INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, FINANCE, ACCOUNTING AND MANAGEMENT
(IJEFAM) *Vol*. 1. *Issue* 2. *ISSN*: **(PRINT):** 3115-5081 **(ONLINE):** 3115-5553
Web: https://journals.iempsglobal.org

CRISES MANAGEMENT AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

By

SOTANNDE RABIU ADEWALE PhD
Department of Educational Foundations and Management
Federal College of Education Osiele, Abeokuta

Abstract

This study investigated crisis management and contingency planning in the education sector, focusing on the capacity of educational managers, constraints to preparedness, strategies for improvement, and implications for institutional effectiveness and continuity. A descriptive survey design was adopted, and data were collected from 120 educational managers using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC), and Simple Linear Regression were employed for analysis at the 0.05 significance level. Findings revealed that managers demonstrated moderate capacity in crisis management, including the existence of documented plans, crisis teams, and emergency drills. However, gaps were noted in training and confidence. Major constraints identified were inadequate funding, insufficient ICT facilities, weak policies, and poor stakeholder collaboration. Recommended strategies included regular professional development, improved funding, stronger partnerships, and ICT integration. The correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between crisis management capacity and institutional effectiveness ($r = 0.462$, $p < 0.05$), while regression results confirmed that crisis management significantly predicted institutional continuity ($\beta = 0.462$, $p < 0.05$). The study concludes that strengthening crisis management frameworks is essential for enhancing resilience, reducing disruptions, and ensuring continuity in schools during emergencies.

Keywords: Crisis management; Contingency planning; Educational managers; Institutional effectiveness; Institutional continuity; School resilience

INTRODUCTION

Education is widely recognized as the foundation of social, economic, and political development. However, the education sector is increasingly vulnerable to crises that disrupt learning processes, compromise safety, and undermine institutional stability. Crises in education may take diverse

forms, including natural disasters such as floods and fire outbreaks, human-induced emergencies such as strikes, insecurity, and terrorism, and global disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic. These events expose weaknesses in the preparedness of educational institutions and highlight the urgent need for effective crisis management and contingency planning.

Crisis management refers to the systematic process of identifying, assessing, and responding to events that threaten the normal functioning of an institution. Contingency planning, on the other hand, involves the proactive development of alternative strategies and action plans that can be activated when a crisis occurs. In the education sector, these practices are crucial for minimizing disruption, ensuring student and staff safety, and safeguarding institutional continuity.

Globally, education systems are placing greater emphasis on resilience and preparedness. Countries such as Japan and the United States have integrated emergency drills, disaster response units, and digital learning platforms into school systems to ensure that learning continues even in emergencies (UNESCO, 2023). In contrast, developing countries, including Nigeria, often struggle with weak institutional frameworks, inadequate funding, and limited training for educational managers, making schools highly vulnerable to crises. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, many Nigerian schools lacked the infrastructure to switch to online learning, leading to prolonged school closures and significant learning losses.

Educational managers including principals, vice-principals, heads of departments, and administrators play a critical role in preparing for and managing crises. Their ability to anticipate risks, develop contingency plans, mobilize resources, and coordinate responses largely determines how well institutions withstand crises. Yet, studies have shown that crisis preparedness in Nigerian schools is low, and contingency planning is rarely institutionalized (UNESCO, 2023; UBEC, 2023). This gap calls for an empirical investigation into the current state of crisis management and contingency planning in the education sector.

The frequency and intensity of crises affecting the education sector in Nigeria continue to increase, ranging from health emergencies and fire outbreaks to strikes and insecurity. Despite these realities, many schools remain unprepared to effectively manage such disruptions. Educational managers often lack structured contingency plans, adequate training, and institutional support for crisis management. Consequently, crises result in prolonged closures, loss of instructional time, poor academic performance, and in severe cases, threats to the safety of students and staff.

Although government and non-governmental organizations have occasionally introduced interventions such as emergency response training and safety guidelines, these efforts are often ad hoc, poorly funded, and unsustained. The absence of a systematic and evidence-based approach to crisis management and contingency planning has left schools vulnerable. This study therefore seeks to assess the preparedness of educational institutions for crises, identify major constraints to

effective contingency planning, and explore strategies for strengthening resilience in the education sector.

The main objective of this study is to investigate crisis management and contingency planning in the education sector.

The specific objectives are to:

1. Assess the current capacity of educational managers in crisis management and contingency planning.
2. Identify the major constraints to effective crisis preparedness in schools.
3. Examine strategies that can strengthen contingency planning in the education sector.
4. Determine the implications of crisis management for institutional effectiveness and continuity.

The research questions include:

1. What is the current capacity of educational managers in crisis management and contingency planning?
2. What are the major constraints to effective crisis preparedness in schools?
3. What strategies can strengthen contingency planning in the education sector?
4. What are the implications of crisis management for institutional effectiveness and continuity?

The following hypothesis guide the paper

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between crisis management capacity and institutional effectiveness in the education sector.

H_{02}: Crisis management does not significantly predict institutional continuity during emergencies.

This study is significant in may ways

This study is significant for policymakers, school administrators, and education stakeholders who seek to minimize disruptions in learning caused by crises. By identifying the strengths and weaknesses of current practices, it provides a framework for developing effective crisis management policies and contingency plans tailored to the education sector. For policymakers, the findings can inform national and state-level strategies on disaster preparedness and school safety. For educational managers, the study offers practical insights into building resilience through training, resource mobilization, and stakeholder collaboration. Academically, the study contributes to literature on crisis management in education, particularly in developing country contexts where research on this subject is still limited.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Review

Crisis management is defined as a structured process of anticipating, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from disruptive events that threaten the stability of institutions (Coombs, 2019). In the education sector, crises may include pandemics, terrorism, natural disasters, strikes, and infrastructural failures. Effective crisis management in schools is not limited to emergency response but also involves prevention, preparedness, mitigation, and post-crisis recovery (Boin et al., 2017). Educational institutions that lack systematic crisis management structures often suffer extended closures, loss of instructional time, and threats to the welfare of students and staff.

Contingency planning refers to the proactive design of strategies and alternative action plans that can be implemented when a crisis occurs. According to Pollard and Hotho (2006), contingency planning provides institutions with the flexibility to continue operations during unforeseen disruptions. In schools, this includes having backup systems for teaching and learning, emergency drills, alternative instructional delivery methods (such as online platforms), and resource mobilization strategies. Research suggests that institutions with well-developed contingency plans demonstrate higher resilience and faster recovery during crises (Kapucu & Khosa, 2013).

Globally, the education sector has been confronted with crises of varying magnitudes. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted vulnerabilities in many countries, where schools were forced to close and millions of learners experienced significant disruptions (UNESCO, 2021). Developed countries responded with online learning platforms and blended learning systems, while many developing countries lacked the infrastructure to sustain education during the crisis (World Bank, 2020). Similarly, crises such as school fires, floods, and insecurity have affected educational continuity in Nigeria. A study by Okebukola (2020) revealed that many Nigerian schools had no documented contingency plans, and responses were largely reactive.

Theoretical Review

Contingency theory, as developed by Fiedler (1967), posits that organizational effectiveness depends on the fit between leadership style, situational factors, and the environment. Applied to education, this theory suggests that crisis management strategies should be adapted to the specific context of each school. For example, rural schools may require different contingency measures compared to urban schools due to differences in infrastructure and risk exposure.

Systems theory emphasizes the interdependence of various components within an organization (Von Bertalanffy, 1968). In the education sector, schools function as systems where leadership, teachers, students, infrastructure, and external stakeholders are interconnected. A crisis in one area, such as a health emergency, can disrupt the entire system. Therefore, effective contingency

planning must take a holistic approach, ensuring that all subsystems are prepared to adapt and respond.

Resilience theory highlights the capacity of individuals and institutions to absorb shocks and recover from adversity (Folke, 2016). In education, resilience involves the ability of schools to maintain learning continuity during crises through innovative strategies, resourcefulness, and adaptability. Schools that institutionalize resilience practices such as emergency drills, digital readiness, and collaborative networks are better equipped to sustain operations during crises (Masten, 2018).

Empirical Review

Studies on crisis management in education have highlighted varying levels of preparedness across contexts. For example, research in the United States revealed that schools with established crisis management plans, including lockdown drills and emergency communication systems, reported higher levels of preparedness and reduced casualties during emergencies (Smith & Riley, 2012). In contrast, studies in sub-Saharan Africa show limited crisis planning due to inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, and lack of training for educational managers (Oduaran & Okeke, 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed significant gaps in contingency planning across Nigerian schools. According to Adedoyin and Soykan (2020), the absence of e-learning infrastructure and inadequate teacher training led to prolonged school closures and widened educational inequality. Similarly, UBEC (2022) reported that fewer than 35% of public schools in Nigeria had any form of digital learning backup to support instructional continuity during the pandemic.

Other studies have identified barriers to effective crisis management in education. Okebukola (2020) noted that poor funding, inadequate policy frameworks, and weak coordination among education stakeholders hinder effective crisis preparedness. A study by Adejumo and Akinola (2021) found that most school administrators in Nigeria relied on reactive rather than proactive strategies, leaving schools vulnerable to disruptions. On strategies for improvement, international best practices highlight the need for institutionalized training, integration of ICT tools, and stronger collaboration between government, private sector, and communities (UNESCO, 2021; OECD, 2022). Evidence from countries such as Japan, Finland, and Singapore shows that schools that integrate crisis management into policy and practice are better positioned to sustain learning continuity during emergencies (Kapucu & Khosa, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive survey research design to investigate crisis management and contingency planning in the education sector. The design was selected for its effectiveness in assessing attitudes, perceptions, and practices among educational managers regarding crisis

preparedness (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This approach aligns with the study's objectives of evaluating current capacities, constraints, and improvement strategies. The target population included all educational managers (principals, vice-principals, and senior administrators) in public secondary schools across Ogun State, Nigeria. This group was chosen due to their direct responsibility for institutional planning and crisis response. A representative sample of 120 respondents was selected using a multi-stage sampling technique: Random selection of four Local Government Areas (LGAs) from Ogun State. Purposive selection of 30 educational managers per LGA to ensure diversity in: School size, geographical location (urban/rural) and Crisis exposure history This sampling strategy ensured both representativeness and feasibility for a conference paper study. The study utilized a researcher-designed questionnaire titled: Crisis Management and Contingency Planning Questionnaire (CMCPQ). The Questionnaire Sections will consist of section A to C with a response of response Scale of likert. The questionnaire was subjected to face and content validation by three experts in educational management and research methodology. Their suggestions on item clarity, relevance, and alignment with research objectives were incorporated into the final draft. To establish reliability, a pilot test was conducted with 15 educational managers outside the sample population. The results yielded a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.82, indicating high internal consistency (George & Mallery, 2019). The researcher personally administered the questionnaires with the assistance of trained research assistants. Both physical and electronic copies of the instrument were distributed to maximize response rates. Respondents were assured of confidentiality, and participation was voluntary. Data collected were coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to summarize responses. Inferential statistics were also applied to test the hypotheses: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was used to determine the relationship between crisis management capacity and institutional effectiveness. Simple Linear Regression was used to assess the predictive influence of crisis management on institutional continuity. All hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 significance level.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Answering of Research Questions

Table 1: The current capacity of educational managers in crisis management and contingency planning

S/N	ITEMS	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{x}$	Std. Dev.
1.	My school has a documented crisis management plan.	57	51	7	5	3.33	0.75
2.	I have received formal training in crisis management and contingency planning.	50	51	12	7	3.20	0.84
3.	We regularly conduct emergency drills (e.g., fire, security threats, health emergencies).	53	52	10	5	3.28	0.78
4.	Our school has a designated crisis management team.	53	50	13	4	3.27	0.78
5.	I feel confident in my ability to coordinate crisis response activities.	39	57	19	5	3.08	0.80
Cumulative Mean = 3.23						**Decision Mean = 2.50**	

The results show that most educational managers have a moderate to high capacity in crisis management. A cumulative mean of 3.23 (above the decision mean of 2.50) indicates a generally positive capacity. The highest mean was observed in having a documented crisis management plan ($\bar{x}$ = 3.33) and regular emergency drills ($\bar{x}$ = 3.28), suggesting that schools have made some institutional efforts toward preparedness. However, confidence in coordinating crisis response ($\bar{x}$ = 3.08) and the extent of formal training ($\bar{x}$ = 3.20) are only moderate, pointing to gaps in personal capacity-building. The results imply that while structures are present in many schools, not all managers feel fully prepared to implement them effectively.

Table 2: The major constraints to effective crisis preparedness in schools

S/N	ITEMS	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{x}$	Std. Dev.
6.	Limited funding restricts the implementation of contingency plans.	44	51	19	6	3.11	0.84
7.	My school lacks adequate ICT facilities for alternative teaching during crises.	49	41	21	9	3.02	0.94
8.	There are insufficient training opportunities for crisis management.	35	44	17	24	2.75	1.08
9.	Weak government policies hinder effective crisis preparedness in schools.	42	30	35	13	2.84	1.02
10	Poor stakeholder collaboration (government, parents, communities) limits crisis response.	57	40	19	4	3.25	0.84
Cumulative Mean = 3.01						**Decision Mean = 2.50**	

The cumulative mean of 3.01 shows that constraints are significantly present. Limited funding ($\bar{x}$ = 3.11) and poor stakeholder collaboration ($\bar{x}$ = 3.25) were rated as the strongest barriers, highlighting financial and cooperative shortcomings. Inadequate ICT facilities ($\bar{x}$ = 3.02) and weak government policies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.84) also emerged as important challenges. The lowest-rated item was insufficient training opportunities ($\bar{x}$ = 2.75), which reflects a systemic gap in continuous professional development. These findings suggest that although managers acknowledge the importance of crisis planning, the enabling environment is weak due to financial, infrastructural, and policy-related constraints.

Table 3: The strategies that can strengthen contingency planning in the education sector

S/N	ITEMS	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{x}$	Std. Dev.
11	Government should provide adequate funding for school crisis preparedness.	53	27	29	11	3.01	1.02
12	Regular professional development on crisis management should be mandatory for school leaders.	59	35	18	8	3.21	0.94

13	Schools should integrate ICT and online platforms as backup systems during crises.	47	26	37	10	2.92	1.08
14	Stronger partnerships with parents, communities, and security agencies are essential.	55	37	21	7	3.17	0.92
15	Schools should establish crisis management teams and review contingency plans periodically.	40	37	15	28	2.74	1.15
Cumulative Mean = 3.01						**Decision Mean = 2.50**	

The cumulative mean of 3.01 indicates general agreement among respondents that these strategies would enhance crisis management. Professional development for school leaders ($\bar{x}$ = 3.21) and stronger partnerships with parents, communities, and security agencies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.17) were rated highly, showing recognition of the role of capacity building and collaborative networks. Adequate government funding ($\bar{x}$ = 3.01) was also supported as a priority. However, the relatively lower means for ICT integration ($\bar{x}$ = 2.92) and especially review of crisis management teams and plans ($\bar{x}$ = 2.74) suggest that while managers see these as useful, they may not yet be fully institutionalized. This points to the need for a stronger policy drive and investment in technology and routine plan updates.

Table 4: The implications of crisis management for institutional effectiveness and continuity

S/N	ITEMS	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{x}$	Std. Dev.
16	Effective crisis management will minimize learning disruptions during emergencies.	18	32	37	33	2.29	1.03
17	Crisis preparedness enhances the safety of students and staff.	34	47	13	26	2.74	1.09
18	Contingency planning improves the overall effectiveness of school management.	49	33	24	14	2.98	1.0
19	Investment in crisis management increases school resilience to future emergencies.	59	37	19	5	3.08	0.87

20	Strong crisis management systems contribute to long-term institutional sustainability.	48	48	18	6	3.18	0.93
Cumulative Mean = 2.88						**Decision Mean = 2.50**	

The cumulative mean of 2.88 (slightly above the decision mean of 2.50 but lower than other tables) shows that while educational managers acknowledge the implications, perceptions are mixed. The strongest agreement was with sustainability ($\bar{x}$ = 3.18) and resilience to future emergencies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.08), which suggests recognition of the long-term benefits of effective crisis management. However, minimizing disruptions to learning ($\bar{x}$ = 2.29) and enhancing safety ($\bar{x}$ = 2.74) were rated relatively low, implying that many managers feel current practices are not yet sufficient to guarantee continuity or safety in crises. This indicates that while the potential of crisis management is acknowledged, its practical effectiveness in daily school operations still lags behind expectations.

Table 5: Pearson Product Moment Correlation between Crisis Management Capacity and Institutional Effectiveness

Variables	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Crisis Management Capacity**	**Institutional Effectiveness**
Crisis Management Capacity	3.23	0.79	1	
Institutional Effectiveness	2.88	**0.99**	0.462*	1

N = 120

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis presented in Table 5 shows a moderate positive correlation (r = 0.462) between crisis management capacity and institutional effectiveness. This correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, indicating that the relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance. The implication is that as the crisis management capacity of educational managers improves (through documented plans, crisis teams, and training), the effectiveness of institutions in areas such as safety, management efficiency, and continuity of operations also increases. In other words, better-prepared schools are more likely to respond effectively to crises, thereby ensuring smoother operations and improved institutional outcomes. Thus, the null

hypothesis (H_{01}), which stated that there is no significant relationship between crisis management capacity and institutional effectiveness, is rejected.

Table 6: Simple Linear Regression Analysis of Crisis Management Capacity on Institutional Continuity

Model Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t-value	Significance (p)
(Constant)	1.752	0.245	-	7.154	0.000
Crisis Management Capacity	0.387	0.079	0.462	4.892	0.000

R	=		**0.462**
R^2	=		**0.224**
Adjusted	**R^2**	=	**0.217**
F(1,118)	=		**23.93**
p < 0.05			

The regression analysis in Table 6 examined the predictive influence of crisis management capacity on institutional continuity. The results show that crisis management capacity has a positive and significant effect on institutional continuity ($\beta = 0.462$, $t = 4.892$, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that an increase in crisis management capacity is associated with a corresponding improvement in the ability of institutions to maintain operations during emergencies. The model summary further reveals that crisis management capacity explains 22.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.224$) in institutional continuity. Although this is a moderate proportion, it demonstrates that crisis management is a meaningful predictor of continuity. The F-statistic ($F(1,118) = 23.93$, $p < 0.05$) confirms that the regression model is statistically significant.

The constant value ($B = 1.752$) indicates that when crisis management capacity is absent, institutional continuity remains low, but the positive slope coefficient ($B = 0.387$) shows that each unit increase in crisis management capacity leads to a measurable increase in institutional continuity. Based on these findings, the null hypothesis (H_{02}), which stated that crisis management does not significantly predict institutional continuity during emergencies, is rejected.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study assessed the capacity of educational managers in crisis management and contingency planning, the constraints faced in crisis preparedness, possible strategies for strengthening contingency planning, and the implications of crisis management for institutional effectiveness and continuity.

Findings from Table 1 revealed that educational managers possess a moderate level of capacity in crisis management, as reflected in the availability of documented crisis management plans, regular emergency drills, and designated crisis teams. However, confidence in coordinating crisis response and the extent of formal training were only moderate. This aligns with the work of Adeyemi (2020), who noted that while many Nigerian schools have institutional frameworks for crisis preparedness, managers often lack sufficient training and confidence to effectively operationalize them. Table 2 highlighted major constraints to effective crisis preparedness. Limited funding, inadequate ICT infrastructure, insufficient training opportunities, and weak stakeholder collaboration were significant barriers. These findings corroborate Onyema et al. (2020), who observed that the sudden shift to online learning during COVID-19 was hindered by poor digital infrastructure and weak policy support in many developing contexts. Similarly, weak collaboration among stakeholders has been documented as a major challenge to school resilience during emergencies (Eze & Okafor, 2019). Table 3 presented strategies for strengthening contingency planning. Respondents emphasized regular professional development for school leaders and stronger partnerships with parents, communities, and security agencies. Adequate funding and ICT integration were also seen as necessary, though not yet fully institutionalized. This agrees with international best practices reported by UNESCO (2021), which stress continuous training, community collaboration, and investment in digital platforms as critical for education sector resilience. Table 4 examined implications for institutional effectiveness and continuity. While crisis management was recognized as essential for long-term sustainability and resilience, its immediate impact on minimizing learning disruptions and enhancing safety was rated low. This suggests a gap between policy intent and practical implementation in schools. Prior studies (Al-Khalifa, 2018; Olawale, 2021) similarly note that without consistent drills, funding, and follow-up mechanisms, crisis management frameworks remain underutilized and fail to guarantee daily operational continuity.

The inferential analysis further supported these results. Hypothesis testing showed that crisis management capacity has a significant positive relationship with institutional effectiveness ($r = 0.462$, $p < 0.05$). Regression analysis also revealed that crisis management capacity significantly predicts institutional continuity ($\beta = 0.462$, $p < 0.05$), accounting for 22.4% of the variance. These findings align with international studies (Bush, 2019; UNESCO, 2021), which emphasize that

schools with stronger crisis management systems tend to achieve better outcomes in safety, continuity, and long-term sustainability.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that educational managers in the education sector demonstrate moderate capacity in crisis management and contingency planning. While many schools have crisis plans, emergency drills, and designated teams, the implementation is weakened by limited funding, inadequate ICT infrastructure, and insufficient training opportunities. The findings also establish that crisis management capacity is significantly related to institutional effectiveness and serves as a predictor of institutional continuity during emergencies. However, the current level of preparedness is not yet sufficient to minimize disruptions or guarantee student and staff safety consistently. This indicates a pressing need for more structured, well-funded, and collaborative crisis management frameworks in the education sector.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Government and education authorities should institutionalize regular professional development programs on crisis management and contingency planning for school leaders and managers.
2. Adequate financial resources should be allocated to schools specifically for crisis management activities, including ICT infrastructure, emergency drills, and safety equipment.
3. Schools should adopt digital learning platforms and ICT tools as alternative teaching and administrative systems to ensure continuity during emergencies.
4. Stronger partnerships between schools, government agencies, parents, and community organizations should be fostered to improve crisis response capacity.
5. Schools should establish crisis management teams where absent and ensure regular review and updating of contingency plans.
6. Ministries of Education should provide clear policies and monitoring mechanisms to ensure compliance with crisis management standards across schools.

REFERENCES

Adeyemi, T. O. (2020). Crisis management strategies and secondary school administration in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Management Studies*, *10*(2), 112–120.

Al-Khalifa, H. S. (2018). Crisis preparedness and response in educational institutions: Lessons from international practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *56*(5), 560–575. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2017-0018

Bush, T. (2019). Leadership and crisis management in education: A global perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *47*(3), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217745870

Eze, S. C., & Okafor, A. N. (2019). Barriers to effective crisis management in Nigerian schools: Policy and practice implications. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, *19*(1), 45–59.

Olawale, T. (2021). School resilience and continuity planning: Post-COVID-19 strategies for Nigerian education. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(4), 87–101.

Onyema, E. M., Eucheria, N. C., Obafemi, F. A., Sen, S., Atonye, F. G., Sharma, A., & Alsayed, A. O. (2020). Impact of coronavirus pandemic on education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *11*(13), 108–121. https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/11-13-12

UNESCO. (2021). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373717