

## Re-Imagining Diversity: Towards an Anthropology for Disruption in UK Higher Education

Toyin Agbetu, University College London, UK  
Harshadha Balasubramanian, University College London, UK  
Sarah Bourke, University of Oxford, UK  
Sally Dennehy, Court Fields School, UK  
Chloe Dominique, University College London, UK  
Alison Macdonald, University College London, UK

### Introduction

Recent years have seen a substantial institutional and governmental impetus to increase access and ensure equal participation from what have been qualified as ‘underrepresented groups’ in higher education in the UK. From Athena Swan accreditations, to Access and Widening Participation agendas, diversity training and renewed pedagogic approaches to inclusive learning, the higher education landscape is now awash with the language of ‘diversity’ as policy and practice. On the one hand, the institutionalisation of ‘diversity’ is a welcome method of inclusion. Yet on the other hand, it is often reproduced as ‘happy talk’ (Bell and Hartmann 2007) that pacifies the call for meaningful structural and institutional change, silencing and even reinforcing the inequality it seeks remedy (i.e. Ahmed, 2012; Alexander, 2005; Archer, Hutchings & Ross 2003; Kirton, Greene & Dean 2007; Mohanty, 2003; Puwar, 2004). As such, the concept and practice of ‘diversity’ is now often viewed with scepticism. Its appealing promise to strive for relations and structures of equality in higher education is entangled with its hazardous and harmful potential to erase complex relations of power, for example, in its discursive mobilisation of a “harmonious empty pluralism” (Mohanty, 2003: 193).

Taking these paradoxical dimensions of diversity as ethnographic and conceptual points of departure, this special issue seeks to unravel some of the everyday experiences, practices and policies encoded in diversity ‘speak’ and ‘diversity work’ (Ahmed 2012) across anthropology departments in the UK. Given that one of the fundamental aims of anthropology is to reflexively challenge dominant hegemonic biases and assumptions through ethnographic practice, it is strikingly conspicuous the extent to which everyday experiences of racism, inequality and discrimination inherent in teaching and learning within the academy are subject to cursory - and often only intellectually abstract - critical and reflective challenge. Despite repeated calls to confront racism and structural inequalities and decolonise the discipline since the 1960s (e.g. Allen & Jobson, 2016; Bolles, 2013; Brodtkin, Morgen & Hutchinson, 2011; Harrison, 1991; 2011; 2012; Hymes, 1960; Jobson, 2020; Mogstad & Tse, 2018; Todd, 2016; Tuhiwai Smith 1999), anthropology remains an overly Western intellectual project and professional practice embedded in relations of power that favour the White elite. Many of us thus continue to work and study in institutions shaped by discriminatory and disempowering processes.

Building on the momentum generated by the aforementioned calls to action, this special issue strives to reveal the hidden injustices and biases in the teaching and learning of anthropology, together with the on-going challenges of implementing inclusion agendas against a backdrop of intensifying institutional diversity strategies in UK higher education. Our intervention revolves around the notion and practice of ‘disruption’ that emerged from several conversations that took place off the back of the panel ‘Re-imagining difference: diversity in anthropology’, convened by Alice Elliot (Goldsmiths University) and Alison Macdonald (UCL) at the 2018 Association of Social Anthropologists (ASA) conference. The panel invited papers from anyone engaged in anthropology in higher education to submit informal ‘think pieces’. These pieces focused on any understanding of ‘diversity’ – be that personal, conceptual, ethnographic, bureaucratic, intimate and/or discursive – as a starting point to re-think how the language, ideology and practices of ‘diversity’ are experienced on the ground in everyday life in UK anthropology departments. The panel sought to raise questions about how far we have come

in our everyday practice to create fair, equitable and anti-racist learning environments within our discipline and education more broadly, and to start conversations about the potential steps we might take to move the diversity debate forward. The papers presented and discussions held on the day of the panel reflected the deeply personal nature of each contributors' experience, as students and practitioners of anthropology. A strong theme across the presentations was 'disruption'; each person saw their positionality and practice struggling against the current, and had felt extraordinary resistance to their bodies, ideas, and practices when situated within their universities as institutions and anthropology as a discipline. Acknowledging the dislocation from the educational institutional structures in which many of us study and work served to further highlight how such institutions continue to be complicit with, and thereby, facilitate and neutralise certain bodies – be that of knowledge, experience, intimacy, histories – as its norm (see Ahmed, 2012). At the same time, this dislocation contained a productive force: a desire for change. In this light, the disruptive potential of the experiences and encounters discussed during the panel also had an emancipatory bent, exposing the difficult and complex questions that we as a community of academics, administrators, students, teachers and scholar activists should confront and be held accountable to if we are to create meaningful change.

Realising this was a conversation which needed to be carried forward, a group of us working in the area of diversity in the UK context formed an Editorial Collective to bring together this special issue for *Teaching Anthropology*. The Editorial Collective is made up of PhD candidates, scholar-activists, a state school teacher and academics who, united by a desire for social justice within our discipline and education more broadly, write this introduction as a collaborative conversation that draws fruitfully from our differentially structured and divergent subject positions. Forming this collective was critical to ensuring that the diversity of the conversations which took place during the panel would be reflected in the members of the collective themselves and empowered throughout the editorial process. This ethos was also extended to authors with experience of diversity in the UK context who were invited to contribute at a later date. The twelve papers we have brought together in this issue are therefore a unique collection of contributions from members of the Editorial Collective, members of the ASA panel and individuals with experiences of diversity in the UK context. Notably, we foreground the voices and perspectives of those who have too often been overlooked and / or disempowered within the UK academy and thus rarely encountered in published works. This includes contributions by undergraduate students in collaboration with their academic colleagues to reveal racism and intersectional bias in higher education pedagogic and collegiate practice (Bafu and Dattatreya; Dawood and Reese); the critical reflections of a state school teacher engaged in widening participation activities from the rural margins of the UK (Dennehy); and PhD student testimonial of personal experiences of class discrimination (Dominique) and intersectional marginalisation (Delany) together with critical reflection on anti-racist and decolonised pedagogic practice (Agbetu) and anthropological methodologies (Balasubramanian; Bourke). Alongside these authors are academic colleagues who deal critically with a wide range of diversity practices such as widening participation agendas (Anyadike-Danes; Mills), re-thinking modes of aesthetic ableism (Sauma) and transforming how we approach decolonised pedagogic practice (Botticello and Caffrey).

Mobilising the theme of disruption that emerged from the ASA conference further, the special issue attempts to disrupt conventional academic practice in anthropology in two major ways. Firstly, the orchestration of a diverse collection of voices is a deliberate attempt to upend conventional modes of knowledge production and dismantle power dynamics within anthropology - and the academy more broadly - by decentring long standing hierarchies around who is the object of inquiry and who 'counts' as the producer of knowledge and voice of authority. Secondly, the format of the contributions as 'think pieces' serves to disrupt normative modes of academic publication. While some contributions stay faithful to conventional literary styles and draw on qualitative and quantitative sources, many other contributions are written as first-person narratives that recount the affective repercussions of the institutionalisation of 'diversity'. By giving credence to accounts of the daily graft of 'diversity work', together with embodied and lived experiences of what 'being diverse' actually entails on the ground, we strive to productively mobilise decentred 'situated knowledges' (Haraway, 1988) in order to displace the continued centrality of white / elite / heteronormative / ableist reference points at the heart of much higher education institutional diversity strategies and inclusion agendas (cf. also Puwar, 2004). Indeed, the use of experiential knowledge is especially percipient to re-imagining diversity in anthropology in light of a strong tradition of leveraging reflexive accounts (e.g. Behar 1997), 'counterstorytelling' (Smith et al. 2006) and testimonios (Fiel-Murriel, 2013) to 'speak back' to structural, racist and discriminatory power dynamics that thwart equity in what is, for many, a hostile academic environment (see also Harrison, 2012). What such testimonial repeatedly reminds us is that we must not only recognise and prioritise physical violence, but also stay attuned to academic practices that commit 'cultural violence' and legitimise symbolic and structural forms of exclusion (Galtung, 1990). Publishing in this vein is no easy feat and is itself an important - but often hidden -

form of diversity work that raises several complex challenges and creates large doses of professional and personal discomfort. In order to raise awareness and encourage more publications of this kind, we critically discuss these challenges and pitfalls in collaboration with the Teaching Anthropology Editorial Board in the Afterward to this introduction.

By de-centering dominant perspectives to highlight the hidden injustices and biases in our institutions, our intervention for disruption intersects with, and develops from, other forms of disruptive collective action by staff and students in anthropology departments across the UK. This includes, to name but a few examples, decolonising curricula and the discipline at large<sup>i</sup>, setting up student and staff led anti-racism committees and networks, and transforming faculty hiring practices. Much of this collective work (which is often student led), has been (re)galvanised by recent global social and political movements and events such as the murder of George Floyd in May 2020, the Black Lives Matter movement, scholarly calls to 'let anthropology burn' (see Jobson, 2020), and the strikes and protests of the 2020 UK University College Union (UCU) 'four fights' campaign<sup>ii</sup>. Developing the efforts and energy sparked by these movements and events, this special issue aims re-imagine diversity as a possibility for praxis. In speaking to praxis, we follow Paulo Freire's definition of praxis as 'reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it' (2000 [1970]: 51). For us, the term 're-imagining' is a call for positive political transformation in which we hope the difficult, uncomfortable - but hopefully - fruitful questions and critiques posed by papers in this special issue galvanise a space for diverse-led action. This emphasis on praxis is not to underestimate nor romanticise the possibility for action in the face of the complex challenges in enacting meaningful institutional and structural change. As Allen and Jobson recently remarked regarding the possibilities of transformation in the machinery of the modern university, 'can a decolonised anthropology and the neoliberal university co-exist?' (2016: 137). The urgency of this question remains as ever pertinent today; indeed its seemingly contradictory and fraught relationship is borne out in many of the papers in this special issue. And, as mentioned above, it is precisely through institutional bureaucratic and administrative channels that inclusion and diversity agendas are implemented - and often to hazardous or lacklustre ends. It is thus against this backdrop that we try to re-imagine diversity in a new light: to bear witness to those who live its effects and thereby reveal the potential to democratically and holistically re-structure anthropology from the ground up.

## **Contributions to the Special Issue**

The twelve papers in this special issue offer a multi-angled lens to illuminate different dimensions – be that biases and assumptions or transformative potentialities – of 'diversity' within higher education. The manner in which the various experiences, concepts and terminologies cut across one another in different papers also reveals how intersectional realities around class, gender, sexuality, race and/or (dis)ability and other contested categories unfold in various guises and to different e/affects in anthropology departments across the UK. This is evidenced in several papers that tackle anthropological pedagogy. Drawing attention to race in particular, and other intersectional identities, some authors speak from their personal perspectives as students/practitioners of anthropology to deliver highly introspective critiques of anthropology's social and structural mores alongside clear directives to decolonise our anthropology departments, classrooms, and scholarship. Toyin Agbetu critiques the pedagogy and practice of British anthropology and its efforts towards decolonisation through the lens of 'race' as a scholar-activist based in London. Agbetu offers a piercing analysis of the contradictions present in the structures, norms, and efforts to 'diversify' he has observed in anthropology departments across the UK. He argues that effective decolonising work requires a level of precision that must be guided by reflections on barriers from those that seek inclusion, for any proposed change based primarily on the analysis of systems already engaged in exclusionary practices rarely, if ever, deliver sustainable, equitable outcomes that are holistic in scope.

Recognising the need for self-reflection, Julie Botticello and Anna Caffrey draw on an ecological metaphor to advocate for embedding anti-racist practices within the higher education system at every level from the self, to relationships with students and approaches in the classroom, to the extended learning environment, and in the university structure and governance processes. Botticello and Caffrey use decolonial theory and methods in their roles as anthropology lecturers to empower their students, and seek to disrupt and dismantle the systems of White supremacy in higher education. In affecting such a transformation through this model, higher education may finally become a space in which everybody can belong and be valued. Expanding further on ways to re-think and decolonise learning and teaching anthropology, Hamss Dawood and Jill Reese examine how colonial relationships and stereotypical racial imaginaries may be deconstructed by harnessing the potential of non-traditional assessment, such as social media, for students and teachers to critically reflect upon contemporary power hierarchies. Dawood and Reese suggest that horizontally structured co-learning environments generate

more meaningful and diverse discussions, and facilitate inclusive learning processes that legitimise the subjective voices of black and ethnic minority (BAME), differently-abled, queer, trans, non-binary, and other marginalised communities within the university space.

Building on the discussion of anthropological pedagogy and the need for the disruption of 'traditional' practices, the next two papers presented in the special issue propose methodological innovations 'from the margins' to challenge and stimulate more inclusive mainstream anthropological praxes. As PhD students, both of these authors found their anthropological education in the UK inadequate for expressing their positionalities. In response, these authors established their own methodologies, drawing from a wide range of theory and their lived experiences to undertake their anthropological work. Sarah Bourke's paper reflects on the challenges she faced in 'Indigenising' her anthropological work as an Aboriginal Australian undertaking a doctorate in the UK. Bringing to the fore a perspective rarely present in the anthropological literature, Bourke advocates for re/incorporating Indigenous research principles of resistance, reflexivity, relationality, and respect into mainstream anthropological work to help decolonise the discipline and critically address problematic power relationships in 'being' and 'doing' anthropology. She highlights the value of research which is driven by a strengths-based agenda to counter the deficit discourse which continues to dominate Indigenous lives. Harshadha Balasubramanian also seeks to contest attempts to suppress marginal experiences by advancing an ethnographic method which is ultimately rooted in her experiences of disability. She explores how institutional articulations of difference could be informed and reimaged by turning to researcher-participant relationships, applying the proposed method to trace and learn from the co-production of difference within somatic fieldwork encounters.

Moving away from direct engagements with anthropological pedagogy and methodology, several other papers invoke the form of testimonio to narrate autobiographical accounts of systemic and interpersonal violence and injustice (Fiel-Muriel, 2013). Naming pain to 'speak truth to power' is fraught with tensions and discomfort and some papers do not make for easy reading, and - for many of the authors - nor were they easy to write. Yet the act of witnessing also contains the explicit intention to galvanise a fight for social change (Nance, 2006). Drawing on a range of professional and personal experiences of racism, ableism, sexism and classism across different domains of higher education, several papers challenge the normalisation of White privilege and elite structures and affects of power. Sara Bafo and Gabriel Dattatreyan's paper illuminates the complex institutional and interpersonal challenges associated with the process of trying to set up a BAME anthropology student representative role. Reflecting on the subsequent harmful failure of this process, their paper draws on critical race theory to deploy the experiences of Black and POC individuals to shine a spotlight on how institutional diversity initiatives can entrench, rather than dispel, racial assumptions and logics of White privilege underpinning academic life. Moreover, the authors reveal the problems that can occur when sincere institutional actors define, instigate and adjudicate on solutions to their department's exclusionary practices. Challenges to their own authority are rejected as othered, and pressured outsiders are denied the power to co-produce knowledge with insiders without the pitfalls of formal co-optation. Invoking personal testimony further, Avery Delany draws on their own personal experience of navigating intersectional identities of class, gender, sexuality and race to reveal the hidden and taken for granted assumptions about diversity work - that it is those in the margins who are expected to perform this work and that this work exerts a relentless exhaustion that compounds positions of marginality in the first place. Based on the notion of refusal, Delany explicitly chooses to not engage conventionally with academic works but rather to mobilise personal experience as a series of 'exercises' for the reader to work through as part of confronting the entanglement of discriminatory power structures of academia. In doing so, their article calls for the burden of diversity work to be shared, and especially by those whose significant privilege in society means they are either rarely expected to engage in this labour or they simply can choose to participate with the option of always being able to walk away.

Turning her attention to the pernicious workings of class, Chloe Dominique's paper vividly illustrates how we have neglected to understand (or have intentionally ignored) the class dynamics of our institutions, which are propped up by middle-class aspirations pertaining to individual 'success' and merit. Dominique charts what she terms 'class accidents' - the atmospheric subtleties, memories, gestures, events and body language - that compound to create a feeling of otherness and thereby generate feelings of shame, embarrassment and stigma among working class academics and students. Dominique presents her class-based critique by combining her own experience of being a working-class academic with those of her peers in order to produce a singular narrative that is suffused with collective experience; what she terms a 'choralised testimonio'. In doing so, her method alludes to the ways working-class academics attempt to blend into the elite academy by hiding, shifting, or unlearning that which may reveal themselves. This powerfully reveals how navigating higher education as a

working-class individual can entail negotiation of an entirely new lifeworld; the dynamics of which are often rendered invisible, and thus perpetuated, with alienating and disempowering effects. In a similar vein, Julia Sauma's paper also speaks to hidden biases and assumptions within academia but focuses on "the body perfect", an image expressing the academic aesthetics of expertise infusing anthropology, which has emerged through the protection of both Whiteness and ableist views. Drawing on her encounters within British and Brazilian academic spaces, Julia Sauma's paper illustrates how, notwithstanding these conversations on diversity, personal experiences of marginalisation may continue to be suppressed if they cannot be tailored to fit the aesthetic values established within academia.

The final three papers explore various aspects of accessing university study, sharing experiences of Widening Participation (WP) policy and practice to help us understand some of the reasons why higher education is still dominated by the White middle and upper classes. Returning to the question of who owns and produces knowledge, these papers reveal ways in which forms of university access work on participants to recreate existing structures. Drawing upon institutional history and quantitative admissions data, David Mills's paper critically re-thinks the ways in which UK universities currently use 'contextual' information about university applicants to make admissions 'fairer'. Highlighting how structural barriers related to 'context' continue to inhibit equitable outcomes in anthropology admissions processes, Mills reveals that student intake to anthropology from private schools continues to dwarf those from state schools. For example, Mills discusses the fact that most social anthropology departments are found in 'Russell group' and 'Sutton-30' universities where student populations are more likely to be able-bodied, White, female and middle class than those in other courses and universities, and have more opportunity to access PhD research funding. Mills concludes that alongside recent acknowledgements of the institutional racism within UK universities, a more encompassing and self-reflective definition of 'contextuality' that includes the institutional contexts of universities themselves, would allow a critical attention to the academic cultures that in themselves create barriers to widening access across both undergraduate and postgraduate study.

Exploring further the ways in which hierarchies exist between students and courses, Chima Michael Anyadike-Danes examines what happens when working-class individuals take up a place on WP higher education foundation programmes. Drawing on interview and ethnographic material, Anyadike-Danes considers the foundation year as a transition rite for UK students from 'diverse' or 'underrepresented' backgrounds, and in doing so, exposes the tension between the intended inclusivity and transformation of WP strategies with the actual lived experience of exclusion and reinforced difference. Far from transforming initiates into fully fledged undergraduate students, the foundation year programme reinforces identities of being 'diverse' and thus marks working class individuals as 'different' from their undergraduate peers. Going back further in the education journey by concentrating on the school experience, Sally Dennehy endeavours to understand why some young adults might not view university as a possible pathway. As a secondary school teacher, Dennehy discusses ways in which WP initiatives fail to reach all communities, using the concept of familiarity and strangeness to understand this. Exploring WP initiatives from the angle of the young people they try to reach, Dennehy draws on her teaching experiences, and experiences of organising trips to attend WP events, to reveal how location acts as a barrier to university study and thus attempts to increase access result in actively excluding a section of disadvantaged rural young people that WP teams are trying to reach. Dennehy concludes by proposing new directions in WP rural outreach in order to facilitate wider participation for other under-represented or disadvantaged groups.

### **An anthropology for disruption as anthropology for change**

As Faye Harrison (1991) posed so many years ago, is there a more transformative and radical potential of anthropology in which our methods, teaching and professional practices can in fact be used to work towards human emancipation and liberation? Far from asking what convenient lessons can be learnt from personal experience, this special issue has tried to take heed of this clarion call and leverage the "epistemological centrality and the legitimacy of experiential knowledge" (Harrison, 2012: 26). It seeks to open up a space for disruptive collaboration within our discipline in which differentially situated professionals, students and scholar activists can interrogate - and thereby re-think - the aims, purposes and practices of 'diversity' across higher education in the UK today. The act of engaging in the uncomfortable practice of speaking truth to power results in those that witness to no longer feign ignorance. It bestows us with the responsibility to change, to act ethically and accept the consequences. In doing so, we urge readers to engage in coalition building - to build support and care for each other to challenge the on-going presumed legitimacy of naturalised structures of discrimination and inequality that are hidden within our institutions and beyond. This includes radically re-thinking our curriculum,

pedagogy and methodologies; challenging our hiring practices and admissions processes and policies; reviewing our communication as we strive to become more transparent, honest and outspoken about the realities of everyday discriminations within our discipline; making space and taking time to hear the voices of those disempowered and disregarded by institutions and, in the light of this testimony, working together to take concrete steps towards creating anti-racist and equitable environments. Redefining 'diversity' thus requires more than advocating token acts of inclusivity, just as collaboration requires so much more than passive participation. As anthropologists, we are equipped to experiment with a more porous and humanistic conception of the term. Moving beyond a deficit mode of simply identifying exclusion and difference, we advocate 'diversity' as a holistic praxis that permeates every aspect of our discipline and is reflective of the anthropologists we are trying to become.

## References

- Ahmed, S. (2012), *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional life*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Alexander, J. (2005), *Pedagogies of Crossing. Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, and the Sacred*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Allen, J.S. & Jobson, J.C. (2016) The Decolonizing Generation: (Race and) Theory in Anthropology since the Eighties. *Current Anthropology*, 57(2): 129-148.
- Archer, L., Hutchings, M., & Ross, A. (2003). *Higher education and social class: Issues of exclusion and inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Behar, R. (1997). *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*.
- Bell, Joyce. M. & Hartmann, Douglas (2007), 'Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of "Happy Talk"', *American Sociological Review*, 72(6): 894-914.
- Bolles, L. (2013), 'Telling the Story Straight: Black Feminist Intellectual Thought in Anthropology', *Transforming Anthropology: Journal of the Association of Black Anthropologists*, 21(1): 57-71.
- Brodkin, K., Morgen, S. and Hutchinson, J. (2011), 'Anthropology as White Public Space', *American Anthropology*, 113(4): 545-556
- File-Muriel, M. D. P. (2013). An exploration of the social effectiveness of political kidnapping testimonios in Colombia. *Journal of Contemporary Anthropology*, 4(1), 2.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, London: Penguin Books.
- Galtung, J. (1990) Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3). SAGE Publications Ltd: 291-305.
- Haraway, D. (1988) "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective". *Feminist Studies*. 14(3): 575-599.
- Harrison, F. V. (ed) (1991). 'Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology of Liberation', Arlington, Virginia, American Anthropological Association.
- Harrison, F. V. (2012), 'Racism in the Academy: Toward a Multi-Methodological Agenda for Anthropological Engagement' in, A. Smedley and J. F. Hutchinson (eds), *Racism in the Academy: The New Millennium: Report by the American Anthropological Association*, pp. 13-24. Also available at: [http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/commissions/upload/CRR\\_reportFULL.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/commissions/upload/CRR_reportFULL.pdf)
- Hymes, D. (1969). *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York. Vintage Books.

- Jobson, R.C. (2020), 'The Case for Letting Anthropology Burn: Sociocultural Anthropology in 2019', *American Anthropologist*, 122: 259-27.
- Kirton, G., Greene, A, and Dean, D. (2007) 'British Diversity Professionals as Change Agents – Radicals, Tempered Radicals or Liberal Reformers?', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(11): 1979-94.
- Mogstad, H and Tse, L. (2018), 'De-colonizing Anthropology', *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology*, 36(2): 53-72.
- Mohanty, T. (2003), *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonising Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Nance, K. A. (2006). *Can literature promote justice?: trauma narrative and social action in Latin American testimonio*. Vanderbilt University Press.
- Puwar, N. (2004), *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. Oxford: Berg.
- Smith, W.A., Yosso, T. J., and Solórzano, D.G. (2006) 'Challenging Racial Battle Fatigue on Historically White Campuses: A Critical Race Examination of Race-Related Stress' in, C. A. Stanley (ed), *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities*, pp. 299-327.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999), *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Tate, W. (2007). *Counting the dead: the culture and politics of human rights activism in Colombia* (Vol. 18). Univ of California Press.

### **Acknowledgments:**

We wish to thank the Editors of *Teaching Anthropology* for their patient enthusiasm for this project which has taken many twists and turns since its original inception. We are hugely grateful to the authors who devoted considerable time, energy and insight to this special issue; we learned so much in the process and we hope to continue these collaborative conversations moving forward. We are also grateful to Alice Elliot for her generous contributions which helped this project come to fruition.

### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

---

<sup>i</sup> A few examples that we are familiar with include: [www.decolonialanth.co.uk](http://www.decolonialanth.co.uk), [SOAS Learning and Teaching-Toolkit](#), and the *PAPER seminar series* .

<sup>ii</sup> This nationwide strike advocated not only for better academic pensions, but fairer contracts for precarious fixed term early career academics, the abolition of the gender and race pay gap, and the eradication of outsourcing of maintenance and security staff.