred; cultivating solidarity without sliding into exclusive nationalism or “civilizational” hierarchies. This highlights the need for a critical dimension of GCE, one that examines the political and ideological conditions shaping educational meaning and explicitly links citizenship to democracy, equality, ethics, and social responsibility (Bosio & Olssen, 2023).

Alongside this, the literature reveals another intellectual tradition: interpreting citizenship education as the development of a “democratic personality” and modes of thinking that enable one to see the whole, act under uncertainty, and sustain “creative tolerance.” From this perspective, “planned thinking” is understood as an interdisciplinary way of making sense of a changing world, and the university is viewed as a site for cultivating active citizens (Yamada, 2023). For teacher education, this implies that citizenship is not reducible to a set of topics or legal norms. Rather, it becomes part of teachers’ professional thinking: the capacity to relate local decisions to wider moral consequences, distinguish propaganda from argument, and remain intellectually steady amid social polarization.

Transformative learning, dialogue, and “learning through encounter” as university practices of GCE

Across the source corpus, at least two interconnected pedagogical logics for implementing GCE in higher education can be traced: transformative learning and learning through interaction (dialogue, collaborative tasks, and encounters with the lived experience of other groups).

The first logic is articulated through the transformative potential of GCE experiences in higher education. A study that juxtaposes learners' and instructors' perspectives examines the conditions, processes, and outcomes of learning and underscores the need for a stronger connection between global citizenship education and transformative learning theory, as well as closer attention to the narratives and conditions under which transformation becomes possible (Coelho et al., 2022). Methodologically, this work is notable for its use of focus groups (72 learners) and interviews with instructors; the analysis is presented as a thematic synthesis informed by critical GCE and transformative learning theory (Coelho et al., 2022). Taken together, these findings suggest that GCE in higher education tends to "work" not through declarations but through a reconfiguration of one's interpretive frames: what counts as justice, how inequality is explained, where the boundary lies between compassion and paternalism, and what language is used to speak about vulnerability.

The second logic centers on dialogue, particularly in online forms of international interaction. A study of a virtual exchange between learners from Europe and the Southern Mediterranean shows that participants linked their learning primarily to "encounters and conversations" with people whose experiences differed from their own; they reported learning to listen actively and to accept or respect other views and life stories (Helm et al., 2024). In this approach, the value lies not only in knowledge acquisition but also in cultivating communicative practices aligned with democratic civic conduct, including attentiveness, restraint in making premature judgments, and the ability to acknowledge complexity.

A related line of work is represented by the Collaborative Online International Learning model, where intercontinental collaboration between two university courses (in India and the United States) is used to examine inequalities and forms of "sub-citizenship" intensified by the pandemic. The authors link this experience to the development of distance communication skills and to the possibility of critical, comparative learning that enriches GCE (Banerjee et al., 2025). In teacher education, such practices have a dual significance: they shape future teachers' civic

dispositions while also modelling pedagogical scenarios that these teachers may later adapt in their own professional practice.

The literature also highlights university community engagement as a distinctive pathway for GCE. A qualitative study employing a decolonial framework warns against construing community engagement as a “civilizing mission” and emphasizes the need to sustain critical thinking about social justice both within and beyond communities (Gyamera & Debrah, 2021). This argument resonates strongly with Ukraine’s wartime reality, where civic initiatives can be both a resource for solidarity and a source of renewed symbolic violence if enacted without reflection on power, inequality, and the voices of those who are positioned as the recipients of “help.”

Teacher education within the GCE framework

For teacher education, a particularly important development is that GCE in universities is increasingly viewed as an experience in which emotions are not a “side effect” but an integral part of the learning mechanism. A study on the role of emotion in higher education, based on a university GCE intervention and conducted through focus groups with 36 pre-service teachers across six teacher education programs, found that references to negative emotions outweighed those to positive ones. Importantly, a substantial share of these emotions was linked to epistemic awareness of humanitarian problems, rather than to the teaching methods themselves (O’Toole & O’Flaherty, 2022).

Within this logic, teacher education requires not only content on rights, democracy, and peace, but also pedagogically guided ways of working with anxiety, anger, shame, and helplessness. Without such support, citizenship education risks becoming either a moralizing discourse or a pathway to emotional exhaustion.

Empathy also emerges as one of the central competencies in GCE; yet, its status remains contested. It can be presented as necessary or desirable, but it may also become a misguided goal when it is conceptualized superficially (Risberg, 2022). For teacher education, this points to the need for a more precise pedagogy of empathy, understood not as a demand to “feel another’s pain” but as the capacity to listen, to recognize the other’s experience, and

at the same time to think critically without erasing inequality or diluting responsibility.

At the same time, the corpus highlights the challenges of engaging with politically sensitive topics. The literature explicitly notes that integrating global citizenship education entails pedagogical challenges, including the need to address contentious issues such as military conflicts without generating bias and stereotypes, and in contexts where institutional support is insufficient (Na & Kim, 2024).

For Ukraine, this is a very real concern. The emergence of studies on teaching democratic citizenship “in moments of conflict” when discussing the war in Ukraine indicates that the war has become a topic of university civic pedagogy, not merely an object of political history (Matto, 2024).

Despite the normative appeal of GCE, the source corpus shows that its core claims are vulnerable to erosion under crisis conditions. The COVID-19 pandemic served as a “stress test” for solidarity in universities, heightening awareness of interdependence while also intensifying inequalities and triggering political responses incompatible with civic openness (Banerjee et al., 2025). In parallel, scholars point to “exclusive nationalist responses” to the pandemic that undermine key premises of global citizenship education in higher education (Hungwe, 2022). This tension is particularly sensitive for education systems operating under wartime conditions: state defense and collective mobilization are existential necessities, yet precisely here, subtle pedagogical tools are needed so that patriotism does not shift into dehumanization, and an ethical stance is not replaced by exclusionary language.

What mitigates this tension is not the “neutrality” of education but its moral and political clarity. In the literature, global citizenship education is described as a framework through which teachers can develop critical consciousness and democratic values grounded in reflection, inclusion, dialogue, and constructive debate (Veugelers, 2024). In teacher education, critical GCE thus takes the form of professional ethics: the capacity to facilitate difficult discussions without betraying either the truth about war or the demand to uphold dignity.

Accordingly, in teacher education, GCE should not be treated as an additional “humanities” module, but as part of professional identity that shapes how teachers speak about conflict, how they withstand polarization, and how they cultivate in learners a disposition for argument and accountability.

Teachers’ Moral and Ethical Culture as a Professional Phenomenon

The teacher as a moral agent: a professional role beyond knowledge transmission

The source analysis indicates a clear shift in how the teacher’s role is conceptualized: from a specialist primarily responsible for delivering content to a moral figure who shapes civic consciousness and supports young people’s readiness for peaceful conflict resolution. This reframing is particularly significant for higher education because teacher education programs largely determine whether ethics becomes part of professional identity rather than a formal component of “pedagogical deontology.”

A discussion of teachers’ moral and ethical culture emphasizes that teachers, as moral agents and ethical role models, influence learners’ values and moral orientations through their professional conduct, including by modeling ethical behavior (Icka & Kochoska, 2024). A critical implication of this claim is that moral and ethical culture cannot be reduced to the declaration of norms. It becomes visible in decision-making practices, in the language a teacher uses, in how they respond to injustice, bias, and humiliation, and in how interactions within the learning group are organized. For teacher education, this perspective implies that the university should be understood as a space for “trial entry” into professional ethics. It is here that dispositions are formed and later carried into teaching practice: how to address contentious issues, how to balance high expectations with support, and how to avoid replacing argument with authority. At the same time, ethical formation cannot remain a private matter of individual educators. It requires time, resources, and psychological support, because teachers cannot cultivate in others what they do not practice themselves.

The moral–political dimension of citizenship education in teacher education

Discussion of teachers' moral integrity within citizenship education almost inevitably extends into the moral–political foundations of education. In the source corpus, this is especially clear in analyses of teacher educators' practices in global citizenship education, where "soft" and critical approaches are distinguished. Waghid (2023) shows that some teacher educators gravitate towards a soft version of GCE, while a smaller share endorses critical characteristics. The study also identifies barriers, including limited access to technology and the dominance of content coverage over substantive dialogue, which makes it more challenging to facilitate respectful discussions and develop critical global citizenship.

These distinctions have direct implications for teacher education. A soft framework may affirm humanistic values yet leave questions of power, inequality, responsibility, and social justice underexamined. A critical framework, by contrast, requires future teachers to be able to discuss contradictions, recognize ideological substitutions, engage with traumatic experiences, and, at the same time, protect the dignity of those who disagree. This heightened demand becomes particularly visible under wartime conditions, where social mobilization coexists with an intensified risk of dehumanization.

In this context, educational ethics and academic culture can serve as a value anchor that supports legality, human dignity, honesty, and transparency, thereby shaping the cultural conditions for educating critically conscious citizens capable of making responsible choices in complex social situations (Ilchenko, 2024). This brings academic culture into proximity with citizenship education not through "ideological" content, but through practice: how assessment is organized, what counts as evidence, how violations are addressed, and whether rules are clear and fair.

Mechanisms for shaping ethical culture in higher education

The source corpus highlights several mechanisms through which teacher education can cultivate a moral and ethical culture as a professional capacity.

The first mechanism concerns dialogic practices, including online intercultural interaction. Helm et al. (2024) demonstrate that learners primarily described their learning through encounters and conversations with people whose experiences differed from their own. They reported developing active listening skills, increased attentiveness, and a greater respect for diverse perspectives and life stories. In teacher education, this serves as training in civic conduct: future teachers learn not only to speak but also to listen, to suspend rapid judgement, and to acknowledge complexity.

The second mechanism is articulated through the lens of social justice. A review of GCE in Korean higher education draws on Nancy Fraser's framework (redistribution, recognition, representation) and highlights a paradox between political aspirations and practical implementation, as universities seek to balance economic competitiveness with the development of socially conscious citizens (Gerstner et al., 2024). For teacher education, this paradox is not merely a managerial issue. It shapes which ethical values are institutionally supported: whether priority is given to content coverage and formal reporting, or to dialogue and responsibility, and whether conditions are created for reflection on one's own biases.

The third mechanism relates to emotion and empathy as professional resources rather than merely "personal traits." A study of a university GCE intervention involving 36 pre-service teachers found that negative emotions were referenced more often than positive ones, with a substantial share linked to epistemic awareness of humanitarian problems (O'Toole & O'Flaherty, 2022). This suggests that teacher education should help future teachers not to avoid difficult topics but to stay with them without destructive consequences for themselves or for the group. In a related discussion of empathy as a goal of GCE, Risberg (2022) argues against superficial understandings and reframes empathy as a cognitive–epistemic capacity tied to attentiveness to others' experience and responsibility for knowledge. For future teachers, this implies combining compassion with critical evaluation of facts and causes, without losing moral clarity.

The war in Ukraine as an ethical challenge for teacher education

War turns moral dilemmas from occasional episodes into an everyday reality of education. Pedagogical approaches to teaching about the war in Ukraine through citizenship education, therefore, require systematic reconsideration. Evidence-informed methods in citizenship education enable the adaptation of teaching models for engaging with complex conflict-related issues, drawing on a robust research base on the role of citizenship education in protecting democracy (Matto, 2024).

For teacher education, this entails at least three requirements. The first concerns the didactics of “difficult knowledge.” Teacher education requires learning formats that enable future teachers to discuss war in ways that foster democratic knowledge, skills, and dispositions, rather than perpetuating simplistic narratives. The second requirement concerns work with bias and stereotypes. Implementing GCE presents challenges and requires caution to prevent difficult issues, such as military conflicts, from exacerbating prejudice or becoming sources of re-traumatization and polarization (Na & Kim, 2024). The third requirement relates to supporting teachers themselves. Under conditions of high stress and social pressure, university-based preparation must include not only values and methods but also practices of professional self-regulation and boundary-setting around responsibility, so that moral load does not culminate in burnout.

Academic integrity cannot be sustained solely through technology. It requires a synergy of pedagogy, institutional norms, and civic consciousness that cultivates moral values and an understanding of social responsibility. In wartime, this claim assumes a broader significance: the resilience of a democratic educational space hinges on whether an institution can uphold honesty, fairness, and dignity not merely in declarations, but also through its rules, communication, and everyday decisions.

Accordingly, in teacher education, a moral and ethical culture is formed through the interplay of professional roles (the teacher as a moral agent), pedagogical practices (such as dialogue, attentiveness to others' experiences, and social justice),

and institutional norms (including academic culture, honesty, and transparency). Under the conditions of the war in Ukraine, this culture becomes a criterion of professional capability: future teachers must be able to facilitate difficult conversations about conflict without abandoning democratic norms and without undermining dignity.

Academic Culture and Academic Integrity in Relation to Citizenship Education

Within teacher education, academic culture is not a technical add-on to disciplinary training. It defines the mode of existence of the university community through which future teachers internalize ethical norms as a “habit of action” rather than as a formal requirement. In the reviewed materials, academic integrity is described as a multidimensional concept that brings together educators’ personal qualities, the conditions that underpin the quality of educational activity, and the norms governing the functioning of the educational environment (Ilchenko, 2024). This approach enables the treatment of academic integrity not merely as a system for preventing misconduct, but as a moral and value-based foundation that sustains trust in knowledge, assessment, and institutional rules.

Particularly relevant to the present topic is the claim that systems built on legality, human dignity, professionalism, honesty, and transparency not only secure the quality of higher education but also provide a cultural basis for educating critically conscious citizens (Ilchenko, 2024). Here, academic culture becomes a form of citizenship education “through practice”: future teachers learn how rules, evidence, fairness, and responsibility operate within a democratic community. In this sense, academic integrity aligns with the concept of “civic maturity” because it habituates learners to distinguish between claims and evidence, acknowledge errors, refrain from appropriating others’ work, and avoid manipulating results.

This logic aligns with broader definitions of global citizenship education, which emphasize social cohesion, mutual respect, and the pursuit of more just and peaceful societies (UNESCO, 2018). If university academic culture is organized around humiliation, selective application of rules, or punitive mistrust, it contradicts

civic aims even when citizenship education is formally “taught.” Accordingly, within teacher education, academic culture must be consistent with the values that teachers are expected to enact in their subsequent professional practice.

The source corpus also contains a line that is central to this review: academic integrity is interpreted as a resource for social justice rather than merely a form of disciplinary control. A study conducted within the Galician university system shows that understandings of academic integrity in the responses of instructors and learners are “forged” around honesty, fairness, responsibility, trust, respect, and effort. Its overall conclusion explicitly links the development of academic integrity to the promotion of just action, arguing that higher education classrooms are a site for shaping the ethical foundations of civic life (Muñoz-Cantero et al., 2024).

For teacher education, this emphasis has two consequential implications. First, it shifts attention from “misconduct as an event” to the conditions that make integrity possible. Academic integrity then requires transparent assessment criteria, accessible explanations of citation rules, fair procedures for addressing violations, and instruction on how to work responsibly with sources. Second, it supports future teachers’ understanding that assessment ethics are part of professional morality. In both school and university practice, assessment is often where symbolic violence is most acutely experienced or where fairness is most strongly felt. Citizenship education embedded in academic culture, therefore, manifests not only in the content of lectures but in how the university enacts honesty and respect through its procedures.

After the pandemic-driven shift to online formats, universities widely adopted digital tools to protect academic integrity, including remote surveillance during examinations. In the source corpus, this phenomenon is treated as an ethical problem rather than merely a technological solution. The very framing of the question in the title “Good proctor or big brother?” captures the central dilemma: where to draw the line between legitimate integrity protection and excessive control that can erode privacy and trust (Coghlan et al., 2021).

Integrity as fairness and trust under crisis conditions

Academic integrity is often discussed in higher education as a normative ideal and a compliance requirement. However, the corpus of sources reviewed here supports a more practically consequential interpretation: integrity becomes sustainable when it is experienced as fairness in procedures and as a credible basis for trust within the academic community. This interpretation is especially relevant under crisis conditions, where the institutional environment is marked by heightened inequality, disrupted routines, and increased vulnerability. In such circumstances, integrity cannot be treated as a “hard” layer of control added to assessment. It must be built into the logic of assessment design, institutional communication, and the ethical constraints placed on technological interventions.

A crisis-sensitive understanding of integrity begins with the recognition that crises exacerbate unequal learning conditions. War-related displacement, unstable connectivity, damaged infrastructure, and intensified psycho-emotional burden affect learners’ capacity to participate in assessment under standardised assumptions of “equal conditions.” When universities respond to the perceived risk of misconduct by escalating surveillance, they may inadvertently transform integrity into a source of injustice. The ethical issue here is not that assessment should tolerate dishonesty. Rather, the question is how to protect the legitimacy of assessment while avoiding procedures that disproportionately penalise those in more vulnerable situations. The “control–trust” dilemma is therefore not an abstract debate about institutional preferences; it becomes a test of procedural justice in contexts where vulnerability is structurally distributed.

Digital proctoring exemplifies this tension clearly. The ethical analysis of online exam supervision technologies emphasizes concerns that extend beyond efficiency, including intrusion into privacy, unequal burdens across groups, and potential discrimination embedded in technological systems (Coghlan et al., 2021). Systematic reviews further show that digital proctoring has become a substantial research area in higher education, indicating that the issue is no longer marginal but structurally tied to contemporary assessment practices (Han et al., 2023). Under crisis conditions, these concerns become sharper.

Learners may lack access to private spaces, stable internet, or suitable devices, and proctoring requirements can exacerbate stress and feelings of exclusion. As a result, a proctoring-centred approach risks producing an integrity regime that is formally consistent but ethically fragile: it secures compliance at the price of dignity and fairness, thereby weakening trust in the institution and, paradoxically, undermining the very moral basis of integrity.

From the perspective of teacher education, this point is particularly important. Future teachers learn not only subject content but also institutional norms of assessment and accountability. If their formative experience of integrity is predominantly surveillance-oriented, they may internalise an implicit model of educational authority grounded in suspicion. Such a model is incompatible with the civic aims of citizenship education, which rely on mutual respect, responsible judgment, and the capacity for dialogue. In contrast, when integrity is institutionalised as procedural fairness and transparent reasoning, teacher education can function as a “school of trust”: learners experience that rules are intelligible, that assessment criteria are stable and publicly justified, and that institutional responses to violations are proportionate and educationally oriented.

A crisis-sensitive approach, therefore, shifts attention from detecting violations to designing conditions in which honesty is feasible and meaningful. This involves several interrelated moves. First, assessment tasks need to be aligned with epistemic goals rather than merely focusing on output production. When tasks privilege authentic reasoning, explicit use of sources, and defensible argumentation, the space for superficial substitution narrows without requiring maximal surveillance. Second, fairness requires clarity: learners must understand what counts as legitimate assistance, what forms of collaboration are permitted, and how evidence and authorship are to be demonstrated. Third, procedural justice requires consistent, non-arbitrary responses to suspected violations, including opportunities for explanation and learning-oriented remediation where appropriate. These elements position integrity as a shared civic practice rather than as a one-sided enforcement mechanism.

The spread of generative AI systems intensifies the urgency of this reframing. The corpus highlights the argument that

integrity “in the age of ChatGPT” is not primarily about catching misconduct but about establishing clear norms and pedagogical boundaries for acceptable AI use in learning and assessment (Perkins, 2023). In crisis contexts, this need becomes more pressing because learners’ reliance on technological assistance may increase due to disrupted learning conditions, stress, and time constraints. If institutions respond by broad prohibitions without pedagogical clarification, they risk creating a regime of hidden practices and implicit inequities, where some learners gain advantage through unspoken strategies while others comply at a cost. Conversely, transparent AI policies can support fairness by making expectations explicit and by aligning them with assessment goals: what is being evaluated (reasoning, evidence, reflection) and what kinds of assistance remain compatible with authorship.

In teacher education, defining “honest help” is also a matter of professional ethics. Future teachers will later set norms for learners’ work in schools and will face similar tensions between control and trust. Therefore, university integrity policies should be viewed as part of professional formation, as they model how a democratic educational institution balances accountability with dignity. This balance is especially consequential in wartime contexts where informational manipulation is widespread and where evidence-based reasoning becomes a civic necessity. Here, integrity is directly connected to citizenship education, as it trains learners to take responsibility for their claims, to distinguish between evidence and assertion, and to treat knowledge as a public good that requires honesty to remain credible.

Ultimately, the crisis lens highlights that integrity cannot be sustained solely by technology. While technological tools may reduce certain risks, they cannot replace the moral and civic foundations of academic culture. Sustainable integrity requires institutional coherence: transparent rules, fair procedures, ethically constrained technologies, and pedagogy that makes honesty meaningful. Under crisis conditions, this coherence becomes the main driver of trust. Without it, integrity regimes risk becoming brittle systems of control that produce compliance but erode legitimacy. With it, integrity can function as a civic practice within the university, preparing future teachers to uphold fairness,

responsibility, and evidential standards in their professional work.

A systematic review of digital proctoring highlights that this area has a substantial and expanding research base, particularly in higher education (Han et al., 2023). Yet the more consequential point is that proctoring relocates academic integrity into the domain of civic rights and university ethics. Under such conditions, teacher education must help future teachers understand integrity as a balancing of legitimate aims. Fair and honest assessment is essential, but it cannot be upheld through practices that undermine human dignity or create unequal conditions for different groups of learners. This tension is amplified in wartime, when unequal learning conditions (displacement, unstable connectivity, heightened psycho-emotional strain) become widespread, and “hard” control solutions may unfairly penalize those in more vulnerable circumstances. In this reality, technological mechanisms for safeguarding integrity need to be aligned with an ethics of fairness, not merely with the efficiency of detecting violations.

The spread of generative language models has sharpened a longstanding question within academic culture: what exactly “independent work” means when tools can produce coherent text, paraphrase, structure ideas, and propose arguments. Within the source corpus, this issue is treated as a distinct research strand in which ChatGPT and similar systems are discussed both as a risk factor and as a catalyst for updating policies and pedagogical approaches (Perkins, 2023). Closely related is work examining academic integrity “in the generative AI era,” which highlights threats and ethical concerns and calls for solutions that are sensitive to disciplinary specificities (AlHajaya, 2025). For teacher education, this implies that moral and ethical culture must incorporate a new component: the capacity to frame acceptable AI use pedagogically and ethically. Future teachers need to understand the distinction between support (for example, language editing or generating an outline) and a substitution of authorship. This is not only a matter of control; it is a matter of honesty as a civic value, involving responsibility for one’s words, sources, and the accuracy of claims. When learners become accustomed to unacknowledged use of generated texts, they lose the habit of responsible judgment. That loss is particularly

dangerous under wartime conditions, where the information environment is saturated with manipulation and the moral cost of falsification is higher.

A separate strand of sources describes technological innovations designed to reduce risks of integrity breaches. Here, proposed solutions operate not at the level of “plagiarism detection” but at the level of assessment architecture and documentation. One example is the integration of natural language processing (NLP) with multilayer encryption to protect examination materials, including automated question generation and controlled access to content, as a mechanism for strengthening the fairness and integrity of online assessments (Abdulhadi et al., 2025). In parallel, research examines blockchain-based approaches to preventing academic document fraud, where systems built on IPFS and smart contracts are presented as a way to produce immutable, cryptographically secured certificates and diplomas that facilitate authenticity verification in digital environments (Sultana et al., 2023).

In the wartime context, this agenda gains additional urgency: mass displacement, the destruction of infrastructure, and an increased need for rapid qualification verification can heighten the risks of document fraud. Yet even such solutions do not remove the moral core of the problem. Academic integrity in the digital age cannot be ensured solely through technology. What is needed is a comprehensive approach that combines digital tools, pedagogical innovation, and the strengthening of civic consciousness that nurtures moral values and an understanding of social responsibility. Technology may make misconduct harder or more visible, but it cannot cultivate an internal readiness to act honestly. In teacher education, therefore, digital solutions should be treated as supports for institutional procedures rather than as substitutes for moral formation.

Digital transformation reshapes not only assessment but also everyday academic communication (Al-Khatib, 2023). This reinforces a point that is particularly salient for teacher education: citizenship education in higher education is increasingly enacted through digital platforms, which means that online interaction ethics become part of teachers’ professional ethics. This involves norms of respect, non-discrimination, accountability for one’s

words, and responsible discussion of sensitive topics. In wartime, these norms carry added weight. Online communication becomes not only a site of learning but also a space for social support and for processing loss, conflict, and strain. As a result, academic culture in digital environments effectively intersects with a broader culture of civic dialogue.

The War in Ukraine as a Condition for Reframing Teachers' Civic, Moral, and Academic Culture

The source corpus documents a fundamental shift in how the pedagogical role is understood: from a “transmitter of knowledge” to a moral figure who educates globally aware citizens while also preparing young people for peaceful conflict resolution. Within this logic, the war in Ukraine cannot be treated as an external topic that may be bypassed in university-based teacher education. It sharpens the demand for teachers’ capacity to act ethically amid collective trauma, informational pressure, and high levels of polarization, and it makes visible the limits of “neutral” education as a professional stance.

When this perspective is read alongside the aims of global citizenship education, a shared normative foundation becomes apparent: a commitment to social cohesion, mutual respect, tolerance of difference, and the pursuit of more just and peaceful societies (UNESCO, 2018). For teacher education in higher education, this means that citizenship education must unfold not only as content (courses, topics) but also as a professional culture of thinking and interaction that can withstand complex social realities.

Citizenship education is directly linked to teaching about the war in Ukraine and to the need to update pedagogical approaches. Educators across institutions and disciplines can adapt civic learning models to engage with complex issues associated with military conflicts, drawing on an established research base on the role of citizenship education in safeguarding democracy (Matto, 2024). Importantly, this logic also presupposes the development of democratic knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable learners to grasp the global consequences of armed conflict and to articulate their civic position in complex international settings.

In the preparation of future teachers, this requirement takes a concrete form: teacher education should not only teach *about* war, but also teach *in ways* that are compatible with democracy. This aligns with the argument that critical consciousness and democratic values need to be cultivated through reflection, inclusion, dialogue, the acceptance of diversity, and constructive debate (Veugelers, 2024). Accordingly, citizenship education in higher education under wartime conditions becomes a test of pedagogical capacity: can the university prepare future teachers to discuss conflict in ways that uphold dignity, evidence-based reasoning, and responsibility, rather than turning educational interactions into an arena of humiliation or simplified ideological formulas?

The integration of citizenship education, particularly when politically sensitive topics are involved, presents substantial pedagogical challenges. Teachers are expected to address contentious issues, including military conflicts, without reinforcing bias, stereotypes, or destructive reactions among learners (Na & Kim, 2024). The literature also notes external pressure (fear of negative parental responses, administrative restrictions, uncertainty about substantive content), as well as a systemic lack of institutional support and professional development, which means that teachers often rely primarily on their own resources (Na & Kim, 2024).

For higher education institutions that prepare teachers, this has two methodological implications. First, teacher education needs modules that explicitly train work with conflict as a didactic situation (discussion design, rules for safe communication, work with sources, and distinguishing facts from evaluations). Second, teachers' ethical culture cannot be developed through "individual effort" alone if the institution fails to create supportive conditions. This conclusion is consistent with the claim that the development of teachers' moral culture requires time, resources, and psychological support.

Within the source corpus, a relationship is traced between global civic consciousness and conflict resolution competence. Empirical findings indicate a correlation between specialized conflict resolution skills and readiness for active participation in addressing global problems, including military conflicts, migration,

and inequality (Balba & Bayr, 2023). For the preparation of future teachers, this result is significant as evidence-based support for the argument that citizenship education cannot be reduced to a knowledge component. It must include deliberate skills training: how to act in conflict, how to recognize escalation, and how to build a conversation in which argument and respect remain possible.

A related emphasis is also evident in research on pre-service social studies teacher education. While most participants articulated clear definitions of democratic citizenship, only some demonstrated a focus on critical multiculturalism. Participants with stronger content knowledge and social justice-oriented beliefs were more effective in enacting practices of multicultural democratic education (Martinelle et al., 2024). This points to a direct requirement for university programs: to provide not only teaching methods but also the intellectual and ethical resources without which justice and democratic culture remain rhetorical claims.

Academic integrity is described as an ethical and value-based foundation of the university environment. Systems grounded in legality, human dignity, professionalism, honesty, and transparency create the conditions for educating critically conscious citizens capable of making responsible choices in complex social situations (Ilchenko, 2024). This proposition is particularly salient in wartime, when the information sphere becomes a site of struggle, and the capacity to distinguish evidence-based claims from manipulation becomes a civic competence. At the same time, advances in academic integrity in the digital age underscore a key conclusion: the problem cannot be solved solely through technology. A comprehensive approach is needed, combining digital tools with pedagogical innovation and the strengthening of civic consciousness that nurtures moral values and an understanding of social responsibility.

For teacher education, this means that the academic culture in the university should function as a “school of trust” and fairness, characterized by transparent assessment, responsible work with sources, and accountable attitudes toward authorship and evidence. In wartime, such a culture supports not only educational

quality but also the resilience of democratic norms in everyday communication.

In sum, the war in Ukraine significantly increases the importance of citizenship education in higher education, particularly within teacher education programs. It elevates democratic values, such as dignity, fairness, and responsibility, from the level of declaration to the level of everyday pedagogical decision-making. At the same time, the war intensifies the risks associated with teaching sensitive topics (bias, stereotypes, destructive reactions) and reveals a lack of institutional support, without which the moral burden placed on educators becomes excessive. Under these conditions, academic culture and academic integrity acquire a distinctly civic meaning because they sustain trust in knowledge and the fairness of educational procedures.

An Integrative Analytical Framework for Teachers' Civic Culture During Wartime

The review indicates that citizenship education in higher education, the professional morality of future teachers, and the academic culture of the university do not operate as autonomous phenomena. They intersect at the level of values and practices. First, global citizenship education provides normative orientations towards social cohesion, mutual respect, and the construction of more just and peaceful societies (UNESCO, 2018). Second, the teacher, as a moral agent, enacts these orientations in everyday communication through modeling ethical behavior and shaping learners' values (Icka & Kochoska, 2024). Third, academic integrity and a culture of transparent rules foster trust in knowledge and assessment, thereby supporting the university community's capacity to act responsibly in complex social situations (Ilchenko, 2024).

Under the conditions of the war in Ukraine, this interdependence becomes more pronounced. Citizenship education serves as a resource for democratic resilience and as a means of organizing teaching about sensitive topics, while teachers' professional ethics act as a safeguard against dehumanization and the perpetuation of hate speech. In the same field, academic culture becomes a practice of informational responsibility and evidence-based reasoning, which is critically

important in wartime and post-truth information environments (Matto, 2024). Accordingly, an integrative framework is needed not to “combine different topics,” but to explain the mechanism through which university-based teacher education can foster civic capacity in situations where moral and ethical dilemmas are inseparable from professional decision-making.

On the basis of the source corpus, it is appropriate to distinguish three interrelated dimensions of culture that are formed in the preparation of future teachers.

(1) Moral culture as an internal orientation towards the good, dignity, fairness, and responsibility that becomes visible in the character of professional decisions. Teachers’ morality is linked to their role as moral agents and ethical role models; the emphasis is not on declarative values, but on modeling ethical conduct and influencing learners’ moral orientations (Icka & Kochoska, 2024).

(2) Ethical culture as a system of interaction norms within the group and the institution: rules for respectful dialogue, boundaries of acceptable speech, and ways of working with conflict and bias. In the source corpus, this culture is described through the need to facilitate discussions of difficult issues (including military conflicts) without reinforcing stereotypes or generating destructive reactions, and under conditions where professional support is available (Na & Kim, 2024). Ethical culture also entails the capacity for constructive dialogue and debate, treated as a means of developing critical consciousness and democratic values (Veugelers, 2024).

(3) Academic culture as a normative and procedural system that upholds honesty, evidential reasoning, transparency, and fairness in assessment. It is conceptualized as the value foundation of the educational environment: legality, human dignity, professionalism, honesty, and transparency sustain educational quality and create conditions for educating critically conscious citizens (Ilchenko, 2024). In its digital dimension, this culture also includes ethical norms of online interaction and rules for working with new tools (including generative AI) that reshape traditional criteria of authorship and independent work (Perkins, 2023).

Operationalising the triadic culture in teacher education

The integrative framework presented above is analytically useful only insofar as it can be translated into observable patterns in university-based teacher education. In other words, the triadic culture of the future teacher becomes a meaningful construct when it is operationalised through institutional practices, learning tasks, and interaction norms that enable the cultivation of civic responsibility under conditions of war and accelerated digital transformation. In this sense, the framework does not merely describe three “types of culture.” It provides a lens for identifying how moral orientation, ethical interaction, and academic integrity are learned, rehearsed, and stabilised in everyday higher education routines.

A first step in operationalisation is to clarify the level at which each cultural dimension becomes visible. Moral culture is primarily expressed through the logic of professional judgment: how future teachers justify their decisions, how they weigh competing goods, and how they take responsibility for the consequences. Ethical culture becomes observable in interaction: how disagreement is managed, which boundaries of acceptable speech are collectively upheld, and how conflict is processed without humiliation. Academic culture is manifested in epistemic practices and procedures, including how evidence is used, how authorship is attributed, and how assessment is organized to be transparent and fair. These three dimensions are interdependent. When one of them is underdeveloped or institutionalised in a distorted form, the others tend to erode as well. For example, assessment practices experienced as arbitrary or punitive can weaken not only trust in knowledge but also the willingness to engage in respectful dialogue, because learners interpret the educational space as unsafe and strategically oriented.

Operationalising moral culture in teacher education requires learning formats in which future teachers repeatedly encounter situations of moral complexity and are guided to articulate reasons for their choices. This is especially relevant under wartime conditions, where teachers may face dilemmas that involve competing responsibilities, such as protecting learners’ dignity while addressing sensitive content, sustaining professional

standards under unequal learning conditions, and balancing solidarity with critical distance in discussions about conflict. Moral culture is not formed by exhortation alone. It grows through structured engagement with dilemmas that demand justification and reflection, and through feedback that helps future teachers recognise the moral consequences of routine pedagogical decisions. In this regard, the notion of the teacher as a moral agent and ethical model provides a concrete mechanism: professional identity is shaped not only by knowledge of norms but by practising responsibility in situations where norms are tested (Icka & Kochoska, 2024).

In practical terms, moral culture becomes visible in the way future teachers learn to frame decisions as accountable. This includes the capacity to (a) explain why a particular pedagogical move is ethically defensible, (b) anticipate possible harms, including symbolic harms such as humiliation or exclusion, and (c) revise one's stance when new evidence or perspectives are introduced. Under informational pressure and polarisation, such capacities are closely related to civic responsibility, because they support the habit of distinguishing moral clarity from moral simplification. The aim is not to produce "neutral" teachers but to cultivate professionals capable of principled judgement that is compatible with democratic values and human dignity.

Operationalising an ethical culture involves building a shared grammar of interaction that enables disagreement without dehumanising others. For teacher education, this is not a peripheral matter of classroom management; it is a core professional competence. Ethical culture is enacted when future teachers learn to facilitate discussions in which conflict is anticipated and managed through agreed norms. This includes establishing boundaries of acceptable speech, addressing stereotypes and bias when they arise, and employing dialogic structures that preserve dignity while maintaining a focus on argument and evidence. The literature on global citizenship education emphasizes that politically sensitive issues, such as military conflicts, can exacerbate bias and destructive reactions if educators lack institutional support and effective pedagogical tools (Na & Kim, 2024). Therefore, operationalisation must include explicit training in conflict-sensitive dialogue: how to structure

discussions, how to intervene when discourse becomes harmful, and how to maintain a learning climate where learners can speak without fear of humiliation.

Ethical culture is also inseparable from the civic dimension of deliberation. Constructive debate and reflective dialogue are not only pedagogical techniques; they model democratic coexistence by legitimising disagreement while rejecting humiliation. In this sense, teacher education can treat dialogic practices as a form of professional ethics: future teachers learn to sustain communicative space where plural experiences can be voiced and examined, and where the group can return to shared standards of respect and evidence (Veugeliers, 2024). Wartime conditions make this competence particularly salient because the educational space often becomes a site where grief, anger, fear, and social tension are expressed. Without a robust ethical culture, these pressures can convert classroom interaction into polarising dynamics that undermine both civic learning and pedagogical safety.

Operationalising academic culture entails treating academic integrity as a formative civic practice rather than a narrow compliance mechanism. In teacher education, academic culture becomes visible through the design of assessment, the transparency of criteria, and the everyday norms of working with sources and claims. If integrity is experienced primarily as surveillance and punishment, it risks reinforcing mistrust and strategic behaviour. Conversely, when academic integrity is institutionalised through clear rules, fair procedures, and a consistent emphasis on evidence-based reasoning, it supports civic maturity by habituating learners to accountability for claims and to respect for others' intellectual work. This aligns with the view that academic integrity is a multidimensional foundation of educational quality and civic formation, rooted in dignity, professionalism, honesty, and transparency (Ilchenko, 2024).

Digital transformation adds a further layer to academic culture. Teacher education must now address how digital tools reshape criteria of authorship, independent work, and permissible assistance. The challenge is not merely technical but also ethical: universities must navigate the tension between control and trust in assessment systems, including the ethical concerns associated with digital proctoring (such as privacy, fairness, and

discrimination) (Coghlan et al., 2021; Han et al., 2023). At the same time, generative AI systems force teacher education to articulate norms of “honest help” and to redesign tasks so that integrity is supported through pedagogy rather than through escalating surveillance. In this respect, academic integrity “in the age of ChatGPT” requires the explicit teaching of boundaries and responsible practices, not only the detection of misconduct (Perkins, 2023). For future teachers, this becomes part of professional culture because they will later translate these norms into school-level assessment, feedback, and classroom discourse.

A crucial implication of operationalisation is that the triadic culture must be treated as an institutional ecology. Moral culture is strengthened when future teachers experience that the institution is consistent: it demands responsibility while practicing fairness; it requires respect while preventing humiliation; it values evidence while ensuring transparent procedures. Ethical culture is sustained when there are stable norms for dialogue and when educators are supported, rather than left to navigate conflicts alone. Academic culture becomes credible when integrity rules are intelligible, assessment criteria are transparent, and digital tools are used in ways that protect dignity and justice. Under wartime conditions, where inequality and vulnerability are amplified, such consistency becomes not a matter of institutional reputation but a condition for democratic resilience within teacher education.

The integrative framework includes two “fields of tension” that simultaneously generate new risks.

Field 1: The war in Ukraine. War brings sensitive topics, high emotional load, and social polarization into everyday pedagogical reality. In wartime, citizenship education is framed as a resource for protecting democracy and as a basis for adapting educational models so that the war is addressed not as a propagandistic narrative but as an object of civic inquiry and deliberation (Matto, 2024). At the same time, the literature documents risks of bias and a lack of institutional support, which often forces educators to rely primarily on their own resources (Na & Kim, 2024).

Field 2: Digitalization and generative AI. Digital transformation produces, simultaneously, instruments of surveillance and control (proctoring) and tools that enable

substitution of authorship (generative text), pushing universities to update both policies and pedagogical approaches. The “control versus trust” dilemma is articulated through ethical concerns about privacy, fairness, and potential discrimination in digital proctoring (Coghlan et al., 2021; Han et al., 2023). From another angle, integrity “in the age of ChatGPT” requires not only detecting violations but also pedagogically defining boundaries of permissible assistance and establishing transparent norms that are intelligible to learners (Perkins, 2023).

These two fields of tension interact. War intensifies inequality in learning conditions and raises the moral stakes of informational responsibility, while digitalization expands both educational opportunities and risks of dishonesty and mistrust. For teacher education, this implies that citizenship education must incorporate new competences: ethical use of digital tools, evidence-based reasoning, resilience to manipulation, and the capacity for reasoned dialogue under pressure.

The source corpus enables the identification of several mechanisms that appear to be shared across the formation of all three dimensions of culture.

The first mechanism is linked to dialogue and learning through interaction. Online virtual exchanges in higher education show that learners associate learning with “encounters” with people whose experiences differ from their own, and that acquired skills include active listening and respect for divergent positions (Helm et al., 2024). For future teachers, this serves as both a civic and an ethical practice, fostering the capacity for dialogue without humiliation and preserving space for debate.

The second mechanism concerns social justice as a lens for organizing teacher education. Research on pre-service social studies teacher education suggests that stronger content knowledge and orientations towards social justice are associated with more effective enactment of multicultural democratic education (Martinelle et al., 2024). This suggests that an “ethical” component cannot be detached from the intellectual one: teachers’ moral culture presupposes knowledge, without which justice and human rights remain abstract concepts.

The third mechanism is institutional transparency and procedural fairness, which form the foundation of academic culture. An empirical study of how academic integrity is understood within a higher education community highlights its association with honesty, fairness, responsibility, trust, respect, and effort, and shows that integrity development can operate as a pathway towards shaping the ethical foundations of civic identity (Muñoz-Cantero et al., 2024).

The fourth mechanism is the pedagogical processing of emotions and difficult topics. In the preparation of future teachers, GCE interventions are associated with the predominance of negative emotions, which often have an epistemic character, namely awareness of the scale of humanitarian problems (O'Toole & O'Flaherty, 2022). This suggests that the formation of moral culture is not possible without developing the capacity to stay with complexity rather than translating it into destructive aggression or indifference.

Coherence, trade-offs, and implementation risks of the triadic framework

The triadic culture of the future teacher is not merely a conceptual aggregation of themes but an institutional configuration that must remain coherent under conditions of war and rapid digital change. This coherence is fragile. It depends on whether higher education institutions can align the moral dimension (responsible judgment and dignity), the ethical dimension (rules of interaction and conflict resolution), and the academic dimension (evidence-based practice and procedural fairness) in a way that is perceived as credible by learners and educators.

A central implication is that *integrity policy functions as civic pedagogy*. When integrity is enacted through transparent criteria, proportionate procedures, and intelligible expectations, it habituates learners to take accountability for their claims and to respect others' work, which supports civic maturity (Ilchenko, 2024; Muñoz-Cantero et al., 2024). Conversely, when integrity is primarily enforced through surveillance and suspicion, it may secure compliance but weaken trust and undermine the civic orientation of citizenship education, particularly in teacher

education, where institutional models are internalised as professional norms (Coghlan et al., 2021; Han et al., 2023). This tension becomes particularly acute under wartime conditions, where inequality in learning conditions is exacerbated and where institutional decisions about assessment can either mitigate or perpetuate injustice.

The review also suggests that war and digitalisation interact in ways that complicate “standard” solutions. The war in Ukraine heightens emotional pressure and increases the risk of polarisation in discussions of sensitive topics, while simultaneously raising the moral stakes of informational responsibility (Matto, 2024). Digitalisation expands opportunities for learning and dialogue, yet it also intensifies the control–trust dilemma and destabilises traditional criteria of authorship and independent work, especially with the diffusion of generative AI (Perkins, 2023). The combined effect is that teacher education needs to cultivate not only civic dispositions but also the professional capacity to manage ambiguity: to articulate boundaries of acceptable assistance, to facilitate conflict-sensitive dialogue, and to sustain evidential standards without slipping into punitive regimes that erode dignity.

A further point concerns the role of emotions and epistemic vulnerability. Evidence from GCE interventions indicates that negative emotions often have an epistemic character, reflecting learners’ awareness of humanitarian problems rather than mere dissatisfaction with pedagogy (O’Toole & O’Flaherty, 2022). This matters for the triadic framework because moral and ethical cultures cannot be sustained if difficult emotions are either ignored or displaced into aggression, stereotyping, or disengagement. In wartime contexts, teacher education must therefore treat emotional processing as part of professional formation: not therapy, but pedagogically guided work that keeps dignity and argument central while acknowledging the reality of grief, fear, and anger.

Finally, the discussion underlines a practical risk: institutional incoherence. Universities may adopt ambitious rhetoric on citizenship education while maintaining assessment procedures that learners experience as opaque, unequal, or punitive; or they may promote ethical dialogue while leaving

educators unsupported in conflict-sensitive teaching. The corpus suggests that such mismatches weaken the triadic culture as a whole because learners interpret values through institutional practices rather than through policy language alone. Accordingly, the most consequential implication of the review is that teacher education under crisis conditions should be evaluated not only by curricular content but by the coherence of institutional norms across communication, assessment, and the pedagogical handling of sensitive topics. Where coherence is achieved, the triadic framework becomes a viable lens for strengthening democratic resilience in teacher education; where it is absent, the same framework reveals why well-intended initiatives remain fragile or symbolic.

Overall, the synthesis supports an understanding of citizenship education in higher education as an environment in which a triadic culture of the future teacher is formed: moral culture (internal value orientation), ethical culture (norms of interaction and work with conflict), and academic culture (honesty, evidential reasoning, and procedural fairness). The war in Ukraine and digitalization serve as factors that intensify the demands placed on this culture, rendering it not an optional element, but a condition of teachers' professional capability.

Conclusions

The literature review suggests that, within higher education, citizenship education, the moral and ethical culture of the future teacher, and the university's academic culture form an interdependent system. This system operates not as a simple sum of separate courses or events, but as a mode of organizing the educational process in which values become visible through rules, communication, assessment practices, and responsibility for knowledge.

Contemporary scholarship frames the relationship between citizenship education and the moral, ethical, and academic culture of future teachers as a link between the value aims of democratic coexistence and university practices that cultivate a habit of responsible judgment among learners. Within this perspective, the future teacher is not only a carrier of teaching methods but also a

moral agent whose professional conduct sets norms of interaction, honesty, and respect.

The war in Ukraine functions as a factor that sharply intensifies expectations for teachers' civic and professional capability. It relocates democracy, dignity, fairness, and responsibility into the realm of everyday pedagogical decisions. Teaching about the war requires methodologically careful approaches that allow conflict to be addressed as a complex social reality while avoiding the reproduction of dehumanization, stereotypes, and aggressive forms of polarization. Under these conditions, institutional support for teachers becomes especially crucial: without such support, the moral burden associated with difficult topics can lead to exhaustion and a narrowing of pedagogical capacity.

A second major tension arises from the digital transformation of higher education and the spread of generative AI. These developments redefine the criteria for independent work, authorship, and legitimate assistance, while also sharpening the "control-trust" dichotomy in assessment systems. Universities are compelled to secure integrity while avoiding the erosion of dignity and procedural fairness, especially under crisis-driven inequalities in access to resources and stable learning environments. This leads to a practical conclusion: academic integrity cannot be sustained solely through technological instruments. Its robustness depends on a combination of transparent rules, a pedagogically coherent logic of tasks, a culture of evidential reasoning, and the development of responsibility as a civic quality.

Accordingly, teacher education in higher education under wartime conditions can be productively conceptualized as the formation of a triadic culture: moral culture (value orientation and responsibility for decisions), ethical culture (interaction norms and conflict resolution), and academic culture (honesty, evidence-based reasoning, and procedural fairness). The coherence of these dimensions is a criterion of quality because future teachers are expected to carry these norms into the broader educational space and sustain them under conditions of high social strain and informational risk.

References

- Abdulhadi, M. T., Kadhim, D. T., & Hameed, R. A. (2025). A Secure Framework for Automated Question Generation and Examination Protection Using Natural Language Processing(NLP) and Multilayer Encryption. *2025 3rd International Conference on Business Analytics for Technology and Security (ICBATS)*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICBATS66542.2025.11258499>
- Al'Abri, K. M., Ambusaidi, A. K., & Alhadi, B. R. (2022). Promoting Global Citizenship Education (GCED) in the Sultanate of Oman: An Analysis of National Policies. *Sustainability*, 14(12), 7140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127140>
- Al-Hajaya, K. (2025). Academic integrity is under fire in the Generative AI age: Insights from accounting educators to overcome challenges, threats and ethical concerns. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-02-2025-0060>
- Al-Khatib, T. (2023). Netiquette rules in online learning through the lens of digital citizenship scale in the post-corona era. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 21(2), 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-08-2021-0089>
- Balbağ, N. L., & Gürdoğan Bayır, Ömür. (2023). The Prediction Level of the Students' Conflict Resolution Skills and Their Demographic Characteristics on Their Global Citizenship Perceptions. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 12(2), 489–504. https://doi.org/10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V12.N2.9
- Banerjee, S., Shaw, D., & Sparke, M. (2025). Collaborative online international learning, social innovation and global health: Cosmopolitical COVID lessons as global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 23(2), 379–392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2209585>
- Bosio, E. (2025). Global South university educators' perceptions of global citizenship education: Reflective dialogue, social change, and critical awareness. *PROSPECTS*, 55(1), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-023-09635-y>
- Coelho, D. P., Caramelo, J., Amorim, J. P., & Menezes, I. (2022). Towards the Transformative Role of Global Citizenship Education Experiences in Higher Education: Crossing Students' and Teachers' Views. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 23(2), 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15413446221103190>
- Coghlan, S., Miller, T., & Paterson, J. (2021). Good Proctor or "Big Brother"? Ethics of Online Exam Supervision Technologies. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), 1581–1606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00476-1>
- Gerstner, N. L., Lim, E., & Abura, M. (2024). Global citizenship education in Korean higher education: moving beyond transformative calls to praxes. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2439855>

- Gyamera, G. O., & Debrah, I. (2021). Utilising university community engagement as a critical tool for global citizenship. *Compare. A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 53(3), 435–453. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2021.1929074>
- Han, S., Nikou, S., & Yilma Ayele, W. (2023). Digital proctoring in higher education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(1), 265–285. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-12-2022-0522>
- Helm, F., Baroni, A. & Acconcia, G. (2024). Global citizenship online in higher education. *Educ Res Policy Prac* 23, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09351-6>
- Icka, E., & Kochoska, J. (2024). The influence of teachers as an ethical model on the students' development. *International Journal of Education Teacher*, 27, 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.20544/teacher.27.12>
- Ilchenko, O. (2024). Academic integrity as a factor of ensuring quality training of specialists in institutions of higher education. *The sources of pedagogical skills*, 33, 100–103, <https://doi.org/10.33989/2075-146x.2024.33.310004>
- Kharchenko, I. I., & Semenikhina, O. V. (2024). Culture of professional communication and emotional intelligence: identifying connections. *Modern educational strategies under the influence of the development of the information society and European integration* : Scientific monograph. Riga, Latvia : "Baltija Publishing", 526-576. <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-405-4-27>
- Martinelle, R., Martell, C. C., & Chalmers-Curren, J. P. (2022). Teaching for transformative citizenship: A study of preservice social studies teachers' developing beliefs and practices. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 19(1), 77-94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979221115796>
- Matto, E. C. (2024). Teaching Democratic Citizenship in Moments of Conflict: Putting Civic Engagement Theory Into Practice When Teaching About the War in Ukraine. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 20(3), 374–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2024.2319839>
- Muñoz-Cantero, J.-M., Pérez Crego, M.-C., & Espiñeira-Bellón, E.-M. (2024). Desarrollo de la integridad académica como oportunidad de justicia. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 27(3), 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.6018/reifop.615081>
- O'Toole, V., & O'Flaherty, J. (2022). The role of emotion in higher education: exploring global citizenship education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 43(4), 645–663. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2022.2135565>
- Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>

- Portera, A. (2023). Global versus intercultural citizenship education. *Prospects*, 53, 233–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-021-09577-3>
- Risberg, E. J. (2022). Fostering Empathy in Global Citizenship Education: Necessary, Desirable, or Simply Misguided? *Educational Theory*, 72(5), 553–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12546>
- Semenikhina, O. (2024). Academic culture: a comparative analysis of approaches to the interpretation of concepts. *Journal "Perspectives and Innovations of Science" (Series "Pedagogy", Series "Psychology", Series "Medicine")*, 3(37), 590-599. [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2024-3\(37\)-590-599](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2024-3(37)-590-599)
- Semenikhina, O. (2025). Integrity as a tool for developing the legal culture of a specialist in higher education in conditions of blended learning. *Pedagogical Sciences: Theory, History, Innovative Technologies*, 2 (142), 570-578, № 2 (142), 570-578. <https://doi.org/10.24139/2312-5953/2025.02/570-578>
- Semenikhina, O., Udovychenko, O., Udovychenko, I. (2024). Academic culture and its development in higher education institutions in retrospect and comparison. *Pedagogical sciences: theory, history, innovative technologies*, 1-2 (135-136), 207-219 <http://doi.org/10.24139/2312-5993/2024.01-02/207-219>
- Sultana, S. A., Rupa, C., Malleswari, R. P., & Gadekallu, T. R. (2023). IPFS-Blockchain Smart Contracts Based Conceptual Framework to Reduce Certificate Frauds in the Academic Field. *Information*, 14(8), 446. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info14080446>
- Veugelers, W. (2024). The moral and political dimensions of education: Response to Hansen. *Journal of Moral Education*, 53(4), 751–756. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2024.2384809>
- Waghid, Z. (2023). Teacher educators' pedagogical practices in global citizenship education using the soft vs critical GCE framework. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2251757>
- Yamada, R. (2023). Planned thinking and democratic personality: Karl Mannheim's legacy for global citizenship education today. *Prospects*, 53, 313–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-021-09573-7>
- Ye-Won Na, Koeun Kim. (2024). Difficulties of early childhood teachers in implementing global citizenship education. *Korean Journal of Early Childhood Education Research*, 26(3), 251-280. <https://doi.org/10.15409/riece.2024.26.3.10>
- Yurchenko A., Momot P., & Semenikhina O. (2024). On the development of teachers' information and digital culture using computer visualization. *Education. Innovation. Practice*, 12(6), 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.31110/2616-650X-vol12i6-014>