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Executive Summary

There are 75 million school-aged children living in countries affected by conflict (Nicolai, 2016). More than 12 million children are refugees residing outside of their country of origin, most in neighboring countries that struggle to meet the educational needs of their own citizens (UNHCR, 2019a; Mendenhall, Russell, & Buckner, 2017). In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, education can serve as a protective factor, supporting the cognitive, social, and emotional development of affected children (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003; UNHCR, 2017; Kirk & Winthrop, 2013). Teachers play an instrumental role in ensuring their classrooms are safe and secure environments that promote this development (Mendenhall, 2017; Riggs & Davidson, 2016; Shriberg, 2007; Dryden-Peterson, 2011). However, in order to do so, teachers must be well themselves.

Teaching is one of the most stressful professions (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). This stress is amplified in crisis and conflict-affected contexts where teachers often work without professional development support, certification, or compensation (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Burns & Lawrie, 2015). Rhoda, a Ugandan refugee who lives in Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya recognizes the connection between teachers’ stress levels and the well-being and learning outcomes of students: “I came to realize the well-being of a teacher to learner is very important in the process of learning because when the teacher is not well, that will affect the learners in the class…Both the teacher and the learner, they should be well in health-wise, mentally, emotionally and physically because if one of them is affected, then the learning will not take place in the school.” While literature from stable contexts supports Rhoda’s assertion (see e.g. Jones, Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013; McCallum et al., 2017), there is little evidence on and attention paid to the well-being of teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts. It is imperative to address this dearth of evidence because teacher well-being can directly impact student learning and have serious implications for equity across school systems.

This landscape review, which was commissioned by the Education Equity Research Initiative, serves as a first step in filling the evidence gap by building an understanding of teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts and identifying the individual and contextual factors that may influence well-being. Organized into five sections, the landscape review introduces the importance of better understanding teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts; outlines the methodology for this report; presents a conceptual framework for teacher well-being informed by the existing literature and evidence on teacher well-being as well as interviews with teachers working in displacement and low resource settings; describes the existing research and evidence base on teacher well-being; and concludes by presenting a Key Actions Matrix with programmatic and policy guidance for supporting teacher well-being.

1 Pseudonyms have been used to protect teachers’ identities.
Section 1: Introduction

The room is hot. Thirty-six degrees Celsius to be exact. Dust covers the various surfaces in the room, and any movement produces small clouds of debris in its wake. 162 girls, between the ages of 12 and 16, sit in neat rows wearing purple and white uniforms and concentrating fiercely on their teacher, Jamaa, despite the stifling heat and the noise reverberating off the corrugated tin walls. At age 21, Jamaa is not much older than her students; in fact, she studied at this very primary school. Her warm demeanor and bright smile welcome her learners’ attention, while her animated voice and clear instruction hold her learners’ focus despite the overcrowded, overheated classroom. Jamaa is South Sudanese, as are many of her learners, yet she has never been to that country. She has spent her whole life in Kenya and became a teacher right after graduating from secondary school. Teaching has not always been easy for Jamaa. In fact, she came close to quitting the previous year. Reflecting on her experience, Jamaa explains, “stress affected me last year...I never wanted to wake up to go to work. And every time I went to work I was late. And I didn’t care about anything. Not the students, not what I taught because I never planned for any lesson. I’d just go to class, just teach anything, people are making noise I don’t care. Teach whatever I have to teach and go out, as long as by the end of the day there is Mathematics on the board...I have taught.”

Jamaa’s classroom is in Kakuma refugee camp in northwest Kenya, one of the oldest camps in East Africa with a population of close to 200,000 refugees from more than 18 countries (UNHCR, 2019b). Kakuma is an extremely challenging place to teach and learn. The class sizes frequently reach over 200 students and consist of mixed age groups, and students from multiple linguistic and educational backgrounds, with varied psychosocial needs (Mendenhall, 2017). Teaching and learning materials in the camp are sparse and teachers receive limited professional development opportunities or support for their own well-being (Mendenhall et al., 2015; Mendenhall, 2017). Jamaa attributed her stress to personal challenges (after graduating from secondary school, she failed to attain a university scholarship) and the stress of her work (she teaches three subjects across four grades to over 500 students). While teachers’ experiences vary across contexts, teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts will face myriad challenges inside and outside of school which affect their well-being as teachers.

Teacher occupational well-being (referred to from here forward as ‘teacher well-being’) is context-specific and encompasses teachers’ affections, attitudes, and evaluations of their work (Schleicher, 2018; Collie et al., 2015). The literature and empirical evidence on teacher well-being from the United States and Europe show that teaching and other caregiving professions are among the most stressful occupations (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). Evidence also indicates that teachers are the strongest school-level variable associated with student learning and has identified a significant relationship between teachers’ well-being and students’ social, emotional, and cognitive development (Schwille, Dembélé, & Schubert, 2007; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Jennings et al., 2017; Jennings, 2016; Jones, Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013; McCallum et al., 2017). Yet, despite the recognition that teachers are key actors in their students’ learning and that teaching is one of the most stressful professions, there is a paucity of attention paid to teacher well-being and few education policies and programs address well-being directly.
The well-being of teachers must be prioritized for the global education community to uphold commitments outlined in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4, the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, and other global frameworks that ensure quality, equitable education for all, regardless of gender, nationality, religion, age, or displacement status. This is particularly true in crisis and conflict-affected contexts where barriers to education disproportionately affect marginalized and vulnerable populations and where the stress of teaching is compounded by the stress of living in unstable and insecure environments (Wolfe et al., 2015a, 2015b; Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Kirk & Winthrop, 2013). It is in these low resource, high-need environments that teachers are expected to create safe, inclusive classrooms that promote the cognitive growth and well-being of their students (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013; Burns & Lawrie, 2015). With unprecedented levels of global displacement and pervasive, protracted inter- and intra-national conflict, an increasing number of children are spending their entire academic life in displacement or in conflict-affected settings. It is imperative to develop a better understanding of how to support teacher well-being in these settings through research, advocacy, policy, and programs.

The Landscape Review

This landscape review is an effort to build a more comprehensive understanding of teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. We examine the existing research and evidence base, present a conceptual framework that outlines the individual and contextual factors that support or hinder teacher well-being, and provide programmatic and policy guidance for scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and donors to bolster collective support for the well-being of teachers working in these settings. This review aims to address the following research question: *What individual and contextual factors influence teacher well-being?* and sub-questions: *In what ways do these factors influence teacher well-being? What are the unique needs and considerations for teachers working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts?* As this report was commissioned by the Education Equity Research Initiative, we were particularly interested in how teacher well-being and related factors promote or impede equity in access, retention, progression, and learning for both teachers and students in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. By *equity*, we mean “the redistribution of resources (human, institutional, and financial) in education with the goal of reducing or eliminating systematic inequality in educational outcomes” (Hatch, 2016, p. 3).

The remainder of this report is organized into four sections: methodology, conceptual framework, existing research and evidence base, and areas for future research and recommendations. The methodology presents our approach to the review, which consisted of a desk review, expert consultations, and interviews with teachers working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. The conceptual framework presents a framework for teacher well-being, which includes different constructs and factors to consider in seeking to understand and support teacher well-being. The existing research and evidence base provides an extensive overview of the literature that informs the conceptual framework, including findings from interviews with teachers. Finally, the future research and recommendations section presents suggestions for next steps and a Key Actions Matrix with programmatic and policy guidance for
improving teacher well-being. Throughout the report, we discuss both the importance of teacher well-being and the possible equity implications when teacher well-being is not supported.

Section 2: Methodology

To answer these research questions, we conducted a desk review; held consultations with experts in the fields of education in emergencies (EiE), psychology, and public health; and drew on interviews with teachers working in displacement and low resource settings in Kenya and Uganda. The desk review and expert consultations informed the development of a draft conceptual framework on teacher well-being. During the early phases of the research, we also analyzed interviews conducted with refugee and Kenyan teachers in Kakuma refugee camp between 2015-2018. This was done by generating open codes, developing a codebook, and coding in NVivo, a qualitative analysis software. After drafting an emerging conceptual framework, we conducted interviews with teachers in Uganda in 2019 to determine if the framework resonated with their experiences. We applied the same analytical process for these interviews and refined the framework based on the results. We then presented the refined framework to over 45 academics, practitioners, policymakers, donors, and teachers during a USAID and Education Conflict & Crisis Network (ECCN)-sponsored workshop on teacher well-being at the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) 2019 conference. Workshop participants provided feedback that was used to finalize the conceptual framework which is presented in this report. The remainder of this section provides additional detail on the methodology used for the desk review, expert consultations, and teacher interviews. At the end of the section, we outline the limitations of our research.

Desk review

We conducted a desk review of more than 100 resources to gain a deeper understanding of the existing research and evidence-base on teacher well-being and to explore how well-being is conceptualized in other fields including public health, psychology, and mental health. For a complete list of journals and our search criteria, please see Appendix A. Given the dearth of literature and empirical evidence on teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, we relied heavily on research from Western and stable contexts and supplemented this with grey literature (e.g. non-governmental organization (NGO) program reports) from low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings. We define low resource as schools, communities, and/or countries experiencing resource deprivation that is either economic or social in nature, and which “may constrain educational opportunities in the absence of social policies that effectively offset them, making poverty groups important to consider in equity analyses” (Hatch, 2016, p. 7). By crisis and conflict-affected contexts, we mean areas experiencing armed conflict, widespread violence, displacement, and/or other risks to people and communities, such as weak civil infrastructure, lack of governance and security, and widespread human rights abuses (OECD, n.d.; EU, n.d.). Due to the timeline for this research and our own experiences and expertise, we focus primarily on conflict-affected and protracted displacement contexts. These are settings where refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been outside their country or community of origin for at least five consecutive years.
UNHCR, 2018a). Future research should consider teacher well-being in naturally-induced crises and complex crises.

While conducting the desk review, we developed a matrix to organize the resources. The matrix captured the resource type (academic, grey), sector (education, public health, and psychology), intervention (where applicable), methodology (including specific tools and measures), findings, and limitations. We also used the matrix as an analytical tool to look across resources for comparisons, contradictions, emerging themes, and common constructs that scholars and practitioners use to describe and measure well-being. We selected four constructs of teacher well-being that emerged most frequently from the literature to examine in-depth for this report. While these four constructs appeared most frequently, they are not exhaustive. Other potentially important constructs are not included in this report due to the limited timeframe of the consultancy. We developed a similar matrix to identify the most common individual and contextual factors that influence teacher well-being in the existing literature.

To assess the quality of the resources reviewed, we included the limitations of the literature in the matrix. Identifying limitations during the review process allowed us to take note of challenges in conducting research on teacher well-being, gaps in the existing literature, as well as methodological weaknesses in research. We chose not to include resources with serious methodological flaws, most notably resources that lacked transparency about methods and the definitions of key terms. However, given that this report is not a systematic review, we adopted an inclusive approach to selecting resources; for example, including emerging evidence from NGO reports. The limited evidence on teacher well-being in crisis and conflict-affected contexts also supported an inclusive approach to this report.

Expert consultations

We supplemented the desk review with consultations with experts from the fields of EiE, public health, and psychology who helped inform our understanding of well-being as a holistic construct. We conducted two consultations with experts outside the field of EiE, one in-person and one over Skype, which lasted between 45 and 60 minutes. We also held regular meetings with the Education Equity Research Initiative’s Teacher Social-Emotional Well-being Task Team, comprised of scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and donors with diverse experience supporting teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. We used these meetings to source additional literature, receive feedback on drafts of the report and ensure we were on the right track in our review. We also conducted a workshop at CIES with members of the Education Equity Task Team, as well as other EiE scholars, practitioners, and policymakers, to solicit feedback on the conceptual framework. We used feedback from this workshop to create the final version of the framework, presented in section 3 of this report.

Teacher interviews

We felt it was critical to include teachers’ perspectives in the review as they are often excluded from the research, policy, and programming processes that affect them. We drew on
interviews that were originally conducted for other projects\(^2\), but that were informative for this review because teachers discussed their own well-being and the factors that affected it. We also drew on interviews with 14 teachers (5 female, 9 male) who are working in low resource and displacement contexts in Kakuma refugee camp and Kalobeyei settlement in Kenya and Palabek settlement and Kampala, Uganda. These interviews represent a small, but important, sample that privileges the perspectives of teachers. It is important to note that the focus of the interviews was not exclusively centered on teacher well-being; however, well-being emerged as an important topic for teachers during these interviews. The interviews helped inform our understanding of how teachers conceptualize their well-being and which factors are most relevant to consider in designing research, programs, and policies to support teachers in these settings. The interviews also allowed us to assess the ways in which literature from Western and stable contexts aligned with or contradicted the perspectives of teachers working in more difficult settings. It is important to note that we only drew on interviews with teachers in Kenya and Uganda, so while these teachers’ perspectives were invaluable for this review, their voices are not representative of all teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts.

**Limitations**

This landscape review has several limitations. First, this review does not provide detailed contextualization guidance, though we recognize contextualization as a key step in any meaningful and sustainable research, programming, and policy processes. It is hoped that the information in this report is a first step in helping researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to better understand and support teacher well-being, and we acknowledge that substantial contextualization processes, informed by local actors, will be necessary to operationalize the information in this review. Second, we draw primarily from teachers’ perspectives from sub-Saharan Africa, where most of our work has occurred. We attempt to bring in policies and empirical examples from other regions but recognize that our own experiences have influenced the regional focus of this review. Third, we reviewed only English-language literature, as we lack fluency in other languages and did not have the time or funding to work with translators or bilingual co-researchers. Including literature published in non-English languages was a priority of the Education Equity Research Initiative’s Teacher Social-Emotional Well-being Task Team; however, the timeframe and budget for the consultancy limited our ability to do so. We recognize this as a limitation and an opportunity for future research. Fourth, the majority of the literature we draw on in this review is from Western contexts. We acknowledge that “well-being” is not a term that necessarily resonates across all settings, and that much of the literature on well-being is rooted in Western, individualistic perspectives. We have done our best to supplement literature from Western contexts with grey literature and teachers’ own perspectives, including instances where teachers discussed well-being as a more collective construct, but we recognize that there is still a Western bias in this review. Future research must

---

\(^2\) We draw on interviews conducted through two projects: *Teachers for Teachers* in Kakuma refugee camp and Kalobeyei settlement, Kenya, and the Education for Life in South Sudan and Uganda project led by Oxfam IBIS and its consortium partners and funded through the European Union. For more information on *Teachers for Teachers*, please visit [http://www.tc.edu/refugeeeducation](http://www.tc.edu/refugeeeducation); for more information on the Education for Life project, please visit [https://uganda.oxfam.org/tags/brice](https://uganda.oxfam.org/tags/brice).
seek to better understand endogenous concepts of well-being and promote participatory methodologies that include teachers and communities in every stage of the research process.

Section 3: Conceptual Framework

This section describes a conceptual framework for teacher well-being, which is aligned with the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) Minimum Standards. The framework includes factors that contribute to well-being and profiles of teachers working in crisis and conflict-affected contexts. Together this provides a foundation for understanding how to provide more comprehensive support to teachers. In section 5: future research and recommendations, we present a Key Actions Matrix with programmatic and policy guidance for operationalizing the conceptual framework, and highlight linkages with the INEE Minimum Standards.

Teacher well-being

The framework uses the following definition of teacher well-being: **Teacher well-being** encompasses how teachers feel and function in their jobs; it is context-specific and includes teachers’ affections, attitudes, and evaluations of their work (Schleicher, 2018; Collie et al., 2015, p. 745). To better understand teacher well-being, it is pertinent to understand the various profiles of teachers working in crisis and conflict-affected contexts (see textbox 1).

**Textbox 1: Teacher Profiles in Crisis and Conflict-affected Contexts**

**Host Community or National Teachers Working with Displaced Children**
Host community or national teachers are teachers who work with displaced children in host community schools or camp settings in countries or communities of asylum. Host community teachers are generally registered with the national teacher service and teach in state schools. In cases of large-scale displacement, host community contract teachers may be hired on a short-term basis to help address teacher shortages. National teachers may also work as volunteers in schools or community learning centers to help fill skills gaps, typically language skills, in the teaching force.

**Internally Displaced Teachers**
Internally displaced teachers are national teachers who have been displaced and are working in a host community school, or an IDP camp or non-camp settlement. Internally displaced teachers often experience difficulties being re-deployed as teachers in their host community. If they are re-deployed they often face challenges collecting salaries and claiming basic entitlements and benefits (Dolan et al., 2012). In some cases, internally displaced teachers continue to be managed from their district of origin, even when those education offices are adversely affected by conflict or disaster. Internally displaced teachers can also be individuals who become teachers for the first time in displacement, and therefore may be un- or under-qualified and uncertified. These teachers frequently lack access to formal in-service training to become certified teachers and to non-formal professional development managed by I/NGOs.
to develop their teaching competencies. These teachers may not be paid (or receive infrequent payment) as they are not registered with the national teacher service system; compensation for these teachers is often organized by community members, community-based organizations (CBOs), or I/NGOs.

Refugee Teachers
Refugee teachers are refugees who have been employed to teach in the host community or camp or non-camp settlement schools. Refugees do not have the legal right to work in many countries and often qualified and unqualified refugee teachers are employed as volunteer or “incentive” teachers. Qualified refugee teachers are often prevented from joining the host country teacher cadre by multiple barriers including restrictions on the right to work, lack of recognition of teacher qualifications and, in some cases, a lack of proficiency in the language of instruction (Sesnan, Ndugga, & Said, 2013). Refugee teachers may also be recruited by a host country’s Ministry of Education to work as teaching assistants in national classrooms.

Returnee Teachers
Returnee teachers are refugee or internally displaced teachers who, upon returning to their country or community of origin, resume teaching. These teachers may have been formally trained prior to displacement and/or received non-formal professional development from I/NGOs during their displacement. Returnee teachers may be experienced teachers, working for many years during their displacement; however, they frequently are unable to work in the national education system when they return if they do not have formally recognized certification.

(Adapted from Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018, pp. 6-7)

Socio-ecological levels
Inspired by Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model of child development, the conceptual framework recognizes the interrelated environments, interactions, and relationships that contribute to well-being. We use a socio-ecological framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) to organize the environments, or levels, pertinent to teacher well-being. There are six levels in the conceptual framework—individual, school, community, national, regional, and global. This nested approach recognizes the interactions within and between settings and is particularly relevant for examining teacher well-being given the different roles that educators play within and outside of school settings (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; McCallum, Graham, & Morrison, 2017).

Teacher well-being constructs and factors
The conceptual framework presents four constructs of teacher well-being: teacher self-efficacy, job stress and burnout, job satisfaction, and social-emotional competence. These were the most common constructs identified during the desk review. These constructs were also commonly present in the tools used by researchers and practitioners to assess well-being, and during interviews conducted with teachers in Kenya and Uganda. It is important to note that these constructs interact with factors at each of the six levels of the conceptual framework.
The conceptual framework examines factors at each level that influence teacher well-being (see table 1). These factors emerged most prominently from the desk review, as well as from interviews with teachers. At the individual level, the factors are gender, displacement status, employment status, level of education, teaching experience, coping mechanisms, content knowledge, and cultural competence. At the school level, the factors examined are teacher-student relationships, peer relationships, school leadership, and school resources. At the community level, we consider access to basic needs, respect and recognition, and responsibility and duty. At the national, regional, and global levels we consider the policy environment for teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings, particularly around teacher management, compensation, certification and right to work, and teacher professional development (TPD).

Table 1: Teacher Well-being Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Well-being Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual (Teacher characteristics)</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Displacement status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Employment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Coping mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1. Teacher-student relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Peer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. School leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. School resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1. Access to basic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Respect and recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Responsibility and duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1. Policy-environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Teacher management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>b. Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Certification and right to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Teacher professional development (TPD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Protective and risk factor framing

Each factor can increase a teacher’s risk for negative well-being outcomes or their propensity toward positive well-being outcomes depending on the context in which the teacher lives and works. These outcomes may even vary between teachers in a given context. To account for the dual nature of factors influencing teacher well-being, the conceptual framework includes a protective and risk factor framing. Protective factors are the attributes of an individual or an environment that “enhance the likelihood of positive outcomes for the person and the system alike” (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016, p. 105) particularly in times of adversity (Riggs & Davison, 2016). Risk factors are attributes of an individual or an environment that “increase the chances of a negative outcome for the person or system” (Prilleltensky et al., 2016, p. 105). To apply these terms to our conceptual framework, we consider the ways in which each factor might contribute, both positively and negatively, to teacher well-being with the understanding that protective and risk factors will differ within and between different populations and settings (Prilleltensky et al., 2016; Beltman, Mansfield, & Price, 2011; Masten & Narayan, 2012). For example, peer relationships may serve as a protective factor for teachers, making them feel supported and comfortable in their school community. However, conflictual peer relationships may be a risk factor and contribute to stress and burnout. Or, for example, respect and recognition from community members may serve as a protective factor for a host community teacher. However, a lack of respect and recognition may be a risk factor for a displaced teacher who experiences discrimination due to his/her displacement status.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for Teacher Well-being in Low Resource, Crisis, and Conflict-affected Contexts
Section 4: Existing Research and Evidence Base

Teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts

Well-being is important for all teachers, but perhaps especially for teachers working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. Teachers in these settings, whether refugee, internally displaced, or from the host community, face numerous challenges that compound and amplify the myriad difficulties and stressors of teaching (Frisoli, 2013; Penson, 2012; Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). Teachers who have been displaced may have experienced trauma and have their own psychological needs that must be addressed before they can be expected to support the psychological and cognitive needs of their students (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Frisoli, 2013; Asimeng-Boahene, 2003; INEE, 2010a). Teachers from the host community also face challenges; as a result of an influx of refugees or IDPs, these teachers may have overcrowded classes and be tasked with managing multilingual, multicultural, mixed-ability classrooms without much, if any, professional development (Frisoli, 2013; Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). Additionally, refugee, internally displaced, and host community teachers in these settings play multiple roles for their students, e.g. the role of a teacher, supporting students’ cognitive and social-emotional growth, and the role of a parent or caregiver, addressing students’ psychosocial needs (Sommers, 2004; INEE, 2010a; Frisoli, 2013). These challenges affect teachers’ own well-being, which has implications for teaching quality, equitable access to education, student learning and well-being, and the sustainability and quality of education systems (Fullan, 2016; Winthrop & Kirk, 2005; Gastaldi et al., 2014). The remainder of this section presents and analyzes the academic and grey literature as well as the teacher interviews that informed the conceptual framework. We begin by presenting individual-level constructs of teacher well-being, and then review different factors at the individual, school, community, and national, regional, and global levels that influence these constructs and, ultimately teacher well-being.

Individual-level constructs

Teacher self-efficacy, job stress and burnout, job satisfaction, and social-emotional competence are frequent constructs used to describe and assess teacher well-being in academic and grey literature. We outline and define these constructs below and refer back to the constructs throughout the section to highlight how the factors on the conceptual framework influence these constructs and teacher well-being.

Teacher self-efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy, sometimes referred to as teacher’s sense of self-efficacy, is a multidimensional social construct and an important measure for teacher well-being (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Spilt, Koomen & Thijs, 2011; Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012; Cook et al., 2017; McCallum et al., 2017; Schleicher, 2018). Self-efficacy is rooted in social psychology, but has been adapted for many sectors—including education—due to its relevance and applicability across fields; it encompasses feelings of self-worth, belief in one’s abilities, and behavior change (Bandura, 1994, 1998, 2001). For teachers, sense of teaching efficacy refers to a teacher’s belief...
that s/he is able to guide and elicit desired outcomes for student behavior, learning, and achievement (Collie et al., 2012; Tschan nen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Within the literature on teacher self-efficacy, three categories of efficacy emerge: 1) efficacy of student engagement, which is the belief in one’s ability to encourage students’ motivation; 2) efficacy for classroom management, which is the belief in one’s ability to respond to misbehavior and encourage positive behavior; and 3) efficacy for instructional strategies, which is the belief in one’s ability to use effective teaching strategies (Tschan nen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000).

Self-efficacy is situated within and influenced by a teacher’s environment, interactions with others, and personal attributes (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Research suggests that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are able to set and achieve goals and implement new and innovative teaching strategies, which leads them to feel more satisfied, motivated, and committed to their work (Frisoli, 2013; Canrinus et al., 2012; Guskey, 1988; Guajardo, 2011). On the other hand, teachers with low or weak self-efficacy are at risk of experiencing increased stress and burnout, which can lead to impaired relationships with their students (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Bandura, 1982; Frisoli, 2013).

Bandura (1994, 1998, 2001) puts forth four main mechanisms for strengthening or impeding an individual’s self-efficacy: enactive mastery, modeling influences, social persuasion, and altered misinterpretations of stress indicators. These four mechanisms are embedded in social activities and are critical considerations for practitioners in their work designing programs to improve teacher self-efficacy, and ultimately to encourage positive changes in teaching practice and improve teacher well-being. Enactive mastery refers to time dedicated to practicing new knowledge and skills, with the aim of mastering specific techniques (Bandura, 1994; Frisoli, 2013). Modeling influences refers to observational learning and gaining confidence in seeing peers successfully implement new techniques (Bandura, 1998, 2001; Frisoli, 2013). Both enactive mastery and modeling influences are forms of experiential learning, a central tenet of adult learning theory (Kolb, 1994; Merriam, Caffarella & Baumgartner, 2007). The third mechanism, social persuasion, refers to receiving positive feedback and praise during experiential learning (Bandura, 1998; Frisoli, 2013); evidence suggests that supportive instructional and emotional environments with peers or supervisors are key for effective teacher professional development and teacher change (Timperley, 2008). Finally, the fourth and final mechanism—altered misinterpretations of stress indicators—refers to individuals’ responses and coping mechanisms when confronted with stress and anxiety (Bandura, 2001; Frisoli, 2013).

The multi-faceted, context-specific nature of self-efficacy is particularly relevant in crisis contexts, where teachers are working in extraordinarily difficult circumstances with limited support. Concerning teacher professional identity, many teachers in displacement settings are “tentative” educators who enter the profession to fill teacher gaps or because teaching is the only viable livelihoods option during displacement (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013). Even with training and years of experience these “tentative” educators “may continue to lack confidence in their own skills as teachers” (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013, p. 123), leading to low self-efficacy and potentially hindered well-being. An additional consideration for teachers working in displacement is the connection between efficacy and agency. Bandura (1998) situates self-efficacy as necessary for “agency” and posits that at the heart of building self-confidence to try new things, is to recover and gain a sense of agency that may be lacking. Agency is a particularly relevant construct for well-being among displaced communities (Expert consultation, March 7,
Yet, the agency of displaced populations is often threatened as they frequently lack access to critical social services and participation in decision-making (Meyer et al., 2019; Schiltz et al., 2018). For teachers who are denied access to the formal national teaching workforce, they will likely have no avenues for advocacy or redress. The implications of this bounded agency on teacher self-efficacy, and ultimately their well-being, are pertinent to consider at the school and national level where participation in decision-making, formal employment, and compensation are potential levers for supporting teacher self-efficacy and well-being.

Teacher self-efficacy is not only important for teacher well-being but also for student well-being and learning. Research suggests that teacher self-efficacy may predict students’ achievement and motivation as well as student self-esteem and prosocial attitudes (Ross, 1998; Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Teacher efficacy has also been shown to predict students’ own sense of self-efficacy and attitudes towards learning (Cheung & Cheng, 1997). Additionally, as described above, teacher self-efficacy encompasses teachers’ beliefs in their ability to respond to misbehavior (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000); when teachers have low levels of self-efficacy, they may resort to harsh disciplinary practices (e.g. corporal punishment), which negatively influences students’ attitudes towards and achievement in learning (Mendenhall et al., 2019).

**Job stress and burnout**

Additional measures of teacher well-being are job stress and burnout. Job stress refers to negative emotional and physical responses as a result of one’s work (Prilleltensky et al., 2016; Schonert-Reichl, 2017). It is often the result of an imbalance or discrepancy between a worker’s ability, resources, or needs and the requirements of his/her job (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). Prilleltensky, Neff, and Bessell (2016) consider stress as a mismatch between protective and risk factors and posit that this framing allows for “identification of factors that help or hinder a sense of well-being” (p. 105). Focusing on risk factors teachers may face in their work, Kyriacou (2001) defines teacher stress as “the experience by a teacher of unpleasant, negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, tension, frustration or depression, resulting from some aspect of their work as a teacher” (p. 28). Research suggests that teachers who report high levels of stress are vulnerable to physical, emotional, and mental afflictions, increased absenteeism and weakened/impaired quality of instruction (Schonfeld, 2001; Howard & Johnson, 2004; Wolf et al., 2015b). Teachers who experience recurring stress at work often experience job burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Le Compte and Dworkin (1991) describe teacher burnout as a product of stress that is comprised of feeling exhausted, ineffective, powerless, alienated, and isolated. Research on burnout is rooted in care-giving and service occupations, such as teaching, and the interpersonal nature of teaching is a critical consideration when understanding the phenomenon of teacher burnout (Maslach et al., 2001; Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Howard & Johnson, 2004). A complex construct, burnout situates an individual’s experiences of stress within the context of and in relation to their work (Maslach et al., 2001).

Research suggests that teachers with low levels of self-efficacy report higher levels of job stress (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Within the literature on teacher stress, two main types of stress emerge: 1) stress related to students’ behavior and discipline; and 2) stress related to workload (Collie et al., 2012). Stress related to students’ behavior and discipline is closely connected to
teacher self-efficacy, particularly concerning classroom management with teachers who experience low self-efficacy more vulnerable to feeling stressed (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Other sources of stress for teachers include managing large class sizes, providing support to students who may require additional attention or lack motivation, feeling a lack of agency over decisions that affect their students and themselves, feeling immense responsibility and pressure for their students’ academic achievement, and being evaluated by others (Jennings et al., 2017; Greenberg, Brown & Abenavoli, 2016; Kyriacou, 2001). Poor working conditions and stressful working environments negatively influence teacher self-efficacy, motivation, and job commitment (Schleicher, 2018).

Teaching is an extremely stressful profession, particularly in crisis contexts where the stress of the job is compounded with the traumas of experiencing conflict (Frisoli, 2013; Wolfe et al., 2015a; Igbinedion, Newby, & Sparkes, 2017; Burns & Lawrie, 2015). In their research with primary school teachers in the Katanga Province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Wolf et al. (2015a) find that the “cumulative hardships” teachers face (e.g. increased workloads, low or infrequent pay, limited professional development, lack of voice) negatively influence their well-being (p. 736). Refugee teachers in Kakuma expressed similar sentiments and recognized how occupational hardships, as well as those experienced in their personal lives, influenced their classroom management strategies and use of corporal punishment (Mendenhall et al., 2019). Reflecting on his stress, one male Somali refugee teacher noted, “I used to take the stress of the home to the school or whatever the problem, all my problem which I’m getting at home, I’m just carrying them to the school. And then I become very stressful. And then even learners when they’re just approaching me, I’m becoming very reactive to them. So I was not actually treating them in good way.” This illustrates that although teachers may be aware of how stress from work and personal life negatively influences interactions with students, they struggle to manage their stress without professional development opportunities or other types of support.

Stress and burnout are important not only for teacher well-being but also for student well-being and learning. Teacher stress is linked to lower levels of teacher performance and ultimately lower student achievement (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). A study in New York City found that high rates of teacher turnover—caused by teacher stress—resulted in lower math and language arts achievement for fourth and fifth-grade students (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). Sustained teacher stress and burnout result in high levels of attrition, with nearly half of teachers leaving the profession within their first five years (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2013). High levels of attrition have significant cost implications for schools, districts, and national education systems. While there are no financial data from crisis and conflict-affected settings, in the United States, the annual cost of teacher turnover is estimated to be $7 billion. In urban school districts, the cost of replacing teachers who leave the profession is estimated to be $20,000 per teacher (Greenberg, Brown & Abenavoli, 2016, p. 2; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017, p. v). Further, research suggests that higher levels of attrition disproportionately affect schools in low-income communities and teachers of color (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2013). Students at these schools experience a “revolving door” of teachers, many of whom are less-experienced, early career-teachers (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017, p. 14); this instability, as well as limited access to experienced teachers, have the potential to disrupt student learning and negatively influence student well-being.
**Job satisfaction**

Despite the challenges of the profession, teaching can elicit a sense of purpose, joy, and satisfaction for educators. Job satisfaction is the sense of fulfillment and gratification an individual receives from his or her occupation, in day-to-day activities, and overtime (Collie et al., 2012; Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Research suggests that teachers’ job satisfaction is associated with their well-being, motivation, and commitment to teaching (Collie et al., 2012; Canrinus et al., 2010). Job satisfaction is also associated with the degree of autonomy teachers feel in their job, which “constitutes a fundamental psychological need” that contributes to dignity and well-being (Gastaldi et al., 2014, p. 18). Job satisfaction is closely linked to both stress and burnout, and self-efficacy; teachers with higher levels of stress typically experience lower levels of job satisfaction, while teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016; Canrinus et al., 2012). In a study with over 2,000 teachers in 75 junior high schools in Italy, Caprara et al. (2006) found that teachers’ sense of self-efficacy positively influenced their job satisfaction as well as their students’ academic achievement. Job dissatisfaction is one of the primary drivers of leaving the teaching profession and sustained levels of dissatisfaction can lead to attrition (Wolf et al., 2015a). Job dissatisfaction in conflict-affected and displacement settings can be driven by a multitude of complex challenges that can vary based on school and teacher characteristics. In an evaluation of a teacher professional development program (TPD) in the DRC, Wolf et al. (2015a) found that “the majority of the variance in teacher job dissatisfaction [could be] attributed to differences across teachers themselves, as well as schools” (p. 34). Job satisfaction is also associated with the quality of instruction and job performance, which has significant implications for student learning outcomes (Klassen & Chiu, 2010).

**Social-emotional competence**

Another construct that emerges from the literature as being closely associated with teacher well-being is teacher social-emotional competence (Jennings, 2016; Jennings et al., 2017; Colvin, 2018; McCallum et al., 2017). Though many frameworks exist, this report defines social-emotional competence as made up of five specific competencies: 1) self-awareness; 2) self-management; 3) responsible decision-making; 4) relationship skills; and 5) social awareness (CASEL, 2019). Teachers across all contexts experience “high social and emotional demands” from their students and empirical evidence, primarily from Western contexts, shows a positive relationship between teacher social-emotional competence and teacher well-being (Jennings, 2016, p. 137; McCallum et al., 2017; Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). Developing social-emotional competence can result in decreased levels of stress and burnout, and improved teacher self-efficacy and performance, all of which contribute to improved well-being (Colvin, 2018; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Jennings et al., 2017). In an issue brief on social-emotional learning (SEL) and teacher stress, Greenberg, Brown, and Abenavoli (2016) assert that “teachers with high social-emotional competence report more positive affect...higher job satisfaction, and a sense of personal accomplishment” (pp. 4-5). In this sense, social-emotional competence can serve as a protective factor against the stress and burnout that teachers experience.

Social-emotional competence is critical for teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings (Wolf et al., 2015b). Both displaced and national teachers in these settings may
be faced with stressors such as struggling to meet their own and their families' basic needs due to a lack of sufficient income and/or an inability to access basic resources such as healthcare (Wolf et al., 2015b; AGORA, 2018). In addition to experiencing their own adversity and stressors outside of school, teachers in these settings contend with overcrowded classrooms, students from varying cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds, and students who may require psychosocial support (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). All of these work-related and external stressors can lead to emotional exhaustion, which contributes to lower cognitive and emotional functioning and affects teachers' well-being and job performance (Jennings, 2016). Additionally, as has been highlighted elsewhere in this report, teachers in conflict-affected and displacement settings play multiple emotionally-demanding roles. In order to fulfill these roles, teachers need support in developing their own social-emotional skills to address their emotional challenges, which in turn allows them to provide better cognitive, social, and emotional support to their students (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). Ignoring social-emotional competence can lead to negative outcomes for teachers, students, and education systems as the combination of high job stress and low social-emotional competence and classroom management skills can lead to poor teacher performance and increased teacher attrition (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016; Montgomery & Rupp, 2005).

Teachers' social-emotional competence is important not only for teacher well-being but also for student well-being and learning. In addition to affecting teachers' performance and quality of instruction (Jennings, 2016), teachers' social-emotional competence is related to classroom climate, and teachers' abilities to form supportive relationships with students (Jennings, 2016; McCallum et al., 2017; Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). A teacher with lower social-emotional competence will be less equipped to manage their own stress, which can have a negative impact on the quality of instruction and teacher-student interactions and ultimately hinder student well-being and learning (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). On the other hand, teachers with higher social-emotional competence are able to better regulate their emotions and stress, form positive relationships with students, and serve as role models that help students develop their own social-emotional skills (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016; Jennings, 2016). Jennings and Greenberg, have conducted research on teachers' social-emotional competence and its relationship to teacher well-being and student well-being and learning outcomes (see Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Jennings et al., 2017; Jennings, 2016). Based on their experience implementing a mindfulness program with teachers in high poverty areas in the United States, Jennings and Greenberg developed a prosocial classroom model which asserts that "teachers with higher levels of SEC [social-emotional competence] have more supportive relationships with their students, utilize more effective classroom management strategies and more effectively teach social and emotional skills to their students" (Jennings, 2016, p.134). Jennings (2016) also asserts that teacher social-emotional competence can lead to more equitable education outcomes for students, writing that there is increasing evidence that the emotional support that teachers provide to students "adds value to instructional support in narrowing the achievement gap among children at risk of school failure" (p. 133).

Teachers require support to develop social-emotional competencies (Jones, Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013; Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). These competencies can be developed through coaching and other forms of professional development. Similar to other competencies, teachers require time to build upon and apply social-emotional skills in their
classrooms. Unfortunately few teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings receive this opportunity. There is evidence from Western settings that integrating mindfulness into teacher professional development programs, such as the one implemented by Jennings and Greenberg, can strengthen social-emotional competence, reduce stress, and improve well-being (see e.g. Roeser, Skinner, Beers, & Jennings, 2012; Srinivasan, 2018; Jones, Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013). In EiE settings, some I/NGOs have begun to integrate mindfulness strategies into social-emotional learning curriculum to help support teacher and student well-being and learning (see e.g. the International Rescue Committee’s (2016) Safe Healing and Learning Spaces Social-emotional Learning toolkit).

Despite a growing evidence base on the benefits of social-emotional learning activities that target children, there is a gap in knowledge on the impact of social-emotional learning that targets teachers on teacher and student outcomes, especially in crisis and conflict-affected settings (Torrente et al., 2015). While evidence from other settings points to the promise of social-emotional learning for improving teacher and student well-being, there is a need to gather more empirical evidence on how best to develop teachers’ social-emotional competence in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings and on the relationship between social-emotional competence and teacher well-being in these contexts. Future research should explore these relationships, the best ways to develop teachers’ social-emotional competence, and whether certain competencies impact teacher well-being more than others.

**Individual-level factors**

It is imperative to understand the profiles of teachers working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts when considering factors at the individual level (see textbox 1, pp. 7-8). While we refer to individual factors for consistency in this report, these actually represent characteristics and/or experiences of individual teachers. It is necessary to understand these characteristics prior to designing programs or policies aimed to support teacher well-being. More information on when and how to collect this information can be found in the Key Actions Matrix (pp. 43-53).

The individual-level factors explored in this subsection are gender, displacement status, employment status, level of education, teaching experience, coping mechanisms, content knowledge, and cultural competence. Some factors (e.g. gender and displacement status) are fixed or unable to be changed through a specific intervention. Other factors (e.g. employment status, level of education, teaching experience, coping mechanisms, content knowledge, and cultural competence) can be addressed directly through programs and policy. It is important to note that these factors are not mutually exclusive; they overlap, influence, and interact with one another. Further, while this list is not exhaustive, it provides a starting place for understanding the importance of individual factors when designing programs and policies. Other factors such as age, mental health, self-dignity, and attitudes or beliefs about teaching also emerged from the literature but a detailed examination of these factors is outside the scope of this review.

**Gender.** Gender is an individual-level factor related to teacher well-being with critical considerations for equitable access to and quality of education. While we recognize that it is important to consider the ways in which gender affects the experiences of both male and female
teachers, this subsection focuses on equitable access to education among girls in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts and the effects of inequitable access and security concerns on female teacher recruitment and retention. There are severe female teacher shortages in displacement settings, particularly in Asia and Africa, where recruiting qualified female teachers is a major challenge due to constrained educational progress, gender-based violence, safety concerns, transportation and mobility issues, and cultural and religious practices, among others (Kirk, 2004; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Frisoli & Smiley, 2018; Smiley, Moussa, & Brown, 2018). Limited opportunities for girls to access and progress in their education leads to a chronic shortage of educated women, and thus female teachers. For example, in Nigeria, female adolescents (15-24 years of age) on average attend three years less of schooling than their male counterparts (Smiley, Moussa, & Brown, 2018). In eight of nine states in northern Nigeria participating in UNICEF’s Girls’ Education Project, female teachers represent less than one-quarter of the overall teacher population (ibid). Lower levels of education or incomplete schooling, particularly in comparison to male colleagues, may hinder female teachers’ self-efficacy, an important construct of well-being. Additionally, working in male-dominated environments has the potential to increase job stress, particularly if female teachers are the only women in the school. More research is needed to better understand female teachers’ experiences in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, specifically around the ways in which their self-efficacy and job stress influence their well-being.

Female teachers also face heightened risk to sexual and gender-based violence in crisis and conflict-affected contexts (Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Ferris & Winthrop 2010), and sexual harassment and abuse are critical barriers for female teachers to enter and stay in the profession (Shepler & Routh, 2012). Once in the profession, retention of female teachers is extremely challenging, particularly in conflict-affected areas (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). For example, after being displaced due to violence, female teachers in Pakistan were afraid and often unwilling to return to work in affected areas; this reluctance had significant implications for girls’ access to school as many families preferred or required their daughters to study with female teachers (Ferris & Winthrop, 2010; Lloyd, Mete, & Sathar, 2005). Violence introduces and often exacerbates stress, particularly in environments where responses to and redress of sexual and gender-based violence are inadequate.

Gender is also a significant factor for teacher well-being when considering responsibilities outside of the home as women often have to balance their role as the primary caregiver for their family with their professional work as an educator (Smiley, Moussa, & Brown, 2018). For example, female teachers frequently are responsible for purchasing food and cooking meals, cleaning the home, washing clothing, and taking care of children (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013; Lloyd, Mete, & Sathar, 2005; Kirk, 2004, 2010). When teachers are concerned with meeting these responsibilities as well as their families’ basic needs, they may not have time to properly prepare their lessons or be focused in class (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013). Further, if and when female teachers become mothers, policies surrounding maternity leave and childcare may be inadequate. Balancing the roles and responsibilities of teaching and caregiving are central to many female teachers’ experiences and pertinent for policymakers and practitioners to consider in their work supporting teaching well-being.

While gender can exacerbate risk factors for teachers (and their students), gender can also serve as a protective factor for teacher well-being and an important input for both equitable
access and quality education for girls. In Afghanistan, female teachers in community-based schools were often the sole figures responsible for providing education for girls in their communities, and they received recognition and praise from the community for this work, which bolstered their well-being (Kirk, 2004; Kirk & Winthrop, 2008). Kirk (2010) found similar community behavior in Walanihby refugee camp in Ethiopia where female teachers experienced “enhanced status” upon becoming teachers and participating in the International Rescue Committee (IRC)’s Healing Classrooms professional development program (p. 167). The presence of female teachers in schools also has positive implications for their students’ attendance and achievement, particularly that of girls. A mixed-methods study in five states in northern Nigeria conducted by FHI 360 on UNICEF’s Girls’ Education Project found that schools with at least one female teacher in rural areas (where the majority of teachers are male) had higher rates of enrollment for girls (Smiley, Moussa, & Brown, 2018). Findings from this research also indicate that the presence of a female headteacher increased the retention of girls and the presence of female teachers improved learning outcomes for both male and female students (ibid). Thus, gender can be both a risk and protective factor that influences teacher well-being, and it is critical for practitioners and policymakers to understand the experiences of female teachers in order to design gender-sensitive programs and policy that support teacher well-being.

**Displacement status.** In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, teachers may be forcibly displaced from their homes or teachers may be deployed far from their homes in hard duty and/or insecure environments. Those forcibly displaced may have crossed international borders in their search for asylum or may have remained within their country seeking safe haven outside of their community. Displacement status, particularly for those forcibly displaced, is a critical consideration for teacher well-being as it influences most other individual-level factors, including teachers’ employment status, level of education, teaching experience, and content knowledge. Teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts face myriad professional and personal challenges, all of which influence their well-being. For refugee and IDP teachers, these are compounded by additional challenges of living outside their country or community of origin, which may limit their access to services or result in weakened social networks.

While displacement status has multiple consequences for teachers’ professional and personal lives, this subsection focuses on the physical security and safety of forcibly displaced teachers. Refugee and IDP teachers have often experienced violence, conflict, and loss, frequently of the same nature as their students, which may uniquely position them to provide psychosocial support to the children in their care. Upon settling in a new community or host country, in a camp or non-camp setting, displaced individuals often continue to be confronted with instability, insecurity, and increased discrimination (Meyer et al., 2019; Mendenhall, Russell, & Buckner, 2017). It is important to note that displacement does not equate to traumatization, and experiences of displacement are not uniform. However, it is imperative to recognize that those displaced may have undergone traumatic experiences that negatively influence their well-being (INEE, 2012).

Displaced teachers in particular work in some of the most challenging environments with limited, sporadic, and sometimes irrelevant professional support (Burns & Lawrie, 2015) which rarely contains support for teacher well-being. The Teachers in Crisis Contexts Collaborative
(TiCC) Training for Primary School Teachers in Crisis Contexts aimed to address this gap by developing a module on Teacher’s Role and Well-being. FHI 360 is also implementing a professional development program on teacher well-being in El Salvador, and War Child Holland is working to better understand and strengthen teacher well-being in the Gaza Strip. These efforts are laudatory, and the field has much to learn from this work in the coming years. It is also critical to note that teacher professional development is not an appropriate mechanism for supporting teachers in need of specialized and/or professional mental health support. It is important for education, protection, and mental health practitioners to collaborate to ensure that teachers and students receive the targeted, specialized support they need in cases where professional mental health support is required.

**Employment status.** In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts displaced teachers face restricted access to the labor market as many host countries limit or completely outlaw employment for refugees and asylum seekers (Sperling & Winthrop, 2016; Morand et al., 2012; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). Limited access to employment has significant implications for refugee teachers’ ability to attend Teacher Training Colleges (TTCs) or other programs with recognized certifications, as well as their right to receive sufficient payment for their work (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). For those who have teaching qualifications from their country of origin (or from where they were living prior to displacement), there are few formal opportunities for recognition of their certification due to a scarcity of equivalency policies (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Sesnan et al., 2013). These restrictions underscore the tremendous barriers to receive recognized employment status, a status that comes with important rights and privileges; teachers who do not have formal employment status face the risk of exploitative working conditions, insufficient payment, and lack access to systems to claim their rights. While there are promising examples of efforts to address cross-border equivalency and certification for displaced teachers (see e.g. the Djibouti Declaration), more advocacy is required to ensure that teachers maintain their right to work, regardless of displacement status. The implications of attaining employment status for teacher well-being is explored in more detail in the national-level section.

**Level of education.** Level of education is an important factor for teacher well-being as teachers working in crisis and conflict-affected contexts may come to the profession with incomplete or non-traditional educational backgrounds. Refugee teachers may be recent secondary school graduates or perhaps the “most educated” in their communities, and are often nominated into the position given their educational attainment (Winthrop & Kirk, 2005). Lower levels of education are partially a product of refugees’ limited access to schooling, with refugee youth being five times more likely to be out of school than their non-refugee peers (UNHCR, 2016). Internally displaced teachers face similar challenges and often join the profession once in displacement. Lower levels of education can negatively influence teacher self-efficacy, particularly when teachers are tasked to teach subjects they themselves had not learned as students. Refugee teachers may have completed primary, secondary, and even tertiary education.

---

3 The TiCC Training for Primary School Teachers in Crisis Contexts is an open-source resource on https://inee.org/resources/teachers-crisis-contexts-training-primary-school-teachers.
education in their country of origin; yet, once displaced, their educational attainment is often not recognized and/or teachers may feel it is insufficient, especially if it differs from the host country’s national curriculum. Making efforts to recognize and respect the level of education of teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts is pertinent in designing programs or policies aimed to support teacher well-being. A necessary first step is to collect more and better data on teachers’ educational backgrounds, particularly among displaced teachers, in order to understand their learning and professional development needs and tailor programs and policy to fit these needs.

**Teaching experience.** Teaching experience is an important factor for teacher well-being as many teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts have limited previous experience. Refugee and IDP teachers, in particular, often enter the profession for the first time in displacement (Winthrop & Kirk, 2005; Sesnan et al., 2013). Kirk and Winthrop (2007) coined the term “spontaneous teachers” to describe how many refugee teachers enter the profession. The spontaneity in this pathway creates “tentative” teachers with fragile professional identities. Minimal experience and limited to no pre- and in-service teacher professional development in crisis contexts further weakens this fragile identity (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). A South Sudanese refugee teacher in Kakuma refugee camp in northwest Kenya expresses this sentiment poignantly, saying, “Yes, I’m happy to be a teacher, but with a condition. If, if I can get training and prove that I’m a teacher, that’s when I will tell that I’m happy to be a teacher. But as per now, I have not yet known the sweetness of being a teacher because I have not been trained.” While this teacher had taught for several years in a primary school in a camp, he felt as though he was not yet a teacher due to his lack of formal training. This fragile professional identity has implications for teacher self-efficacy, stress, and burnout, as teachers with wavering confidence may experience more stress and/or feel uncertain about their ability to effectively teach and manage classrooms.

Fragile professional identity is often linked to teaching experience and studies on early-career teachers in stable contexts help shed light on the potential implications of this fragile identity for teacher retention (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2013). Analyzing data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and its supplement Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) over two decades (1988-2008), Ingersoll and Merrill (2013) find that the annual attrition rate of teachers in the United States has risen 41% (from 6.4% to 9%), with between 40-50% of early-career teachers leaving the profession within their first five years. High rates of teacher turnover disproportionately affect impoverished urban and rural public schools (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2013). Additionally, minority teachers have significantly higher rates of attrition than their white peers (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2013). These findings suggest that even in stable contexts, such as the United States, equity issues concerning teacher retention are pervasive. Australia and the U.K. face similar challenges with one-quarter of the teaching force leaving the profession within their first five years (Mansfield, Beltman, & Price, 2014), and the OECD (2013, 2018) recognizes that teacher attrition, particularly for early-career teachers, is a global issue. While there has been recent scholarly interest on refugee teacher retention (see e.g. Ring & West, 2015), more research is needed to better understand whether “spontaneous” and “tentative” teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts experience similar risks of attrition as early-career teachers in stable contexts. There is also a need for more
longitudinal research on teachers’ reasons for staying in or leaving the profession and on the cost of attrition to education systems, particularly in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. This information is necessary to build more resilient education systems that are better equipped to handle shocks without losing a significant portion of the teaching force.

**Coping mechanisms.** Teacher coping mechanisms or strategies make up a broad category that includes different ways that teachers problem solve, exert their agency, and alleviate the stresses associated with their work (Mansfield et al., 2016). The literature points to teachers’ own coping strategies as mechanisms to mitigate risk factors and support teacher well-being (Mansfield et al., 2016). Coping strategies can be used both in and outside of school, and relate to the various socio-ecological levels of the conceptual framework. Individual-level coping strategies include things such as maintaining work-life balance, setting emotional boundaries, and practicing faith, while an example of a school-level coping strategy is collaborating with colleagues (Mansfield et al., 2016; Curry & O’Brien, 2012). Multiple scholars also discuss “engaging in ongoing professional learning” as an important school-level coping strategy, and one that is especially effective if the professional development “responds to teachers’ interests, needs and aspirations” (Mansfield et al., 2016, p. 81).

Coping mechanisms present an opportunity to take an asset-based approach to support teacher well-being. While teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts face immense challenges and stress in their jobs, they also exhibit resilience, persistence, and commitment to their work. It is important for research to highlight ways in which teachers cope with challenges, without losing sight of the challenges. Similarly, it is important for education stakeholders and policymakers to understand the coping mechanisms already in place to better support teacher well-being.

**Content knowledge.** Content knowledge is an important factor for teacher well-being that is influenced by the displacement and employment status of teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts. Content knowledge refers to a teacher’s “deep” understanding of the subject matter they teach (Kleickmann et al., 2012, p. 91). This review focuses on subject content knowledge and not pedagogical knowledge. Though the latter is relevant to teacher well-being, especially as it relates to self-efficacy, it is outside the scope of this review. For host community or national teachers working with displaced children, the pathway to the teaching profession is typically formal, with many, if not all, teachers attending certificate, diploma, or degree teacher training programs, often in TTCs managed by the Ministry of Education. In many contexts, TTCs prepare teachers to enter the profession through pre-service training or provide upskilling programs through in-service courses. While these pre- and in-service programs provide guidance and support on the national curriculum and subject content knowledge, they often fail to address the pedagogical strategies and child protection skills and knowledge necessary for crisis contexts, particularly those that may develop teachers’ cultural competence. In fact, teachers across various settings often consider their pre-service training as having little influence on their actual teaching practice or effectiveness (Guskey, 1989; Joyce et al., 1977).

In reflecting on her formal teaching preparation, one female Kenyan teacher noted that her time at TTC and teaching as a primary school teacher in Nairobi did not prepare her for teaching in Kalobeyei settlement, a new local integration community 40 kilometers from Kakuma.
refugee camp in northwest Kenya. Compounding the challenge of teaching in a class with 170 students was a lack of teaching and learning materials, and, perhaps most significantly, the psychosocial needs of the newly arrived refugee students. She explains, “Just because in the TTC we were only taught on how to organize the chalkboard, but these other things on how you can attend to this kind of learner [in Kalobeyei], how you can teach, how you can motivate the learners, we weren’t told anything about that.” Teachers in high-income countries face similar challenges. While formally trained and certified, these educators frequently express needing new skills to address the needs of refugee and immigrant students (Bunar et al., 2018; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). In fact, nearly half of teacher trainers in OECD countries indicated that the training provided to teachers did not sufficiently prepare them to handle diversity in their classrooms, with strategies to meet the needs of immigrant populations representing a prominent gap in professional development (GEMR, 2015).

**Cultural competence.** While refugee and IDP teachers may have lower levels of content knowledge due to limited access to formal professional development, they have considerable cultural competence stemming from their experiences (Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). Cultural competence refers to a teacher’s awareness of and sensitivity to the culture(s), experiences, and backgrounds of students (Colvin, 2018). Kirk & Winthrop (2013) “highlight the context-specific qualities and abilities that inexperienced and unqualified teachers in crisis and post-crisis contexts do have, especially with regard to child well-being” (p. 126). These “alternative qualifications”—such as belonging to the community in which they’re teaching—strengthen teachers’ cultural competence and uniquely position them to understand and support the psychosocial needs of their students (Kirk & Winthrop, 2005, 2013). Further, this cultural knowledge prepares teachers to use culturally appropriate teaching strategies that resonate with members of the community and the parents of their students (ibid, 2013). This stability and coherence from adults—parents, community members, teachers—is particularly important for children in crisis and conflict-affected contexts (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013; Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003; Betancourt & Khan, 2008).

**School-level factors**

There are a number of contextual factors that interact with teacher well-being. This section examines contextual factors at the school level.

**Teacher-student relationships.** An important school-level factor that emerges from the literature is the relationship between teachers and students. Teacher-student relationships refer to the interactions and relationships that teachers have with their students at school, including the “interpersonal demands that teachers may experience from their students” (Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011, p. 458, emphasis in original). Teacher-student relationships include how teachers interact with and respond to their students, including instances of misbehavior; these relationships also encompass teachers’ perceptions of their students (Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011; Gastaldi et al., 2014; Chang, 2009; Collie et al., 2015). Positive teacher-student relationships are characterized by warmth, supportive interactions, trust, and low levels of conflict (Torrente et al., 2015). Teacher-student relationships are an essential factor for both
Evidence concerning teacher-student relationships suggests that quality relationships support improved job satisfaction and well-being for teachers, as well as improved classroom climate, and well-being and learning outcomes for students (Schonert-Reichl, 2017; Schleicher, 2018; Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011; Torrente et al., 2015). On the other hand, poor relationships between teachers and students can lead to lower student achievement, increased student misbehavior, and increased stress and burnout for teachers (Schonert-Reichl, 2017; Colvin, 2018; McCallum et al., 2017). Quality teacher-student relationships also fulfill a basic psychological need for teachers. In their examination of the effects of teacher-student relationships on teacher well-being, Spilt, Koomen, and Thijs (2011) assert that in line with theoretical understandings of interpersonal relationships, teachers “have a basic need for relatedness with the students in their class” (p. 457). Similarly, according to self-determination theory, teacher-student relationships “fulfill basic psychological needs for autonomy, safety, connectedness, and competency...and are fundamental for mental health” for students (Torrente et al., 2015, p. 51).

Teacher-student relationships are closely related to the individual-level constructs of self-efficacy (particularly for classroom management) and stress and burnout (Gastaldi et al., 2014). Poor relationships with students—as well as negative perceptions of student behavior—lead to increased levels of stress and burnout among teachers. Student misbehavior is one of the biggest influencing factors on the quality of teacher-student relationships and issues related to managing student misbehavior are one of the most prominent school-level stressors for teachers (Collie et al., 2015; Gastaldi et al., 2014). Teachers with high levels of stress or low levels of self-efficacy struggle to build or maintain positive relationships with their students and may resort to the use of corporal punishment when handling instances of misbehavior, feeling that they are ill-equipped to manage behavior in another way (Mendenhall et al., 2019). Poor management of student behavior can in turn increase misbehavior in the classroom, perpetuating a cycle of teacher stress and low self-efficacy (Gastaldi et al., 2014). On the other hand, positive teacher-student relationships often lead to lower levels of student misbehavior, creating a healthy classroom environment that supports well-being for teachers and students (Mendenhall et al., 2019).

Much of the empirical evidence that supports the link between quality teacher-student relationships and student learning and well-being comes from Western contexts. Longitudinal studies from the United States show that warm relationships between teachers and students and emotionally supportive classrooms lead to positive outcomes related to student engagement, achievement, and mental health “including improved social competence, life satisfaction, and behavioral self-control, as well as reduced depression, anxiety, and aggression” (Torrente et al., 2015, p. 51). However, there is a gap in the empirical evidence base on teacher-student relationships in crisis and conflict-affected settings, including how to foster quality relationships between teachers and students, and what the effects of positive teacher-student relationships are for teacher well-being, student well-being, and student learning (Torrente et al., 2015; Wright, 2009).

In conflict-affected contexts, in particular, attachment relationships play a central role in understanding how children respond to war-related stressors (Betancourt & Khan, 2008). For some children in these settings—especially those who have been separated from their families,
whose parents or caregivers may have died as a result of conflict, or whose parents may be unable to provide necessary emotional support to their children—teachers may be the only supportive adult figures in children’s lives (Winthrop & Kirk, 2005). For children experiencing severe, chronic, or extreme stress—also known as toxic stress—supportive and stable relationships with an adult figure, such as a teacher, can help to mitigate and reverse the detrimental effects that toxic stress has on brain development, and physical and mental well-being (NSCDC, 2014; Shonkoff et al., 2012). However, even when teachers desire healthy, positive relationships with their students, it may be difficult to cultivate these connections for a number of reasons. Teachers who have been displaced themselves may require support for their own well-being prior to being able to foster meaningful connections with students (Wolf et al., 2015a). Additionally, national or host community teachers who are experiencing an influx of refugee students in their classrooms may require additional TPD to form quality relationships with students from different cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). In certain instances, displaced teachers may be better positioned to form supportive relationships with students since they may have experienced the same traumatic events as students, or share students’ linguistic or cultural backgrounds (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Ager & Strang, 2008; Kirk & Winthrop, 2013; Colvin, 2018).

Finally, teacher-student relationships are also highlighted in global education frameworks and reports as central to creating quality school environments and improving learning outcomes (Torrente et al., 2015). For example, the 2005 Global Education and Monitoring Report discusses teacher-students relationships as an “authentic’ form of school improvement” and asserts that improving these relationships is “a prerequisite for enhancing the nature and quality of learning experiences” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 169). Along a similar vein, UNICEF’s Child Friendly Schools Model places teacher-student relationships, including teachers’ management of student behavior, at the core of creating learning environments that are psychologically, emotionally, and physically protective (Wright, 2009). These frameworks highlight the fact that education and schools do not always play a protective role for children in crisis and conflict-affected settings (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013) and that fostering healthy teacher-student relationships is a critical component in creating inclusive classroom environments that support both student and teacher well-being (Wolf, 2015a, 2015b; Kirk & Winthrop, 2007, 2013).

Peer relationships. Peer relationships among teachers are an important school-level factor for teacher well-being that has both personal and professional benefits. One form of positive peer relationships for teachers is collaboration. Research from stable, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts highlight the potential for and benefit of peer collaboration (Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017; Papay, Taylor, Tyler, & Laski, 2016; Mendenhall, Pacifico, & Hu, forthcoming; Mendenhall, 2017; Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Frisoli et al., 2013; Frisoli, 2013). Peer collaboration refers to the working relationships and activities between teachers at a school or across schools (Collie et al., 2012; Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Guskey, 2002) and includes the beliefs that teachers hold about the value of such collaboration (Frisoli, 2013). Teacher professional development plays a key role in fostering peer collaboration among teachers, particularly professional development initiatives that are continuous and enable teachers to create communities of practice. Communities of practice are learning networks that encourage teachers to share knowledge, resources, and ideas in order to continually develop their teaching
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Peer collaboration can occur in formal, organized activities, such as Teacher Learning Circles (TLCs) or in a more informal way, such as teachers asking one another questions or seeking advice. Peer collaboration has been shown to positively impact teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy (Schleicher, 2018), two of the most important teacher well-being constructs identified in the literature. Teaching can be an isolating profession (Prilleltensky et al., 2016) and building in opportunities for productive, positive peer collaboration can lead to increased feelings of self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Further, peer collaboration may contribute to collective efficacy, i.e. people’s shared beliefs in their “collective” ability and purpose, and collective agency, i.e. “people’s shared beliefs in their collective power to produce desired outcomes” (Bandura, 1998, p. 65).

Despite the potential for positive effects, peer collaboration can become a source of stress when inadequate time is provided for collaboration activities, leaving teachers feeling overburdened, even if they find collaboration beneficial. Additionally, in settings with more traditional, hierarchical teacher assessment and professional development, it can be challenging to garner support for peer collaboration, particularly without first obtaining support from school leadership (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). Despite these challenges, peer collaboration holds great potential in crisis and conflict-affected contexts because it embraces an asset-based approach that acknowledges the meaningful contributions and unique strengths of un- or under-trained teachers. In settings where teachers may have limited prior professional development or teaching experience, peer collaboration recognizes teachers’ “alternative qualifications” and cultural competence as meaningful contributions to the profession and to one another (Kirk & Winthrop, 2013). It is important to note that peer collaboration requires clearly identifying teachers’ needs as well as providing the support, resources, and structures (e.g. additional TPD or built-in time for collaboration in the school schedule) necessary for it to be effective and sustainable (Burns & Lawrie, 2015).

The majority of research on peer collaboration in crisis and conflict-affected contexts centers around one form of this practice, TLCs. Two interventions in conflict and displacement settings in East Africa shed light on the experiences and perspectives of teachers participating in TLCs. Frisoli, Frazier, and Hansen (2013) explore teachers’ perceptions of TLCs in the DRC as a continuation of Frisoli’s (2013) dissertation work and a qualitative case study of the IRC’s Healing Classrooms program. Findings from this research highlight the positive perception teachers with limited formal training have about TLCs. Teachers viewed TLCs as meaningful professional development and appreciated the opportunity to socialize and learn from one another. Through their collaboration, teachers were able to strengthen their self-efficacy, which in turn increased their motivation and improved their well-being (Frisoli, Frazier, & Hansen, 2013).

In Kakuma refugee camp, Teachers for Teachers utilized peer coaching to establish TLCs within and between schools in the camp. Program evaluations suggest that the peer collaboration fostered through the TLCs increased teacher self-efficacy, improved teacher well-being, and strengthened teaching instruction, particularly disciplinary practices (see Mendenhall, Pacifico, & Hu, forthcoming; Mendenhall et al., 2019; Mendenhall, 2017). It also strengthened the fragile professional identities some of the refugee teachers brought to their work. Describing his interaction with a peer coach, one South Sudanese refugee teacher explains, “I’ve been teaching but no one has ever commented about how my class is progressing. Not in the school, not even the headteacher...So when [my peer coach] came to my school and mentioned [my use
teaching aids in the lesson, I said, ‘ah, at least my objective and my goals are achieved.’ Now I feel like I’m a real teacher.” While these findings are promising and point to the potential of peer collaboration to support teachers’ professional identity, self-efficacy, and ultimately well-being, more research is needed to understand the ways in which peer collaboration—in its various forms—supports teachers to improve their teaching practice and increase their well-being.

**School leadership.** School leadership influences school climate and teacher well-being (Wolf et al., 2015a). For this review, we refer to school leadership as principals, head-teachers, and other school administrators (Schleicher, 2012). We focus primarily on the interpersonal relationships between school leaders and teachers, as well as school leaders’ support to TPD. We recognize that school leadership and management are impacted by national policies and systems, and address this briefly at the end of the section. School leaders are essential for establishing and maintaining “positive workplace practices that foster working and learning conditions appropriate for well-being” among teachers (McCallum & Price, 2010, p. 32). In an empirical study on teacher well-being among teachers in British Columbia, Collie et al. (2015) found that teachers’ perceptions of school leadership were related to well-being. Similarly, in a study on stress and burnout among teachers in Australia, Howard and Johnson (2004) found that “strong caring leadership was a major source of personal support” for teachers (n=10) (p. 412). In their examination of teacher well-being, Day and Qing (2009) also assert that interactions with and perceptions of school leadership play a large role in influencing teacher emotions and well-being.

School leaders are central actors in shaping working conditions for teachers and the school communities in which teachers cultivate their professional identities. School leaders are, at least partially, responsible for “encouraging, enabling and engendering a culture of trust and care and a sense of belonging in schools” for teachers and students (Day & Qing, 2009, p. 28).

School leaders can have a large effect on teacher turnover. There are myriad ways that school leadership influences teacher turnover, from providing “administrative support, school functioning, hiring, evaluation, and professional development to the organization of time and resources to opportunities for teacher input and creativity in the classroom” (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 67). In a study conducted in middle schools in New York City, Kraft and Marinell (2016) found that turnover rates were close to “25% among teachers who strongly disagree that their administrator encourages and acknowledges staff, communicates a clear vision, and generally runs a school well” (LPI, 2017, p. 1).

School leaders, particularly head teachers, also play a critical role in promoting individual teacher efficacy as well as collective efficacy in schools (Frisoli, 2013). One way that school leaders can promote individual and collective efficacy is by providing professional development opportunities that are relevant and responsive to teachers’ needs (McCallum & Price, 2010; Segal, Jeffries, & Rappaport, 2017). School leaders can support teachers to develop and apply new skills in order to improve their teaching practice which can contribute to teachers’ improved practice, motivation, and well-being. School leaders can also support teachers’ professional development and self-efficacy by assessing teacher growth and progress (Burns & Lawrie, 2015).

Recognition and support from school leaders can lead to more positive relationships between teachers and school leaders, and to increased teacher motivation (Day & Qing, 2009; Mansfield et al., 2016). Teachers working in displacement settings in Uganda pointed out that
even the smallest bit of recognition from school leadership was a motivating factor that helped alleviate some of the school-level challenges they face. A Ugandan secondary school teacher working with refugee and national students in Kampala told a story about how even receiving a small token of appreciation from his school leaders contributed to his motivation: “Like maybe for instance...I woke up at 5 for the purpose of making these students come to class. So if they [school leaders] come and say, take a soda, appreciate me, reinforce me by giving me something small. It makes me feel so good and therefore the following day, I’ll be motivated.” While school leaders play an essential role in supporting teacher growth, performance, and motivation, the behaviors and competencies “required for effective nurturing of teacher performance” are often absent in school leaders in crisis and conflict-affected settings (Burns & Lawrie, 2015, p. 117).

The disparity between the quality of school leadership in more marginalized settings versus more well-resourced settings holds true in other contexts. Research from the United States has found that teachers in high-poverty, low-achieving schools often rate their principals as less effective than teachers working in better-resourced schools (LPI, 2017).

Finally, school leaders and management systems also determine the extent to which teachers are able to participate in decision-making processes at school, which are related to teacher burnout and job satisfaction constructs of teacher well-being. School management systems that are responsive to teachers’ needs and enable teachers to participate in school decision-making processes support teacher agency and dignity, which leads to lower levels of burnout (Asimeng-Boahene, 2003). When school management systems include teachers in decision-making, teachers feel valued and respected, which has been linked to increased teacher commitment and job satisfaction (Mansfield et al., 2016). However, when management systems are opaque and teachers feel they are not able to influence the decisions that impact their working environment, they may experience lower levels of motivation and job satisfaction, and higher potential for burnout (Asimeng-Boahene, 2003).

While it is important to acknowledge the effect that school leaders and management systems can have on teacher well-being, it is also essential to recognize that leaders are often constrained by external factors. Common barriers to effective school management systems in crisis and conflict-affected settings include lack of resources, funding shortages, broken or fragmented teacher salary systems, and high mobility rates among staff, among others (Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Dolan et al., 2012). All of these factors affect teacher well-being but cannot be addressed by school leaders alone; they require collaboration between stakeholders at the international, national, and school level. Though it is beyond the scope of this review, it is also worth underscoring that in order to better support teachers and teacher well-being, school leaders (many of whom are classroom teachers themselves) working in crisis and conflict-affected settings require more and better support for their own professional development and well-being (Mansfield et al., 2016; Schleicher, 2012; Burns & Lawrie, 2015). Future research should examine the link between school management and teacher well-being, including the personal and professional competencies that school leaders in these contexts require to better support their own and their teachers’ well-being.

**School resources.** School resources is the final school-level factor that emerged from the literature on teacher well-being. A lack of resources or infrastructure is related to teacher stress and burnout, as well as a low sense of self-efficacy (Wolf et al., 2015b). Insufficient resources
and infrastructure have also been linked to lower teacher motivation (Guajardo, 2011; Frisoli, 2013). In conflict-affected and displacement settings, school infrastructure can be poor, especially if schools were directly targeted in the fighting. Even undamaged infrastructure may be insufficient, particularly if a community experiences an influx of refugee or IDP children (Burns & Lawrie, 2015; Burde et al., 2015). In these settings, schools may be temporary structures such as tents, particularly if the school infrastructure is set up quickly during or after an emergency. A lack of teaching and learning materials is also common in these settings, and teachers often have to teach lessons without any materials, or with multiple students sharing one textbook (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). Teachers may also lack space to prepare for lessons, mark their students’ work, or meet with their students or fellow teachers since staff rooms may be converted to additional classrooms or storage areas if they exist at all. The challenges related to school resources serve as a stressor for teachers, adding a layer of difficulty to delivering their daily lessons. Despite these challenges, it is worth highlighting that teachers in these settings are extremely resourceful and creative, often using local materials and resources in their lessons.

A lack of school resources can undermine teacher well-being, particularly in crisis and conflict-affected contexts, where there are frequently high student-teacher ratios. For example, a needs assessment conducted in 332 primary, secondary, and junior secondary schools across three states in northeast Nigeria found that 11% of all primary schools surveyed (n=192) had student-teacher ratios of over 160:1 (Igbinedion et al., 2017, p. 32). Large class sizes were a result of destroyed school infrastructure as nearly 40% of all classrooms surveyed (n=7,293) were no longer functioning (ibid, p. 59). As a result, teachers were forced to teach outside, share classrooms, or teach in shifts; all without adequate teaching and learning materials. The lack of school infrastructure and resources, coupled with high student-teacher ratios, resulted in teachers feeling ill-equipped to carry out their jobs, thus taking a toll on morale and well-being (ibid).

Community-level factors

In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of teacher well-being, it is important to understand the community context in which teachers are situated. Though there is a scarcity of literature on the relationship between community-level factors and teacher well-being, the literature that exists points to the following factors as important for teacher well-being: access to basic needs, respect and recognition, and responsibility and duty (Frisoli, 2013; Kirk & Winthrop, 2008; Wolf et al., 2015b; Wessells, 2015).

**Access to basic needs.** Understanding teachers’ ability to meet their basic needs for food, water, shelter, transportation, and physical security is necessary to understand the broader community context (Poston, 2009). The ability to fulfill one’s basic needs is foundational to being able to meet psychological needs, to function well in one’s environment, and to achieve outcomes associated with esteem (e.g. feeling accomplished in one’s work) and self-actualization (e.g. achieving one’s full potential), such as occupational well-being (Poston, 2009). The link between basic needs and well-being is acute in conflict-affected and displacement settings, where both displaced and host community teachers may struggle to access clean water and
sufficient food, find adequate shelter, and afford transportation to and from school (Burns & Lawrie, 2015).

In settlement and camp contexts, refugee teachers are typically dependent upon external providers, such as UN agencies and INGOs, for accessing water, food, and shelter. Insufficient funding and influxes of new arrivals to settlements often have adverse effects on service provision, decreasing the amount and the quality of services provided in the settlement (Meyer et al., 2019). For example, upon an influx of new refugee arrivals in 2019, South Sudanese refugees in Kiryandongo and Adjumani settlements in northern Uganda experienced an increase in food insecurity due to cuts in rations, increased need for psychosocial support, and increased instances of violence and insecurity (Meyer et al., 2019). The inability to meet basic needs had direct and adverse effects on social relationships in the settlements, including between teachers and students in school. Meyer et al. (2019) found that “Increased hunger was routinely linked to increased irritability leading to heightened tensions within adolescent-caregiver relationships [and] between students and teachers at school” (p. 83). The challenge of meeting basic needs was also raised by teachers in Palabek settlement in northern Uganda, and by refugee teachers working in Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya. A South Sudanese refugee teacher in Palabek discussed the challenges she faces meeting the needs of her seven children, and how neither her salary nor the food rations provided by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) were sufficient to support her family: “Because we are depending only on the food given by the UNHCR, that is World Food Programme. And the ratio they are giving is small. Like me, I have three children [of] my own children and I am taking care of almost four others, makes it seven. So they are giving little food, and the little money I am getting from the school I have to use to buy for food.”

Refugee teachers in urban areas also experience challenges in meeting basic needs. Though urban refugees are typically not as reliant on external actors such as the United Nations (UN) and INGOs for services, they are often left to meet basic needs on their own, or are reliant on municipal governments who may lack the capacity to provide services to both host community and displaced populations, or who may be unaware of how many displaced persons reside in the local community and/or which services these populations are unable to access. A lack of information on how to access services and an inability to afford “basic services and amenities such as health care and accommodation” (AGORA, 2018, p. 3) serve as major barriers to refugee teachers residing in urban areas. In urban areas, in particular, the cost of accommodation can be prohibitively high, especially when considering the minimal salaries many teachers are paid. These challenges exist for national teachers as well. Findings from a multisector assessment on access to basic needs in nine urban settlements in Kampala revealed that “refugees and host-communities tend to report relatively similar socio-economic needs” and that Ugandan-headed households were only “slightly better off than their refugee-headed household neighbors” (AGORA, 2018, p. 3). This finding is not unique to Uganda; 85% of refugees reside in neighboring countries, most of which are low- and middle-income and do not have sufficient resources to provide quality services to national populations, let alone to displaced populations (UNHCR, 2018a). Additionally, refugee populations often end up residing alongside marginalized populations within these low- and middle-income host countries, and service provision and funding for refugee populations can inadvertently undermine support to national populations. Therefore, in crisis and conflict-affected contexts, it is often the case that both
displaced and national teachers are struggling to meet basic needs, which in turn undermines their ability to meet their psychological needs and achieve, among other things, outcomes associated with occupational well-being.

Physical security is another basic need that is pertinent for teachers working in areas of ongoing conflict or in communities where education institutions and teachers are the targets of violence and attacks (Igbinedion et al., 2017). According to the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA), “violence directed at students, educators, and their institutions” has increased on a global-scale since 2013 (2018, p. 8). Teachers are the target of attacks in conflict-affected and displacement settings in Central and South America, the Middle East, and sub-Saharan Africa (GCPEA, 2018). For example, during the Colombian conflict, teachers were often threatened or directly targeted as part of the fighting; from 2009-2012, 140 teachers were murdered and more than 1,000 teachers received death threats (GCPEA, 2014). In northeast Nigeria, more than 2,000 teachers have been killed and 19,000 teachers displaced due to the conflict spurred by Boko Haram (UNESCO, 2018). In the Philippines, security forces from the government and paramilitary threatened 140 teachers during the reporting period for Education Under Attack 2018, a nearly 200% increase from the 2014 report (GCPEA, 2018). In Afghanistan, there was a significant increase in documented threats and intimidation of teachers between 2013 to 2016, with written and verbal threats disproportionally affecting girls’ education (UNAMA, 2016). Threats and intimidation led to the closure or partial closure of over 200 schools in 2015, affecting access for more than 50,000 girls (UNAMA, 2016). Many of these challenges related to basic needs are structural (government or military violence), systemic (low or infrequent pay), and beyond the control of teachers, teacher educators, or other education actors working in these settings. Looming, macro-level challenges can be incredibly discouraging but developing an understanding of these challenges —many of which contribute to job stress and burnout—is critical for improving teacher well-being.

**Respect and recognition.** Research suggests that a sense of connection to one’s community is important for one’s psychological and social well-being (Bragin, 2015). Empirical studies from crisis and conflict-affected settings highlight respect and recognition as a community-level factor that interacts with teacher well-being (Frisoli, 2013; Kirk & Winthrop, 2008; Wolf et al., 2015b). Teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts play multiple and important roles for their communities (Frisoli, 2013; VSO, 2002). On one hand, teachers can be regarded by community members as knowledgeable and critical agents that help communities “reach their educational aspirations” (Frisoli, 2013, p. 4). Teachers may experience respect and recognition from community members, who view them as educators not just for students but for the community as a whole (Dembélé & Schwille, 2006). This respect and recognition can serve as a positive influence on teacher dignity, professional identity, and motivation. Teachers themselves draw a connection between respect and recognition from the community and the motivation and pride they feel as teachers. A South Sudanese primary school teacher in Kakuma refugee camp, explains the joy he feels when he is greeted as a teacher. He says, “I feel satisfied because now people recognize a teacher of course. Every time people see me they [say], ‘That’s our teacher.’ That is the recognition that also comes with teaching and I feel happy that I’m actually contributing back.” Being recognized and greeted as a teacher outside of the school compound provides a sense of purpose for this teacher, and makes him feel that he is giving
back to his community.

On the other hand, negative community perceptions of teachers and difficult relationships with community members can undermine teacher dignity, motivation, and well-being. Relationships between teachers and the community can also be complicated by issues related to teachers’ salary and payment as well as the distribution of limited resources. In interviews with teachers in Kampala, it was clear that low salaries contributed to teachers feeling “small” in relation to other community members because they were not able to contribute in a meaningful way to their communities. One secondary school teacher in Kampala made a connection between the insufficient payment and lack of recognition from the community when he said, “recognition today depends on how much you can contribute to the society. You find that in the society we live...our contribution to society is little or is not felt. That depends on our income.” In this example, financial contributions seem to outweigh non-monetary contributions, such as educating children in the community, when it comes to gaining respect and recognition from community members. Low resource environments can further complicate the respect and recognition afforded to teachers as tensions may emerge over resource distribution and allocation. For example, in Uganda, escalating tension over limited resources has sparked clashes between host and refugee communities (Okiror, 2019).

Responsibility and duty. A sense of responsibility and duty to their community influences teachers’ well-being. Teachers contend with various responsibilities and duties outside of school. These can include family and caregiver obligations that may serve as additional stressors that affect teachers’ well-being, particularly if stress over low or delayed salaries makes it difficult for teachers to support their families. Teachers also experience responsibilities within their community that are related to their profession. In conflict-affected and displacement settings, community members often turn to teachers as leaders and expect teachers to help support children’s well-being, particularly during or after times of crisis and conflict (INEE, 2010a; IRC, 2011; Kirk, 2004; Torrente et al., 2015; Frisoli, 2013; Kirk & Winthrop, 2008). For teachers, this expectation may serve as an additional stressor, particularly if teachers are contending with their own psychosocial needs. For “alternatively qualified” and “spontaneous” teachers who become teachers during or after a crisis with little or no experience, this sense of responsibility and duty to the community may compound other stressors related to low self-efficacy and sense of professional identity, impacting their well-being (Kirk & Winthrop, 2008).

On the other hand, a sense of responsibility and duty to one’s community can serve as a protective factor for teacher well-being. Adult learning theories, particularly those situated in self-directed learning (SDL), illustrate the protective elements of feeling a sense of responsibility and duty to one’s community, especially as it pertains to teachers’ motivation and well-being. The notion of homonomy, utilized by Boucouvalas (2009), expands individualistic, Western-oriented notions of the ‘self’ to recognize the critical role of the community in motivating learning. Homonomy refers to “the meaning derived in life by being and feeling part of a greater whole” (Boucouvalas, 2009, p. 3), and emphasizes a “connected self sense” that inspires “motivation that emanates from participation in something greater than the individual” (Boucouvalas, 2009, p. 6). Teachers in crisis contexts experience this “connected self sense” acutely and may draw strength, motivation, and purpose from their responsibility and duty to the community. Studies in stable contexts also underscore the connection between teacher well-
being and a feeling of duty/commitment to the community. In their research with teachers in England, Day and Qing (2009) find that teachers who consider their profession as a “calling” are better able to achieve and sustain a healthy state of well-being.

Feeling that they are giving back to their community through their role as educators can also provide a sense of purpose and strengthen job satisfaction, an important construct for teacher well-being. A male South Sudanese refugee teacher in Kakuma refugee camp describes his sense of purpose poignantly, saying, “When I look at myself I see that I’m capable to contribute into something big. What is bigger than helping the learners within Kakuma refugee camp? There was a time a parent came through that gate and told me, ‘Mwalimu [teacher], here’s my child. Whatever you do with this child it’s your own.’ Then it made me discover something very important. As a teacher when you’re given a child, that child is very innocent. It is as transparent as a piece of glass you can even see through. Whatever the child becomes depends on a teacher. It is me as a teacher that will put the mark on a learner.” Clearly, supporting children’s development gives this teacher a strong sense of purpose and serves as a motivating factor. Yet, this sense of purpose can become a risk factor if the low resource environment decreases teachers’ sense of self-efficacy or increases job stress and burnout.

Another important concept that emerges from the literature on community and well-being is the idea of collective agency and well-being. When considering responsibility and duty to the community, it is important to consider the notion of collective agency, or “people’s shared beliefs in their collective power to produce desired outcomes” (Bandura, 1998, p. 65). In crisis and conflict-affected contexts, collective agency may be threatened by limited or unavailable resources necessary for daily functioning or by damaged social networks. Within the education sector, a sense of collective agency may be threatened by destroyed physical infrastructure, minimal or nonexistent teaching and learning materials, and a lack of qualified teachers. If teachers are not able to meet the expectations placed on them by their community, their students, and themselves, they face increased risks to their well-being.

National-level factors

This section provides an overview of national-level factors that influence teacher well-being. We examine national-level policies related to teacher management, compensation, certification, right to work, and professional development. At the national level, as well as the regional- and global levels, education actors must advocate for policy change and ensure that promising policies are translated into practice effectively in order to improve teacher well-being. It is critical to continually assess how policies are implemented and how they affect the teaching and learning happening inside classrooms.

Teacher management

Teacher management policies have considerable implications for teacher well-being. While teacher management systems across all settings face challenges, these challenges are felt acutely in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts (Mulkeen et al., 2017; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). In these settings, teacher management systems face mass teacher shortages, inadequate funding to cover teacher salaries, and low quality or nonexistent education data, which undermines planning, recruitment, and deployment (Mulkeen et al., 2017;
Nicolai, 2016; UNESCO, 2016). Teacher shortages in these settings are one of the most pressing issues (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018; Mulkeen et al., 2017). National- and local-level data show that most countries experiencing large-scale displacement and/or an influx of refugees or IDPs struggle to find enough teachers to meet the educational needs of the displaced and host community populations (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). For example, in Germany, it is estimated that 24,000 more teachers are needed to meet the educational needs of refugee children (ibid, p. 3). Uganda needs nearly 7,000 more teachers to provide education to the 580,000 primary school-age children in the country, 334,259 of whom are refugees (Uganda MoES, 2018, pp. 10, 13). Large teacher shortages strain the existing teacher corps which is forced to take on large class sizes or work in multiple shifts.

Large-scale teacher shortages often result in an increase in the number of teachers working as incentive, contract, or volunteer teachers, who are hired on short term contracts to fill the gaps in the teaching force (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). These teachers frequently lack formal training or are under-qualified and face difficult working conditions (ibid). They lack job security, often earn less money than teachers on the national payroll, if they are paid at all, and rarely receive access to professional development opportunities, all of which influence their well-being as teachers. The proliferation of un- or under-qualified teachers working as volunteers or incentive teachers is not only detrimental to teachers’ well-being, but it also has negative impacts on students’ well-being and learning. Teachers who step in to fill gaps without training and/or compensation are asked to meet the varied cognitive and social-emotional needs of their students without professional and fiscal support. This lack of support may compromise teachers’ ability to respond to their students’ needs as well as to remain motivated to stay in the profession. In some instances, there are certified and trained teachers available to fill teacher gaps, however national-level policies prohibit the number of teachers who can be on the government payroll. Uganda, for example, is facing teacher shortages, especially in areas hosting large numbers of refugees. However, a ceiling exists for government primary schools which restricts the number of teachers who can be on the payroll in each district (Uganda MoES, 2018). Therefore, though there are certified and trained teachers looking for employment, the ceiling prohibits the government’s ability to address the teacher shortage (ibid). Teacher ceilings, such as the one in Uganda, are often a result of a lack of funding and the government’s inability to pay more teachers’ salaries. In addition to funding, restrictive national qualification and certification standards also prevent countries from hiring refugee and displaced teachers to fill teacher shortages, even when qualified teachers from the displaced population are available to work (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018).

In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, inequitable recruitment of teachers is also common and leads to mass shortages of female teachers in some settings, particularly those where girls face significant barriers to accessing and completing school (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). For example, boys enrollment rates in Pakistan are 50% higher than girls, and in Afghanistan, dropout rates for girls can be as high as 90% (UNHCR, 2016). This educational trajectory has implications for recruiting and hiring female teachers as the entry requirement for teachers, especially at the primary level, is a secondary school diploma. However, as has been explored earlier in this report, empirical evidence shows that increasing the number of female teachers can have positive effects for both students and teachers (Smiley, Moussa, & Brown, 2018). The presence of female teachers encourages families to send their daughters to school.
(Kirk, 2004; Burde et al., 2015; Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018), helps to erode gender stereotypes, and encourages girls to increase their educational aspirations (Sperling & Winthrop, 2016).

Inequitable recruitment, retention, and high turnover rates have important equity implications for students. Turnover typically occurs in more marginalized, low resource school settings, resulting in the further deterioration of these schools and a loss of “continuity in relationships between teachers, parents, and [the] community” which negatively affects students’ access to education, learning outcomes, and well-being (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016, p. 6; Beteille, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2011). Research from the United States finds that students in high-poverty and high-minority settings experience inequitable teacher shortages acutely. “When there are not enough teachers to go around, the schools with the fewest resources and least desirable working conditions are the ones left with vacancies” (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 5). During the 2013-2014 school year, nationally, “on average, high-minority schools had four times as many uncertified teachers as low-minority schools. These inequities also exist between high-poverty and low-poverty schools” (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 5). The evidence reveals that inequitable recruitment and retention of teachers along gender, ethnic, or racial lines results in inequitable educational access and learning outcomes for students. This is especially pertinent to consider in crisis and conflict-affected settings, where inequitable access and learning outcomes for students can further exacerbate existing conflicts and social tensions if access to quality education is a source of grievance (Soares, Smiley, & Lavan, 2018).

**Compensation**

Providing adequate and regular payment to teachers is a persistent challenge on a global scale and one that is particularly severe in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. Teacher salary systems in these settings are compromised by a number of factors, including destroyed payroll records and teacher qualifications, inefficient teacher management systems and auditing mechanisms for tracking teacher pay, and a lack of funding (Golden, 2012). Therefore, payment to both national and displaced teachers in these contexts is often delayed or completely absent (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). Displaced teachers, who are unable to access the national education system, work as incentive or volunteer teachers and receive minimal, if any, pay for their work (Ring & West, 2015). Even when displaced teachers are able to access national schools, pay disparities between the salaries of refugee and national teachers may cause social tensions at school (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). A male Congolese refugee teacher in Kakuma refugee camp explains, “We are doing the same work. We are doing the same work but we are getting different salary. You can find a national teacher is getting fifty thousand. Fifty thousand. Fifty thousand, but an incentive teacher is getting seven thousand. Seven thousand, which even cannot be able to handle the problem with their family. Very little. At least they could say, ‘We are going to give you a half of a national teacher,’ but we are not getting even a half. Even a quarter. Somebody’s getting fifty, and somebody getting seven, and they’re doing the same work.” In Chad, refugee teachers are able to get certified and work in public schools, however, the compensation structure in place is restrictive. Refugee teachers are compensated by UNHCR as incentive teachers and, unlike national teachers, their salaries are not commensurate with their certification or qualifications (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018).
Beyond exacerbating social tensions between national and refugee teachers, policies that result in inequitable or inadequate payment can lower the status of the teaching profession, lower teachers’ sense of professional identity, and hinder their well-being.

For national teachers in these contexts, stress around payment also looms large. Internally displaced teachers who are on the government payroll but working outside of their home district experience challenges accessing their payment, especially if their contract is still managed by their home district (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). In crisis and conflict-affected settings, another challenge teachers face is the inability to collect their salaries safely (Golden, 2012). In Afghanistan, teachers are required to travel to collect their salaries, often through insecure areas (ibid). Given the danger, many teachers send proxies to collect their salaries who extract a travel fee (ibid). The Syrian government was also at one point requiring teachers to travel to government-controlled areas on a monthly basis to collect their salaries (Assistance Coordination Unit, 2017). Many teachers who braved the trip were detained or arrested, discouraging others from collecting their salary and resulting in teachers working without pay (ibid). An inability to collect pay or earn enough money is a major barrier to teacher well-being. In Uganda, national teachers reported that their salaries were insufficient to meet basic needs, and made teachers feel that they were not valued by school leaders, community members, or the Ministry of Education. One Ugandan teacher in Kampala noted how little support teachers receive to meet their basic needs, sharing: “For teachers, there’s nothing. When their [other community members’] children fall sick they are covered. But a teacher, if you don’t have money your child can die.”

Low teacher salary also has direct implications on equitable work experiences for teachers. In order to meet basic needs and provide enough for their families, many teachers end up taking on a second job to subsidize their income from teaching. Teachers in the United States make 30% less than their college-educated peers entering other professions (Darling-Hammond, 2017), and “[in] 11 states, more than 20% of teachers work second jobs during the school year to supplement their incomes, as well as the additional work they take on in the summertime” (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 55). Similarly, refugee and national teachers in Palabek settlement in Uganda described taking on additional jobs to supplement their low salary, which was frequently delayed. According to teachers, challenges related to payment were also linked to other factors that impact well-being, such as a lack of respect and recognition from community members who look down on teachers because of their low salaries. These factors compound to increase teacher stress, which results in high attrition (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016). Delayed and insufficient payment also results in high rates of teacher absenteeism and attrition which impacts equity. In the United States, teacher attrition disproportionately affects teachers of color and counteracts increased efforts to strengthen minority teacher recruitment strategies (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 13).

When national governments in crisis and conflict-affected settings cannot provide adequate funding for teacher salaries, the burden to compensate teachers can fall to I/NGOs (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). However, this approach is not sustainable, as most I/NGOs do not have sufficient funding to support these large recurring payments. Education in crisis and conflict-affected settings is startlingly underfunded; less than 2% of humanitarian funding goes to education (Nicolai, 2016). Organizations working in these contexts face short-term funding
and shrinking budgets and are ill-equipped to finance teacher salaries. Additionally, donors working in these contexts are hesitant to fund recurring costs, such as teacher salaries (Dolan et al., 2012). The proliferation of actors (e.g. national governments, I/NGOs) paying teachers results in unharmonized payment scales and leads to teachers in the same school earning different amounts. A study of the education systems in Syria in 2017 found that 87% of teachers were being paid irregular stipends from different local providers and INGOs (Assistance Coordination Unit, 2017, p. 40). However, there are promising examples of efforts to harmonize teacher pay across providers. For example, in 2018, the Education Cluster in Erbil, Iraq brought together education providers to coordinate an incentive scale for teachers and other education workers (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). Additionally, in 2019, government and non-governmental actors in South Sudan developed a standardized payment scale for teachers across government and I/NGOs to ensure teachers earn equivalent salaries irrespective of their employer. While efforts like the ones in Erbil and South Sudan are a step in the right direction, the inability to sufficiently and consistently compensate teachers remains one of the most pressing issues in education, particularly in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings.

Certification & right to work

Policies on certification and the right to work influence teacher well-being. For displaced teachers, a country’s labor policies dictate whether and where they are able to secure a job—e.g. in the national system or a parallel system run by I/NGOs or CBOs. These policies also have implications for teachers’ access to pre- and in-service professional development. Refugee teachers, in particular, face increased barriers to participating in formal professional development that culminates in recognized certification. Displacement also limits teachers’ ability to progress in the profession, which negatively impacts teachers’ motivation and professional identity. An Ethiopian teacher in Kakuma refugee camp describes the limits on professional growth, explaining, “in Kakuma there is no progress, no progressing now some teachers is teaching 12 years without any progress, 12 years, 15 years, 20 years, no scholarship, no increasement, no another good position.” Despite devoting years of service to the teaching profession, refugees and other non-formal teachers have limited access to continuing professional development or promotions. These constraints negatively influence their well-being as teachers.

Teacher professional development (TPD)

For teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings, a lack of access to pre- and in-service professional development opportunities—particularly consistent and relevant opportunities—leaves teachers un- or underprepared to address the challenges they face in their classrooms. In these contexts, teachers’ displacement status and national labor policies determine the types of professional development they are able to access if they are able to access professional development at all. National TPD policies in many contexts are restrictive and exclude refugee teachers from accessing formal training opportunities that culminate in certification; instead, teachers access training through non-governmental actors. As a result, training ends up being ad hoc and sporadic, provided by a mix of I/NGO, CBO, and government partners, often with little coordination across organizations (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). Since training provided by non-governmental actors often does not lead to certification, many
teachers are left without formal recognition of their training and are unable to work in national education systems or receive the compensation and benefits that come with formal employment (ibid). Additionally, while I/NGOs may implement innovative, responsive professional development for teachers in crisis and conflict-affected contexts, there are often limited opportunities for these actors to collaborate with government entities (e.g. the Ministry of Education) to share promising practices and lessons learned. Further, TPD from I/NGOs may lack subject content knowledge included in professional development from Ministries of Education. The missed opportunity for collaboration across these stakeholders demands attention.

As the teacher profiles and individual-level characteristics in this report indicate, educators working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts enter the profession with varied experiences and educational backgrounds. TPD policies and programs must be tailored to these varying needs. A displaced teacher without prior teaching experience will require different support than a national teacher who now has refugee students in her classroom (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018). While there are promising TPD initiatives, many national policies and training programs in these contexts continue to fall short when it comes to providing comprehensive support to teachers that is tailored to the various needs of teachers and their students. In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings, TPD initiatives rarely enable teachers to meet the complex and shifting educational and emotional needs of their students (Nicolai, 2016). Many teachers who enter the profession in these contexts are “spontaneous” teachers without prior experience (Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). Even displaced teachers who have experience and are certified in their home countries may not be able to access certification and formal training in their host country. Therefore, though they are certified teachers they may lack the subject knowledge, language proficiency, or cultural competencies to support students in their host country effectively. National teachers who experience an influx of refugee or displaced students in their classrooms also require additional support and training to be able to cater to the different educational, language, social-emotional, and psychosocial needs of their students (Mendenhall, Gomez, & Varni, 2018).

Furthermore, as has been referenced throughout this report, teachers in these settings may be contending with their own psychosocial needs that must be addressed prior to being able to support students effectively. In addition to contending with diverse student populations and students’ emotional and psychosocial needs, teachers in these settings are likely dealing with overcrowded classrooms comprised of mixed-age groups (Mendenhall et al., 2015; Mendenhall, 2017). These are daunting conditions for even the most experienced teacher, let alone for teachers who may be un- or underqualified and for teachers who receive minimal support for their own professional development and personal emotional health (Mendenhall et al., 2015; Mendenhall, 2017; Mendenhall, Gomez & Varni, 2018).

As a result of minimal or no professional development support, teachers may face low levels of self-efficacy, low motivation, or feel “left alone” to address these challenges without guidance (Vogel & Stock, 2017, p. 23). Additionally, teachers who are unable to access formal training that leads to certification likely have a difficult time finding jobs with desirable working conditions, benefits, and long-term job security. Teachers without formal certification may also have a fragile professional identity, particularly if they entered the profession with little or no prior experience and have received minimal training (Burns & Lawrie, 2015). A lack of training and ongoing support exacerbates the complex challenges that teachers in these contexts are
facing and undermines their well-being. This persistent lack of TPD opportunities is also detrimental for students. Without training, teachers will not be able to tailor their pedagogy to the diversity in their classrooms, which means that lower-performing students or students who require different types of learning and/or emotional support will likely not receive it, thus perpetuating education inequities that already exist (Darling-Hammond, 2017).

While there are examples of TPD initiatives that provide comprehensive support to teachers in these contexts (see e.g. Teachers for Teachers in Kakuma refugee camp and Kalobeyei settlement, Kenya), there is still a glaring absence of sustained training for teachers that results in formal certification. Additionally, few training programs provide targeted, specific support for teacher well-being; some include well-being as one module of a multi-day training, while other programs include well-being that focuses on the teacher’s role in supporting students’ well-being rather than on the teacher’s own well-being. However, there are promising strides being made in this area and more organizations are recognizing that providing support to teacher well-being through professional development is critical in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts. For example, FHI 360 implements teacher professional development for teachers in El Salvador that supports their well-being through mindfulness strategies and the development of social-emotional competencies; and War Child Holland is working to better support teacher well-being among Palestinian teachers in the Gaza Strip. Organizations that are working to provide more comprehensive professional development support to teachers in these contexts, including to their well-being, should share their findings with the global education community so that the sector can gain a better understanding of what works in these settings to support teacher well-being through professional development.

**Regional- and global-level factors**

This section reviews the ways in which certification and right to work policies at the regional and global levels influence teacher well-being.

**Certification & right to work**

Regional and global policies also have implications for teacher well-being, particularly education and labor policies around certification and the right to work. At both the regional and global level, there are promising policies for the inclusion of displaced teachers into national education systems, including support for cross-border certification, equivalency, and TPD. On a regional level, policies such as the Djibouti Declaration, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems, and the Cartagena Declaration on Refugees outline refugee rights, including the right to education, and set guidelines for integrating refugee teachers into national education systems. The Djibouti Declaration addresses the teacher gap and the needs of displaced teachers specifically, calling on signatories to “strengthen frameworks to promote the inclusion of refugee teachers, and their professional development and certification, in national education systems and support of equivalency” (Djibouti Plan of Action, 2017, p. 2). Additionally, the Djibouti Declaration addresses aligning payment scales for host and refugee teachers, supporting continuous professional development opportunities for all teachers, and increasing gender parity in recruitment and promotion structures (Djibouti Plan of Action, 2017). Both the Cartagena Declaration and the OAU
Convention expand the definition of refugee to encompass varying reasons for displacement and encourage the inclusion of refugees in national systems, including refugee teachers.

At the global level, there are also education frameworks and policies that aim to include refugee teachers in national education systems and to enable displaced teachers to access training and certification in their host country or community. The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants and the accompanying Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) call for the inclusion of refugee students into national education systems. 193 States adopted the New York Declaration and 15 countries signed onto the CRRF. The CRRF in particular aims to support host countries to operationalize inclusive education policies in a contextually-relevant manner. While these documents do not explicitly mention the inclusion of refugee teachers into national education systems, signatory countries have recognized the need to include refugee teachers. For example, Chad “officially converted all refugee community schools into government public schools and has enrolled refugee teachers in official teacher training colleges affording them national certification” (UNHCR, 2018b, p. 8). Germany established the Refugee Teachers Programme in Potsdam University, an 18-month program designed to support refugee teachers to learn about and gain entry into the German education system (Le Blond, 2018). More generally, the New York Declaration (2016) urges signatory countries, particularly those hosting large numbers of refugees, to open their labor markets as well as establish equivalency programs that recognize foreign qualifications.

While there are promising policy developments at both the regional and global levels that promote the inclusion of displaced teachers and students in national systems, it remains to be seen if and how these policies translate into practice and improved outcomes for all teachers and students. The policies and guidelines referred to above directly support factors that contribute to teacher well-being, but they do not explicitly address or prioritize teacher well-being, a glaring absence considering the extraordinary expectations placed on teachers in these settings. The global push toward inclusion and the provision of quality and equitable education for displaced and host community children is encouraging, however, without more comprehensive support to teachers and their well-being, these policies will not be translated into practice effectively and both displaced and host community children will be denied their right to quality and equitable education.

Section 5: Future Research and Recommendations

Our review of the existing evidence base reveals that improving teacher well-being has important implications for teachers, students, and education systems. In low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts it is imperative to provide comprehensive support to teachers to ensure that the most marginalized populations receive equitable and quality education opportunities. In displacement settings where governments, the UN, and I/NGOs are working to contextualize and implement more inclusive education policies, such as the CRRF, there is a window of opportunity to ensure that teacher well-being is a core consideration in operationalizing these policies. Keeping teachers and teacher well-being at the center of education policy, practice, and research is not only necessary to build sustainable education systems that provide equitable education opportunities, it is also the least that we, the global education community, can do for the teachers who continue working and supporting their
students in the world’s most extreme and difficult circumstances. This section presents recommendations for future research and a Key Actions Matrix to support researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to operationalize the conceptual framework and the findings from this report.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the paucity of literature and empirical research on teacher well-being in conflict-affected and displacement settings, it is imperative to gather more empirical, longitudinal evidence in order to better understand teacher well-being and how best to support and sustain it. Perhaps most importantly, there is a striking absence of teachers’ own perspectives in the literature on teacher well-being. Researchers must prioritize participatory methodologies that include teachers and communities in every stage of the research process. Teachers’ perspectives should be included in all research that is about them, but perhaps especially, in research that relates to their well-being. Without hearing from teachers directly, the research will never be able to provide a comprehensive understanding of teacher well-being in conflict-affected and displacement settings. We suggest the following approaches, areas, and topics for future research on teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings:

Contextualization

- Use participatory methodologies. Apply the conceptual framework presented in this report to various low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts in order to identify factors that are consistent and different across settings, and to contextualize the framework further to these settings;
- Examine existing research on teacher well-being from non-English language sources. Research from other languages should be compiled to bolster this teacher well-being landscape review and conceptual framework;
- Examine teacher well-being in naturally-induced crises as well as the ways in which natural disasters affect teachers’ experiences in conflict-affected and displacement contexts;
- Examine the ways in which complex crises (conflict, food insecurity, displacement, etc.) influence teacher well-being.

Social-emotional competence

- Explore the effects of developing particular social-emotional competencies on well-being, and whether certain competencies influence teacher well-being more than others;
- Assess how to most effectively develop teachers’ social-emotional competence through TPD, with attention to the content and process of TPD;
- Examine the impact of teachers’ social-emotional competence on teacher outcomes and the relationship to classroom climate and student holistic outcomes (e.g. teacher retention, and student learning and well-being).
**Teacher-student relationships**
- Explore how teacher-student interactions, and the perspectives that teachers and students have of one another, influence teacher well-being and student well-being;
- Examine how teachers and students define and understand ‘quality’ relationships, and assess how to foster quality relationships among teachers and students;
- Explore the effects of quality teacher-student relationships on teacher and student outcomes (e.g. teacher retention, teacher well-being, student achievement and well-being, student motivation).

**Peer relationships**
- Examine how various forms of peer collaboration (e.g. formal and non-formal collaboration) support teacher well-being, and what the most effective forms of peer collaboration are for supporting teacher well-being;
- Assess school-level attributes and characteristics that contribute to effective and sustainable peer collaboration.

**School leadership**
- Examine the link between school management and teacher well-being, including the personal and professional competencies that school leaders in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts require to better support their own and their teachers’ well-being.

**Community contexts**
- Examine the relationship between community-level factors and teacher well-being.

**Employment status and right to work**
- Examine the influence of employment status on individual-level constructs of self-efficacy, job satisfaction, stress and burnout, and social-emotional competence.

**Teacher attrition**
- Conduct longitudinal research on teachers’ reasons for staying in or leaving the profession;
- Calculate the cost of high attrition to school systems in crisis and conflict-affected settings;
- Calculate the link between teacher well-being, teacher retention and respective cost-savings to an education system.

**Teacher mobility**
- Conduct longitudinal research on teacher mobility, and teachers’ perspectives and experiences of moving, including patterns of mobility (spatial and geographic) and whether teachers move with, to, or from their families, with particular attention to cross-border mobility;
- Explore teacher mobility and the ways in which it influences certain outcomes for teachers (e.g. attrition, cross-border certification).
**Equity implications**

- Examine the relationship between teacher well-being and student well-being and learning; and the ways in which teacher well-being influences equitable outcomes for teachers, students, and education systems.

**Key Actions Matrix**

This Matrix recommends activities for supporting teacher well-being at the individual, school, community, national, regional, and global levels at different phases of emergency response. The actions aim to provide comprehensive support to teachers in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, including to their well-being. We recognize that the phases are not mutually exclusive and that many of these actions will need to take place consistently and at multiple times across the three phases. This report defines the phases of emergency response as:

- **Acute crisis**: A crisis in which disruptive events have recently occurred or increased in intensity. Acute crises include the initial phase of a crisis and/or the worsening impact of a crisis (Burde et al., 2015, p. 6). In situations of acute crisis, schools and/or education systems may be damaged or destroyed and temporary education infrastructure may be set up rapidly in the form of tents and other temporary structures.

- **Protracted crisis**: Also referred to as a chronic crisis; a crisis in which a large subsection (according to UNHCR: 25,000 people or more) of a population has been displaced for five years or longer (UNHCR, 2008). In some situations of protracted crisis, host governments may take steps to include internally displaced and refugee populations in national schools. In other instances, refugees and IDPs continue to access education through non-formal and/or I/NGO- or CBO-run systems.

- **Early recovery**: A “multidimensional process of recovery” in crisis and conflict-affected contexts guided by development principles that aim to foster local, sustainable, and resilient processes post-crisis, and to restore the capacity of national institutions and communities to recover from crises and incorporate contingency plans to respond to future crises (IASC, 2008, p. 6).
### Teacher Well-being Outcomes

When global, national, and local education stakeholders implement policies and practices that support teacher well-being in low-resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, there is an opportunity to increase teacher retention and create inclusive learning environments that support greater equity opportunities and better learning outcomes (cognitive, social, and emotional) for students.

**Foundational outcomes:** Increased teacher self-efficacy; improved teacher social-emotional competence; increased teacher job satisfaction; decreased job stress; improved quality of instruction; increased teacher participation in school-level decision-making; improved classroom and school climate.

**Intermediate outcomes:** Improved teacher well-being; increased teacher retention; improved student learning and well-being outcomes; more systematized, contextualized TPD; strengthened relationships between schools and communities.

**System-level outcomes:** More gender-sensitive, equitable recruitment, deployment, and compensation for teachers; high numbers of more experienced teachers with increased capacity to mentor novice teachers; more sustainable education systems; more equitable access to and quality of learning for students; increased student completion and transition rates and decreased student drop out.

### Process

In order to achieve the outcomes above, global, national, and local education stakeholders (e.g. ministries of education; teacher training colleges; local education institutions; local communities and families; non-governmental organizations; donors) must increase their commitment to improving teacher well-being by providing comprehensive, contextualized support to teachers at the individual, school, community, and national levels. Efforts to improve teacher well-being should follow a participatory process that: 1) includes and values the perspectives and experiences of teachers, 2) works across relevant sectors (education, labor, finance, etc.) and fields (e.g. mental health-psychosocial support (MH-PSS)) in policy design, program planning and implementation, and assessment and monitoring, and 3) contextualizes the following programmatic and policy guidance. The programmatic and policy guidance below provides key actions aligned with the six levels of the teacher well-being conceptual framework and the INEE Minimum Standards.
### Programmatic and Policy Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Phase of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual (Teacher-related)</td>
<td>Mixed-methods approaches for assessments are strongly recommended; qualitative approaches, in particular, provide opportunities to better understand teachers’ perspectives and experiences. Conduct assessments through joint efforts from government and local actors to gather information on individual-level factors (characteristics), including displacement status, gender, employment status, teaching experience, level of education, and other important equity factors related to marginalization. This assessment should also include gathering information on teacher accommodation, distance to school (transport), access to clean water, and other basic needs. At the emergency phase of the response, it will be important to conduct needs assessments to better understand the teacher profiles and communities in which teachers are working. Ongoing assessments in chronic and early recovery may seek to assess changes in the factors above, improvements from programs or policies, or changing needs of teachers and communities.</td>
<td>Acute/Emergency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S1. Participation); Analysis (S1. Assessment, S3. Monitoring, S4. Evaluation); Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S3. Support and Supervision)*
| Implement responsive, gender-sensitive pre- and in-service teacher professional development (TPD) that leads to certification and that adopts an asset-based approach to recognize teachers’ existing experience, skill sets, and characteristics as strengths and contributions to the profession.  

*INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment (S1. Equal Access); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development, and Support)* | X | X | X |
|---|---|---|---|
| Implement continuous professional development programs, such as teacher learning circles and peer observation, that provide teachers instructional and social support, and opportunities to reflect on their teaching practice as they work to make and maintain positive changes in their teaching practice.  

*INEE MS: Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development, and Support)* | X | X | X |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provide TPD for teachers to learn about and develop their own social-emotional competencies and well-being, mindfulness and stress-management techniques to address the stress of their work as well as additional stress from living and working in crisis-affected contexts.  

*INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment (S2. Protection and Well-being, S3. Facilities and Services); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support); Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Support and Supervision)* | X | X | X |
|---|---|---|---|
| Identify existing MH-PSS support structures and collaborate with protection and health sectors to establish referral systems for MH-PSS in the school and/or community for teachers who need specialized support.  

*INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment* | X | X | X |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S3. Support and Supervision)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include social-emotional learning (SEL) in pre- and in-service TPD to support teachers to integrate SEL into their lessons in order to develop students’ social-emotional competencies and well-being.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment (S2. Protection and Well-being); Teaching and Learning Domain (S1. Curricula, S2. Training, Professional Development and Support) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provide TPD on classroom management and positive discipline to equip teachers with the knowledge and skills to proactively prevent and positively respond to student misbehavior; and provide TPD on child protection, well-being, and development to enable teachers to better understand the behaviors and needs of their students. | X | X | X |

| INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment (S2. Protection and Well-being); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in the development, design, and facilitation of professional development programs. | X | X | X |

| INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S1. Participation); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School The programmatic guidance for this level aims to improve | Provide professional development for school leaders, ministry inspectors, and supervisors to promote equitable working conditions that are inclusive for marginalized and underrepresented teachers. | X | X |

<p>| | | |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School climate and support quality relationships between teachers and school leaders, peers, and students.</th>
<th>INEE MS: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Support and Supervision); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional development to school leadership on positive leadership and supportive communication to create participatory school management systems with increased teacher participation in school-level decision-making; and provide opportunities for head teachers to attend—or familiarize themselves with—teachers’ professional development so that they can better support teachers to implement new skills in their classrooms.</td>
<td>INEE MS: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Support and Supervision); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include time for continuous TPD, such as teacher learning circles and co-lesson planning, in school schedules to provide in-school time for peer collaboration.</td>
<td>INEE MS: Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support); Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Support and Supervision)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for and adhere to national standards for teacher-student ratios, adequate teaching and learning materials, and fair distribution of classes.</td>
<td>INEE MS: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Conditions of Work)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a whole-school approach when designing and implementing programs to ensure that all teachers have the opportunity to</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participate and benefit from the program, and that changes are made and sustained on an individual-teacher and school-level.

*INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S1. Equal Access); Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support); Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Support and Supervision)*

Collaborate with child protection sector/staff to strengthen the referral systems and follow up for child protection and MH-PSS in the school and community.

*INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services)*

### Community

The programmatic guidance for this level seeks to understand the community contexts in which teachers live and work, and the key actions aim to create opportunities for the community to interact with teachers and engage in school programs.

Conduct a risk and resource mapping in the community to understand the existing formal and informal structures, resources, and individuals that may be risk or protective factors for teachers; use humanitarian needs assessments to understand teachers’ needs.

*INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S2. Resources); Analysis (S1. Analysis)*

Establish and provide training for Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) on the importance of education and the role of teachers in crisis contexts; mobilize members to provide support for non-teaching tasks at school (e.g. feeding programs, security, teachers’ incentives for irregular salaries).

*INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S1. Participation); Coordination (S1. Coordination)*

<p>| | X | X | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th><strong>Provide opportunities for teachers and PTA and SMC members to interact with one another (e.g. inviting community members to a teacher training, organizing teacher appreciation days).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S1. Participation); Coordination (S1. Coordination)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th><strong>Strengthen national Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) through multi-stakeholder data collection to better understand teacher profiles and professional development needs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Foundational Standards Domain - Community Participation (S1. Participation), Coordination (S1. Coordination); Analysis (S1. Assessment); Education Policy Domain (S1. Law and Policy Formation; S2. Planning and Implementation)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th><strong>Review national teacher competency frameworks to see if and how issues related to teacher well-being are included, and the extent to which frameworks include guidance around working with displaced teachers and students.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain (S1. Law and Policy Formation)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th><strong>Advocate for the inclusion of teacher well-being in national education policies; integrate support for teacher well-being into Teacher Training Colleges (TTCs) and other national and local education institutions.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|          | **district resources and services.**                                                                                            |
|          | *INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>district resources and services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>district resources and services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>district resources and services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>district resources and services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Advocate and collaborate across Ministries (e.g. Education, Labor, Finance, Social Welfare) to allow displaced teachers to access the</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>district resources and services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INEE MS: Access and Learning Environment Domain (S2. Protection and Well-being; S3. Facilities and Services); Education Policy Domain</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession, along with the associated benefits of the profession (e.g. certification, compensation, parental leave, sick pay).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INEE MS</strong>: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S1. Recruitment and Selection; S2. Conditions of Work); Education Policy Domain (S2. Planning and Implementation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include policies in national education sector plans to prepare for and respond to crises and displacement (e.g. rapid deployment of teachers or recruitment of contract teachers to high-need areas).

**INEE MS**: Foundational Standards Domain - Analysis (S2. Response Strategies); Education Policy Domain (S1. Law and Policy Formation, S2. Planning and Implementation)

Ensure sufficient and timely payment for teachers, aligned with the local economy, and harmonize pay-scales across education providers.

**INEE MS**: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Conditions of Work)

Ensure compensation aligns with teachers’ experience and qualifications; provide hardship allowances for teachers working in crisis and conflict-affected areas.

**INEE MS**: Teachers and Other Education Personnel Domain (S2. Conditions of Work)

Provide pathways to certification through pre- and in-service professional development from national TTCs and/or alternative programs, such as partnerships between organizations and formal educational institutions or distance/blended learning programs.

**INEE MS**: Teaching and Learning Domain (S2. Training, Professional Development and Support)

<p>| X | X | X |
| X | X | X |
| X | X | X |
| X | X | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Strengthen and/or establish regional frameworks to promote the inclusion of displaced and returnee teachers into national education systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INEE MS: Education Policy Domain (S2. Planning and Implementation)</strong></td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Create pathways for certification equivalency for refugee and returnee teachers to ensure their qualifications and experiences are recognized in their host country or country of origin.

**INEE MS: Foundational Standards - Analysis (S2. Response Strategies)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Establish mechanisms for collecting and sharing good practices for the inclusion of displaced and returnee teachers into national education systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INEE MS: Foundational Standards - Coordination (S1. Coordination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The policy guidance in this level aims to generate more evidence around teacher well-being in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected settings and garner increased attention and support to teachers in these contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a global agenda to draw more attention to the needs of teachers working in low resource, crisis, and conflict-affected contexts, and to promote comprehensive professional and personal support to teachers in these settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the generation of evidence on teacher well-being (see Section 6: Future Research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the provision of global goods, best practices, evidence generation, and policy guidance on teacher well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A: Academic Journals and Key Search Terms

Academic Journals
1. Advances in Teacher Emotion Research
3. American Psychologist
4. Annual Review of Psychology
5. Canadian Journal of Education
6. Child Abuse and Neglect
7. Child Development Perspectives
8. Children and Society
10. Comparative Education Review
11. Economic Development and Cultural Change
12. Educational Psychology Review
13. Educational Review
15. Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry
17. European Journal of Psychology of Education
18. Gender and Development
19. Gender and Education
20. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs
21. International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives
22. International Journal of Educational Research
24. International Review of Education [Special Issue on Quality Education in Africa: Challenges & Prospects]
25. International Review of Psychiatry
26. Journal of Comparative and International Education
27. Journal of Educational Psychology
28. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment
29. Journal of Refugee Studies
30. Journal of School Psychology
31. Journal of Student Wellbeing
32. Journal of Teacher Education
33. Journal on Education in Emergencies
34. Mental Health in Schools
35. Pediatrics
36. Phi Delta Kappan
37. Psychology in Schools
38. Review of Educational Research
39. Social Psychology of Education
40. Social Science and Medicine
41. Teachers and Teaching
42. Teaching and Teacher Education
43. The Future of Children
44. The Social Studies
45. Theory Into Practice

Key Search Terms
- Caregiver well-being
- Crisis
- Conflict-affected
- Displaced
- Education in emergencies
- Equity
- Forcibly displaced
- Low resource
- Mental health
- Occupational well-being (wellbeing)
- Public health
- Psychosocial well-being (wellbeing)
- Refugee well-being
- Resilience
- Social-emotional well-being (wellbeing)
- Student well-being (wellbeing)
- Teacher well-being (wellbeing)
- Well-being (wellbeing)