

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-3-14>

UDC 339.1

Kramarenko Anna

*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Department of Management and Administration
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine
e-mail: a.o.kramarenko@karazin.ua
ORCID ID: [0000-0001-5987-1247](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5987-1247)*

From theory to practice: the phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship in EdTech

Abstract. University professors and instructors are increasingly transitioning from traditional academic roles into educational technology entrepreneurship, fundamentally reshaping how knowledge is created, packaged, and delivered.

Problem statement. Despite the growing scale of this phenomenon, the mechanisms driving the transition from academic to entrepreneurial activity remain insufficiently systematized, and the key competencies required for sustainable EdTech entrepreneurship lack a coherent conceptual framework.

Unresolved aspects of the problem. Critical gaps persist regarding the long-term sustainability of EdTech business models, the ethical tensions between academic values and commercialization, and the structural inequalities that constrain access to entrepreneurial pathways for teachers from underrepresented groups or less affluent regions.

Purpose of the article. This study aims to analyze the socioeconomic and technological prerequisites underpinning the emergence of teaching entrepreneurship, to define the characteristic profile of the entrepreneurial educator, and to systematize the principal business models and developmental stages of EdTech projects.

Presentation of the main material. The research identifies a convergence of factors — academic career precarity, pandemic-driven digitalization, growing demand for quality continuing education, and accessible EdTech tooling — that collectively catalyze the formation of a new teacher profile integrating pedagogical expertise with entrepreneurial competencies. Three primary business models are examined: online courses and platforms, educational SaaS products, and corporate consulting, alongside hybrid academic-entrepreneurial arrangements. Key implementation stages — problem identification, MVP development, monetization, and promotion — are described with reference to current market data.

Conclusions. Teaching entrepreneurship represents a structural transformation of the education industry rather than a passing trend. Its development is catalyzing systemic changes in higher education institutions and accelerating the adoption of AI-driven, micro-learning approaches. The findings offer a practical guide for educators considering the EdTech transition and a conceptual contribution to understanding the evolving academic-entrepreneurial interface.

Keywords: *teaching entrepreneurship, EdTech, academic entrepreneurship, online education, educational technology, digital transformation.*

Formulas: -; fig.: -; tabl.: 1; bibl.: 36

JEL Classification: I21, L26, O33

For citation: Kramarenko Anna. From theory to practice: the phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship in EdTech. Financial and Credit Systems: Prospects for Development. №3(22) 2026. P. 216-229. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-3-14>

Introduction. The last decade has witnessed a radical transformation of the education industry. The global EdTech market, estimated at \$254 billion in 2021 [22], continues to grow rapidly, opening up unprecedented opportunities for those who are at the very heart of the educational process — teachers. Increasingly, university professors and teachers are making unexpected career turns, turning from transmitters of knowledge into creators of educational technologies and successful entrepreneurs.

This phenomenon is not accidental. Teachers have a unique combination of deep subject expertise, understanding of teaching methodology, and direct knowledge of students' needs — assets that cannot be bought or quickly acquired. In an era when education is becoming more technological and personalized, it is those who have stood at the blackboard for years who are best equipped to create truly effective educational solutions.

From the creators of Coursera, who graduated from Stanford University, to thousands of teachers who have launched their own online schools and educational platforms, examples of a successful transition from an academic career to entrepreneurship are multiplying every year. This transition is changing not only the destinies of individuals, but also the very nature of education, making it more accessible, flexible, and results-oriented. This article examines how the profile of an entrepreneur teacher is formed, as well as how the transition from the academic to the commercial sphere is changing the role of universities and new technologies.

Literature Review. The scholarly foundation of this study draws on a diverse body of research spanning academic labor economics, educational technology, entrepreneurship theory, and digital pedagogy. The crisis of the traditional academic career has become one of the main shocks. In most countries of the world, the profession of university lecturer has ceased to be financially attractive. Salaries have not kept pace with the rising cost of living, especially in large cities where leading universities are located. From 2019 to 2023, the purchasing power of teachers fell by 7.7%, and only in the 2023-2024 academic year did real salaries increase by 0.5% [10]. The NEA report for 2025 showed that the purchasing power of teachers increased by only 1% compared to the previous year, but still has not recovered to the pre-pandemic level [22].

Young scientists have been working in temporary positions for years without guarantees of permanent employment. 68% of teachers at American colleges and universities had temporary contracts in 2021, up from about 47% in 1987 [30]. About 76% of part-time teachers worked on short-term, non-renewable contracts as of fall 2023 [30]. According to research, the 2024 average faculty salary of U.S. Colleges is \$67,371 over all ranks [31], which is significantly lower than specialists with their skill level in the private sector could earn. A study by the National Bureau of Economic Research showed that professors earn about 15% less than other professionals with advanced degrees [13].

At the same time, the academic environment is increasingly suffering from bureaucratization. An Italian study has shown that research units with a higher level of bureaucratization demonstrate lower scientific efficiency. The share of university teaching expenses has decreased from 41% to 29% since 1980, while the share of administrative expenses has remained stable [5]. Endless committees, the struggle for grants, the need to publish in certain journals for the sake of performance rather than scientific value — all this takes time and energy away from what is really important: teaching and research. Teachers report that they work an average of 56 hours per week, of which 28.3 hours are spent on teaching, 14.4 hours on research, and 13.3 hours on other activities, including 6.2 hours on administrative duties [3]. Many talented teachers feel that the system stifles their creativity and limits their ability to have a real impact on students. In a study by Dr. Hanich and his colleagues, 43% of respondents were at serious or very serious risk of burnout. 77% of researchers in the field of media and communications agreed that for success in an academic environment it is necessary to work overtime and during vacations [24]. In October 2020, a survey of American university professors showed that 70% of respondents felt stressed — twice as much as a year earlier, when 32% of respondents reported stress. More than

two thirds of teachers reported fatigue, one of the most common symptoms of burnout syndrome. More than half of the respondents stated that they were seriously considering a career change [23].

It should be noted that the COVID-19 pandemic has played the role of a powerful catalyst for the digitalization of education. In a few months in the spring of 2020, educational institutions made a leap that would normally take years. The results of the study show that 89.7% of teachers agree that after COVID-19 they make more efforts to teach and develop students' abilities [15]. Teachers who had never thought about online learning were forced to learn digital tools. This experience has opened many people's eyes to the possibilities of distance education and has shown that high-quality learning is possible beyond physical classrooms. Several platforms of massive open online courses (MOOCs) have taken advantage of the virtual transition and offered their online portfolio for free as a temporary alternative [33].

At the same time, the pandemic has demonstrated the vulnerability of traditional educational institutions. Universities were losing students and income, cutting programs and freezing hiring. The study found that the institutions analyzed showed an average of 14% cumulative revenue declines for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, with further losses looming on the horizon due to falling enrollment, tuition freezes, and COVID-related costs. According to researchers, financial losses in more than 4,000 colleges in America amount to about 183 billion dollars [2]. The Fall 2020 enrollment survey shows that the total enrollment of international students has decreased by 16%, while new enrollment has dropped by 43%. If US institutions of higher education are forced to shrink or close due to falling enrollment, this will have a multiplier effect of job losses [16]. For the first time, many teachers seriously considered diversifying their sources of income and independence from one employer.

At the same time, the market's demand for high-quality educational content is growing exponentially. In 16 of the 17 countries surveyed, students emphasized the importance of a well-organized online course with a clear path and step-by-step guidance as one of their top priorities [27]. The concept of continuous learning has become the norm in the modern world. Professionals understand that a diploma received ten years ago no longer guarantees competitiveness. Companies invest billions in employee training. Individual students are willing to pay for courses that will help them change their profession, upgrade their qualifications, or learn a new skill. By 2028, the market volume is expected to grow at an average annual growth rate of 8.56% and reach \$8.93 billion. In addition, in the same year, the number of users in the professional certificate market will exceed 70 million [27].

At the same time, the market is oversaturated with low-quality content. 43% of higher education students in the United States in 2022 believed that the quality of online education is worse than face-to-face [28]. In 2024, 18% of students expressed concern about the quality of teaching and the availability of academic support in online programs [7]. In particular, courses created by marketers without deep expertise promise quick results, but rarely provide real knowledge. This creates a demand for educational products created by real experts — those who not only know the subject, but also know how to teach.

In addition to all of the above, the availability of technological tools has reduced the barriers to entry into EdTech to almost zero. The global e-learning market exceeded \$315 billion in 2021 and is expected to reach \$1 trillion by 2028 with a CAGR of 20% [26]. Kajabi recorded more than 50,000 users at the end of 2024, demonstrating steady growth over the 8 years since 2016 [19]. In a 2024 study with more than 1,000 respondents, 95% said they had learned something new from the content creator in the last 12 months [19]. Ten years ago, creating an educational platform required serious technical knowledge and investment, today a teacher can launch a full-fledged online course using ready-made platforms like Teachable, Thinkific, or even just YouTube and social networks. Tools for creating videos, interactive tasks, tests, and even virtual labs are available by subscription for a few dollars per month. Moreover, entire ecosystems of support have emerged for creators of educational content: from communities of practice to accelerators specializing in EdTech projects.

In 2023, 28% of Americans were considering starting a business selling online courses to share their knowledge [19]. This number will only grow as new technologies make the industry more accessible.

Taken together, the reviewed literature establishes a multidimensional theoretical and empirical foundation for understanding teaching entrepreneurship as a structurally determined, psychologically complex, and institutionally consequential phenomenon. The gaps identified — particularly regarding long-term sustainability, social equity in access, and university policy frameworks — define the directions for the present study's contributions.

Purpose, objectives and research methods. The purpose of this study is to analyze the socioeconomic, technological, and institutional factors underpinning the emergence of academic entrepreneurship in EdTech; to construct a structured profile of the entrepreneurial educator; and to systematize the principal business models and developmental pathways available to teachers transitioning into educational technology entrepreneurship.

In pursuit of this purpose, the study addresses the following research objectives:

1. To identify and analyze the convergence of prerequisites that have created conditions for the mass transition of academic professionals into EdTech entrepreneurship.
2. To construct a multidimensional profile of the entrepreneurial teacher.
3. To systematize the principal business models available to teacher-entrepreneurs.
4. To describe the key stages of EdTech project development.
5. To evaluate the systemic transformations that teaching entrepreneurship catalyzes within higher education institutions.

The study employs a multi-method research design combining systematic literature analysis, secondary data synthesis, and comparative case-based reasoning. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the research object — situated at the intersection of educational science, entrepreneurship theory, labor economics, and digital technology — the methodological approach integrates tools from several scholarly traditions.

Systematic literature review constitutes the primary methodological foundation. Academic sources were selected from peer-reviewed journals, institutional reports, and authoritative industry publications covering the period from 2007 to 2025, with particular emphasis on research published after 2018 to reflect the most current developments in EdTech and academic labor markets. The selection criteria prioritized empirical rigor, relevance to the research objectives, and disciplinary diversity, encompassing contributions from educational science, organizational psychology, entrepreneurship studies, and digital economics.

Secondary data analysis was applied to quantitative evidence drawn from market research reports, institutional surveys, and administrative datasets. Sources including Kajabi's State of the Creator Economy (2022), Coursera's Learner Outcomes Report (2023), HolonIQ's education market projections, AAUP faculty employment data, NEA salary reports, and HubSpot's State of Marketing were analyzed to establish the empirical parameters of the EdTech market, the economics of academic careers, and the behavioral patterns of creator-entrepreneurs.

Comparative analysis was employed to examine contrasting business models, institutional strategies, and teacher profiles, allowing for the identification of structural patterns and trade-offs across different entrepreneurial pathways.

Typological synthesis was used to construct the profile of the entrepreneurial teacher as an ideal-typical construct integrating empirical findings across psychology, pedagogy, and entrepreneurship research.

Structural modeling informed the organization of findings into the prerequisite-profile-model framework presented in Table 1, which maps the relationships between EdTech background factors and the characteristics of academic entrepreneurship.

Research results. The massive transition of teachers into entrepreneurship did not arise out of thin air. There is a whole range of social, economic and technological factors behind this phenomenon.

The described prerequisites became the basis for the formation of a new profile of an entrepreneur teacher. At the same time, some factors became an accelerator for the development of existing qualities and activation of potential opportunities, while others formed the basis for a qualitative transition to a new teaching role, restructuring economic relations and mastering new skills from the field of the entrepreneurial ecosystem (see Table 1).

Table 1. Prerequisites for the development of EdTech and the profile of an entrepreneur teacher

Background of EdTech	Characteristics of academic entrepreneurship
Academic career crisis	Methodical teaching skills
Bureaucratization of the academic environment	Creative freedom of activity in the presence of entrepreneurial risk and uncertainty
The COVID-19 pandemic	Developing entrepreneurial thinking
Vulnerability of universities to crisis phenomena	The opportunity to ensure financial independence
Increasing demand for high-quality content	The "impostor syndrome" common in the academic environment
Oversaturation of the market with low-quality content	Difficulties with commercialization and pricing
Availability of technological tools	Technological literacy

Source: formed by the author

An analysis of successful cases shows that entrepreneurial teachers come from a wide variety of disciplines and age groups, but they share certain characteristics. In particular, the key competencies of a successful entrepreneur teacher go far beyond the scope of subject expertise. Deep knowledge of the subject is the foundation, but not the sufficient condition for success. The market is full of experts who know a lot, but cannot effectively transfer knowledge to others. The advantages of a teacher are the experience of working with students of different levels of training, the ability to explain complex things in simple language, the ability to structure material from simple to complex, and the ability to diagnose typical errors and misconceptions. Experts often overestimate students' understanding, ignoring the typical difficulties of newcomers, which leads to learning gaps, as shown in research on the "curse of knowledge". Compared to experts and beginners in biology teaching, experienced teachers are more likely to notice student mistakes, specific difficulties on topics, and the need to generate ideas on their own. This confirms the inability of pure experts to diagnose misconceptions without pedagogical experience [4]. These competencies cannot be acquired quickly. In this regard, the formation of this parameter in the profile of an entrepreneur teacher is due to the crisis of an academic career and the opening up of professional development opportunities in a new environment.

Another important characteristic of the profile is creative freedom. At the university, a teacher is bound by a curriculum approved by committees, limited by formats and standards. By creating his own educational product, teacher gets complete freedom to experiment with methodology, formats, and topics. CISRus research has shown that online space is perceived as a place of freedom — academic, civic and personal. In the motivation letters of the online course participants, the key factor was precisely the opportunity to experiment with methodology and topics, without the restrictions of the training committees [8]. It is possible to create a course that would never be approved in the university curriculum, but which solves a real problem of real people. However, the downside of creative freedom is uncertainty and risk. An academic career, for all its disadvantages, is predictable. There is a clear trajectory from assistant to professor, clear criteria for success, and a stable salary. Entrepreneurship is a step into the unknown, where no one guarantees success, where the first months or even years may not bring income, where every day you have to make decisions in conditions of incomplete information. Nevertheless, the step towards

entrepreneurship is based on the desire to overcome the numerous bureaucratic frameworks inherent in academic culture.

An important component in the emerging new phenomenon of teaching is entrepreneurial thinking, something that academic professionals often lack. Namely, the ability to see market opportunities, understanding customer needs, willingness to take risks, and perseverance in the face of setbacks. Surveys confirm that university students and teachers have a high interest in entrepreneurship (45-50% express their intention to start a business), but low confidence due to lack of experience and skills in assessing markets [36]. Successful entrepreneurial teachers either initially possess entrepreneurial qualities, or consciously develop them. At the same time, it can be noted that the COVID-19 pandemic has forced many to look for new opportunities and work formats. And this, in turn, activated the natural entrepreneurial qualities.

It is also worth noting that for many representatives of the academic community, one of the priorities is not only the issue of career, but also financial independence. After a long period of working for a fixed salary, the prospect of creating a scalable source of income looks extremely attractive. An online course can be marketed for years with minimal support efforts. A teacher who used to receive a fixed salary for teaching 30 students per semester can now reach thousands of students worldwide and earn multiples more. According to Kajabi's 2022 report, online courses have become the main source of income for content creators with six-figure incomes. 70% of content creators stated that online courses have brought them the most revenue in the last 12 months [17]. Given the vulnerability of traditional educational institutions to crisis phenomena, it is the desire for financial independence that pushes teachers to embark on the path of entrepreneurial activity.

A special psychology, the so-called "impostor syndrome", is characteristic of many academic specialists [1]. Years of working in an environment where academicians are constantly evaluated by colleagues, where every statement must be supported by references, where recognition comes slowly – all this is due to sincere doubts about the sufficient value of knowledge [11]. Nevertheless, it is the demand for high-quality educational content, rather than a one-time examination, that helps to overcome this barrier and entrenches entrepreneurial orientation among representatives of the academic community.

Another characteristic feature of the teacher's entrepreneurial profile is a prejudice against the commercialization of knowledge, which traditionally considers profiting from education as something not entirely ethical [29]. Many teachers experience an internal conflict between the desire to help people learn and charging for their services. Overcoming this barrier requires rethinking the value of one's own expertise and understanding that fair payment for quality education is normal and ethical. At the same time, the glut of the educational market with low-quality content actualizes the arrival of the academic community and the development of an entrepreneurial culture among teachers.

In the era of digitalization, an important characteristic of the profile of an entrepreneur teacher is technological literacy, which involves comfortable work with digital tools, understanding the possibilities of technology and a willingness to constantly learn new things [35]. An entrepreneur teacher should be able to record and edit videos, set up a webinar room, work with a learning management system, and analyze student data. The availability of a variety of digital tools supports the development of technological literacy, creates conditions for the development of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship in the academic ecosystem.

Thus, the prerequisites that led to the development of EdTech systems and business models simultaneously formed the basis for the phenomenon of academic entrepreneurship. Having outlined the key characteristics of the entrepreneur's profile in the field of EdTech and the directions for improving the product being created.

Taking into account the peculiarities of the EdTech ecosystem, the transition from teaching to entrepreneurship involves several stages of implementation, on which there is a need to focus the efforts:

1) Identification of the educational problem and the target audience. A successful educational product solves a specific problem of specific people. The question is, what do people want to learn and what are they willing to pay for [25]. A typical mistake of academic specialists is to create a course on a topic that they themselves find interesting and important, without checking the real demand [34]. The best approach is to start with audience research. Sources of insight include forums, social media groups, comments on existing courses, conversations with students, and surveys of potential clients.

2) Creating an MVP (minimum viable product) is a concept from the startup world that is applicable to educational products. Instead of creating an ideal full course, a minimal version can be created in a few weeks and be tested on real students. An MVP for an educational product can simply be a series of live webinars, the recordings of which will form the basis of a future course [18]. The main thing is to include enough material to give real value to students and get feedback. The MVP approach makes it possible to quickly find out if there is a real demand for a product and get feedback from real users before months are invested in creating content.

3) Monetization is the topic that raises the most questions among teachers. Pricing should reflect the value that the student receives, not the number of hours spent creating content. If the course is better and gives more results, then a higher price can be set. Paradoxically, sometimes an increase in price increases sales, because a high price signals high quality [18]. Monetization models are diverse: selling a course at a fixed price, subscribing with access to all materials, cohort model (closed groups that take the course together on certain dates, which creates a shortage and allows to set a higher price), corporate sales (companies are willing to pay many times more for employee training, especially if the course can be adapted according to their specifics).

4) Marketing and promotion are the most difficult issues for most teachers. 52% of course creators stated that attracting potential customers is their biggest challenge [17]. The main models include the following:

- Content marketing is the creation of free valuable content - articles, videos, podcasts — that demonstrate expertise and solve small problems of the target audience. This attracts attention, builds trust, and naturally some of the audience will want to move on to deeper learning through a paid course.

- Social media is a powerful tool for educational entrepreneurs. LinkedIn works great for professional training. YouTube is for almost any topic. TikTok and Instagram are for more visual or youth-oriented topics.

- Email marketing remains one of the most effective channels. If regularly send valuable content, then selling a paid course is natural. The number of email users was expected to grow by 2.5% in 2024 and 2025, reaching approximately 4.73 billion people [20]. The growing popularity of email underscores the need for course creators to add email marketing to their efforts to attract, retain, and convert potential customers. The average return on investment in email is \$36 for every dollar spent. AI-based personalization can increase the return on investment by up to 70%. In addition, the average rate of opening emails was 44%, and the average rate of click-throughs was 3.7% [20].

- Partnerships and collaborations can accelerate growth. Teacher can find other creators with a similar audience but complementary expertise, make a guest appearance on a podcast, create a joint webinar, and recommend each other's courses. This is a win-win model: both sides gain access to a new audience.

According to the Hubspot report for 2024, the most effective methods used by content creators to reach their audience were social networks (16%), electronic newsletters (14%), blogging (16%), paid advertising (14%) (HubSpot). In addition, 78% of course creators surveyed by Kajabi

reported that regular interaction with the audience is the most important marketing method. Another 88% of content creators named social media as their main channel for attracting potential customers. According to the Kajabi report, 28% of the highest-paid content creators plan to invest in a newsletter, 27% plan to offer exclusive membership, and 20% plan to create an email list [17].

Taking into account the possibilities of mastering these key stages, teachers who decide to try their hand at entrepreneurship can choose from a variety of business models, each of which has its own advantages and challenges.

1) Online courses and educational platforms are the most popular entry point into EdTech entrepreneurship. The model is simple and straightforward: the teacher creates a structured course on certain topic and places it on a platform where students can buy access. There are two main approaches:

- Using existing marketplaces like Udemy, Coursera, Skillshare. Advantages: ready-made audience, technical infrastructure, payment system. Disadvantages: high platform fees (up to 50% or more), limited pricing control, competition with thousands of other courses, and restrictions on interaction with students outside the platform. At the same time, online learning revenues are expected to grow at an average annual growth rate of 8.6% between 2024 and 2029 and exceed \$279 billion. Online learning platforms and the professional certificates they offer will account for almost \$65 billion of these revenues [9].

- Create own platform. Tools like Teachable, Kajabi, Podia make it technically accessible even without programming skills. The teacher gets full control over the brand, pricing, and student contacts, but must independently engage the audience and resolve technical issues.

2) Creating educational SaaS products is a more difficult but potentially more profitable path. Instead of selling content, the teacher creates a software solution that helps to learn or teach. These can include platforms for checking assignments, adaptive learning systems, tools for creating interactive learning materials, and applications for practicing skills. Examples include Quizlet for creating flash cards, Duolingo for learning languages, Brilliant for interactive learning in mathematics and natural sciences. The key advantage of the SaaS model is recurring revenue through subscriptions. If an educational course is usually purchased once, then a subscription to a software product generates regular income month after month. However, developing a software product requires a much larger investment of time and money, a technical team is needed, and entering the market takes more time.

3) Consulting and development of training programs for corporations is a model that is often underestimated, but can be extremely profitable. Companies spend huge budgets on employee training, but often do not have the internal expertise to create high-quality programs. Hiring a new employee is more expensive than training and retraining an existing employee. According to the Labor Institute, the cost of staff turnover is \$20,000, while the cost of retraining an employee is less than \$10,000 [32]. A teacher with deep knowledge in a sought-after field can offer services in developing corporate training programs, conducting trainings, and creating educational content for the company's internal needs. The advantage of this model is the high cost of services (corporate clients are willing to pay many times more than individual ones), long-term contracts, and the opportunity to work on interesting projects. The disadvantage is limited scalability. Consulting services require a teacher's personal time, so income is directly related to the number of hours they work. However, many successful business teachers use consulting as a source of stable income at the initial stage, while building more scalable products.

Hybrid models based on combining teaching with entrepreneurship can also find application. This often turns out to be the optimal solution, especially at the initial stage. The teacher continues to work at the university full-time or part-time, using a stable income as a safety cushion, and at the same time develops EdTech project. This approach reduces financial risk and gives the time to experiment and make mistakes. In addition, continuing to teach provides constant access to the audience to test ideas and materials, as well as maintains a professional reputation.

Many universities today even encourage such activities, seeing it as a way to increase the visibility of an educational institution and attract students.

Based on the systematization of the prerequisites, characteristics and business models of EdTech entrepreneurship among the academic community, several trends can be identified that are likely to have the most significant impact on the evolution of teaching entrepreneurship:

1) The success of entrepreneurial teachers forces universities to rethink their role and work model. When students can receive high-quality online education for a small fraction of the cost of a university course, traditional institutions are forced to evolve [12]. Some universities see this as a threat and try to limit the external activities of teachers. But more far-sighted institutions are following the path of partnership. They create incubators for EdTech projects of teachers, provide resources and support, in return receiving a share or partner status [25]. Prestigious universities such as MIT, Stanford, and Harvard actively host their faculty's courses on open platforms. This increases the global visibility of the university, attracts the best students, and creates new revenue streams. The professor becomes not only an employee of the university, but also its ambassador in the global educational space.

Hybrid models are emerging where the university and the teacher's startup complement each other. For example, a teacher creates an introductory massive online course that anyone can take for free or for a small fee. Those who want to go deeper can enroll in a full-fledged university program, where the same teacher conducts advanced courses [21]. Or another model: the university recognizes online teacher courses as part of the curriculum, students take them instead of traditional lectures, and contact time at the university is used for discussions, projects, and mentoring, which really requires physical presence. Perhaps the most significant impact of teaching entrepreneurship is the democratization of access to quality education. A talented teacher from a leading university is no longer available only to a narrow circle of students enrolled in this institution. This knowledge can reach people all over the world, regardless of their geography, financial situation or formal qualifications.

2) Artificial intelligence is revolutionizing education, and entrepreneurial educators are at the forefront of these changes. AI assistants can provide instant feedback to students, adapt the pace and complexity of the material to an individual level, and identify gaps in knowledge. For course creators, this means the ability to scale personalized learning. Instead of creating one linear course for everyone, a teacher can develop an adaptive system where each student receives a unique learning path based on their previous knowledge, goals, and learning style. AI also helps teachers create content faster: generate tests, create practical tasks, and even help with the structuring of the material. This lowers the barrier to entry and allows teachers to focus on what they do best — expertise and methodology. 49% of people are ready to consume content created by artificial intelligence and available through online courses. This opens up the possibility for course creators to use AI to optimize lesson planning and other administrative tasks [14]. In 2024, 73% of content creators with six-figure incomes expect artificial intelligence to save more than 26 hours per week. Meanwhile, 56% believe that AI will be one of the best ways to reduce the level of professional burnout [9].

3) The trend is moving away from long courses to short, targeted modules. In a world where skills are becoming obsolete faster, people want to learn just-in-time — to acquire specific skills exactly when they are needed. This is changing the way teachers structure educational content. Instead of full courses, there are libraries of micro-modules that can be combined. It also opens up new monetization opportunities: subscriptions with access to a constantly updated library of content. Coursera's 2023 report states that 77% of students who took courses on the platform and 91% in developing countries reported career benefits such as getting a job, a promotion, and more. The same report found that 30% of the unemployed who completed training found a job after completing their last course or program, and 25% of graduates of advanced training courses for aspiring professionals found a new job [6]. The skills of the future — critical thinking, creativity,

emotional intelligence, and the ability to learn — are becoming more in demand than specific technical knowledge. Teachers who can effectively teach these meta-skills will be especially appreciated.

Discussion. The results of the study reveal the versatility of the phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship in EdTech, however, they raise a number of important issues that require further analysis.

First, the question of the balance between the academic mission and the commercialization of education remains debatable. Critics argue that turning teachers into entrepreneurs can lead to an erosion of fundamental academic values. When education becomes a product, there is a risk that the content will be simplified to attract a wider audience, and complex but important topics will be ignored in favor of more "marketable" ones. Moreover, the focus on monetization can distract teachers from research and publications, which are the foundation of academic progress, even if they do not bring immediate financial returns. On the other hand, proponents of academic entrepreneurship rightly point out that commercialization does not necessarily mean a decrease in quality. On the contrary, the direct connection with the market forces the creators of educational content to be more attentive to the real needs of students and the effectiveness of learning.

Secondly, there is considerable uncertainty about the long-term sustainability of EdTech's business models. Although the market is showing impressive growth, the high level of competition and rapid technological changes are creating an unstable environment. The data shows that many EdTech startups face difficulties in attracting and retaining users. This calls into question not only the financial viability of some models, but also their real educational value. In addition, teachers, even those with outstanding expertise, may have difficulty promoting their courses in the face of information noise. This creates an advantage for those with marketing skills or resources, but not necessarily the best pedagogical expertise.

Thirdly, the issue of social inequality in access to teaching entrepreneurship remains insufficiently studied. Despite claims of democratization, success in EdTech entrepreneurship often requires significant privileges: a financial safety cushion for experimentation, technological literacy, social capital for advancement, knowledge of English for access to the global market. Teachers from less affluent countries, representatives of minorities, and women in certain disciplines may face additional barriers.

Finally, the institutional policy of universities in relation to the entrepreneurial activities of teachers remains ambiguous and fragmented. The lack of a clear regulatory framework creates uncertainty and may hinder the development of the phenomenon. Further work is needed to develop ethical standards and institutional policies that would protect the interests of all parties: teachers, universities, students and society as a whole.

Future research should focus on the long-term effects of the phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship, its impact on the quality of education, mechanisms for ensuring equitable access and sustainable models of interaction between academic and entrepreneurial spheres.

Conclusions. The phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship in EdTech is not a temporary trend, but a fundamental shift in the nature of education and academic careers. There is the birth of a new type of educational professional: a person who combines deep subject expertise, pedagogical skills and entrepreneurial thinking.

The conducted research allows to formulate several key conclusions. Firstly, the transition of teachers to EdTech entrepreneurship is due to the convergence of multiple factors: the crisis of traditional academic careers, technological accessibility, the COVID-19 pandemic as a catalyst for digitalization, and the growing demand for quality continuing education. These prerequisites not only created opportunities for an individual career trajectory, but also formed a new teacher profile that integrates pedagogical expertise with entrepreneurial competencies.

Secondly, successful teaching entrepreneurship requires a specific set of characteristics that go beyond traditional academic training. Methodological teaching skills should be combined with

technological literacy, the ability to commercialize knowledge, and a willingness to work in an environment of uncertainty. At the same time, the barriers characteristic of the academic environment — the "imposter syndrome" and prejudices about the monetization of education — are gradually being overcome under the pressure of market opportunities and economic necessity.

Third, the variety of business models in EdTech — from simple online courses to complex SaaS solutions and corporate consulting — provides teachers with multiple entry points into entrepreneurship. Hybrid models combining academic work with entrepreneurial activity turn out to be particularly stable and allow minimizing the risks of the transition period. The stage-by-stage development of the EdTech project — from identifying an educational problem through the creation of an MVP to scaling and monetization — offers a structured path for teachers without entrepreneurial experience.

Fourth, teaching entrepreneurship catalyzes systemic changes in higher education. Universities are forced to rethink their role, evolving from monopolists of education to partners in a broader educational ecosystem. The emergence of hybrid models, where online courses for business teachers are integrated into university programs, indicates the possibility of synergy between traditional and innovative approaches.

Fifth, technological innovations, especially artificial intelligence, are radically transforming the landscape of teaching entrepreneurship. AI not only simplifies the creation and personalization of educational content, but also changes the very nature of the interaction between teacher and student. The trend towards micro-education and just-in-time education reflects a broader shift from formal to continuing education, where entrepreneurial educators play a central role in providing access to relevant knowledge and skills.

The practical significance of the research lies in the systematization of the prerequisites, characteristics and models of teaching entrepreneurship, which can serve as a guide for teachers considering the transition to EdTech. The theoretical value of the work is to conceptualize a new professional profile at the intersection of academia and entrepreneurship, as well as to identify systemic transformations in the educational industry.

References

1. Al Lawati, A., Al-Wahshi, A., Al-Mahrouqi, T., Al-Mufargi, Y., Al Shukaily, S., Al Aufi, H., Al-Shehhi, I., Al Azri, A., & Al-Sinawi, H. (2025). The prevalence of imposter syndrome and its association with psychological distress: A cross-sectional study. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(7), Article 986. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15070986>
2. Allen, T. D., Miller, M. H., French, K. A., Kim, E., & Centeno, G. (2023). Faculty time expenditure across research, teaching, and service: Do gender differences persist? *Occupational Health Science*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-023-00156-w>
3. Allgood, S., & Walstad, W. (2007). Faculty time allocations to teaching, research, and other work. *Economics of Education Review*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228918061_Faculty_Time_Allocations_to_Teaching_Research_and_Other_Work
4. Auerbach, A. J., Higgins, M., Brickman, P., & Andrews, T. C. (2018). Teacher knowledge for active-learning instruction: Expert-novice comparison reveals differences. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 17(1), Article ar12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-07-0149>
5. Coccia, M. (2009). Bureaucratization in public research institutions. *Minerva*, 47(1), 31–50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-008-9113-z>
6. Coursera. (2023). *Coursera learner outcomes report 2023*. Retrieved from: <https://www.coursera.org/about/press/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Learner-Outcomes-Report-2023.pdf>
7. Coursmos. (n.d.). *Online learning statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://www.coursmos.com/online-learning-statistics/>
8. CISRus. (2025). *Freedom online*. Retrieved from: <https://cisrus.org/ru/2025/11/30/freedom-online-rus/>
9. HolonIQ. (n.d.). *HolonIQ education in 2030*. Retrieved from: <https://comms.holoniq.com/hubfs/Education/Asset%20downloads/HolonIQ%20Education%20in%202030.pdf>
10. HubSpot. (n.d.). *State of marketing*. Retrieved from: <https://offers.hubspot.com/thank-you/state-of-marketing>
11. Huecker, M. R., Shreffler, J., McKeny, P. T., & Davis, D. (2023). Imposter phenomenon. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK585058/>
12. Hollands, F. M., & Tirthali, D. (2014). *MOOCs: Expectations and reality*. Columbia University, Teachers College. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271841177_MOOCs_Expectations_and_reality
13. Inside Higher Ed. (2018). *New data show wage gap between professors and other advanced degree holders*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/02/21/new-data-show-wage-gap-between-professors-and-other-advanced-degree-holders>

14. Inside Higher Ed. (2024). *Full-time faculty raises finally beat inflation, just barely*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/2024/04/11/full-time-faculty-raises-finally-beat-inflation-just-barely>
15. Imran, M., Almusharraf, N., & Abbasova, M. Y. (2025). Digital learning transformation: A study of teachers' post-Covid-19 experiences. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, Article 101228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101228>
16. Ithaka S+R. (2021). *Ithaka S+R US faculty survey 2021*. Retrieved from: <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/ithaka-sr-us-faculty-survey-2021/>
17. Kajabi. (2022). *The state of the creator economy 2022: Insights and trends from knowledge creators*. Retrieved from: https://assets-global.website-files.com/6011cc5bd95cd4a9622884f8/625dfa1030c49b1730789449_State%20of%20the%20creator%20economy%204_15_22.pdf
18. Komljenovic, J., Birch, K., & Sellar, S. (2024). Monetising digital data in higher education: Analysing the strategies and struggles of EdTech startups. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 6, 1196–1215. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00477-3>
19. Learning Revolution. (n.d.). *Online learning statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://www.learningrevolution.net/elearning-statistics/>
20. Market.us. *What is email marketing?* Retrieved from: <https://market.us/statistics/internet/email-users/>
21. Means, B., Bakia, M., & Murphy, R. (2014). *Learning online: What research tells us about whether, when and how*. Routledge.
22. National Education Association. (n.d.). *Eight charts that tell you everything about faculty pay*. NEA Today. Retrieved from: <https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/eight-charts-tell-you-everything-about-faculty-pay>
23. The Oxford Scientist. (2024). *Too stressed for success: The academic epidemic*. Retrieved from: <https://oxsci.org/burnout-in-academia/>
24. QS Insights Magazine. (2025). *How has 'publish or perish' become 'publish and perish' in academia?* Retrieved from: <https://newsletters.qs.com/how-has-publish-or-perish-become-publish-and-perish-in-academia/>
25. Ríos Yovera, V. R., Ramos Farroñán, E. V., Arbulú Ballesteros, M. A., Vera Calmet, V. G., Aguilar Armas, H. M., Soto Deza, J. M., Licapa Redolfo, R., Martel Acosta, R., & Reyes-Pérez, M. D. (2025). Academic entrepreneurship evolution: A systematic review of university incubators and startup development (2018–2024). *Sustainability*, 17(12), Article 5365. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17125365>
26. Sell Courses Online. (n.d.). *Online learning statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://sellcoursesonline.com/online-learning-statistics/>
27. Skillademia. (n.d.). *Online learning statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://www.skillademia.com/statistics/online-learning-statistics/>
28. Statista. (n.d.). *Opinions on quality of online education among college students in the United States*. Retrieved from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/956123/opinions-online-college-students-quality-online-education/>
29. Taylor, Y., & Breeze, M. (2020). All imposters in the university? Striking (out) claims on academic Twitter. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 81, Article 102367. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102367>
30. American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). *Tenure and contingency in US higher education*. Retrieved from: <https://aaup.org/article/data-snapshot-tenure-and-contingency-us-higher-education>
31. Univstats. (n.d.). *University salary statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://www.univstats.com/salary/>
32. Work Institute. (2019). *Work Institute 2019 retention report*. Retrieved from: <https://info.workinstitute.com/hubfs/2019%20Retention%20Report/Work%20Institute%202019%20Retention%20Report%20final-1.pdf>
33. World Economic Forum. (2020). *COVID-19 has accelerated the digital transformation of higher education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2020/07/covid-19-digital-transformation-higher-education/>
34. Xedu. *EdTech startup funnel*. Retrieved from: <https://www.xedu.co/news/edtech-startup-funnel>
35. Yang, X., Yeo, K. J., Lee, S.-H., & Handayani, L. (2024). A systematic review of impostor syndrome in higher education. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(6), 3876–3886. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i6.30726>
36. Zulkifli, N. A., Suhairom, N., Abd Wahid, N. H., & Saipudin, N. A. (2025). Fostering entrepreneurial mindsets in teacher trainees: A study on entrepreneurship education for future educators. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(4), 4371–4390. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400313>

Received: 10.03.2026

Accepted: 02.09.2026

Received after review: 24.07.2026

Published: 05.10.2026

Declaration on the use of artificial intelligence

During the preparation of this article, the artificial intelligence tools Claude, Copilot, and Perplexity were used to search for relevant sources and format references in the reference list. The final selection of the literature was made independently by the author based on verified scientific publications. The concept, content, scientific novelty, and research findings are the author's own. The final version of the article was reviewed, revised, and edited by the author.

Крамаренко Анна

доктор економічних наук, доцент

доцент кафедри управління та адміністрування

Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна

майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна

e-mail: a.o.kramarenko@karazin.ua

ORCID ID: [0000-0001-5987-1247](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5987-1247)

Від теорії до практики: феномен викладацького підприємництва у EdTech

Анотація. Університетські професори та викладачі все частіше переходять від традиційних академічних ролей до підприємництва в освітніх технологіях, принципово змінюючи спосіб створення, упаковки та поширення знань.

Постановка проблеми. Незважаючи на зростаючі масштаби цього явища, механізми, що стимулюють перехід від академічної діяльності до підприємницької, залишаються недостатньо систематизованими, а ключові компетенції, необхідні для сталого розвитку EdTech-підприємництва, не мають чіткої концептуальної основи.

Нерозв'язані аспекти. Зберігаються серйозні прогалини щодо довгострокової стійкості бізнес-моделей EdTech, етичних суперечностей між академічними цінностями та комерціалізацією, а також структурної нерівності, яка обмежує доступ до підприємницької діяльності для викладачів з недостатньо представлених груп або менш забезпечених регіонів.

Мета статті. Метою даного дослідження є аналіз соціально-економічних і технологічних передумов, що лежать в основі виникнення викладацького підприємництва, визначення характерного профілю викладача-підприємця і систематизація основних бізнес-моделей і етапів розвитку EdTech-проектів.

Основний матеріал. Дослідження виявило збіг факторів - нестабільність академічної кар'єри, спричинена пандемією цифровізація, зростаючий попит на якісну безперервну освіту та доступні інструменти EdTech - які в сукупності стимулюють формування нового профілю викладача, що поєднує педагогічний досвід з підприємницькими компетенціями. Розглядаються три основні бізнес-моделі: онлайн-курси та платформи, освітні SaaS-продукти та корпоративний консалтинг, а також гібридні академічні та підприємницькі механізми. Ключові етапи впровадження - виявлення проблем, розробка MVP, монетизація та просування - описані з посиланням на поточні ринкові дані.

Висновки. Викладацьке підприємництво являє собою структурну трансформацію освітньої галузі, а не минулу тенденцію. Його розвиток стимулює системні зміни у вищих навчальних закладах та прискорює впровадження підходів мікронавчання, заснованих на штучному інтелекті. Результати є практичним посібником для викладачів, які розглядають перехід до EdTech, та концептуальним внеском у розуміння еволюційної взаємодії науки та підприємництва.

Ключові слова: викладацьке підприємництво, EdTech, академічне підприємництво, онлайн-освіта, освітні технології, цифрова трансформація.

Формули: –; рис.: –; табл.: 1; бібл.: 36.

Для цитування: Kramarenko Anna. From theory to practice: the phenomenon of teaching entrepreneurship in EdTech. *Фінансово-кредитні системи: перспективи розвитку*. №3(22) 2026. С. 216-229. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-3-14>

Список літератури

1. Al Lawati A., Al-Wahshi A., Al-Mahrouqi T., Al-Mufargi Y., Al Shukaily S., Al Aufi H., Al-Shehhi I., Al Azri A., Al-Sinawi H. The prevalence of impostor syndrome and its association with psychological distress: A cross-sectional study. *Behavioral Sciences*. 2025. Vol. 15, No. 7. Article 986. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15070986>
2. Allen T. D., Miller M. H., French K. A., Kim E., Centeno G. Faculty time expenditure across research, teaching, and service: Do gender differences persist? *Occupational Health Science*. 2023. Advance online publication. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-023-00156-w>
3. Allgood S., Snow A. Faculty time allocations to teaching, research, and other work. *Economics of Education Review*. 2007. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228918061_Faculty_Time_Allocations_to_Teaching_Research_and_Other_Work
4. Auerbach A. J., Higgins M., Brickman P., Andrews T. C. Teacher knowledge for active-learning instruction: Expert-novice comparison reveals differences. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*. 2018. Vol. 17, No. 1. Article ar12. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-07-0149>
5. Bureaucratization in public research institutions. *PubMed Central*. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2758356/>
6. Coursera learner outcomes report 2023. Coursera, 2023. URL: <https://www.coursera.org/about/press/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Learner-Outcomes-Report-2023.pdf>
7. EdTech startup funnel. Xedu. URL: <https://www.xedu.co/news/edtech-startup-funnel>
8. Eight charts that tell you everything about faculty pay. *NEA Today*. URL: <https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/eight-charts-tell-you-everything-about-faculty-pay>
9. Freedom online. CISrus. 2025. URL: <https://cisrus.org/ru/2025/11/30/freedom-online-rus/>

10. Full-time faculty raises finally beat inflation, just barely. *Inside Higher Ed*. 2024. URL: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/2024/04/11/full-time-faculty-raises-finally-beat-inflation-just-barely>
11. Hollands F. M., Tirthali D. MOOCs: Expectations and reality. New York : Columbia University, Teachers College, 2014.
12. HolonIQ education in 2030. HolonIQ. URL: <https://comms.holoniq.com/hubfs/Education/Asset%20downloads/HolonIQ%20Education%20in%202030.pdf>
13. How has 'publish or perish' become 'publish and perish' in academia? *QS Insights Magazine*. 2025. URL: <https://newsletters.qs.com/how-has-publish-or-perish-become-publish-and-perish-in-academia/>
14. Huecker M. R., Shreffler J., McKenry P. T., Davis D. Imposter phenomenon. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island : StatPearls Publishing, 2023. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK585058/>
15. Imran M., Almusharraf N., Abbasova M. Y. Digital learning transformation: A study of teachers' post-Covid-19 experiences. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. 2025. Vol. 11. Article 101228. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101228>
16. Ithaka S+R US faculty survey 2021. Ithaka S+R, 2021. URL: <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/ithaka-sr-us-faculty-survey-2021/>
17. Kajabi. The state of the creator economy 2022: Insights and trends from knowledge creators. Kajabi, 2022. URL: https://assets-global.website-files.com/6011cc5bd95cd4a9622884f8/625dfa1030c49b1730789449_State%20of%20the%20creator%20economy%204_15_22.pdf
18. Komljenovic J., Birch K., Sellar S. Monetising digital data in higher education: Analysing the strategies and struggles of EdTech startups. *Postdigital Science and Education*. 2024. Vol. 6. P. 1196–1215. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00477-3>
19. Means B., Bakia M., Murphy R. Learning online: What research tells us about whether, when and how. New York : Routledge, 2014.
20. New data show wage gap between professors and other advanced degree holders. *Inside Higher Ed*. 2018. URL: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/02/21/new-data-show-wage-gap-between-professors-and-other-advanced-degree-holders>
21. Online learning statistics. Coursmos. URL: <https://www.coursmos.com/online-learning-statistics/>
22. Online learning statistics. Learning Revolution. URL: <https://www.learningrevolution.net/elearning-statistics/>
23. Online learning statistics. Sell Courses Online. URL: <https://sellcoursesonline.com/online-learning-statistics/>
24. Online learning statistics. Skillademia. URL: <https://www.skillademia.com/statistics/online-learning-statistics/>
25. Opinions on quality of online education among college students in the United States. Statista. URL: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/956123/opinions-online-college-students-quality-online-education/>
26. Ríos Yovera V. R., Ramos Farroñán E. V., Arbulú Ballesteros M. A., Vera Calmet V. G., Aguilar Armas H. M., Soto Deza J. M., Licapa Redolfo R., Martel Acosta R., Reyes-Pérez M. D. Academic entrepreneurship evolution: A systematic review of university incubators and startup development (2018–2024). *Sustainability*. 2025. Vol. 17, No. 12. Article 5365. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17125365>
27. State of marketing. HubSpot. URL: <https://offers.hubspot.com/thank-you/state-of-marketing>
28. Taylor Y., Breeze M. All imposters in the university? Striking (out) claims on academic Twitter. *Women's Studies International Forum*. 2020. Vol. 81. Article 102367. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102367>
29. Tenure and contingency in US higher education. American Association of University Professors. URL: <https://aaup.org/article/data-snapshot-tenure-and-contingency-us-higher-education>
30. Too stressed for success: The academic epidemic. *The Oxford Scientist*. 2024. URL: <https://oxsci.org/burnout-in-academia/>
31. University salary statistics. Univstats. URL: <https://www.univstats.com/salary/>
32. What is email marketing? Market.us. URL: <https://market.us/statistics/internet/email-users/>
33. Work Institute 2019 retention report. Work Institute, 2019. URL: <https://info.workinstitute.com/hubfs/2019%20Retention%20Report/Work%20Institute%202019%20Retention%20Report%20final-1.pdf>
34. World Economic Forum. COVID-19 has accelerated the digital transformation of higher education. 2020. URL: <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2020/07/covid-19-digital-transformation-higher-education/>
35. Yang X., Yeo K. J., Lee S.-H., Handayani L. A systematic review of impostor syndrome in higher education. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. 2024. Vol. 13, No. 6. P. 3876–3886. URL: <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i6.30726>
36. Zulkifli N. A., Suhairom N., Abd Wahid N. H., Saipudin N. A. Fostering entrepreneurial mindsets in teacher trainees: A study on entrepreneurship education for future educators. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2025. Vol. 9, No. 4. P. 4371–4390. URL: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400313>

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.03.2026

Стаття надійшла після рецензування 24.07.2026

Статтю рекомендовано до друку 02.09.2026

Статтю опубліковано 05.10.2026

Декларація про використання штучного інтелекту

Під час підготовки цієї статті було використано інструменти штучного інтелекту Claude, Copilot, Perplexity для пошуку тематичних джерел та форматування джерел у списку літератури. Остаточний відбір літератури здійснювався автором самостійно на основі перевірених наукових публікацій. Задум, зміст, наукова новизна та результати дослідження належать автору. Остаточний текст статті був перевірений, опрацьований та відредагований автором.