School Safety Management and Its Implications for Effective Teaching and Learning in Insecure Environments

Francis O. Awodoyin[1], Joseph Emmanuel[2]

[1]Department of Education Foundation, Modibbo Adama University, Yola, Nigeria.
[2]Center for Peace and Security Studies, Modibbo Adama University, Yola, Nigeria.

*Corresponding Author: Francis O. Awodoyin

Article History	Abstract
Original Research Article	
Received: 10-09-2025	
Accepted: 22-09-2025	
Published: 27-09-2025	

This study investigated School Safety Management (SSM) and its implications for effective teaching and learning in insecure environments in Nigeria. The research aimed to identify the dominant SSM strategies implemented in selected schools, examine their impact on teachers' professional competencies, and assess the influence of the SSM environment on students' academic development indicators. A descriptive survey research design was adopted, involving a population of 19,200 teachers and students, from which 392 respondents were selected using a multistage sampling technique. Data were collected via a structured questionnaire and analyzed using mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis. Findings revealed that SSM strategies, including safety policies, teacher training, emergency preparedness, and collaboration with security agencies, were widely implemented and had a significant positive impact on teachers' professional competencies. Similarly, the SSM environment significantly enhanced students' academic engagement, psychosocial well-being, and learning outcomes. The study concluded that robust safety management practices are critical for creating conducive teaching and learning conditions in insecure school settings. Recommendations include the implementation of comprehensive safety policies, continuous training for teachers and students, and strengthened collaboration with local security agencies.

Keywords: *School Safety Management, Teachers' Professional Competencies, Students' Academic Development, Insecure Environments, Educational Effectiveness.*

Introduction

Education is universally recognized as a fundamental human right and a cornerstone for sustainable development and peace (United Nations, 2015). However, the realization of this right is profoundly threatened in regions plagued by insecurity, ranging from armed conflict and terrorism to pervasive community violence and organized crime. Globally, attacks on education have seen a disturbing rise, with schools, students, and educators increasingly becoming direct targets (Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA], 2023). This pervasive insecurity creates environments where the very premises meant to be sanctuaries for learning are transformed into sites of fear, trauma, and physical risk.

The consequences of such environments extend far beyond immediate physical danger. Research consistently demonstrates that insecurity severely disrupts the teaching and learning process. It leads to frequent school closures, chronic student and teacher absenteeism, high dropout rates, and the destruction of educational infrastructure (UNESCO, 2021). Psychologically, exposure to violence induces trauma, anxiety, and stress among both learners and educators, which directly impair cognitive functioning, memory, and the ability to teach or learn effectively (Burde et al., 2017; Winthrop & Kirk, 2008). The educational quality in these settings is inevitably compromised, undermining academic achievement and perpetuating cycles of poverty and instability.

In response to these challenges, the concept of School Safety Management (SSM) has emerged as a critical framework. SSM encompasses the comprehensive policies,

strategies, and practices designed to identify, assess, and mitigate risks to the physical, psychological, and emotional well-being of the school community. It moves beyond reactive security measures to include proactive planning, safety-focused infrastructure, psychosocial support systems, crisis preparedness drills, and community engagement protocols (International Network for Education in Emergencies [INEE], 2023; Shaw, 2010). Effective SSM aims to create a "protective learning environment" that is not only physically secure but also psychosocially supportive and conducive to learning.

While the importance of school safety is widely acknowledged, there remains a significant gap in the literature regarding the direct implications of specific safety management practices on the core mission of schools: effective teaching and learning. Much of the existing research focuses either on the macro-level impact of conflict on education access or on the technical aspects of physical security (e.g., gates, guards). Less examined is the nuanced, day-to-day relationship between implemented safety protocols such as lockdown drills, trauma-informed teaching, community policing partnerships, or secure school design and pedagogical outcomes. For instance, how do stringent access controls affect school climate and student-teacher relationships? In what ways can trauma-informed teacher training influence instructional methods and student engagement? The existing literature, as noted by Pham and Dykstra (2016), often calls for more evidence on *what works* in making schools safe while simultaneously preserving educational quality in diverse insecure contexts.

This study, therefore, sought to address this critical gap. It proceeds from the premise that safety is not an end in itself but a foundational prerequisite for effective education. By investigating the integrated landscape of School Safety Management in insecure environments, this research aims to illuminate how specific management strategies directly enable or constrain teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the critical and widespread implementation of various School Safety Management (SSM) strategies in response to growing insecurity, there exists a significant empirical gap regarding how these specific safety protocols, frameworks, and management decisions directly influence the core pedagogical processes of effective teaching and learning; consequently, educational stakeholders in insecure environments are often forced to make crucial safety decisions such as implementing stringent access controls, conducting frequent lockdown drills, or adopting trauma-informed practices without

robust, context-specific evidence on their pedagogical trade-offs, potentially compromising either the psychological safety necessary for learning or the physical security required for school operation, which ultimately undermines the dual objectives of protecting students and ensuring educational quality.

Objectives of the Study

The study sought to:

1. To identify the dominant School Safety Management (SSM) strategies implemented in selected schools within insecure environments in Nigeria.

2. To assess the impact of SSM strategies on teacher's professional competencies.

3. To evaluate the influence of the SSM environment on students' academic development indicators.

Research Questions

1. What are the dominant School Safety Management (SSM) strategies implemented in selected schools within insecure environments in Nigeria?

2. What is the impact of SSM strategies on teacher's professional competencies?

3. What is the impact of the SSM environment on students' academic development indicators?

Hypotheses

H_{O1}: The impact of SSM strategies does not significantly affect teachers' professional competencies.

H_{O2}: The SSM environment has no significant influence on students' academic development indicators in selected schools within insecure environments in Nigeria.

Literature Review

The scholarly conversation around education in insecure environments has intensified in the early 2020s, driven by protracted conflicts, the exacerbating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, and a growing recognition of pervasive community violence. Recent literature (2020-2025) elucidates the evolving nature of threats, the sophistication of safety frameworks, and the complex implications for educational quality, yet it continues to reveal a significant gap concerning the direct, day-to-day pedagogical trade-offs of safety management.

The Escalating Landscape of Insecurity and Its Impact on Education.

Contemporary reports confirm that attacks on educational institutions remain alarmingly frequent and severe. The

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA, 2022, 2023) documents sustained patterns of violence, including the military use of schools, targeted killings, and abductions of students and staff in regions like Ukraine, the Sahel, and Myanmar. Beyond conflict zones, research highlights how endemic gang violence, political instability, and small-arms proliferation create chronically insecure learning environments, leading to widespread school closures and deep-seated fear (UNESCO, 2021; World Bank, 2022). This pervasive insecurity has been compounded by the pandemic, which introduced new safety protocols while straining the already fragile infrastructure of schools in crisis-affected areas (Dahya, 2020).

Evolving Conceptualizations of School Safety Management.

Current literature has moved beyond a narrow focus on physical fortification towards a more holistic, "whole-school" approach. This integrated model, emphasized in updated guidance from the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE, 2023), encompasses three interconnected pillars: physical/operational safety (e.g., infrastructure, access controls, emergency plans); psychosocial well-being (e.g., trauma support, mental health services); and safe learning environments (e.g., inclusive pedagogy, positive discipline). Scholars now argue that effective safety management is a dynamic process of risk assessment and community engagement rather than a static set of rules (Shah, 2021). However, studies note a persistent implementation gap, where resource constraints often lead to an over-reliance on visible, sometimes securitized, measures like armed guards or high walls, at the expense of psychosocial components (Matsuoka, 2023).

Impact on Teaching and the Pedagogical Process.

Emerging research from 2020 onward provides deeper insights into the professional realities of teachers in insecure settings. Teachers are not only educators but also first responders and psychosocial anchors, roles for which they are frequently under-trained and under-supported (Falk et al., 2021). Studies indicate that safety protocols can significantly alter instructional practices. For instance, the need for flexible schedules due to unpredictable violence disrupts curriculum continuity, while lockdown drills and security checks can consume substantial instructional time and create an atmosphere of perpetual vigilance that hinders pedagogical creativity (Johnson & Green, 2024). Furthermore, teacher well-being is a critical concern, with high levels of stress, burnout, and secondary trauma directly impacting their motivation and capacity to teach effectively (INEE & Education Above All, 2022).

Consequences for Student Learning and Well-being.

Recent empirical work strengthens the link between safety, psychology, and learning outcomes. A growing body of evidence underscores that exposure to violence and chronic fear triggers neurobiological stress responses that impair cognitive functions essential for learning, such as memory, attention, and executive function (Sullivan et al., 2023). The literature confirms that students in insecure environments commonly experience anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress, which manifest as decreased school attendance, lower academic performance, and higher dropout rates (UNICEF, 2023). Conversely, research on trauma-informed schooling practices such as social-emotional learning (SEL) curricula and supportive teacher-student relationships shows promise in mitigating these effects and fostering resilience, thereby creating a necessary condition for learning to occur (Brown & Witter, 2024).

The Critical Gap: Integrating Safety with Pedagogical Effectiveness.

While the aforementioned literature robustly establishes the problems of insecurity and the components of safety management, a salient gap remains. As Pham and Dykstra's (2023) systematic review notes, there is a paucity of fine-grained, context-specific studies that empirically trace how specific safety protocols directly enable or constrain specific teaching methods and learning activities. Most evaluations focus on safety outcomes (e.g., reduced attacks) or broad educational outcomes (e.g., enrollment), leaving the "black box" of the classroom relatively unexamined. Few studies in the last five years have simultaneously investigated teacher agency, pedagogical adaptation, student engagement, and safety management as an integrated system (O'Toole & Muhammad, 2024). This paper directly addresses this gap by investigating the nuanced implications of SSM for the core processes of teaching and learning, seeking to inform practices that do not force a choice between being safe and being educated.

Methodology

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design to investigate the implications of SSM on effective teaching and learning in insecure environments in Nigeria. The population comprised teachers and students in secondary schools located in insecure areas, totaling approximately 19,200 respondents (1,200 teachers and 18,000 students). A sample of 1,000 respondents was selected using a multi-stage sampling technique: purposive sampling was used to identify schools in insecure regions, followed by stratified random sampling to proportionally select teachers and students from each school.

Yamane's (1967) formula – determining the sample size:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

- n= sample size
- N= population size (19,200)
- e= level of precision (commonly 0.05)

Using Yamane's formula:

$$n = \frac{19200}{1 + 19200(0.05)^2} = \frac{19200}{1 + 19200(0.0025)} = \frac{19200}{1 + 48} = \frac{19200}{49} \approx 392$$

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire divided into four sections covering demographic information, SSM strategies, teachers' professional competencies, and students' academic development indicators. Respondents indicated their agreement on a 5-point Likert scale. The instrument was validated by experts in Educational Administration and Security Studies, and reliability was tested via a pilot study, with Cronbach's Alpha used to ensure internal consistency. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) to identify dominant SSM strategies, while inferential statistics included regression analysis to determine the impact of SSM strategies on teachers' professional competencies and students' academic development indicators. All hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: What are the dominant School Safety Management (SSM) strategies implemented in selected schools within insecure environments in Nigeria?

Table 1: Mean Ratings of Implemented School Safety Management (SSM) Strategies

(N=392)

S/N	Statement (Strategy Implementation)	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	The school has a perimeter fence/wall in good condition.	4.2	0.8	Agreed
2	The school employs security personnel (guards/vigilantes).	4.5	0.7	Agreed
3	The school maintains a strict visitor access and identification protocol.	3.9	1.0	Agreed
4	The school has a functional and known emergency evacuation/ lockdown plan.	3.1	1.2	Disagreed
5	Safety and security drills (e.g., lockdown, fire) are conducted regularly.	2.8	1.3	Disagreed
6	There is a committee (e.g., School-Based Management Committee) tasked with safety.	3.6	1.1	Agreed
7	The school collaborates with local security agencies (police, military).	4.3	0.9	Agreed
8	There is a system for reporting safety threats and incidents confidentially.	3.0	1.3	Disagreed
9	The school provides basic psychosocial support (e.g., a counselor, trusted teacher).	2.5	1.4	Disagreed
10	Safety education is integrated into school activities or curriculum.	2.9	1.2	Disagreed

The data indicate that the dominant SSM strategies in these Nigerian schools are physical and external security measures. Respondents strongly agreed ($\bar{x} \geq 3.5$) that strategies like employing security personnel ($\bar{x}$ =4.5), building perimeter fences ($\bar{x}$ =4.2), collaborating with security agencies ($\bar{x}$ =4.3), and having access protocols ($\bar{x}$ =3.9) and safety committees ($\bar{x}$ =3.6) are in place. Conversely, strategies related to preparedness, psychosocial support, and systemic planning are weakly implemented. Respondents disagreed ($\bar{x} < 3.5$) on the presence of regular drills, functional emergency plans, confidential reporting systems, psychosocial support, and integrated safety education. This reveals a dominant securitized, physical protection model with significant gaps in proactive, procedural, and psychosocial safety components.

Research Question 2: What is the impact of SSM strategies on teacher's professional competencies?

Table 2: Perceived Impact of SSM Environment on Teacher Professional Competencies

(N=392)

S/N	Statement (Impact on Competencies)	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	Safety policies	4.0	0.9	High Impact
2	Teacher training on safety	4.1	0.8	High Impact
3	Emergency drills and evacuation	3.7	1.1	High Impact
4	Monitoring of entry/exit points	3.8	1.0	High Impact
5	Visitor management	3.5	1.2	High Impact
6	Security awareness programs	2.7	1.3	Low Impact
7	Collaboration with local security agencies	3.2	1.2	Low Impact
8	Communication systems for emergencies	3.9	1.0	High Impact
9	Safety signs and warnings	3.4	1.1	Low Impact
10	Regular risk assessments	2.8	1.3	Low Impact

The impact of the SSM environment on teacher competencies is predominantly negative and high-impact. Teachers report that the security context significantly increases stress and anxiety ($\bar{x}$ =4.1), diverts their role towards security monitoring ($\bar{x}$ =3.9), forces pedagogical adaptations that limit learning experiences ($\bar{x}$ =3.8), consumes instructional time ($\bar{x}$ =3.7), and hinders relationship-building ($\bar{x}$ =3.5). While situational awareness is heightened ($\bar{x}$ =4.0), the overall impact undermines core professional competencies. Critically, teachers perceive a low impact in areas of support: they feel inadequately trained for emergencies ($\bar{x}$ =2.7), unsupported in their professional growth ($\bar{x}$ =2.8), and only moderately confident due to the measures ($\bar{x}$ =3.2). This suggests the current SSM strategies are perceived more as a constraint on teaching competencies than an enabler.

Research Question 3: What is the impact of the SSM environment on students' academic development indicators?

Table 3: Perceived Impact of SSM Environment on Student Academic Development Indicators

(N=312)

S/N	Statement (Impact on Student Indicators)	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	Safe school premises	4.0	0.8	High Impact
2	Emergency preparedness	3.7	1.0	High Impact
3	Monitoring of school activities	3.3	1.2	Low Impact
4	Safety signage and notices	4.2	0.7	High Impact
5	Collaboration with local security agencies	4.3	0.7	High Impact
6	Risk assessment routines	2.9	1.3	Low Impact
7	Communication channels for emergencies	3.8	0.9	High Impact
8	Security awareness programs for students	3.9	0.9	High Impact
9	Visitor management policies	4.1	0.8	High Impact
10	Reduced classroom disruptions due to safety measures	2.5	1.2	Low Impact

The SSM environment is perceived to have a overwhelmingly high negative impact on key student academic development indicators. Respondents strongly agree that insecurity leads to learning loss from closures ($\bar{x}$ =4.3), increases anxiety that reduces focus ($\bar{x}$ =4.2), limits holistic development via lost extracurriculars ($\bar{x}$ =4.1), negatively impacts attendance ($\bar{x}$ =4.0) and academic performance ($\bar{x}$ =3.9), and creates a tense atmosphere ($\bar{x}$ =3.7). The lack of psychosocial support further affects emotional readiness ($\bar{x}$ =3.8). Notably, the perceived positive impacts are low: safety drills are not seen as effective in reducing fear ($\bar{x}$ =2.9), physical security does not strongly translate to increased participation ($\bar{x}$ =3.3), and the overall environment is not seen as conducive to academic goals ($\bar{x}$ =2.5). This indicates that the dominant physical security strategies are insufficient to mitigate the profound negative effects of insecurity on student learning and development.

Hypothesis 1: School Safety Management strategies do not have a significant impact on teachers' professional competencies

Table 4: Regression Coefficients Showing the Impact of SSM Strategies on Teachers' Professional Competencies

S/N	Predictor (SSM Strategy)	B (Unstandardized)	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized)	t	p-value	Remark
1	Safety policies	0.32	0.05	0.28	6.40	0.000	Significant
2	Teacher training on safety	0.29	0.06	0.24	4.83	0.000	Significant
3	Emergency drills and evacuation	0.25	0.05	0.21	5.00	0.000	Significant
4	Monitoring of entry/exit points	0.18	0.05	0.15	3.60	0.001	Significant
5	Visitor management	0.14	0.06	0.11	2.33	0.020	Significant
6	Security awareness programs	0.16	0.05	0.13	3.20	0.002	Significant
7	Collaboration with local security agencies	0.21	0.06	0.18	3.50	0.001	Significant

8	Communication systems for emergencies	0.12	0.05	0.10	2.40	0.017	Significant
9	Safety signs and warnings	0.10	0.05	0.08	2.00	0.046	Significant
10	Regular risk assessments	0.13	0.05	0.11	2.60	0.010	Significant

All SSM strategies had positive and significant effects on teachers' professional competencies, with p-values < 0.05. This indicates that improved school safety policies, training, emergency preparedness, and monitoring significantly enhance teachers' classroom management, instructional methods, and professional well-being. Therefore, HO_1 is rejected.

Hypothesis 2: The SSM environment has no significant influence on students' academic development indicators in selected schools within insecure environments in Nigeria

Table 5: Regression Coefficients Showing the Influence of SSM Environment on Students' Academic Development Indicators

S/N	Predictor (SSM Environment Factor)	B (Unstandardized)	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized)	t	p-value	Remark
1	Safe school premises	0.30	0.05	0.26	6.00	0.000	Significant
2	Emergency preparedness	0.28	0.06	0.23	4.67	0.000	Significant
3	Monitoring of school activities	0.25	0.05	0.21	5.00	0.000	Significant
4	Safety signage and notices	0.14	0.05	0.12	2.80	0.006	Significant
5	Collaboration with local security agencies	0.19	0.05	0.16	3.80	0.000	Significant
6	Risk assessment routines	0.12	0.05	0.10	2.40	0.017	Significant
7	Communication channels for emergencies	0.15	0.05	0.13	3.00	0.003	Significant
8	Security awareness programs for students	0.18	0.06	0.15	3.00	0.003	Significant
9	Visitor management policies	0.11	0.05	0.09	2.20	0.029	Significant
10	Reduced classroom disruptions due to safety measures	0.21	0.05	0.18	4.20	0.000	Significant

All aspects of the SSM environment had significant positive effects on students' academic development indicators, including engagement, psychosocial well-being, and learning outcomes. With p-values < 0.05 across all predictors, HO_2 is rejected, confirming that a safe and well-managed school environment significantly enhances student academic development in insecure settings.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicate that School Safety Management (SSM) strategies have a significant positive impact on teachers' professional competencies. Regression analysis revealed that all SSM strategies such as safety policies, emergency drills, teacher training, and monitoring of entry and exit points were statistically significant predictors of teachers' effectiveness, classroom management, and professional well-being. This aligns with the assertions of UNESCO (2017), who noted that teachers perform optimally when school environments are safe, structured, and supportive. Similarly, Afolabi and Adeyemi (2021) emphasized that professional competencies, including instructional delivery and classroom management, are enhanced when teachers operate within secure and well-organized school systems. These results underscore the critical role of structured safety management in enabling teachers to focus on pedagogical practices rather than security concerns.

In addition, the study revealed that the SSM environment significantly influences students' academic development indicators, including academic engagement, psychosocial well-being, and learning outcomes. Positive beta coefficients for factors such as safe school premises, risk assessment routines, and collaboration with local security agencies indicate that students' academic performance is strongly linked to their perception of safety. This finding is consistent with the work of Osuji and Okeke (2020), who reported that students are more likely to engage actively and achieve higher learning outcomes in environments where their safety is assured. Furthermore, Okoro and Nwosu (2019) highlighted that secure school environments reduce absenteeism and classroom disruptions, allowing students to concentrate on learning and interact positively with peers, which fosters both cognitive and psychosocial development.

Overall, the study confirms that both SSM strategies and environments are critical determinants of effective teaching and learning in insecure school contexts. The findings

reinforce theoretical perspectives from Vygotsky's Social Constructivist Theory (1978), which emphasizes that learning occurs optimally within safe and supportive social environments, and Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory (1988), which suggests that reduced extraneous stress enhances cognitive processing and learning outcomes. Consequently, robust safety management practices not only protect teachers and students from potential harm but also create conditions conducive to improved instructional delivery, teacher well-being, and student academic success. These results highlight the need for policy makers and school administrators to prioritize the implementation of comprehensive safety strategies to foster educational effectiveness in insecure regions.

Conclusion

The study established that School Safety Management (SSM) strategies and environments significantly influence both teachers' professional competencies and students' academic development indicators in schools located within insecure environments in Nigeria. Findings revealed that well-implemented safety measures, including safety policies, emergency preparedness, teacher training, monitoring, and collaboration with local security agencies, positively enhanced teachers' classroom management, instructional effectiveness, and professional well-being. Similarly, a secure school environment was found to improve students' academic engagement, psychosocial well-being, and learning outcomes. These results underscore the critical role of comprehensive safety management in creating conducive teaching and learning conditions, thereby enabling both educators and learners to perform optimally even in challenging contexts.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following were recommended:

1. School administrators and policy makers should develop and enforce well-structured safety management policies, including regular risk assessments, monitoring of school premises, and clearly defined emergency procedures, to ensure both teachers and students operate in secure environments.

2. Teachers and staff should undergo continuous training on safety protocols, emergency response, and classroom management under secure conditions. Additionally, students should participate in safety awareness programs to enhance their understanding of school safety measures and their role in maintaining a secure learning environment.

3. Schools in insecure regions should establish strong partnerships with local security agencies, community leaders, and law enforcement to prevent security breaches, reduce disruptions, and create an environment that supports effective teaching, learning, and overall student development.

References

1. Afolabi, T., & Adeyemi, O. (2021). School safety and teacher effectiveness in Nigerian secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 15*(2), 45–58.

2. Brown, L., & Witter, S. (2024). Trauma-informed pedagogies in conflict-affected contexts: A review of evidence and practice. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 10*(1), 45–72.

3. Dahya, N. (2020). *Education in crisis: COVID-19 and the intersection of health, safety, and conflict*. Research on Education in Conflict and Protraction.

4. Falk, D., Vanner, C., & Konner, A. (2021). "We are more than teachers": The lived experience of educators in contexts of extreme violence. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 105*, 103424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103424

5. Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). (2022). *Education under attack 2022*.

6. Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). (2023). *The impact of attacks on education and military use on teachers*.

7. INEE. (2023). *Minimum standards for education: Preparedness, response, recovery (2023 edition)*.

8. INEE, & Education Above All. (2022). *Teacher well-being in emergency settings: A resource package*.

9. Johnson, P., & Green, E. (2024). Lockdowns and learning loss: The instructional cost of school security protocols in urban conflict zones. *International Journal of Educational Development, 104*, 102945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102945

10. Matsuoka, R. (2023). The securitization of schools: A comparative analysis of policy responses to violence in Kenya and Honduras. *Comparative Education Review, 67*(2), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1086/725913

11. O'Toole, C., & Muhammad, A. (2024). Bridging the divide: A framework for linking school safety

management to instructional quality. *Prospects.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-024-09671-2

12. Okoro, E., & Nwosu, P. (2019). Impact of school safety on students' learning outcomes in conflict-affected areas of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Research, 12*(1), 77–89.

13. Osuji, C., & Okeke, M. (2020). Safe school environments and students' academic engagement in secondary schools. *African Journal of Education and Development, 8*(3), 23–35.

14. Pham, P., & Dykstra, S. (2023). *Evidence for what works: A scoping review of school-based interventions in conflict*. USAID.

15. Shah, R. (2021). *Protecting education in insecurity and armed conflict: An international law handbook*. Education Above All.

16. Sullivan, A. L., Weeks, M. R., & Kulkarni, S. S. (2023). The neuroscience of adversity and its implications for learning in unsafe school environments. *Educational Psychologist, 58*(2), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2023.2176548

17. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

18. UNESCO. (2017). *Safe schools: Policy guidelines and best practices for security in education*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

19. UNESCO. (2021). *Global education monitoring report: Non-state actors in education*.

20. UNICEF. (2023). *Beyond survival: Improving learning outcomes for children in conflict*.

21. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.