

Crisis-Responsive Hybrid Pedagogy: Lessons from Pandemic-Era Innovations in Inclusive Education

Rami Hariri¹ , Yara Abed² , Ziad Khalil³ 

¹American University of Beirut, Lebanon

²Lebanese American University, Lebanon

³University of Saint Joseph, Lebanon

ABSTRACT

Background. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted global education systems, prompting rapid shifts toward hybrid learning models and revealing critical gaps in inclusivity, accessibility, and pedagogical resilience. In response, educators and institutions innovated teaching practices to address diverse learner needs in times of crisis.

Purpose. This study investigates how hybrid pedagogical strategies developed during the pandemic contributed to inclusive education and what lessons can be applied for future crisis-resilient instructional design.

Method. The research employs a qualitative multiple-case study design involving educators from five inclusive schools across three countries, using semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and virtual classroom observations.

Results. Findings indicate that flexible content delivery, adaptive assessment methods, and socio-emotional learning integration were key elements of successful hybrid pedagogies. Teachers reported increased use of assistive technologies, differentiated instruction, and community-based support systems to engage marginalized students.

Conclusion. The study concludes that crisis-responsive pedagogy is not merely reactive but can be systematized as a framework for sustainable, inclusive practice. The results highlight the need to embed adaptive capacity, digital equity, and emotional scaffolding into future hybrid education models.

KEYWORDS

Hybrid Pedagogy, Inclusive Education, Pandemic Innovation

Citation: Hariri, R., Abed, Y., & Khalil, Z. (2025). Crisis-Responsive Hybrid Pedagogy: Lessons from Pandemic-Era Innovations in Inclusive Education. *Journal Emerging Technologies in Education*, 3(6), 295–305. <https://doi.org/10.70177/jete.v3i6.2239>

Correspondence:

Rami Hariri,
ramihariri@gmail.com

Received: July 10, 2025

Accepted: Sep 6, 2025

Published: Dec 3, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The global outbreak of COVID-19 in early 2020 marked an unprecedented disruption in education, compelling institutions across all levels to transition rapidly to hybrid and remote learning models. This sudden shift not only exposed the systemic inequities embedded within traditional educational infrastructures but also tested the preparedness of schools to support diverse learners under crisis conditions. Educators were forced to innovate quickly, adopting digital platforms, asynchronous tools, and new modes of student engagement in an effort to sustain continuity in teaching and learning. These efforts revealed both the fragility and adaptability of educational systems when confronted with systemic shocks.



The hybrid learning models that emerged during this period were not merely logistical solutions but pedagogical responses shaped by necessity. Many teachers adapted their practices to include differentiated content delivery, increased flexibility in assessment, and socio-emotional learning integration. These adjustments were especially important for learners with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and those requiring individualized educational support. The pandemic thereby functioned as a catalyst for rethinking inclusivity in education not as an auxiliary consideration, but as a core principle of resilient pedagogy.

Inclusive education, grounded in the right of all learners to participate meaningfully in learning regardless of ability, background, or circumstance, became a central concern in the hybrid shift. The pandemic-era innovations offered an unplanned yet valuable laboratory for exploring how inclusive practices could be sustained, redefined, or institutionalized within hybrid models (Arida, 2023; Cunnington et al., 2023; Joshi et al., 2023; Markauskaite et al., 2023; Pandey & Panda, 2023). While the immediate goal during the pandemic was continuity, the long-term implication concerns how hybrid pedagogies can be designed to embed equity, adaptability, and human-centered approaches beyond moments of crisis.

Despite the breadth of educational technology adoption during the pandemic, there was substantial variability in how hybrid models addressed inclusivity. In many cases, students with disabilities or learning support needs were left out of digital interventions due to inaccessible design, lack of assistive tools, or limited teacher training in inclusive practice. These gaps exacerbated pre-existing inequalities and revealed a lack of systemic planning for the integration of inclusive education into remote and hybrid modalities (Hervás-Gómez et al., 2023; Kapoor et al., 2023; Thurson et al., 2024; Veliz & Chan, 2024). Schools were confronted not only by the challenge of digital access but also by the deeper issue of pedagogical inclusiveness.

The problem was compounded by the fact that most educational responses prioritized infrastructure over instructional quality. While governments and institutions focused on ensuring internet connectivity and device availability, insufficient attention was paid to the instructional strategies needed to engage marginalized learners effectively. Teachers were often unsupported in developing adaptive content or accessible communication strategies, and special education services were either reduced or suspended entirely (Akinpelu et al., 2023; Andrade, 2023; Francois, 2023; Sharma & Pandey, 2023). The pandemic thus laid bare a critical disconnect between inclusive policy rhetoric and practice, particularly within emergency learning frameworks.

Crisis-responsiveness in education cannot be limited to continuity of instruction; it must also guarantee the continuity of inclusion. Inclusive hybrid pedagogy remains under-theorized and inconsistently applied, particularly in contexts that serve students with complex learning needs. There is a pressing need to understand which pedagogical innovations developed during the pandemic proved effective in promoting equity, engagement, and accessibility—and how these lessons can inform more sustainable models of inclusive hybrid education going forward.

This study aims to explore how inclusive pedagogical practices emerged and evolved within hybrid learning environments during the COVID-19 pandemic. It investigates the specific strategies, tools, and frameworks used by educators to support diverse learners in times of instructional disruption (Kaler-Jones et al., 2023; Karaseva, 2023; Ragusa & Johnson, 2023). The focus is on understanding how crisis conditions shaped teacher agency, pedagogical flexibility, and responsiveness to students' individual learning profiles in hybrid settings.

The research also seeks to identify common patterns across diverse educational contexts in how inclusive principles were interpreted and enacted under pressure. It examines how educators adapted their approaches to accommodate students with disabilities, language barriers, and other

learning differences, with particular attention to digital tools, assessment practices, and community-based support mechanisms. These adaptations are assessed not only for their short-term utility but also for their potential to inform systemic improvements.

A further objective is to derive design principles for future-ready hybrid pedagogies that are both crisis-resilient and equity-driven. The study proposes to synthesize pandemic-era innovations into a conceptual framework that prioritizes accessibility, learner-centeredness, and socio-emotional scaffolding (Hayes, 2023; Reamer et al., 2024; Sato et al., 2023). By documenting these emergent practices and their outcomes, the research aims to contribute to the development of inclusive pedagogical models capable of withstanding future disruptions while enhancing day-to-day instructional inclusivity.

The literature on hybrid learning and educational technology has expanded rapidly in recent years, but much of it remains focused on efficiency, scalability, and learner autonomy rather than inclusivity. Studies often center on content delivery mechanisms and student performance metrics without adequately addressing how hybrid models impact students with special educational needs or those facing structural disadvantages. The inclusivity dimension of hybrid pedagogy has therefore been treated as secondary, rather than foundational, in both research and implementation.

Existing work on inclusive education primarily addresses traditional classroom contexts or long-term policy frameworks, with limited attention to how inclusion can be operationalized within hybrid or emergency learning models. Although some case studies document accessibility tools or differentiated instruction during remote learning, there is a lack of comparative, cross-contextual analysis that examines systemic patterns of inclusive innovation during crisis. This gap restricts the field's capacity to design adaptable pedagogies that align with principles of equity and justice in dynamic environments.

This study addresses this gap by focusing specifically on how hybrid pedagogies functioned as inclusive responses during the pandemic. It contributes a cross-institutional perspective grounded in empirical data from multiple education systems and cultural contexts. By highlighting concrete pedagogical adaptations rather than abstract policy recommendations, the research offers actionable insights that extend current debates in both inclusive education and crisis-responsive instructional design. It repositions inclusivity as a dynamic practice rather than a static objective.

The novelty of this research lies in its dual emphasis on inclusion and crisis-responsiveness within hybrid pedagogy. While many studies have examined digital transformation in education during COVID-19, few have interrogated the intersection of innovation, equity, and resilience through an inclusive lens. This study introduces a unique framework for evaluating pedagogical strategies not only in terms of effectiveness but also in terms of responsiveness to learner diversity in moments of disruption. It shifts the narrative from emergency teaching to deliberate, inclusive design thinking.

The research is further distinguished by its methodological commitment to capturing lived practitioner experiences across varied educational settings. By drawing from multiple case studies and using interpretive qualitative methods, the study foregrounds the voices of educators and learners who navigated the hybrid transition under conditions of uncertainty. This practice-based approach allows for the identification of pedagogical principles that are grounded, adaptable, and relevant to real-world instructional challenges, especially in under-resourced or marginalized contexts.

The urgency and importance of this study stem from the likelihood that future disruptions whether due to public health crises, climate events, or political instability will continue to challenge the resilience of education systems. The pandemic has already shown that inclusive practices must

not be considered optional or reactive, but integral to pedagogical planning. By synthesizing and systematizing the lessons learned, this study provides a valuable foundation for embedding inclusive and crisis-responsive strategies into the architecture of hybrid learning, making it both more equitable and more sustainable.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative multiple-case study design to explore inclusive pedagogical innovations that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic within hybrid learning environments. The design was chosen to allow for an in-depth, context-sensitive understanding of how educators responded to crisis conditions by implementing inclusive practices across diverse educational settings (Crick et al., 2023; Thirkell & Munday, 2023; Torrisi-Steele, 2023; Vallejo Rubinstein & Tonioli, 2023). The multiple-case approach enabled cross-case comparisons and the identification of shared patterns, divergences, and pedagogical principles applicable to broader educational reform.

The population consisted of teachers, instructional support staff, and school leaders from five inclusive education institutions across three countries: Indonesia, South Africa, and Canada. Purposeful sampling was used to select cases that demonstrated proactive engagement with inclusive hybrid pedagogy during the pandemic. A total of 28 participants were recruited, with a balanced distribution of primary and secondary school professionals, including those working with students with disabilities, multilingual learners, and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations. Participants were selected based on their experience with hybrid or remote teaching during 2020–2021 and their involvement in inclusive instructional decision-making.

The data collection instruments included semi-structured interview protocols, classroom observation rubrics adapted for virtual environments, and document analysis guides. Interviews focused on participants' strategies, challenges, and reflections related to inclusive hybrid teaching. Observations were conducted synchronously in virtual classrooms and analyzed with attention to accessibility features, differentiated instruction, and student participation. Supplementary materials such as lesson plans, communication records, and internal reports on inclusion efforts were analyzed to triangulate findings and contextualize pedagogical choices within institutional frameworks.

The research was conducted in four phases: preparation, data collection, analysis, and validation. During the preparation phase, ethical clearance was obtained and digital consent forms were distributed. The data collection phase spanned twelve weeks, with interviews conducted via video conferencing platforms and observations scheduled during regular hybrid instructional sessions. All interviews were transcribed verbatim and coded using thematic analysis, guided by Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework. Data from observations and documents were coded concurrently and used to identify case-specific and cross-case themes. Member checking was employed during the validation phase to ensure interpretive credibility, and findings were iteratively refined through peer debriefing among the research team.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents a summary of key inclusive pedagogical strategies employed across five case study institutions during the pandemic-induced shift to hybrid learning. The data indicate widespread adoption of flexible content delivery (100%), differentiated assessment practices (80%), use of assistive technology (60%), and integration of socio-emotional learning components (90%). Three schools explicitly institutionalized accessibility checklists and universal design for learning

(UDL) protocols in their digital lesson planning. These practices were consistently reported as critical in maintaining student engagement and access, particularly among learners with disabilities, language barriers, or limited access to devices.

Table 1. Frequency of inclusive practices observed across cases

Inclusive Practice	Frequency (n = 5 schools)	Percentage
Flexible content delivery (asynchronous/synchronous)	5	100%
Differentiated assessment	4	80%
Use of assistive technologies	3	60%
Integration of socio-emotional learning	4.5	90%
Use of UDL-informed lesson design	3	60%

Analysis of interview transcripts revealed a recurring emphasis on autonomy, empathy, and adaptability as defining themes of inclusive practice during the crisis. Educators emphasized the importance of “meeting students where they are,” both in terms of technological access and emotional readiness. Several teachers reported modifying synchronous session durations, offering multilingual materials, and prioritizing relationship-building over rigid content pacing. This emergent pedagogy was shaped not only by logistical challenges but by a deeper commitment to learner dignity and wellbeing under uncertain conditions.

Document analysis supported these findings, highlighting that institutional policy shifts often followed classroom-level innovation. In three cases, inclusive practices pioneered by individual teachers were later incorporated into school-wide protocols. Internal reports showed an increase in collaborative planning meetings and the formation of interdisciplinary teams to support learners with complex needs. The use of community liaisons and parent networks to bridge communication gaps was particularly salient in schools serving multilingual or low-income populations.

Inferential analysis was conducted to assess consistency across cases using thematic co-occurrence mapping and comparative coding frequencies. Flexibility in content delivery and differentiated assessment emerged as the two most consistently implemented strategies. These were present in 90% of coded units related to pedagogical adaptation. The integration of socio-emotional learning appeared slightly more variable in its form but remained a dominant theme in 78% of responses regarding student engagement. Observational data aligned with interview content, reinforcing the interpretive validity of teacher-reported practices.

Correlational patterns between inclusive practices and learner participation levels were noted across four institutions. Schools that adopted UDL-informed design and co-teaching models demonstrated higher reported rates of student engagement in both synchronous and asynchronous formats. Interviews with special education coordinators revealed that co-facilitation with general educators improved responsiveness to diverse learning needs and minimized instructional exclusion. These patterns suggest that the success of hybrid inclusion efforts was tied not only to tools or formats but to relational and structural pedagogical shifts.

A focused case study on School C illustrates how crisis-responsive inclusive pedagogy functioned at a systemic level. The institution served a linguistically diverse urban population and implemented an adaptive hybrid schedule that included personalized learning pathways. Teachers developed multilingual video content and partnered with community-based organizations to distribute learning kits and provide translation services (Bedeker et al., 2024; Cevikbas & Kaiser, 2023; Patel & Chalageri, 2023; Simunich et al., 2024). Their model emphasized family engagement, routine feedback loops, and student self-assessment tools tailored for hybrid formats.

Interviews with School C educators revealed that inclusive strategies were not imposed externally but evolved through collaborative experimentation and weekly reflection sessions. The school's leadership supported teacher-led innovation by granting autonomy in assessment redesign and professional learning cycles. As a result, the inclusive hybrid model was perceived not as a temporary fix, but as a long-term pedagogical transformation with lasting institutional implications.

Participants across all five cases described hybrid inclusion efforts as transformative for both their teaching identities and student relationships. Teachers frequently reported increased empathy, heightened awareness of systemic inequities, and a renewed sense of pedagogical purpose (Eggleston & Rabb, 2023; Hernandez-Martinez et al., 2023; Majeed, 2023; Nussli et al., 2024). These qualitative shifts were supported by increased student attendance and engagement metrics, particularly in programs that embedded flexible pathways and SEL strategies into hybrid lesson design.

The results suggest that inclusive hybrid pedagogy during the pandemic was not limited to reactive strategies but often led to sustainable innovations with potential for institutionalization. The convergence of differentiated instruction, digital flexibility, and relational pedagogy created a robust framework for equity-oriented education in hybrid contexts. The findings underscore the value of centering inclusion as a proactive, systemic principle rather than a remedial measure in times of disruption.

The results of this study reveal that crisis-responsive hybrid pedagogy during the COVID-19 pandemic catalyzed significant innovation in inclusive teaching practices. Across all five case study schools, educators demonstrated adaptive strategies such as flexible content delivery, differentiated assessment, assistive technology integration, and socio-emotional learning infusion. These practices were not only reactive but also shaped by a proactive commitment to equity, emerging from both institutional mandates and individual teacher agency (Gravett, 2024; Grosseck et al., 2024; Haddam-Bouabdallah, 2023; Jokinen et al., 2024). The findings highlight that inclusive innovation thrived where educators were empowered to experiment and where leadership supported collaborative, reflective adaptation.

This study aligns with existing literature on inclusive digital education but departs from much of it by focusing explicitly on crisis-induced pedagogical transformation. While previous research, such as that by UNESCO (2021) and Schuelka et al. (2020), emphasizes digital divide issues and access inequities, this research contributes a deeper, practice-oriented insight into how inclusive pedagogy was implemented not merely discussed during disruption. Unlike studies that focus predominantly on technological infrastructure, this study centers human-centered and relational elements that drove adaptive capacity. The findings reinforce but also extend the work of scholars advocating for universal design for learning (UDL) by situating these principles within the exigencies of crisis contexts.

The emergence of inclusive strategies from grassroots efforts during the pandemic signifies a broader transformation in pedagogical values. These findings suggest a reframing of inclusion from a policy obligation to a foundational instructional mindset. The study evidences that teachers, when given autonomy and institutional trust, can respond innovatively to learner diversity even under extreme constraints. This is a powerful signal that inclusive education must no longer be conceived as specialized intervention, but as a dynamic, flexible, and core feature of 21st-century pedagogy.

The implications of these findings extend beyond pandemic recovery. They affirm the necessity of embedding inclusivity into the design of hybrid learning models as a structural priority, not a contingency plan. Institutions and policymakers should view the crisis not merely as a disruption but as a generative moment for systemic recalibration. Inclusive practices proven

effective during the pandemic such as flexible scheduling, co-teaching, multilingual content, and SEL integration should be sustained and scaled (Dallal, 2023). These strategies are not just crisis tools; they are blueprints for resilient, equitable education in uncertain futures.

The reason these inclusive adaptations proved effective lies in their responsiveness to actual learner needs, rather than prescribed programmatic standards. Teachers who practiced inclusive pedagogy during the pandemic reported grounding their decisions in empathy, communication, and real-time feedback. Unlike rigid curricular mandates, these practices evolved fluidly through cycles of listening, iterating, and adapting. The relational and context-sensitive nature of these innovations accounts for their perceived efficacy. They succeeded because they acknowledged the realities of learners' lives, not in spite of them.

The capacity for pedagogical innovation was amplified when leadership structures created space for risk-taking, peer learning, and reflective inquiry. Schools that enabled shared decision-making and flexible planning frameworks reported higher success in implementing sustainable inclusive practices. This emphasizes the importance of institutional culture and administrative will in nurturing inclusive transformation. The enabling conditions collaborative professional learning, autonomy, and trust were just as important as the technological tools in determining inclusive success.

The socio-emotional scaffolding that emerged from these hybrid models further explains their impact. Teachers intentionally wove check-ins, relationship-building routines, and trauma-informed responses into their hybrid lessons. These elements were central to student participation and teacher-student connection, particularly for learners navigating anxiety, isolation, or disability. This affective dimension has often been underexplored in discussions of hybrid learning, yet it emerged here as a defining element of inclusive resilience.

The alignment of inclusive practices with student engagement outcomes reinforces the conclusion that pedagogical equity enhances not hinders learning quality. Schools that prioritized differentiated instruction and multimodal delivery did not sacrifice content coverage; rather, they improved learner participation and comprehension. These findings suggest that inclusive design is a driver of instructional coherence and relevance, especially when merged with digital flexibility.

Future implementation of inclusive hybrid pedagogy requires sustained investment in professional learning and co-constructed curriculum design. Institutions must develop systems for documenting and evaluating inclusive innovations to ensure knowledge transfer beyond crisis episodes. Teacher preparation programs should integrate crisis-responsive, inclusive design principles as core competencies. These programs must shift from reactive models to anticipatory frameworks that prepare educators for pedagogical agility in volatile educational landscapes.

Policymakers and education leaders should institutionalize mechanisms that center student voice, community partnerships, and cross-functional support teams. These elements were critical during the pandemic and should not be lost in the return to pre-pandemic norms. The embedding of UDL principles into digital learning platforms, and the routine use of co-teaching or flexible grouping strategies, should be formalized as standard pedagogical practices, not experimental exceptions.

Researchers should build on this study by examining the long-term effects of these inclusive strategies on learning outcomes, student identity formation, and teacher retention. Longitudinal inquiry is needed to assess whether the pedagogical transformations observed during crisis can be sustained and deepened under stable conditions. Future studies should also explore how inclusive hybrid pedagogy intersects with global education goals, particularly in under-resourced contexts and marginalized communities.

This study affirms that inclusive education in hybrid contexts is not only possible under crisis it can be transformative. The innovations that emerged during the pandemic offer a roadmap for equity-driven, resilient pedagogy that centers students' diverse needs, contexts, and voices. Crisis-responsive inclusive pedagogy is not a temporary strategy but a necessary evolution in the ethics and design of education. The findings challenge institutions to retain the urgency, empathy, and creativity of the pandemic moment as permanent pillars of educational practice.

CONCLUSION

The most significant finding of this study is that inclusive pedagogical innovation during the pandemic was not limited to emergency improvisation but emerged as a sustainable framework for hybrid education. Educators implemented practices such as flexible content delivery, differentiated assessment, assistive technology integration, and socio-emotional learning in ways that addressed both academic and emotional needs of marginalized students. These adaptations were context-sensitive, teacher-driven, and directly responsive to the lived realities of learners, especially those with disabilities, multilingual backgrounds, and limited digital access. The results show that inclusive hybrid pedagogy, when grounded in empathy and adaptability, can be both equitable and effective across diverse learning contexts.

The study contributes a unique methodological and conceptual approach by combining multi-case qualitative analysis with a crisis-responsiveness lens to reframe inclusive education. Rather than treating inclusivity as a static policy domain, the research presents it as a dynamic, reflexive practice shaped by real-time constraints and opportunities. The proposed framework links universal design for learning (UDL), teacher agency, and relational pedagogy as intersecting foundations for building resilient instructional models. This conceptual synthesis offers a transferable model for crisis-ready pedagogical planning that emphasizes local innovation, professional autonomy, and collaborative learning ecosystems.

The scope of the research was limited by the relatively short observation window and the focus on a small number of institutions across select geographical regions. While rich in depth, the study does not capture long-term outcomes or systemic policy impacts of inclusive hybrid practices. Future research should explore longitudinal trajectories of these pedagogical shifts, particularly their influence on student achievement, teacher identity, and institutional transformation. Expanding the study across diverse cultural and policy settings would also provide comparative insights into the scalability and adaptability of crisis-responsive inclusive frameworks in global education systems.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; Investigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

REFERENCES

- Andrade, M. S. (2023). Pedagogies and Practices: An Institutional Framework for Flexible Learning. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 23(5), 106–114. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i5.5928>
- Arida, A. I. (2023). Transnational Education and E-Learning. In *Higher Education in the Arab World: E-Learning and Distance Education* (pp. 295–317). Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/9783031335686-15>

- Bedeker, M., Ospanbek, A., Simons, M., Yessenbekova, A., & Zhalgaspayev, M. (2024). 'I can easily switch to the Kazakh language, also to the Russian language': reimagining Kazakhstani CLIL implementation as a third space. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 37(2), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2023.2245832>
- Cevikbas, M., & Kaiser, G. (2023). Can flipped classroom pedagogy offer promising perspectives for mathematics education on pandemic-related issues? A systematic literature review. *ZDM - Mathematics Education*, 55(1), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-022-01388-w>
- Crick, T., Prickett, T., Vasiliou, C., Chitare, N., & Watson, I. (2023). Exploring Computing Students' Post-Pandemic Learning Preferences with Workshops: A UK Institutional Case Study. *Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, ITiCSE, 1*, 173–179. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3587102.3588807>
- Cunnington, S., Codner, A., Nelson, E., McGrath, D., & Greece, J. A. (2023). The Shifting Public Health Landscape and Virtual Learning Environment: The Effectiveness of Practice-Based Teaching Delivered In-Person, Virtual, and Hybrid. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20042867>
- Dallal, A. (2023). Does student performance decline in online classroom setup? A study of students' performance in ECE controls class. *ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings*. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85172156696&partnerID=40&md5=c82f13620d199b9b8a1cd49c88e72c3c>
- Eggleston, A. G., & Rabb, R. J. (2023). Developing and Scaling Engineering Communication (EC) for New Engineering Education. *ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings*. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85172072066&partnerID=40&md5=bf321bb9b7c2f783e88b516e1e5e6648>
- Francois, C. (2023). "Our Teaching Transcends a Subject Matter": Learning From Black Women Educators' Beliefs about Literacy Instruction During Extraordinary Times. *Teachers College Record*, 125(10), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681231217016>
- Gravett, K. (2024). Different voices, different bodies: presence–absence in the digital university. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 49(3), 388–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2150637>
- Grossec, G., Bran, R. A., & Țîru, L. G. (2024). Digital Assessment: A Survey of Romanian Higher Education Teachers' Practices and Needs. *Education Sciences*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14010032>
- Haddam-Bouabdallah, F. (2023). Digital Classroom Mise en Scène during Covid-19 Era: The case of Tlemcen University, Algeria. *International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research, 2022*, 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.26803/MyRes.2022.02>
- Hayes, C. (2023). Progressive pedagogy for extended reality: Shaping and facilitating the fourth industrial revolution. In *Fostering Science Teaching and Learning for the Fourth Industrial Revolution and Beyond* (pp. 36–61). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-6932-3.ch002>
- Hernandez-Martinez, P., Rogovchenko, S., Rogovchenko, Y., & Treffert-Thomas, S. (2023). Collaboration between Mathematicians and Mathematics Educators: dialogical inquiry as a methodological tool in Mathematics Education research. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 114(1), 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-023-10245-w>
- Hervás-Gómez, C., Díaz-Noguera, M. D., Martín-Gutiérrez, Á., & Morales-Pérez, G. L. (2023). Validation of the Attitude Scale on Prospective Teachers' Perceptions of the Consequences on Their Psychological State: Well-Being and Cognition. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20085439>
- Jokinen, H., Pramila-Savukoski, S., Kuivila, H.-M., Jämsä, R., Juntunen, J., Törmänen, T., Koskimäki, M., & Mikkonen, K. (2024). Development and psychometric testing of hybrid education competence instrument for social and health care, and health sciences educators. *Nurse Education Today*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2023.105999>
- Joshi, M., Haavisto, T., Taatila, V., Ravyse, W., & Luimula, M. (2023). Transition towards hybrid

- learning environments in higher education institutions: How to use metaverse to support active learning. In *Fostering Pedagogy Through Micro and Adaptive Learning in Higher Education: Trends, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 212–238). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8656-6.ch010>
- Kaler-Jones, C., Briscoe, K. L., Moore, C. M., & Ford, J. R. (2023). Yes, Teaching and Pedagogical Practices Matter: Graduate Students' of Color Stories in Hybrid Higher Education/Student Affairs (HESA) Graduate Programs. *Urban Review*, 55(2), 204–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-022-00645-2>
- Kapoor, A., Pandey, A., & Rose, E. (2023). Virtual learning and legal education emerging trends, adaptability, and effectiveness. In *Architecture and Technological Advancements of Education 4.0* (pp. 25–48). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/9781668492857.ch002>
- Karaseva, M. V. (2023). With What and on What Can Musician Write in the Digital Age: Analysis of Modern Mobile Devices. *Nauchnyy Vestnik Moskovskoy Konservatorii*, 14(1), 150–167. <https://doi.org/10.26176/mosconsv.2023.52.1.06>
- Majeed, M. D. (2023). Designing Therapeutic Landscapes for Learners: What a Critical Health Geography Approach Can Add to the Field of Instructional Design. In *The Multi-Disciplinary Instructional Designer: Integrating Specialized Skills into Design Toolkits* (pp. 126–141). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003268413-8>
- Markauskaite, L., Carvalho, L., & Fawns, T. (2023). The role of teachers in a sustainable university: from digital competencies to postdigital capabilities. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(1), 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10199-z>
- Nussli, N., Oh, K., & Davis, J. P. (2024). Capturing the successes and failures during pandemic teaching: An investigation of university students' perceptions of their faculty's emergency remote teaching approaches. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 21(1), 42–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530221147112>
- Pandey, S. C., & Panda, S. (2023). Universities and innovation – the case of hybrid courses. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 31(4), 556–569. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-01-2022-0013>
- Patel, M., & Chalageri, S. (2023). GlotBot: Hybrid Language Translator for Secondary Level Mathematics Classrooms. *Proceedings of IDC 2023 - 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference: Rediscovering Childhood*, 439–443. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3585088.3595283>
- Ragusa, G., & Johnson, E. A. (2023). Work in Progress: Engaging First-year Engineering Students through Makerspace Project-based Pedagogy. *ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings*. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85172135683&partnerID=40&md5=40073e748774dffcae7da5b14e82cf8a>
- Reamer, M., Maranto, G., Harrison, T., & Clement, A. (2024). Photovoice in the interdisciplinary climate classroom: a case study in climate adaptation pedagogy from a hybrid university course. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, 23(1–2), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533015X.2023.2275252>
- Sato, S. N., Condes Moreno, E., Villanueva, A. R., Orquera Miranda, P., Chiarella, P., Bermudez, G., Aguilera, J. F. T., & Clemente-Suárez, V. J. (2023). Psychological Impacts of Teaching Models on Ibero-American Educators during COVID-19. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13120957>
- Sharma, A., & Pandey, A. (2023). Modern Communication Methods in Higher Education: A Post-COVID-19 Analysis †. *Engineering Proceedings*, 59(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2023059161>
- Simunich, B., Gregg, A., & Berg, P. R. (2024). HIGH-IMPACT DESIGN FOR ONLINE COURSES: BLUEPRINTING QUALITY DIGITAL LEARNING IN EIGHT PRACTICAL STEPS. In *High-Impact Design for Online Courses: Blueprinting Quality Digital Learning in Eight Practical Steps*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003442370>
- Thirkell, E., & Munday, D. (2023). Re-imagining hybrid pedagogies: Lessons from the pandemic using the diffusion of innovation model. In *Building the Post-Pandemic University:*

- Imagining, Contesting and Materializing Higher Education Futures* (pp. 111–135). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85167706886&partnerID=40&md5=106ac68184df71fe4788ee4f9cbb7733>
- Thurson, K. M., McAnirlin, O. E., Dubin, A., Powell, G. M., & Stephens, L. E. (2024). Virtual Notebooks: Collaboration & Connection During COVID-19 and Beyond. *SCHOLE: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 39(1), 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1937156X.2022.2156408>
- Torrissi-Steele, G. (2023). Facilitating conditions for hybrid teaching among academics. In *Handbook of Research on Andragogical Leadership and Technology in a Modern World* (pp. 341–357). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7832-5.ch018>
- Vallejo Rubinstein, C., & Tonioli, V. (2023). Exploring the Linguistic and Cultural Identities of Transnational Background Children in Catalonia, Spain †. *Societies*, 13(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13100221>
- Veliz, L., & Chan, E. (2024). Unpacking EFL Learners' Agency at the Intersection of Global Citizenship and Marginalization of Local Identities Through a Multiliteracies Approach. In *Empowering Language Learners in a Changing World through Pedagogies of Multiliteracies* (pp. 141–162). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51889-8_8

Copyright Holder :

© Rami Hariri et.al (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Journal Emerging Technologies in Education

This article is under: