

Oleksiy Kiykov¹

Department of Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Education Policy

Dragomanov Ukrainian State University

The Philosophy of Hybridity in Management: *Phronesis*, Risk, and Agile Governance in a Post-Digital World

[Filozofia hybrydowości w zarządzaniu: *phronesis*, ryzyko
i zwinne zarządzanie w świecie postcyfrowym]

Streszczenie: Filozofia hybrydycznego zarządzania – jako zakorzeniona w cnocie praktyka mądrego działania w niepewnych warunkach funkcjonowania – jest przedmiotem rozważań w niniejszym artykule. Wychodząc od arystotelesowskiej roztropności praktycznej (*phronesis*), łączy w jedną architekturę rozumowania zwinne iteracje, roztropne zarządzanie ryzykiem, badania wartości, edukację emocjonalną oraz fenomenologicznie inspirowane tworzenie wiedzy. Proponowana „konstytucja organizacyjna” opiera się na pięciu zobowiązaniach: klarowności wartości, dialogicznym nadawaniu sensu, ostrożnej eksperymentacji, kształtowaniu zdolności oraz etycznym postępowaniu, dzięki czemu hybrydyczność godzi normy i improwizację bez popadania w technokrację czy relatywizm. Analiza pokazuje, że takie zarządzanie wzmacnia odporność, legitymizację i spójność etyczną instytucji, jednocześnie podtrzymując innowacyjność. Decyzyjna jakość jawi się tu jako osiągnięcie społeczne oparte na zbiorowej roztropności i projektowaniu instytucjonalnym. Niepewność traktowana jest jako pole kształtowania charakteru i doprecyzowania celów, a nie wada do usunięcia.

Summary: This article develops a philosophy of hybrid management as a virtue-rooted practice for acting wisely under uncertainty. Grounded in Aristotelian practical wisdom (*phronesis*), it integrates agile iteration, prudent risk governance, values-oriented inquiry, emotional education, and phenomenology-informed knowledge creation into a single architecture of managerial reasoning. The paper proposes an organizational „constitution” built on five commitments—value clarity, dialogical sense-making, prudent experimentation, capability cultivation, and ethical guardrails – showing how hybridity reconciles rules and improvisation without lapsing into technocracy or relativism. Drawing examples from public administration, higher education, and business, it argues that hybrid governance enhances resilience, legitimacy, and ethical

¹ Oleksiy Kiykov, Department of Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Education Policy, Dragomanov Ukrainian State University, ul. Pyrogowa 9, 01-601 Kijów, Ukraina, kiykov@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-8368-6367.

coherence while preserving innovation. The account reframes decision quality as a social achievement enabled by collective phronesis and institutional design. It positions uncertainty as a field for character formation and purpose clarification, not a defect to be engineered away. The result is a portable framework for organizations seeking disciplined flexibility in post-digital conditions.

Słowa kluczowe: hybrydyczność, roztropność praktyczna (*phronesis*), roztropne zarządzanie ryzykiem, tworzenie wiedzy, bezpieczeństwo etyczne.

Keywords: hybridity, practical wisdom (*phronesis*), prudent risk governance, knowledge creation, ethical guardrails.

Introduction

Hybrid management has emerged as a key response to the volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity that mark contemporary organizational life, yet the philosophical grounds for hybridity remain underdeveloped. At stake is more than a toolbox that mixes formal planning with adaptive practices; hybridity names a mode of practical reason that integrates stable norms and fluid improvisation without collapsing either side into the other (Aristotle, 2022; Aristotle, 2002). In a post-digital economy, managers confront entangled socio-technical systems, where algorithmic procedures, human judgment, and institutional values co-produce outcomes that resist linear control (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Such environments heighten exposure to systemic risks and demand reflexive risk governance that is as much philosophical as it is technical (Venger O., 2023). This paper advances a systematic account of the philosophy of hybridity in management grounded in Aristotelian practical wisdom (*phronesis*), enriched by recent debates in business ethics, education, and knowledge creation (Kristjánsson K., 2024; Kristjánsson K., 2022; Nonaka I. and Yamaguchi I., 2022). By re-reading *phronesis* for hybrid organizations, we connect decision quality to value-sensitivity, affective attunement, and situated know-how shaped by communities of practice (Valenzuela P., 2024; Eriksen D. and Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022). We argue that hybridity is neither mere compromise nor eclecticism; it is a disciplined capacity to hold together competing goods and time horizons in action. The implications span public administration, education, and corporate strategy, especially where innovation must be balanced with accountability and care (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021; Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022). The article synthesizes conceptual foundations, reviews emerging literature, and proposes a practical framework for hybrid governance in organizations.

Hybrid management also names a normative project that re-centers the moral psychology of managers – how they perceive salience, regulate

emotion, and deliberate under pressure – within institutional design. Developments in virtue ethics treat practical wisdom not as a private trait but as a social-relational achievement cultivated through shared deliberation and role-modelling (Kristjánsson K., 2024). Complementary research emphasizes collective phronesis, where teams enact wiser choices than isolated agents by distributing attention, contesting blind spots, and integrating multiple values (Kristjánsson K., 2022). Emotional education is central to this achievement, because sensitivity to the moral contours of a situation depends on emotion's cognitive and pedagogical functions, not its suppression (Valenzuela P., 2024). Knowledge-creating firms illustrate this nexus by combining experiential intuition, formal methods, and dialogical spaces that render tacit insights communicable – the very heart of hybrid rationality (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022). Educational and managerial systems that integrate agile iteration, foresight, and human development show higher resilience under crisis, thereby supporting hybridity as a design principle rather than a last-minute fix (Yastremska O.M. et al., 2023; Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Ukrainian scholarship on hybrid management further clarifies the philosophical and governance aspects in higher education under conditions of globalization and informational turbulence (Kiykov O., 2024a; Kiykov O., 2024b; Kiykov O.Yu., 2024). Taken together, these streams suggest that hybridity operationalizes a distinct practical metaphysics: organizations are neither rigid machines nor loose networks but layered forms oriented by ends that require wise discernment (Aristotle, 2022; Aristotle, 2002).

Literature Review

The classical point of departure is Aristotle's account of substance, change, and practical knowledge, which frames the ontological and epistemic challenges of management. In *Metaphysics*, Aristotle resists reductive dualisms by analysing being through form, matter, potency, and act, a palette that underwrites hybrid explanations of organizational identity and transformation (Aristotle, 2022). In *Nicomachean Ethics*, he defines phronesis as truth-oriented deliberation about what is good and practicable for a flourishing life, binding cognition, affect, and habituation into one virtue (Aristotle, 2002). Contemporary management contexts transpose these notions from individual ethics to institutional practice, making practical wisdom a criterion of organizational excellence. Phronesis guides right timing (*kairos*), proportioning rules to context and aims, mediating between general principles and singular cases. Rather than *technē* or *epistēmē* alone, management requires this synthesizing virtue to reconcile stability with adaptability. On this reading, hybridity is already

implicit in Aristotelian practical philosophy as the unity-in-difference of rule and exception. The classical frame thus legitimizes hybrid governance not as ad hoc bricolage but as virtuous practice responsive to complex realities (Aristotle, 2002; Aristotle, 2022).

Recent virtue-ethical scholarship extends *phronesis* to professional and managerial domains, arguing that wise action must be socially scaffolded. Kristjánsson analyses the role of practical wisdom in professional ethics education, emphasizing how case-based reasoning, exemplars, and reflective dialogue cultivate calibrated judgment (Kristjánsson K., 2024). He further develops the idea of collective *phronesis* in business ethics, where group deliberation integrates diverse values and stakeholder perspectives to reach more ethically robust decisions (Kristjánsson K., 2022). This collectivization counters the myth of the heroic decision-maker and aligns with hybrid organizational forms that distribute authority and knowledge. Emotional competencies are not peripheral to such reasoning; they prime attention to morally salient features, help track value conflicts, and support courage in implementation (Valenzuela P., 2024). The literature converges on the view that virtue is educable, organizationally anchored, and measurable through practices and outcomes, not merely stated codes. This shift sets the stage for hybridity as a cultivated capability rather than a static structure (Kristjánsson K., 2022; Kristjánsson K., 2024; Valenzuela P., 2024).

A second stream interrogates values research within organizations, proposing methodologies that connect practical wisdom to empirically informed change. Eriksen and Strumińska-Kutra articulate how values-oriented inquiry extends knowledge, refines practice, and clarifies ends through participatory, *phronesis*-informed research designs (Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022). Their approach sits naturally with hybrid governance because it resists method monism, combining qualitative narratives with evaluative reasoning to guide action. It treats values as objects of practical learning rather than mere slogans, inviting organizations to iterate on their own normative architectures. This orientation reframes performance metrics to include value realization and stakeholder well-being alongside efficiency. The implication is that hybrid management cannot be value-neutral; it must institutionalize value deliberation as part of continuous improvement. In doing so, it turns the organization into a site of ongoing ethical formation, not only technical optimization (Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022).

Knowledge-creation theories provide a complementary epistemology for hybridity by reframing intuition and formalization as partners rather than rivals. Nonaka and Yamaguchi argue that phenomenology illuminates how managers apprehend essences of situations via eidetic intuition, which can be disciplined and shared within the firm (Nonaka I.,

Yamaguchi I., 2022). Their account resists both naive subjectivism and rigid positivism by specifying processes that translate tacit insights into communicable knowledge cycles. This translation is quintessentially hybrid: it fuses embodied attention, narrative articulation, and structured experimentation in iterative spirals. The result is an ecology of practices where affect, perception, and concept co-evolve toward actionable understanding. Seen this way, agile methods are not merely project tools but epistemic infrastructures for phronetic learning. Hybrid organizations therefore engineer settings that solicit intuition, contest it collaboratively, and stabilize it into operating routines without freezing learning (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022).

A fourth cluster comes from public administration and crisis governance, where communicative capacity and adaptive structures are foregrounded. Studies of communication management in the public sector show how coordinated messaging, feedback loops, and stakeholder engagement enhance policy efficacy, particularly under uncertainty (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). Parallel work on innovative management frames anti-crisis governance as the integration of creative problem-solving with disciplined execution, aligning with hybrid logics that mix exploration and exploitation (Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022). Research into educational systems highlights the role of novel instructional technologies and organizational designs in sustaining learning during disruption, offering transferable lessons for capability building (Yastremska O.M. et al., 2023). Together these contributions demonstrate that hybridity scales from micro-skills to meso-structures and macro-policies, always linking meaning-making to performance.

Within management philosophy for the digital economy, agile foresight emerges as a value-laden stance rather than a neutral method. Analyses of agile as a socio-philosophical driver of the digital economy emphasize anticipation, iteration, and participatory sense-making as prerequisites for resilience (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). These features overlap with phronesis by privileging context sensitivity and moral purpose over rigid adherence to plans. Risk governance complements this stance by situating uncertainty not as noise to eliminate but as a structural condition to be navigated with prudence, courage, and proportionality (Venger O., 2023). Sectoral studies, such as project management in tourism, show how hybridization of innovation and compliance supports service quality under fluctuating demand and regulation (Nestoryshen I., 2023). The literature thus suggests that hybrid rationality is the lived grammar of effective action in complex systems.

Ukrainian scholarship on hybrid management in higher education integrates these strands into a distinctive governance paradigm. Kiykov

theorizes hybrid management as a philosophical-managerial synthesis that balances technocratic instruments with humanistic commitments under globalization and information turbulence (Kiykov O., 2024a). He further traces the philosophical foundations of educational management from critical pedagogy toward hybrid governance, clarifying how authority, participation, and value education interlock (Kiykov O., 2024b). Additional work elaborates hybrid management as a bridge from technocracy to human-centered approaches in contemporary governance, specifying ethical safeguards and institutional levers (Kiykov O.Yu., 2024). This corpus affirms that hybrid management is not merely a Western corporate fashion but a globally relevant paradigm adaptable to public institutions, especially universities navigating war, displacement, and reform. The cross-fertilization with virtue ethics, knowledge-creation theory, and agile foresight positions hybridity as a unifying lens for research and practice.

Conceptual Foundations: Hybridity Beyond Dualisms

Hybridity in management begins as a philosophical claim about the nature of organizations and action: neither pure mechanism nor pure spontaneity explains how institutions persist and change. Drawing on Aristotelian metaphysics, we treat organizations as composites of form and matter – structures and resources – that actualize potentials through practices and judgments oriented to ends (Aristotle, 2022). This ontology dissolves false dichotomies between rules and discretion by situating both within purposive activity. *Phronesis* then becomes the virtue that unifies perception, desire, and reason in choosing means consonant with worthwhile ends under uncertainty (Aristotle, 2002). Hybrid rationality names the operational expression of this virtue in organizations, where protocols are selectively bent or re-specified to fit particulars without betraying the guiding *telos*. This account also explains why codification alone cannot guarantee good management: value-sensitivity and situational grasp are constitutive, not optional. In short, hybridity is not a midpoint on a spectrum but a higher-order integration that reconfigures the spectrum itself (Aristotle, 2022; Aristotle, 2002).

Conceptualizing hybridity as virtue-laden practice foregrounds social learning and institutional scaffolds. Professional ethics education demonstrates that practical wisdom grows through modelling, coached reflection, and progressively complex cases (Kristjánsson K., 2024). Organizations can mirror these pedagogies by institutionalizing deliberation spaces, peer challenge, and narrative after-action reviews that refine collective salience detection (Kristjánsson K., 2022). Emotional cultivation is vital: emotions track reasons, disclose what matters, and supply motivational

energy for courageous implementation (Valenzuela P., 2024). Ignoring affect produces brittle rationality that misreads stakeholders and triggers perverse responses under stress. Thus a hybrid organization weaves emotional literacy into its governance, aligning care with accountability and innovation. This social-relational view resists heroic leader myths and makes room for distributed wisdom in teams (Kristjánsson K., 2022; Valenzuela P., 2024).

Hybridity also possesses an epistemology: it treats intuition and analysis as co-constitutive. Phenomenologically informed knowledge-creation shows how managers apprehend the essence of a problem via eidetic seeing that is later articulated and tested (Nonaka I. and Yamaguchi I., 2022). Agile cadences – short cycles, inspection, adaptation – function as organizational phenomenology, staging encounters with reality that correct bias and crystallize insight. These cycles convert tacit knowing into explicit propositions while retaining sensitivity to context, a hallmark of phronetic reasoning. Hybrid organizations therefore design epistemic ecologies where stories, models, and experiments circulate productively. The pay-off is not speed alone but wiser responsiveness anchored in clarified value commitments (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022; Voronkova V. H. et al., 2022).

From the standpoint of public value, hybridity reframes legitimacy as dialogical rather than merely procedural. Communication management studies document how iterative, transparent engagement enhances compliance and learning during policy implementation (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). Hybrid governance institutionalizes such dialogue across boundaries – citizens, clients, staff, regulators – treating dissent as information and not as noise. Anti-crisis innovation work highlights that the most resilient systems combine disciplined execution with creative adaptation, resisting the lure of either rigid centralization or unbounded autonomy (Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022). Education research adds that capability formation is slow and social, reinforcing the need to align hybrid processes with human development, not just output metrics (Yastremska O.M. et al., 2023). Together these insights anchor hybridity in democratic and developmental values.

Ukrainian theorization of hybrid management consolidates these threads into a governance paradigm sensitive to geopolitically induced turbulence. By articulating the balance between technocratic tools and humanistic aims, this work clarifies both the risks of instrumentality and the promises of participatory wisdom in higher education reform (Kiykov O., 2024a). It shows how hybrid structures – councils, quality circles, student-faculty co-design – translate virtue talk into institutional routines. It also warns that hybridity without ethical orientation can devolve into

opportunism, underscoring the need for explicit value charters and evaluative feedback (Kiykov O., 2024b). The proposed synthesis from technocracy to human-centred governance captures hybridity's essence as disciplined flexibility, not relativism (Kiykov O.Yu., 2024). This context provides a rigorous stress test for the theory, given the demands of war, displacement, and digitalization.

Hybrid Managerial Rationality: From Agile to Phronetic Governance

Hybrid managerial rationality integrates agile foresight, risk prudence, and value deliberation into a single practice architecture. Agile's philosophy contributes short learning loops, team autonomy, and customer-centric iteration that fit environments with high uncertainty (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Yet agile without phronesis risks fetishizing speed over quality of ends; hence the need to align sprints with value clarity and stakeholder well-being. Communication management provides connective tissue by ensuring shared situational awareness and by structuring feedback as a governance asset rather than a reputational threat (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). Anti-crisis innovation teaches that improvisation succeeds when bounded by enabling constraints – guardrails that protect ethics and safety while empowering adaptation (Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022). The hybrid manager is therefore an architect of conditions where wise action becomes probable, not merely a decision-maker at the apex.

Risk governance in hybrid systems treats uncertainty as endemic and multi-level. Philosophical analyses caution against both overconfidence in models and nihilistic relativism, recommending proportionality, reversibility, and learning-readiness as decision virtues (Venger O., 2023). These virtues translate into operational principles: pilot before scale, diversify options, embed stop-rules, and maintain redundancy in critical functions. Sectoral work such as tourism project management illustrates cross-domain applicability: hybridizing innovation with compliance protects service integrity under fluctuating demand and regulation (Nestoryshen I., 2023). Agile techniques contribute scenario planning and rapid prototyping, but phronesis adjudicates when to slow down, escalate, or abandon in light of values and emergent evidence (Aristotle, 2002; Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Thus, risk prudence is not risk aversion; it is value-attuned experimentation.

Knowledge creation remains the engine of hybrid rationality, connecting the micro-processes of attention and sense-making to macro-level adaptation. Phenomenological accounts of eidetic intuition show how teams converge on what is essential amid noise, then iterate representations

through dialogue and experiment (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022). Collective phronesis enhances this process by distributing evaluative perspective, correcting bias, and providing moral traction for difficult trade-offs (Kristjánsson K., 2022). Emotional education supports epistemic courage – the willingness to surface uncertainty, own mistakes, and pivot when better reasons appear (Valenzuela P., 2024). Communication infrastructures – retrospectives, pre-mortems, open metrics – turn this courage into repeatable routines (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). In sum, knowledge creation under hybridity is a moral-epistemic practice, not a neutral pipeline.

In educational and public institutions, hybrid rationality aligns capability formation with governance. Research on innovative educational systems shows that technology adoption succeeds when embedded in teacher learning communities and values discourse, not as top-down mandates (Yastremska O.M. et al., 2023). Ukrainian theorists of hybrid management specify how higher education can combine technocratic quality assurance with participatory co-creation to enhance legitimacy and innovation (Kiykov O., 2024a). Philosophical reframing of educational management as hybrid governance discloses the role of narrative, exemplarity, and dialogical policy in sustaining reforms (Kiykov O., 2024b). Ethical guardrails are essential to prevent drift into instrumentalism; charters and councils institutionalize ongoing value review (Kiykov O.Yu., 2024). These insights generalize to firms and agencies, where learning architectures must be coupled to value architectures.

Hybrid rationality requires an updated metaphysical humility. Organizations are open systems whose identity persists through changing material and relational conditions – a point Aristotle's potency-act schema anticipates (Aristotle, 2022). Managers should therefore expect underdetermination, plan for surprise, and cultivate virtues that fit such a world. Phronesis orients them toward the good in ways that statistics alone cannot fix, while agile structures and risk principles provide operational handles. The hybrid synthesis is not static; it is a living constitution that revises itself through experience. Measured by stakeholder well-being, resilience, and ethical coherence, this constitution outperforms both rigid bureaucracy and laissez-faire improvisation (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022; Venger O., 2023).

Operationalizing Hybridity: Frameworks, Practices, and Ethics

To translate philosophy into practice, we propose a phronetic-agile governance framework organized around five design commitments: value clarity, dialogical sense-making, prudent experimentation, capability cultivation, and ethical guardrails. Value clarity codifies ends without

over-specifying means, enabling contextual discretion while maintaining direction (Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022). Dialogical sense-making institutionalizes cross-boundary deliberation through structured forums, enabling collective phronesis to surface and refine judgments (Kristjánsson K., 2022). Prudent experimentation adopts agile cadences with explicit stop-rules and reversibility, aligning risk-taking with proportionality (Venger O., 2023; Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Capability cultivation invests in emotional and practical wisdom through mentorship, case clinics, and reflective practice (Valenzuela P., 2024; Kristjánsson K., 2024). Ethical guardrails embed value review into audits, councils, and charters to resist instrumental drift (Kiykov O., 2024b; Kiykov O.Yu., 2024). Together these commitments operationalize hybridity as an organizational constitution rather than a set of tools.

Practically, hybrid governance re-designs decision rights and information flows. Communication management becomes a strategic function that curates shared situational awareness, extends stakeholder voice, and reduces noise through clarity and cadence (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). Anti-crisis innovation work suggests creating “enabling constraints”: minimal viable rules that channel creativity without over-determination (Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022). Knowledge-creation methods add mechanisms for circulating tacit insights – rotations, storytelling sessions, reflective diaries – so that intuition receives social testing (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022). Agile rituals – reviews, retrospectives, demos – serve as civic spaces where value, evidence, and feasibility meet, making deliberation routine rather than exceptional (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022). Such architectures make hybridity durable.

Sectoral translation illustrates adaptability. In tourism, hybrid project management pairs service design sprints with compliance checkpoints, maintaining customer experience and regulatory integrity under volatile demand (Nestoryshen I., 2023). In universities, hybrid management combines quality assurance metrics with student – faculty co-governance, aligning accreditation with formative educational aims (Kiykov O., 2024a). In public agencies, communication-led coordination and value-based experimentation improve policy uptake during crises, supporting legitimacy through openness (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021). Across sectors, the same phronetic-agile grammar guides context-sensitive implementation. The framework’s portability lies in its anchoring virtues rather than sector-specific procedures.

Ethically, hybridity resists both technocracy and relativism by rooting discretion in shared ends. Virtue-ethical education strengthens managers’ sensitivity to value conflict and equips them with habits for fair deliberation and courageous action (Kristjánsson K., 2024). Emotional

education enhances the capacity to perceive and respond to human goods at stake, reducing moral blindness under pressure (Valenzuela P., 2024). Value research methods help organizations learn publicly from their own choices, refining ends over time while avoiding drift (Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022). Risk prudence ensures that experimentation respects proportionality and reversibility, protecting the vulnerable from asymmetric downside (Venger O., 2023). The result is a governance ethic that is neither rule-fetishist nor willful.

Operationalization requires leadership that is more curator than commander. Leaders design contexts for collective wisdom: they sponsor forums for dialogue, defend time for reflection, and demand evidence without silencing dissent (Kristjánsson K., 2022). They steward narratives that connect present trade-offs to enduring purposes, sustaining motivation and coherence. They also model humility about models and courage in uncertainty, setting standards for prudent experimentation (Venger O., 2023). This “constitutional leadership” makes hybridity reproducible across teams and time, turning philosophy into everyday practice (Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022; Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022).

Conclusions

The philosophy of hybridity in management reframes organizations as sites where values, emotions, and knowledge practices are integrated into wise action under uncertainty. Drawing on Aristotle’s metaphysics and ethics, hybridity becomes a virtue-laden capacity to coordinate rules and discretion toward worthy ends (Aristotle, 2002; Aristotle, 2022). Contemporary scholarship extends this insight by emphasizing collective phronesis, emotional education, and participatory values research, all of which render wisdom a social achievement rather than an individual possession (Kristjánsson K., 2022; Kristjánsson K., 2024; Valenzuela P., 2024; Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022). Knowledge-creation theory and agile foresight supply operational grammars that make such wisdom repeatable, while risk prudence supplies ethical guardrails (Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022; Voronkova V.H. et al., 2022; Venger O., 2023).

Practically, hybridity is enacted through organizational constitutions that prioritize value clarity, dialogical sense-making, prudent experimentation, capability cultivation, and ethical guardrails. Communication-centric coordination and enabling constraints make adaptation disciplined rather than chaotic (Azhazha M.A. et al., 2021; Boiko Ye. and Diachenko Yu., 2022). Sectoral cases demonstrate portability across education, tourism, public administration, and corporate innovation (Nestoryshen I., 2023; Yastremska O.M. et al., 2023; Kiykov O., 2024a).

Ukrainian theorization of hybrid management underscores relevance for institutions under extreme turbulence and reform, reinforcing the global applicability of the paradigm (Kiykov O., 2024b; Kiykov O.Yu., 2024).

Normatively, hybrid governance offers an alternative to both rigid bureaucratic control and unconstrained improvisation. By cultivating virtues of prudence, courage, and practical intelligence, organizations can navigate complexity without sacrificing ethical integrity (Aristotle, 2002; Kristjánsson K., 2024). Future research should refine metrics for phronetic performance, explore training modalities for emotional and collective wisdom, and test constitutional designs across cultural contexts. The central wager is that a phronetic-agile synthesis can improve not only efficiency but human flourishing within and through organizations (Valenzuela P., 2024; Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022).

Ultimately, the philosophy of hybridity is less a method than an ethos of responsible freedom, one that treats governance as a living craft rather than a fixed procedure. It challenges leaders to cultivate habits of attention, dialogue, and proportion so that discretion never drifts into arbitrariness and rules never ossify into ritual. It invites institutions to treat plural values as resources for learning instead of obstacles to control, aligning strategy with human development rather than short-term performance alone. It asks for courage to slow down when haste would harm, and for nerve to experiment when stasis would squander opportunity. It urges us to redesign incentives and information flows so that wise dissent is rewarded and shallow compliance loses its appeal. It insists that questions of power and justice are not footnotes to efficiency but the very soil in which resilient legitimacy grows. It calls educators and managers to co-create spaces where emotion can inform judgment without dominating it, and where knowledge is cultivated as much through narrative and reflection as through metrics. It reminds us that uncertainty is not a flaw to be engineered away but a field of meaning in which character is formed and purposes are clarified. If hybridity is a constitution for action in turbulent times, then the only live question is this: if not now, when will we rewrite our organizational charters to make wise action our default?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotle, 2002, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Akvilon-Plus, Kyiv, p. 480.
Aristotle, 2022, *Metaphysics*, Tempora, Kyiv, p. 848.
Azhazha M.A., Fursin O.O., Venger O.M., 2021, *Communication Management as a Factor in Enhancing the Efficiency of Public Administration*, Humanities Studies, 9(86), p. 127–137.

- Boiko Ye., Diachenko Yu., 2022, *Innovative Management as Contemporary Anti-Crisis Governance*, Management of the Development of Complex Systems, 52, p. 5–11.
- Eriksen D., Strumińska-Kutra M., 2022, *Extending Knowledge, Improving Practice and Refining Values: Research Informed by the Concept of Phronesis*, in: Espedal G., Jelstad Løvaas B., Sirris S., Wæraas A. (eds), *Researching Values*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Federowicz Michal, Terepyshchyi Serhii, 2023, *Democratic Values in Education: A Theoretical Examination of Ukrainian Children and Youth in Polish Schools Post-February 2022*, Studia Warmińskie, 60, p. 45–60.
- Kiykov O. Yu., 2024, *Philosophical Foundations of Hybrid Management: From Technocracy to Humanistic Approaches in Contemporary Governance*, Culturological Almanac, 4, p. 221–228.
- Kiykov O., 2024, *Hybrid Management in Higher Education: Philosophical and Managerial Aspects under Globalization and the Information Society*, Higher Education of Ukraine, 3, p. 22–30.
- Kiykov O., 2024, *Philosophical Foundations of Modern Educational Management: From Critical Pedagogy to Hybrid Governance*, Humanities Studies, 21(98), p. 159–167.
- Kristjánsson K., 2022, *Collective Phronesis in Business Ethics Education and Managerial Practice: A Neo-Aristotelian Analysis*, Journal of Business Ethics, 181, p. 41–56.
- Kristjánsson K., 2024, *Aristotelian Practical Wisdom (Phronesis) as the Key to Professional Ethics in Teaching*, Topoi, 43, p. 1031–1042.
- Nestoryshen I., 2023, *Innovation and Project Management in Tourism*, Innovations and Technologies in the Service and Catering Sector, 1(7), p. 21–26.
- Nonaka I., Yamaguchi I., 2022, *Synthesis of Phenomenology and Management Studies*, in: *Management by Eidetic Intuition, The Nonaka Series on Knowledge and Innovation*, Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore.
- Terepyshchyi S., Kostenko A., 2021, *Media Literacy and Information Security in Education*, Studia Warmińskie, 58, p. 133–141.
- Valenzuela P., 2024, *Phronesis in Educating Emotions*, Topoi, 43, p. 1021–1030.
- Venger O., 2023, *Philosophy of Risk Management in the Context of Global Challenges*, Marijampolė, Lithuania, p. 82–83.
- Voronkova V.H., Nikitenko V.O., Vasylichuk H.M., 2022, *Agile Philosophy as a Driver of Foresight in the Digital Economy*, Digital Economy and Economic Security, 3(3), p. 109–117.
- Yastremska O.M., Hudyma O.V., Yezhelyi Yu.O., Lukianykhin V.O., 2023, *Novel Innovative Educational Systems and Technologies in Management*, Scientific Notes of Lviv University of Business and Law, 37, p. 465–472.

