

Confronting Research Neocolonialism: Reflections on a Quantitative Study Codesign in Myanmar

Authors: Gray Rinehart, Myat Thandar Aung, Naw Bway Paw, May Yi Myint, and Saw Ler Moo

Source: *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (July 2026), pp. 189-201

Published by: Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies

Stable URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/2451/75797>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33682/awta-dd61>

REFERENCES:

This is an open-source publication. Distribution is free of charge. All credit must be given to authors as follows:

Rinehart, Gray, Myat Thandar Aung, Naw Bway Paw, May Yi Myint, and Saw Ler Moo. 2026. "Confronting Research Neocolonialism: Reflections on a Quantitative Study Codesign in Myanmar." *Journal on Education in Emergencies* 11 (1): 189-201.
<https://doi.org/10.33682/awta-dd61>.

The *Journal on Education in Emergencies (JEiE)* publishes groundbreaking and outstanding scholarly and practitioner work on education in emergencies (EiE), defined broadly as quality learning opportunities for all ages in situations of crisis, including early childhood development, primary, secondary, non-formal, technical, vocation, higher and adult education.

Copyright © 2026, Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies.



The *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, published by the [Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies \(INEE\)](#), is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#), except where otherwise noted.

CONFRONTING RESEARCH NEOCOLONIALISM: REFLECTIONS ON A QUANTITATIVE STUDY CODESIGN IN MYANMAR

GRAY RINEHART, MYAT THANDAR AUNG, NAW BWAY PAW,
MAY YI MYINT, AND SAW LER MOO

ABSTRACT

Research neocolonialism—a term we use to describe situations where actors from the Global North design and control research while their partners from the Global South play subordinate roles—is pervasive in the education in emergencies field. In this field note, we reflect on our efforts to push back against these dynamics while codesigning quantitative instruments for the Myanmar research program of the Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crises consortium. Working in monastic and ethnic Karen settings, we sought to move from adapting generic global tools to developing instruments that could serve the local education communities. We describe our codesign process and identify three principles that guided the work: redistributing epistemic authority, practicing contextual and cultural humility, and recognizing the interdependence of different forms of expertise. We also acknowledge where we fell short: compressed timelines, informal rather than intentional learning, and structural arrangements that limited investment in research capacity in the Global South. Our reflections are from Myanmar, but we believe they carry relevance for North-South partnerships wherever neocolonialism shapes how knowledge is produced. Codesign is not a formula, but relational and ethical work.

INTRODUCTION

Recent scholarship has challenged research in education in emergencies (EiE) because of its entanglements with colonial and imperial logics, particularly in partnerships between actors in the Global North and Global South (Barakat, Bellino, and Paulson 2024). Power asymmetries shape how knowledge is produced: Northern funders often

Received December 1, 2025; revised February 8, 2026; accepted March 10, 2026;
electronically published July 2026.

Journal on Education in Emergencies, Vol. 11, No. 1.

Copyright © 2026 by the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE).

ISSN 2518-6833

set research agendas; Northern researchers tend to lead projects and define what counts as valid knowledge;¹ Southern researchers frequently find their labor extracted, with the data they gathered analyzed and published in the Global North (Shah et al. 2023; Shah et al. 2024). As Moghli and Shuayb (2022) argue, more equitable partnerships require researchers to examine their own positionality, unlearn assumptions about unfamiliar contexts, recognize that knowledge flows in multiple directions, and push back against the structural hierarchies of Global North institutions.

Shanks and Paulson (2022, 169) remind us that ethical research in EiE “is not dependent solely on the activity at the site of research, but also on decisions made across the entire ecosystem of a research project.” Taking this seriously, we use this field note to continue our team’s effort to document the ethical, participatory, and equitable research processes used in the Myanmar research program of the Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crises (ERICC) consortium. Whereas our earlier reflections examined the co-creation of a country-level research agenda (Rinehart et al. 2025), we focus here on study codesign—specifically, on how we collaboratively developed quantitative instruments for two distinct schooling contexts, monastic education and education for ethnic Karen people, both of which operate within conflict-affected and politically contested settings.

Our authorship reflects a Global South partnership between the Myanmar Country Research Team (CRT), Phoo Pwint Wai Thi (PPWT), and the Karen Education and Culture Department (KECD). All authors are based in the Global South; most are affiliated with Global South institutions, one is independent, and all but one of us are from the Global South. This shared positionality shapes the ethical commitments and relational practices behind our approach.

In this field note, we focus on the ethical dimensions of codesigning quantitative research instruments—a topic that receives far less attention in the EiE literature than qualitative approaches. We begin by unpacking how we understand research neocolonialism in North-South partnerships and consider its implications for our multicountry study, which aims for a cross-country comparison. We then describe how we collaborated with our partners from the Global North to develop fit-for-purpose questionnaires for students, teachers, and principals. Finally, we reflect on three principles that helped make our codesign process more equitable, and where we still need to improve.

¹ We use *Northern* and *Southern* researchers as shorthand for researchers affiliated with Global North and Global South institutions, respectively. Research neocolonialism operates primarily through institutional power rather than through the identities of individual researchers, who are mobile and heterogeneous in their positionalities, irrespective of their geographical or racial origin.

RESEARCH NEOCOLONIALISM

Across our collective experiences, we have observed—and at times directly encountered—a constellation of practices that we call research neocolonialism.² By this we mean arrangements in which Global North actors design, control, and direct research carried out in the Global South while involving local actors primarily in subordinate, instrumental, and/or implementation roles. The result is that intellectual labor and data extracted from the Global South is then analyzed, theorized, and packaged in the Global North. The evidence comes from Southern communities; the thinking happens in Northern institutions.

Research neocolonialism operates through three interrelated dimensions: epistemological, relational, and motivational. It is doctrinaire in its adherence to Northern theories, methods, and frameworks as “universally valid knowledge” while sidelining alternative ways of knowing.³ It is characterized by paternalistic assumptions that Northern partners “know best” and that Southern actors require oversight or guidance. It also presents a benevolent framing of research as “helping” or “doing good,” thereby obscuring power asymmetries, shielding practices from critique, and creating a moral hierarchy between “helper” and “helped.”

These dynamics are often set in motion before Southern partners enter the picture. Donors from the Global North frequently require predefined research questions, methodologies, and analytical frameworks before they award funding, which means that the design of a study is largely completed before Southern researchers are meaningfully involved. As Shah et al. (2023, 512) observe, this reproduces a pattern in which Northern organizations “stretch a hand to involve the locals, pay them for the roles they are to perform, and put up measures to ensure those roles are performed... ‘he who pays the piper dictates the tone.’” This intersects with what Tilley and Kalina (2021) describe as the gatekeeping burden placed on Southern researchers, who are expected to mediate Northern researchers’ access to communities while having limited influence over conceptual or methodological decisions. Haelewaters, Hofmann, and Romero-Olivares (2021) call this helicopter research: Northern researchers descend on Global South settings, where they conduct studies and depart without engaging in any meaningful collaboration, coauthorship, or sharing of benefits.

2 We use *neocolonial* rather than *colonial* to emphasize that our critiques are typically reproduced through contemporary (and conventional) arrangements, while also acknowledging that these dynamics may sit atop longer histories of imperialism. We also recognize forms of research collaboration, such as academic activism and solidarity movements, that challenge conventional arrangements.

3 Throughout this field note, we use quotation marks—sometimes called scare quotes—around terms (e.g., “universally valid knowledge”) to signal critical distance from the assumptions or framings these phrases imply, rather than to indicate direct quotation.

We are not writing from a position of innocence. Several of us have worked on projects where these dynamics played out, where we have facilitated access, collected data, and then watched the analysis and publication happen elsewhere and for others. This is one reason why we have tried, in the work described here, to do things differently.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

Myanmar is one of four countries in the ERICC Pathways for Learning multicountry study; the others are South Sudan, Bangladesh, and Jordan. The study uses large-scale longitudinal surveys to generate evidence that aligns with the ERICC Conceptual Framework (Kim et al. 2026). Data is collected on conditions of conflict and crisis, four drivers of learning (access, quality, continuity, coherence), and student outcomes related to academic performance, social and emotional learning, and wellbeing.

We want to be clear that our own research with ERICC has not been immune from certain neocolonial dynamics. The overarching ERICC research architecture—its global research agenda, conceptual framework, and methods—was established before the Myanmar CRT had been fully formed and before formal partnerships with PPWT and KECD were in place. We did not shape the foundations of the overall multicountry study. Our role has been to work with principal investigators from the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and University College London (UCL), the consortium coleads, to operationalize the global research agenda by developing research processes and instruments that are meaningful, feasible, and appropriate for Myanmar's diverse, fragmented, and conflict-affected landscape.

Since the 2021 military coup, many nonstate education providers operate outside and in parallel to the central public education system, across different political and territorial authorities (Salem-Gervais et al. 2024). As South (2025) argues, Myanmar can no longer be understood as a coherent nation-state; it is better described as a space of multiple sovereignties, each with its own claims to legitimacy. In this context, orienting research and its findings toward the stakeholders with local legitimacy and decisionmaking authority is methodologically sound and ethically necessary. These stakeholders are best positioned to interpret research endeavors in ways that are beneficial to their education community. Hence, the Myanmar study operates through partnerships with PPWT in monastic schooling settings and KECD in Kawthoolei.

Monastic schools follow the national curriculum and policies set by the Naypyitaw Ministry of Education, but they have considerable autonomy in how teaching and learning happen. In the absence of regular ministerial support, they receive assistance from nongovernmental organizations such as PPWT. Accordingly, research evidence should serve not the Ministry but PPWT and the members of the monastic order they

work with, including principals and the national and subnational monastic committees involved in education planning. KECD, meanwhile, functions as the education wing of the political organization representing the self-determination aspirations of the ethnic Karen communities in Kawthoolei. KECD determines its own policies, develops the Karen curriculum, and oversees teacher management and school governance. Its leadership and the bodies shaping education delivery are the primary audience for research evidence.

Research neocolonialism manifests when external actors assume, explicitly or not, that the “appropriate” audience for EiE evidence is a central state ministry or international agency. In Myanmar, such assumptions are inaccurate and harmful. Partnerships with PPWT and KECD challenge the neocolonial logic that institutions in the Global North are best positioned to decide for whom evidence is produced and whose educational priorities matter most.

THE CODESIGN PROCESS

When quantitative instruments are developed without meaningful input from actors in local EiE settings, they risk imposing external constructs, norms, and measurement models that lack contextual and cultural validity and have limited relevance for participants and stakeholders. This is an ethical and methodological issue. Rigorous quantitative research requires collaborative practices through which instruments can be designed in situ, with local expertise shaping what is measured and how. This requires navigating extractive or transactional approaches wherein generic, “off-the-shelf” instruments may be the focus or instruments developed by particular authors or organizations may be desired.

We understand codesign as an iterative process of shared decisionmaking in which Northern and Southern expertise—technical, relational, cultural, contextual—jointly shapes research priorities, constructs, item phrasing, ethical boundaries, and implementation strategies. It involves redistributing epistemic authority and recognizing that validity is negotiated across different perspectives, not handed down from the North.

Working with colleagues from the IRC and UCL, we developed background questionnaires for monastic and Karen students, teachers, and principals across four phases: grounding, building, testing, and refining. Test consultants from each setting worked in parallel with an IRC specialist to design literacy and numeracy assessments tailored to each curriculum. This work was done largely by others not on our primary research teams; thus, the reflections that follow focus on the codesign of questionnaires.

PHASE 1: GROUNDING

Principal investigators from the IRC and UCL convened weeklong workshops with PPWT and KECD in Myanmar and Thailand, respectively. These events socialized the overarching Pathways for Learning study architecture and created space for negotiating how to operationalize it in each context. Drawing from their knowledge of local schooling structures, community dynamics, conflict-related constraints, and what education leaders need from the research, PPWT and KECD led decisions on purposive sampling criteria and what evidence each study should prioritize.

Northern colleagues shared compilations of largely generic items from global surveys that aligned with our study's thematic areas. These provided a starting point, but they also revealed limitations. Many required substantial reworking to reflect the lived realities of children and education personnel in monastic and Karen settings. Through lengthy discussions, it became clear that developing instruments would not be a matter of transferring global tools to Myanmar. Rather, it would require us to jointly negotiate meaning, intent, and feasibility. This phase established the shared North-South foundations, relational and conceptual, on which subsequent work would depend.

PHASE 2: BUILDING

Over several months, the collaborators worked across geographies, some entirely online and others through online and in-person work. We combined video calls—often with our principal investigator from UCL—with extensive offline drafting and, when possible, in-person reviews with colleagues working in physical proximity.

Our focus was twofold. First, we crafted background questionnaires for participants whose educational lives are shaped by instability, displacement, political contestation, and civil war. Second, we identified social and emotional learning and wellbeing scales that were worth piloting, with inspiration from global instruments psychometrically tested in more stable, often wealthier or Western settings. For the background questionnaires, we drew from precedents from the Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics (implemented in Myanmar in 2019) and the Young Lives Survey (with which our principal investigator had prior experience). For the scales, we examined measures of resilience, school belonging, empathy, and individual attitudes, and asked what assumptions the scales held and whether those assumptions held in our contexts.

We tried to stay attentive throughout to the relational labor that codesign demands when working across geographic, cultural, and institutional boundaries. We created space for reflection and negotiation with our Southern team members and our Northern colleagues. Concerns were surfaced, priorities adjusted, and tensions named. This was fractious at times, such as during discussions about whose priorities were being served or what time and budget limitations we faced, but we made compromises and most

issues were resolved. Our instruments grew more grounded as our own understanding deepened of what rigorous and ethical measurement requires in these settings, and as our Northern colleagues became more familiar with the realities of education in the monastic and Karen contexts.

PHASE 3: TESTING

We piloted all instruments in Burmese and S'gaw Karen, the main languages of each research setting. Our colleagues ran statistical analyses of scale performance, which we used to evaluate suitability and inform selection. We looked at internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha), construct validity (factor analysis), and distribution of responses.

We also carried out a qualitative pilot of the questionnaires. Students and teachers participated in focus group discussions, and principals were interviewed. These methods were essential for identifying issues of comprehension, cultural resonance, and administrative feasibility.

PHASE 4: REFINING

Insights from the pilot led to further revisions. Through several iterations, our instruments became more contextually grounded, linguistically accessible, and culturally appropriate for the monastic and Karen education communities. The process was intensive, and it was also valuable in terms of resisting research neocolonialism by ensuring that the evidence to be produced remained accountable to those the research aimed to serve.

PRINCIPLES FOR CODESIGN

During the codesign process, three interrelated principles emerged that helped us confront neocolonial tendencies and work toward more genuine North-South collaboration. We offer these not as a formula but as orientations that shaped our practice.

REDISTRIBUTING EPISTEMIC AUTHORITY

Quantitative studies across multiple countries may often favor generic instruments for standardizing evidence, to the extent possible, and allowing for—in our opinion—reductive cross-country comparison. This reflects doctrinaire assumptions—that is, that items developed in global-level (typically Northern) settings are almost universally valid, and that “localization” involves merely translating or lightly adapting preexisting instruments. In our view, this gets methodology backwards and is especially problematic in EiE settings, which we argue have a greater degree of heterogeneity than stable ones.

Designing rigorous quantitative instruments requires that constructs be developed in situ, with local expertise leading the effort. The choice of what to measure, how to operationalize it, and what response options make sense must emerge as much as possible from the context and culture. When instruments are designed elsewhere and “localized”—what we refer to as imported and adjusted—researchers risk measuring invalid constructs poorly. The problem in such cases is not poor data collection but a poor conceptual fit. Rubbish in, rubbish out.

And yet, context-specific development often does not occur. Timelines are compressed. Budgets are stretched. Funders and journals favor familiar, generic instruments. Northern expertise is valued; Southern expertise is underestimated. There is pressure to use off-the-shelf tools that international audiences recognize, even when they lack local meaning. These dynamics reflect the epistemological dimension of research neocolonialism: privileging Northern ways of knowing over situated understanding.

Redistributing epistemic authority means treating Southern knowledge as the architecture of locally valid measurement. We came to understand localization as a form of stewardship, of the intellectual, cultural, and contextual resources that shape how constructs get defined, operationalized, and interpreted. Without this, instruments are likely to produce data that may satisfy global reporting needs but offer little to local communities. Our codesign process required continuous negotiation between cross-country comparability and local contextual and cultural meaning. Our principal investigator and CRT approached instrument development as substantive methodological work, wherein Southern knowledge shapes the definition of problems, the relevance of items, phrasing, and ethical boundaries.

Consider children who board in monasteries. The issue was not simply creating a category for “boarders.” Many children board as novice monks or nuns not specifically for religious education (monastic schools are secular) but as protection against exposure to conflict, forced recruitment into armed groups, or instability at home. Or consider questions about teacher remuneration. It was not enough to note that Karen teachers receive modest annual stipends; it also was important to recognize that teaching in Karen schools is an act of service rooted in community identity and collective aspiration. The wording of questions required careful attention to avoid undermining teacher morale or misrepresenting their motivation. In both instances, local knowledge reshaped what the constructs actually meant.

CONTEXTUAL AND CULTURAL HUMILITY

Redistributing epistemic authority requires adopting a posture of contextual and cultural humility. This means that researchers working across contextual and cultural boundaries, Northern and Southern alike, must acknowledge the limits of their own knowledge, question assumptions embedded in existing instruments, and make room for alternative ways of knowing to guide decisions. Some might find this particularly uncomfortable, as it may threaten their “expert” status or infringe on other aspects of their identity.

Taking this posture challenges the benevolent dimension of research neocolonialism. When Northern researchers believe they are helping Southern communities by bringing in established tools and frameworks, critique becomes difficult, as it can appear to be ingratitude or obstruction. Adopting an attitude of humility disrupts this by treating external knowledge as provisional rather than authoritative. It acknowledges that external instruments carry normative assumptions about schooling, identity, and social relations that may not hold in local EiE settings shaped by conflict or crisis. Taking a humble approach is a recognition that items that appear technically sound can carry political, historical, or cultural weight that undermines trust or distorts meaning. This attitude of humility enabled our team to interrogate assumptions and avoid reproducing harm, erasing lived experience, or reinforcing problematic narratives. External tools can inform, but we must not lose sight of a critical starting point: what do we want to measure, why, and what can others’ attempts teach us?

For example, terms like peace or unity have long histories of being co-opted by military and state actors in Myanmar, which complicates their use in scales related to civic attitudes. Global measures about gender attitudes often assume patterns of boys being privileged over girls, whereas our own observations and broader evidence from Myanmar (Than 2014) suggest more complex dynamics and debates.

Adopting an attitude of humility means revisiting such constructs with skepticism, having difficult conversations about what ethically can be asked, and designing items in ways that honor lived realities. It reminded us that validity is not a byproduct of technical rigor alone, that it also depends on ethically attuned collaboration.

INTERDEPENDENT EXPERTISE

Finally, effective codesign depends on recognizing that different forms of expertise are complementary and overlapping. In our collaboration, Northern colleagues contributed much technical expertise: methodological structure, psychometric experience, and familiarity with cross-country comparisons. Southern colleagues brought relational expertise: contextual and cultural knowledge, linguistic nuance, political awareness, and the lived experience of conflict-affected education.

But this framing risks reproducing a paternalistic division: Northern expertise as technical and obligatory, Southern as relational and supplementary. We challenged this: we wanted Southern expertise to do more than add contextual color to Northern frameworks. For example, the term “armed conflict” needed reframing to be locally intelligible and safe. In the principal questionnaire, capturing how conflict and crisis affect schooling required collaboration. Northern colleagues understood what the ERICC Conceptual Framework sought to explore; Southern colleagues knew how principals and headteachers would interpret questions about school closures, attacks, and displacement, and what could safely be asked, given local political realities. Technical expertise offered structure but was only partial, while relational expertise created meaning and was required for technical expertise to function at all.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The codesign process was largely empowering, but we see ways it could have been stronger. When decisions hinged on local insights, Southern colleagues made the final call. Nevertheless, the experience revealed structural and procedural gaps that reflected broader challenges in North-South collaboration.

First, the process could have been more systematic. Each instrument went through multiple rounds of engagement (often three or more) which, while productive, put pressure on our teams. These iterations were necessary to achieve the desired quality, but it was not always clear how many rounds of revision to expect, what level of detail was needed, or which aspects of the instrument required the closest attention.

The pressure was intensified by substantial time demands. Over just a few months, we were tasked with operationalizing a multiyear, large-scale study while navigating an emergent process and responding to evolving feedback from across the consortium. We met our deadlines despite the compressed timeline and felt appreciated for doing so, but the pace raised questions about the depth of reflection we were ultimately able to bring, and whether the workload was sustainable. Earlier planning and more flexible timelines would have helped. We were fortunate to have early and total buy-in from all colleagues, and regular communication enabled us to build successful partnerships and navigate research complexities.

Second, our learning was more incidental than intentional. Most learning came through doing work collaboratively rather than from structured capacity-building. Our Southern colleagues, recognizing their limited experience in quantitative research, observed that more in-person time with Northern colleagues would have deepened their understanding of global instruments and the theoretical frameworks behind them. Codesign depends

on shared conceptual clarity, which is harder to build when engagement is largely virtual, fragmented, or under time constraints.

Embedding capacity-building in the process from the outset could have strengthened it. More structured opportunities to engage with the theoretical foundations and methodological considerations shaping quantitative EiE research and the ERICC global research agenda could have improved the quality of our codesign. It also would have supported our partner organizations in developing their own research capacities and enabled them to design and conduct studies independently in the future. This would have required additional time and energy, which is a real tradeoff, but it is nonetheless worth naming. We recommend that research capacity-building receive weight comparable to the generation of evidence, which will help to ensure that the evidence produced is used in context.

To some extent, these gaps reflect neocolonial arrangements in which Southern teams contribute intellectual labor without commensurate investment in their long-term research capabilities. More deliberate and better-resourced approaches to codesign would help ensure that North-South collaborations move beyond extracting instrumental contributions and instead foster enduring research sovereignty within Southern institutions.

CONCLUSION

We do not claim that our codesign process was flawless. It was intensive, at times messy, and occasionally contentious. These conditions may be inevitable when developing complex quantitative instruments across multiple institutions, languages, cultures, and EiE contexts, not to mention being under significant time constraints. But the principles we have outlined—redistributing epistemic authority, demonstrating contextual and cultural humility, and engaging interdependent expertise—helped anchor our work around dialogue, trust, sensitivity, and shared ownership. These principles enabled us to confront research neocolonialism and to create instruments that are meaningful to monastic and Karen education communities.

Our insights reflect the Myanmar context, but we believe they speak to many North-South research partnerships in EiE settings. Wherever neocolonial dynamics shape these partnerships, strengthening codesign matters. It matters in terms of producing more valid and useful evidence, and for building more just and equitable forms of knowledge production across our field.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our colleagues from PPWT and KECD, whose reflections shaped this field note, as well as Caine Rolleston and Tejendra Pherali for their thoughtful feedback on earlier drafts.

REFERENCES

- Barakat, Bilal, Michelle J. Bellino, and Julia Paulson. 2024. "Broken Mirrors: Reflexivity, Relationships and Complicity in Researching Education in Emergencies." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 22 (3): 391-552. <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/cgse20/22/3>.
- Garbagni, Giulia, and Matthew J. Walton. 2020. "Imagining Kawthoolei: Strategies of Petitioning for Karen Statehood in Burma in the First Half of the 20th Century." *Nations and Nationalism* 26 (3): 759-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12613>.
- Haelewaters, Danny, Tina A. Hofmann, and Adriana L. Romero-Olivares. 2021. "Ten Simple Rules for Global North Researchers to Stop Perpetuating Helicopter Research in the Global South." *PLoS Computational Biology* 17 (8): e1009277. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009277>.
- Kim, Ha Yeon, Carly Tubbs Dolan, J. Lawrence Aber, Silvia Diazgranados, and Tejendra Pherali. 2026. "A Conceptual Framework for Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis (ERICC): A Holistic Approach for Systematic Field Building." *Educational Researcher* 53 (3): 204-11. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X251406243>.
- Moghli, Mai Abu, and Maha Shuayb. 2022. "Equitable Partnerships for Education: A Myth or a Panacea." *Recherches Sociologiques et Anthropologiques* 53 (2): 177-201. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ras.5766>.
- Rinehart, Gray, Tejendra Pherali, Htet Thiha Zaw, Elaine Chase, and Thein Naing. 2025. "Cocreating an Agenda for Education Research in Conflict-Affected Contexts of Myanmar." *Education and Conflict Review* 5: 15-25. <https://doi.org/10.14324/000.ch.10207773>.
- Salem-Gervais, Nicolas, Summer Aung, Amber Spreelung, Ja Seng, Phyo Wai, Myo Sett Paing, and Pau Sian Lian. 2024. *Education in Post-Coup Myanmar: A Shattered Landscape with Resilient Actors*. Bangkok: Institut de Recherche sur l'Asie du Sud-Est Contemporaine. <https://doi.org/10.4000/127fb>.

- Shah, Ritesh, Kayla Boisvert, Ana Maria Restrepo Saenz, Chima Egbujuo, and Mai Nasrallah. 2023. "Education in Emergencies Research Partnerships through the Looking Glass." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 22 (3): 505-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2190877>.
- Shah, Ritesh, Francine Menashy, Julie Chinnery et al. 2024. "Reimagining Education in Emergencies: A Conversation between Practitioners and Scholars." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 55 (1): 118-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2024.2395864>.
- Shanks, Kelsey, and Julia Paulson. 2022. "Ethical Research Landscapes in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Contexts: Understanding the Challenges." *Research Ethics* 18 (3): 169-92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161221094134>.
- South, Ashley. 2025. "Failing Assumptions and the 'Post-Myanmar Turn.'" *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 55 (5): 822-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2025.2463524>.
- Than, Theraphi. 2014. *Women in Modern Burma*. Routledge.
- Tilley, Elizabeth, and Marc Kalina. 2021. "'My Flight Arrives at 5 AM, Can You Pick Me Up?' The Gatekeeping Burden of the African Academic." *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 33 (4): 538-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13696815.2021.1884972>.