



Academic Audio Transcription Ltd
International House
109-111 Fulham Palace Road
London W6 8JA
United Kingdom

hello@academicaudiotranscription.com

Anti-racist Qualitative Health Research: Co-production, Racial Justice and Mental Health with Mary Sadid

Speaker information

- Sohail Jannesari (Interviewer) (Sohail)
- Mary Sadid (Speaker) (Mary)

[Start of recording]

[downtempo electronic music 00:00:00—00:00:10]

- 00:00:10 Sohail Hi, I'm Sohail Jannesari. I am a migrant rights researcher and sometimes activist. I am welcoming you to a new Qualitative Applied Health Research Centre series on anti-racist qualitative health research, [music fades] and we look at whether, how and to what extent qualitative health research can contribute towards anti-racism and decolonisation. In these past few episodes, we've taken a journey through qualitative research, taking in the questioning, the theories, the process, the results, and now we're looking at, "Okay, well, how do we actually make a difference?" So, today, we're very lucky to have Mary with us. Mary, do you want to introduce yourself?
- 00:00:49 Mary Sure, thank you, Sohail. I'm Mary. I am the policy manager at the National Survivor User Network. We're a membership organisation for individuals with lived experience of mental ill health, distress and trauma, and for user-led groups. And I lead on work at the intersection of racial justice, migrant justice and mental health and also looking at the social determinants of mental ill health.
- 00:01:08 Sohail Great. So could you explain a bit about that intersection, and also how issues of racism and structural racism might link into issues of migrant justice? And also mental health justice.
- 00:01:20 Mary Yeah. Absolutely. So when it comes to—I'll start with mental health and racial justice. There's been a real turn over the last few years and a real focus on expanding approaches to racial justice in the mental health sector, especially since sort of global events—the murder of George Floyd. There's been a shift towards anti-racist strategy in mental health and understanding the links. And there's always these data and statistics that are thrown around, around the experiences of certain racialised groups, often at most acutely Black groups, and how they are on the sharp end of the mental health system. But what's often missing is including racialised people who are considered migrants or especially those who don't have status in this conversation around racial justice. So you'll have, say, a manifesto or a strategy that's on the mental health of a particular racialised group who are acutely impacted. And there will be no mention of people who belong to that ethnic group, for example, but have a status, which means that they are made invisible deliberately by sort of the institutions and systems they're in. Forced to live these kind of clandestine lives. And there's this replication of that in the mental health sector as well. Because it's such a sensitive political issue, people don't really want to speak on it. And so the easy way to speak on racial justice and mental health is to exclude migrants. And it's just an example of the way in which racism continues to function and impacts the people who are marginalised, really vulnerable and really easy to exclude in mainstream conversations because there's so little, like, representation or so little space to voice experiences.
- 00:02:48 Sohail Great. Thank you. And so, in the context now of qualitative health research, I mean, what's the current state of play in terms of how qualitative health research links in with calls for migrant justice and racial justice? Are there really good things happening? Does a lot need to be done yet to make qualitative health research actually impactful?
- 00:03:07 Mary Yeah, so I'm—I think just to start off, I'm coming at this from the perspective of someone who isn't a researcher, who's outside of academia, but who interacts with some of these sort of materials and practices through my work in policy. And I think it's quite interesting sort of thinking about where we are in terms of—you know, in the past, there have been lots of conversations around hard-to-reach groups and framing—this framing of problematising certain groups' experiences, or self-understanding as being sort of outside of norms of say, mental health. And there's been—it feels like there's been this kind of shift. This sort of, like, greater focus on insider understandings or on letting people kind of name their experiences and name their own kind of concepts and understandings, instead of it just being imposed by this sort of external model. But I think where it kind of—when it comes to mental health, it feels like there's

this fundamental underlying concept, which is this othering or this outsidership of these experiences. And when they're brought in as sort of like a case study or an example, there's still this kind of sense that this relativity and this—there's the legitimate kind of normative stuff, and then there's this—these other kind of external experiences. And I think there's something there around scale as well, and when, you know, you're talking about a potentially really small population of people, there's variation that's lost in that context. And, for example, there's been developments in the last years on the Mental Health Act and developing, like, the plan for community mental health and various other kind of policy around the Mental Health Act. And, you know, one thing that we see is research being commissioned, qualitative research looking at people's experiences, where people are broken down into groups. Like, it'll be older people, queer people, Black people and very much this kind of categorisation that is external and really doesn't look at the ways in which people have intersecting identities. Yep.

00:04:52 Sohail Cheers. Thank you. So why does it make a difference if you can continue that thought further? Like, why does it make a difference for people to be able to name their own understandings and have their intersections acknowledged?

00:05:03 Mary I think it's a number of things. There's something there around agency. And so, you know, often in mental health, we talk about 'experts by experience', for example. And there's this framing and this idea of, "You are the expert on your life, and you have an understanding." And there's this kind of sense of trying to give people back some of the legitimacy that's been taken away. Or there's been this framing where it's, "You're being told about yourself." Being an expert by experience or being in this space where you're a survivor researcher is taking back some of that. Those processes of delegitimisation through traditional, like, fields and things. I think these categories are treated like things that are fundamental or based in fact, but what they are actually based in is outside perspectives. And there's this real kind of, I guess, disparity in terms of who gets to decide what their categories are that they belong to and what their labels are, and who is labelled. And I think especially coming from a context of talking about migration and people who have been through transitions and journeys where you can experience a loss of identity and loss of place and home and kind of connection, to then be placed in a context where you're further labelled and further treated as being alienated from having an understanding of yourself, I think that's another form of sort of, like, you know, harm and this picture of violence that we see that—and possibly trauma that is happening across journeys and transitions. And it's also about the ways in which these categorisations can be really neat and useful for research, if you're able to break people up into discrete groups. But it's so often not reflective of people's experiences and means that they might have to pick an identifier or marker, or be labelled with a primary marker that might not actually speak to the depth or richness of their experience. And I think there's this sense of wanting to complicate the picture, which, if you're trying to sort of present a narrative in terms of research, it's maybe something that people shy away from sometimes or is a bit daunting, this idea of complicating the picture you have.

00:06:51 Sohail And how does that affect sort of the impact of research? So, okay, if you use these categories, and you don't necessarily come up with a sort of nuanced, intersectional, complicated picture—I can see how maybe a simple message is maybe better for impact. So, like, what's the—in real life, like, how does that categorisation not make a difference or not help things?

00:07:12 Mary Yeah, I guess it depends on the site of impact, right? So it's thinking about mental health care and the ways in which there's been lots of conversations around cultural competency. And the—there's the Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework and these pieces of work that are coming out around racial justice and mental health. And I think the impact is that we're ending up with this kind of abstraction and this idea of, "This is how you treat X group of people," and this idea of homogeneity in those groups. And what's lost there is that people might end up being placed in sort of categories or different kind of contexts that don't actually speak to their experiences at all. But it's as a simplifier. So as someone who's external to sort of that lived

experience, it makes your life easier. And it's—I think there's something there around wanting to think about people's, like, humanity and letting someone be a whole person instead of this—what tends to happen is you get boxed into different labels. And I think people get lost. People get lost in these spaces where they are treated as sort of, yeah, I guess, like, objects of research or as fitting a pattern. And it's this thing of—pattern identification can be really satisfying, but the reality is, is that there's a potential of creating this sort of—this model of what a person from a certain group is like or, like, what their experience is. And that model is then used to treat—you're trying the model. You're not treating the person. And there's also a sense of, I think, lots of people do have an understanding—who are seen as being alienated from things like mental health or having cultural and social stigma, do have sort of deep understandings of, like, experiences and their needs that might have a different framing. And I think there's something there around—it feels a bit lazy, almost, like looking to these really simplistic kind of forms of understanding instead of thinking about what are the ways in which you can experience—you can maybe step into someone's world and experience it from their perspective or see some kind of like—maybe some kind of alignment between the kind of internal and external world.

00:09:12 Sohail Cool, thank you. And you mentioned a couple of ongoing research projects. So how do you feel about them? Can you give us a bit more detail about—you said pieces of work around racial justice and mental health. So, yeah, what's happening there? And what would you like to see?

00:09:30 Mary Sure. Yeah. So I think I've sort of come across some good and some not so good examples lately, or some examples of pieces that—and so, I think there are examples of work where it's very much—you know, so as an organisation, we are sometimes asked to take on pieces of research for people are interested, to be part of research bids, sort of as many sort of lived experience mental health organisations are. And one thing that I do see is this pattern of this categorisation that doesn't speak to people's experiences and excludes kind of deeper understanding and its sort of more complex pictures. But I guess there's something there around the purpose of the research. And I think sometimes the purpose of research, especially when it feeds into mental health policy, is not actually to gain deeper understanding, and is driven by a desire to show that work has been done or there's been—you know, it's almost like the research supports the sort of foregone conclusions and not the other way around. And so, that's something that I think—that's something that happens. And sort of people get caught in. I think coming from a perspective on sort of working in and around lived experience, there is often work that appears to be co-produced or has this label of being co-produced. But co-production is really, really complex. And, actually, often it's seen as a legitimising factor of adding and something that's additive instead of something that's sort of fundamental in the core of a project. But I've also seen some really, really interesting projects. And I think one example that I recently came across is by a researcher called Umit Cetin, who is doing—or has been doing research for many years with the Alevi community in London, looking at experiences of suicide in the second generation. And that was a really, really interesting example of someone who has connection to a community, unpacking over many years this kind of experience and sort of pulling out these factors, giving colour to an experience that, in a broader project, could be sort of framed as research on racialised young men dying by suicide in a certain area or something. And I think what would really be lost there is this kind of understanding of this specific cultural context. I think specificity is something that really gets lost. Because, especially when you belong to a much smaller group, there's this framing of—you might be seen as, "You belong to a Muslim community." But the experience of being in that community might not—it might be very specific of, "I belong to a community of this demographic, this ethnicity and this kind of practice." And it's not—but it's that thing of the external understanding and the internal experience being different, and the practices of labelling. And I think there are these processes that are called—sort of alienation so—especially for people who—racialised people who have been through the migration system or are going through the migration system. I think there's something for me there around the ways in which you become lumped into a group, and you lose that—there's that sense of recreating processes of identity loss, and there's something so rich. And—but it feels quite rare to be part of something

that's specific. If you're taking part in research, or you're a research subject, you can contribute to the framing and understanding of that specificity.

00:12:23 Sohail Great, thanks. And really glad you mentioned co-production. We had an episode on co-production in the last series. And I learnt that there were four different definitions of co-production. And it's really quite complicated, so I would really encourage listeners to listen to that. Okay. So specificity is important in making impact—making policy impact. But hopefully, a lot of qualitative health researchers are thinking about specificity. They are thinking about people's real, individual experiences. And I think people still struggle a lot to feel like they're making any sort of policy impact, especially in migrant justice. But what's missing there? Like, what do people need to then put on and then do once they have their very specific intersection with nuanced findings?

00:13:15 Mary So I guess the first thing about policy impact is that it's an incredibly hostile context. And just because something is a good piece of research, and it shows really clearly sort of need and the ways in which systems are producing harm and sort of what's going on, doesn't mean that there will either be any—or sort of in the current context, there will be any resourcing or any interest. And I think it's starting from the perspective of a lot of the harms that we see are deliberately generated and are part of—the system is sort of functioning as expected. And there's something there around—you know, for us as an organisation, when we consider this, we think a lot, also, about what the different sites of change are. And there's the sort of like high-level stuff, which is really, really important, like movements like Kill the Bill and movements to resist sort of a lot of the other legislation, like Nationality and Borders, that's been happening sort of in recent times. But there's also something around—a lot of our members are user-led groups and thinking about what's the impact on a grassroots level and what can the impacts be that people can take back to their communities and can contribute to their sort of, like—their own knowledge building and their own understanding, their own activism and campaigning in those contexts, which might not necessarily be very public facing or be very visible, which is often also related to safety. And because it's not for everyone's consumption. And—yeah. There's definitely something there around thinking around the level of the impact and who it's actually for. And who it's with, as well.

00:14:34 Sohail What do you mean, "Who it's with"?

00:14:38 Mary I think there's a difference between being 'done to' or 'done for' and 'done with'. And when looking at impacts on a grassroots or a user-led level and thinking about, "What can I take back to people? Or what can I kind of—what can we share? And what are the sort of positive kind of outcomes on that level?" I think there's something there around—yeah, I guess it comes back to that question of like collaboration, co-production. I think there's something around producing research to have a policy impact but not necessarily kind of involving or amplifying the voices of people who are affected. And it's—often it can be in really small ways as well. Like producing resources that aren't accessible to people in different languages, producing resources that are meant to support people that don't actually talk to any of the people who are meant to use it, and that kind of stuff. And there are sort of, like—I there's a lot of kind of unpacking that needs to be done around the ways in which loads of the norms and processes are kind of, by default, on behalf of people, or have this kind of paternalism, or—yeah.

00:15:41 Sohail Can you tell me a bit more about the norms and processes that mean that research and the findings are always just on behalf of people and not necessarily with people?

00:15:51 Mary Sure, yeah. I think it's that classic thing of like, you know—and, also, like, you know, like you said, a lot of people are looking and thinking around doing this stuff differently. But they're kind of default from—you know, an outsider's perspective seems to be that there is a group of interest or a phenomenon that—you know, a pattern that, you know, people want to study. And there is a sense of kind of going through this cycle where you're generating information. You have research subjects or sources of data that you're using and producing your conclusions and kind of then trying to influence policy. But I think there's something there around—and maybe this is a bit of cynical

perspective. But I think there can be something there around doing research for research's sake or doing research to product that kind of policy influencing. And there's something there, I think, for me, around, like, relationships and what are the relationships that are part of the research. And I think there is quite a lot of research in which there are no relationships built, and part of that—or like, no meaningful relationships—and part of that is because this stuff takes time. And in my work, and sort of my colleagues, also, we all, like, work on relationship building over time, but it's very much a long-term process and not something that can necessarily be rushed or kind of be neatly fit into the lifespan of a project.

00:16:52 Sohail

Okay. Cool. So some of the, I guess, institutional ways that research is done from the university perspective might make it difficult for people to build relationships with the people they're hopefully working with. Does it make it difficult to have both levels of impact you've talked about? Like you talked about sort of broader policy impact, if not on a national level, then maybe on a local government level, and then you also talked about this more grassroots level impact. Is that sort of the chain of causation?

00:17:28 Mary

Yeah. I mean, I don't know if I would necessarily, like, frame it as a chain of causation, but I guess—I think there's definitely something there around, you know, if your desired impact isn't to genuinely sort of interact with and give something to the people, the community that you're kind of taking something from for your research, I think there's often the case that it then doesn't produce something that's of value that you can give back. And I think it's the idea—this, like, classic idea of extraction and the ways in which extraction is really normal and a really standard kind of mode of practice. And it's justified because it's sort of like, "Well, it's really important to have this information in the first place, and it's really important to do this research." But I think one question that we sometimes come back to is sort of, "Is it really important to do this research if it's done in a way that is extractive?" And it's the thing of, "Are you the only person who could do this research? Is there someone else who could do it better? Is there a way in which it could be sort of planned in a more sort of long-term kind of sustained sustainable way?" Guess it's that thing of it often feels like—that research is fundamentally important, but it's—I think, for me, it's the context is the fundamental thing and the embeddedness. And if it's not there, then that feels like it could—even if the findings are really interesting, it feels like that's something that takes away from the value of the—yeah, of the research.

00:18:41 Sohail

Great, thanks. Yeah. So I guess, in a way, you're saying that—and please correct me if I'm wrong. You're saying that when we think about policy impact or impact from the perspective of a researcher, it shouldn't be, like, this one-off thing where you have the findings, and then it happens somehow. It's part of a long-term relationship building process. And so there should be lots of little stages where, somehow, the research makes a difference. I don't know if you've got a concrete example we can hook this on, where you might have seen it done alright or not so well. Or even just things you want to see done differently.

00:19:21 Mary

Yeah. So I think an example of some of the ways of working that can be a bit different—and, again, this is not necessarily sort of—it's not embedded in kind of a research environment. It's embedded more in this kind of—you know, we're coming from this, like, charity sector context. It's—there are lots of points of sort of contact, but it's still different. And I think one of the ways of working is—one of my colleagues is leading sort of long-term, like, exploratory projects on safeguarding. And it's around kind of disrupting and addressing and naming some of the ways in which practices of safeguarding can actually generate harm, especially to racialised groups, especially to people who experience, like, different forms of marginalisation because of, like, gender, sexuality, growing up in the care system. And this is kind of a long-term project that has a research aim which is to elucidate and identify what good safeguarding practices look like. But the way in which that happens is this, you could call it, a community of practice. It's not actually called that, but that's the kind of model that people might sort of be familiar with. But it's a collective of people who get together over—and have been getting together over a sustained period of time just to share what's happening in their organisations, and include sort of grassroots and user-led organisations and some

other charities. I think there's a sense there of space, and there's a sense of not having a foregone conclusion, or not having—sure there are ideas about what it might look like, but there isn't—it's not following this, like, rigid path. And I think there's something there around—that research could also model, which is starting from a place of—yeah, maybe there are people who work like this. But starting from a place of connection and practice and creating that spaciousness, and then kind of going on to generate findings and things that are of interest. But also doing it in a way where it speaks to the people who have been on the journey. But obviously, there are loads of questions and issues around this. So one of the issues around doing work that is co-produced, or doing work that is in partnership is obviously resourcing and funding, especially when lots of groups are really precarious and often direct their kind of limited resources towards service provision and looking after and supporting community members. And so, there can be, like, ethical questions around taking away people's, like, time and resources to feed into research questions and projects. But I also think there's also a question of sort of, "Who does it serve?" And I think the safeguarding one is a really nice example of where that's something that is a really impactful thing in the day to day of people's, like, practice. It's something people do whether they consciously think about it or not. Every day in these contexts, there's a sense of taking people's time, yes, and—but building something together and giving something back that will influence how they work sort of going forward.

- 00:21:45 Sohail Cool. And that piece of work, presumably, is done by someone who works for the organisation anyway and is really familiar with the issues people are going through. So they're kind of like almost an embedded researcher or facilitator, or they're like—you know, is that how qualitative health research can also make a bit more of a difference, if it comes from organisations and campaigners?
- 00:22:11 Mary Yeah. I don't want to sort of create this image of there being sort of this one solution that's this ideal model or way of working because there isn't. But I think there is definitely something around embeddedness. And you know, there are lots of people who do research and also have experience of working with organisations on the ground and have that kind of connection. I think that connection is really, really important. But it's when there is kind of a sense of—when you have kind of research that's divorced from its context, I think that's when it's sort of, like—even if it's sort of qualitative, and there is richness there, it feels like there's something fundamental—there's that kind of gap that is maybe that embeddedness and that kind of connection, which also needs trust. And there's also the sense of, like, even if you're embedded, people will share with you what they share with you, and that kind of—there are so many factors there that influence what your outcomes will look like, and—yeah.
- 00:22:03 Sohail Cool. Thank you. Yeah. There's definitely no 'one size fits all'. That's definitely useful to emphasise. Though, getting towards the end of things, I kind of had a couple more questions for you. I wanted to end with a—maybe a slightly difficult one. So thinking about embeddedness, thinking about what you mentioned before about, "Are you the right person to do the research in terms of, like, you know, if you do it, will it have the biggest change? Or maybe if someone else does it..." So in the context of our anti-racist series, there'll be a lot of white researchers listening and being like, "Okay. Well, can I do impactful anti-racist research?" So do you think that white researchers can do good anti-racist research? If so, what's it look like?
- 00:23:38 Mary Yeah, I think there's something there around positionality of, like, you can do really impactful anti-racist—but also—so there's—so I think the starting point for me is that often, even if you are a researcher who has a connection to the community you're researching, it's often imperfect. And there's often not this kind of fit where you're an exact mirror of your participants. But also because the participants, you know, or like the people you're working with, are not going to be kind of all coming from the same perspective anyway. So I think it's kind of—that also needs a kind of interrogation of, like, positionality and an understanding of where you're coming from. And I think that's kind of the fundamental thing, is thinking about, "What is your positionality? How do people relate to you? How do people see you?" You know, I can imagine in some contexts that white researchers are maybe afforded more legitimacy in certain

environments, or are seen as more kind of, like, belonging to the academy or more trustworthy or whatever because of, I guess, sort of internalised racism and things like that. But I think there's also—that's something that I do sometimes hear is this idea of, like, "I'm going to use my whiteness or my privilege to help others, or to push forward this agenda." And, sure, that's, like, a nice sentiment. But I think what underlies that is this idea that you're not getting something out of it yourself, and you're not kind of benefitting from this interaction and this position that you have. And I think there's something there around genuinely wanting to work in solidarity and not just kind of wanting to see—I think that kind of—that line kind of extends into ideas of, like, white saviourism, which can be quite subtle and can be quite quiet, actually, in interactions and how people understand their research. And people might be—but it's that question of solidarity, and, and are you doing things with people or for people or to people? And not necessarily, yeah, an understanding that you're not the only person who can do it from this position. Or you're not the only person who is able to do this research, but you're afforded this position, and there are reasons why. But then that should also generate further question of sort of, "Why am I in the position I'm in? And who can I do this work with? Or who can I kind of build a relationship with? How can I build trust?" And there are people—so talking to someone a while ago who's leading a refugee youth project in London. She's just joined as a programme manager, I think. And she's white, but she's really, really embedded in that community and has historically had, for many years, relationships. And people know who she is. And people will be like—you know. And she'll describe it as, "Oh, well, someone would meet me, and they'd be like, 'Oh, yeah, my cousin told me they met you here or whatever.'" And it's that sense of kind of being different but not being an outsider, in that sense of still having that kind of—like, whiteness doesn't preclude you from having deep meaningful connectedness and relationships and an interest in the long-term kind of experiences and well-being of the communities that you're working with, beyond your research project or beyond your grant, and the funding that you have.

00:26:16 Sohail

That's an incredibly great answer to a very, very difficult question, so I appreciate that. Just a quick thing to pick up on with what you mentioned: that if you were a white researcher, maybe you have more legitimacy and trust in the academy. So if you come up with some sort of, you know, anti-racist finding about—let's say it's racism in university or something there is—but let's—[laughs] let's say that this finding showed that, and then, you know, maybe they would—you know, the university hierarchy would listen more to a white researcher. Even if that has an impact, doesn't that also entrench white privilege, still? I find that a very tricky thing to think through. I don't know what you think about it.

00:27:06 Mary

Yeah, for sure, for sure. And I think, actually, one of the things that kind of I was thinking about was if I was sort of doing research with the community that I'm from, and how I would be seen versus how a white—a person who is viewed as sort of a white scholar or a sort of—would be seen. And I think there is, yeah, I think there's also something there from both ends of seeing this relationship between—you know, it's obviously really variable. But I can really picture that happening on both ends. That idea of, like, legitimacy and grace and legitimacy being afforded. And there's something there for me around care in the work as well. And it's really tricky, right, when you're talking about people's kind of careers and their livelihoods and their incomes. And it's ultimately, like, naming what's happening. Standing back when there's someone else who could step forward. Recognising—yeah, recognising practices that benefit you and disadvantage others. And—but it's a really tricky one, right? Because it's this sort of thing of like—again, it comes that angle of people who are sort of putting forward that kind of, 'use your privilege' angle. "Put someone on your grant proposal and kind of work in collaboration," and—that actually—there's something fundamental about actually breaking down those systems. And there's something about academia that is fundamentally linked to this kind of, like, privilege and this sort of privileging of certain voices and types of knowledge. And I think it's thinking about the ways in which you're fundamentally part of, like, this unequal hierarchy of evidence when you're in the institution. And obviously, like, yeah, coming from the charity sector, that also exists of that kind of—there's always—even working with people, there's always an imbalance. And I think there's something about not kidding ourselves around what's actually

happening or what people are able to do in those contexts. And that there's something there around, like, dismantling and thinking about the way you work and the practices, and how do those practices contribute, or sort of benefit you if you're a white researcher? And thinking about, yeah, what are the ways of reimagining practice and reimagining practice in a way that other voices who have been historically silenced and invisibilised are centred? Which is a long-term process and commitment, right? It's not—like, it's not something that can be reimagined sort of from one project to the next, I guess.

00:28:58 Sohail Thank you, much appreciated. And that was—oh, yeah. Just before we leave, do you have any resources that people could go to, to learn more about the work you guys are doing? To learn more about good impactful qualitative health research?

00:29:11 Mary Yeah, sure. I'd actually like to shout out and share our—so NSUN host a project called Synergi, which is a project looking at racial justice in mental health. And we've actually just launched our grants programme that is supporting groups who are doing campaigning work around racial justice and mental health—grassroots and user-led groups. So I guess if we can, yeah, share a link to that. But also, yeah, please do have a look at our website: nsun.org.uk. And yeah, that's it from me.

00:29:39 Sohail Thank you so much, Mary. It's been a real pleasure. And thanks also to our listeners. [downtempo electronic music fades in] We're coming to the end of our series on anti-racist qualitative health research. The next series is going to look at qualitative health ethics. So I really hope you can join us for that. [music fades]

[End of recording]