

***Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change.* By Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (Eds.). New York: Routledge, 2014. 244 pp. ISBN: 9780415816830.**

While many educational institutions aspire to be sites of citizenship, inclusivity, and equity, the reality is that they are oftentimes spaces where youth are marginalized, denied dignity, and refused their voices. Further, when youth resist these spaces, there is a possibility their resistance may be misinterpreted, lead to their further marginalization, or be co-opted within colonial structures. Within this context, Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's text, *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change*, problematizes existing resistance research in order to reinvigorate the field through a more contextualized and dynamic approach that dialogues with theories of power and change. Considering educational institutions are sites where power is exercised and felt, the text has implications for how to create institutions where students are educated as creatively resistant and participatory citizens.

Tuck and Yang begin by identifying the current calcification of research and expectations surrounding youth resistance, which indicates a need to explore the "gap between the expectations we have for resistance movements and resistance in the real" (p. 12). By focusing on specific and contextualized examples of real resistance, particularly through queer, feminist and alternative lenses, they assert that resistance research may "reveal unquestioned assumptions about youth, communities, and social transformation" (p. 9) and allow us to theorize power and change in alternative ways. Initiating a dialogue between recent research and established theories, such as Paul Willis' *Learning to Labor* (1977), the text powerfully asserts how youth resistance holds potential to offer "other forms of survivance, decolonial possibilities, agnosticism with progress, and desires for dignity that would enrich the currently paltry discussion on theories of change" (p. 17). Central to this contextualized approach is how Tuck and Yang treat "youth" not as a developmental category but as a "structural (and historical, generational, political) location... a legally, materially, and always raced/gendered/classed/sexualized category" (p. 4). It is the exploration of youth resistance through such "multiple, sometimes simultaneous and contradictory, sometimes self-injuring, sometimes triumphant ways" (p. 2) that opens up possibilities for the kinds of alternative theorizing for which the contributors aspire.

Through its structure, the text as a whole leads readers through a questioning of established research to a generative space whereby new, more imaginative modes of resistance research may come into consideration. Part I opens by troubling foundational resistance research through interviews with influential theorists who "complicate and reclaim" their own theories. Part II interrogates various theories of change in relation to youth resistance to probe how the two are mutually informing. Part III presents new youth resistance research in diverse contexts of educational injustice to explore new and expanded theories and research methods. Though at times the contributions may appear contradictory, in particular the sometimes disparate reflections of those interviewed in Part I, the diversity and specificity of contributions reinforces Tuck and Yang's call for more contextual approaches and reinforces the very point that there are no generalizable rules regarding resistance research.

Part I opens with Dmitriadis, who provides context by weaving the various interviews that constitute this section together with a historical overview of resistance research, emphasizing the need for an imaginative break from current valorization of youth resistance and its packaging into tidy and stable theories of change. The following interviews open conversations about “what counts” as resistance, providing potential frames for resistance research. Fine, for instance, captures resistance as an epistemology, which “insists on denaturalizing, indeed, queering social arrangements and provoking the social imagination for what else is possible” (p. 54). Scott calls for attunement to more subtle forms of resistance which undergird greater social disruption; by contrast, Noguera asserts the particular political and strategic agency contained within larger organized social movements. While Kelly elucidates how acts of youth resistance are powerfully diagnostic and revelatory, Fordham shifts her focus from resistance to transformation, questioning the effectiveness of resistance which is carried out within – and thus legitimizes – existing structures. Finally, Vizenor provides examples of how creative energy may slowly break existing frameworks, while simultaneously invigorating resistance and survivance; he thus initiates consideration of the forms and objects of change, providing a fitting transition to the next section of the text.

In their introduction to Part II, Tuck and Yang remind us not to assume resistance leads to change, but to dig into how and why particular expressions of resistance may lead to the particular good and just changes we want. Continuing the contextual approach to resistance outlined in Part I, Tuck and Yang allow that approaches to change “tend to be plural – the same actors often have multiple theories of multiple changes appropriate for their multiple modes of engagement with colonial modernity” (p. 121), and the following contributions reflect divergent contexts and conclusions. To begin, Tuck and Yang use crowd-sourced insights to demonstrate how locally situated examples serve to counter the teleological and colonial model common to educational research whereby deprivation is documented then presented to an external locus of power in a bid for support. Patel and Ares explore a dialogical process of change, whereby resistance of undocumented youth must continually adapt to ever-shifting national narratives and policies, while simultaneously relying upon a stable social network throughout the lengthy process of structural change. Similarly grounded in a collective sense of resistant agency, Akom, Scott and Shah contribute a transformative vision of resistance, which involves linking individual resistance to structures, communities and cultures that resist domination. Almost by way of example, Albahari and Yang present how Palestinian youth resistance challenges Western frames and presents decolonial alternatives. Taken as a whole, the contributions to Part II move well beyond classification of resistance as “successful” or “unsuccessful,” demonstrating instead how resistance responds in adaptive and multiple ways to dominant frames, worldviews, and structures.

The final section of the text introduces new research in youth resistance that responds to the themes presented in Parts I and II. To begin, Guishard and Tuck examine the ethical and methodological challenges of engaging in youth resistance research by presenting a mode of “theorizing back,” which involves thinking *with* youth in an ethical manner that subverts colonial modes. Locating resistant power within various youth populations, the subsequent articles demonstrate new ways of conceptualizing change in response to specific expressions of youth resistance. For instance, by analyzing indigenous youth resistance to “whitestream” outdoor

Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education, 2017, 12(1), pp. 71-73.

ISSN 1718-4770 © 2017 University of British Columbia/University of Alberta
<http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE>

education programming through the lens of cultural practices of orality, Friedel demonstrates how youth express “epistemic persistence” in the face of ongoing coloniality. In a study of “resistant sociality,” Cruz draws attention to “infrapolitics,” the “off-stage” practices of subjugated communities like LGBTQ street youth “to negotiate the continuous scrutiny and containment by the powerful” (p. 211), which demonstrate creative possibilities for being and relating. Finally, drawing on their collection of research with undocumented youth, Diaz-Strong, Gomez, Luna-Duarte and Meiners powerfully conclude the text by asserting the dynamic, intellectual and imaginative nature of resistance, shaped by both the self-determination of individuals and the strategic power of collectivization.

Taken as a whole, the text holds significant implications for citizenship education through its framing of youth as a structural location, its break with idealized models, and its invigoration of resistance as a site of survivance, decolonial possibilities, and alternative conceptions of change. By restoring personhood to youth, wherein resistance is viewed as agency rather than simply an expression of identity development, the text emboldens educators to leverage educational policy, structures and practices that create spaces for youth to imagine, experiment and resist. While such education would not prescribe modes of youth resistance, it could encourage youth to imagine, theorize, and intellectually analyze their contexts – and concurrently teach them practical skills for citizenship actions such as organizing, researching, networking, and leveraging media. Such education would move beyond the “circuits of conventional political participation, and the rubrics of self-discipline and self-governance” (p. 9) that are familiar to citizenship education towards a kind of education that is more “critical and sophisticated,” as Noguera recommends, in order to prepare youth for the challenges of acting outside of established structures.

In response to such expressions of citizenship, educators could participate in a dialogical way with students whose acts theorize institutional policies and operations that may be in need of reform. Rather than mapping institutional understandings onto acts of resistance, educators could begin to more purposefully engage with youth to interpret their own behaviors in the ways that Guishard and Tuck introduce. Further, educators may encourage youth participation in institutional change by ethically involving students in institutional research and working with them to imagine ways to reform unjust educational policies and practices. These kinds of dialogical work would require educational contexts that allow for change in multiple and unpredictable forms, which may be uncomfortable for those institutions that tend towards constancy. However, should educators be willing to relinquish some institutional stability for responsiveness, youth resistance may lead to an acknowledgement of the assumptions and gaps that may be preventing more ethical ways of being and educating for citizenship.

*Reviewed by Carrie Karsgaard, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta
karsgaard@ualberta.ca*