Book Review

The Journal of Educational Foundations
Vol. 35, No. 2
Fall 2022, pp.
Copyright 2022 by Caddo Gap Press

Pedagogies of With-ness: Students, Teachers, Voice, and Agency
Edited by Linda Hogg, Kevin Stockbridge, Charlotte Achieng-Evensen, & Suzanne SooHoo

Reviewed by Hannah Edber

Pedagogies of With-ness: Students, Teachers, Voice, and Agency (2021), edited by Linda Hogg, Kevin Stockbridge, Charlotte Achieng-Evenson, and Suzanne SooHoo, aims to center youth voices in U.S. and New Zealand contexts, and to offer examples of how teachers can work in solidarity with students to "change realities problematized by these voices" (Hogg et al., 2021, p. xix). Work on student voice generally engages with power dynamics between teachers and students and the possibility of social change that emerges from considerations of student voice (Chukwuere, 2021; Cooper & Anwaruddin, 2016; Müller-Kuhn, et al., 2021) and *Pedagogies of With-ness* takes up these themes as well, to varying degrees of success. This review addresses two main issues where the volume falls short: its failure to engage with the significance of geographic space and place, and its occasionally oversimplified treatment of student voice.

The editors of *Pedagogies of With-ness* open their volume with gratitude to their publisher (Myers Education Press) for "the opportunity to feature scholars from two countries as a path to global solidarity of teachers for and with students" (p. xii). The editors do not acknowledge the specificity and context of the two locations featured in the book (the U.S. and New Zealand), nor do they take up what global solidarity might

Hannah Edber is a Pd.D. student in the Tift College of Education at Mercer University, Atlanta, Georgia. Her e-mail address is: hannah.edber@live.mercer.edu

look like in practice beyond the production of this volume. By neglecting to engage with critical geography, *Pedagogies* misses an opportunity to seriously and critically consider what global perspectives on student voice can and do for educational foundations.

In this review, I will first discuss the multiple ways "student voice" has been taken up by critical scholarship. Then, I will introduce how critical geography helps scholars in the field consider the "spaciocurricular" (Helfenbein, 2021)—what material spaces, places, and geographies teach. Finally, I will discuss how *Pedagogies of With-ness* misses opportunities to "take place seriously"—to consider how "geography is…an inherently political as well as pedagogical enterprise" (Helfenbein, 2021, p. 6) and thus stalls the possibilities for solidarity in action called for in chapter one. This is important to the rest of the book because without a consideration of the material and political significance of place, possibilities for global solidarity through this project stay vague, underdeveloped, and difficult for the reader to imagine or engage.

Student Voice and Agency

Critical education scholarship establishes student voice as a fund of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) to be tapped, developed, and uplifted in the interest of democratizing educational projects (Cooper & Anwaruddin, 2016). Student voice can strengthen academic outcomes for students (Kahne, Bowyer, Marshall, & Hodgin, 2022). It can and should be taken up to establish restorative justice practices that combat the school-to-prison pipeline (Gardner, 2016; González, Sattler, & Buth, 2018), and to contribute to more inclusive school environments (Berman & MacArthur, 2018). While taking student voice seriously offers critical possibilities to foster students' resistance capital (Yosso, 2005; 2016) and to participate in dialogic pedagogy that attends to students' lives (Van Manen, 1988), students and their voices are also shaped by, and shape, interconnected and co-constituted assemblages of violence (Wozolek, 2021), power, interests, and investments. Student voice is not a fixed entity with an unwavering meaning. It is not unattached nor untouched by the forces educators might hope student voice can be leveraged to dismantle. For critical educators, especially for classroom teachers whose professional lives are complicated by increasingly alienating duties and accountability structures, teaching and learning alongside students, who are developing their voices and, in turn, whose voices are developed by educators, is an ongoing and complex project with multidirectional investments and goals.

In considering the possibilities for achieving solidarity with students through a consideration of student voice, the editors of *Pedagogies of*

With-ness place their work in a COVID-19 context, which exposed social and educational inequities. They write that they hope to build student resilience through relationships in an ongoing moment where "with-ness is more important than ever" (Hogg, et al., 2021, p. xv). The first chapter, Christopher Lewis's "Who is Listening to Students?" points to meaningful social change made possible by "Generation Z's interconnectedness" in digital spaces and differentiate between "youth voice as tokenism" (p. 3) and youth voice as "dismantling the hierarchy of dialogic space between teachers and students" (p. 1). The volume builds on this notion of student voice by engaging interdisciplinary approaches to education, bringing together disability studies, indigenous epistemologies, critical race analysis, and school discipline scholarship to present multiple inroads towards a central contention: that "student voice, as an expression of critical consciousness, necessitates more than simply hearing. It compels us to move into action" (p. xix). This call to action is compelling in its insistence that educating for and with student voice is necessary to bring adults and young people into the same field, fighting for schooling experiences that serve and honor the lives of youth.

One of the introductory assertions of *Pedagogies of With-ness* is that student voice must be considered as a stakeholder in making social change. But what happens when teachers, school leaders, and other youth workers encounter youth voices who don't want change? Or youth voices that want changes for some at the expenses of others? What about student voice that is racist, misogynistic, or transphobic? When the introduction to this volume declares that "student voice is sacred" (xviii), the editors foreclose what could be generative reflections on what is complicated or fraught about cultivating student voice, especially when the desired ends (social and educational change, a destruction of teacher-student hierarchies, etc.) have been predetermined. This is an important consideration for scholars using this book as it relates to educational foundations, which is a field that has, in its historical and contemporary iterations, attended closely to a diversity of student voice and perspectives (Brockenbrough, 2016; Camangian & Stoval, 2022; Gerson, 2017; Erevelles, 2000; Meiners, 2010; Morris, 2016).

There are additional dangers to an uncritical assumption that student voice is inherently sacred. What does it mean to be sacred? Is something sacred protected from critique, from pushback, from change? Morna McDermott (2020) has clarified that youth voice emerges in relation to the "possible/imagined/desired voicings" that are "elicited, or made available, to you in pedagogical encounters" (p. 347). What students have to say is shaped by context, which includes the relationships and contexts present in the exchange of voice and ear. Another danger is the untroubled idea that structural educational issues, embedded in racist histories,

can be solved by the individuated act of listening. Discipline systems that disproportionately target Black youth, pedagogical relationships overly governed by neoliberal efficiency models, and curriculums that center Whiteness, heterosexuality, and other dominant ideologies and identities are systems of violence embedded into the foundations of U.S. public education. This is not to say that individuals and communities have no agency, and that relationships, resistance, and survivance (Vizenor, 2008)—the ongoing and active sustaining of Indigenous tradition, life, and ways of knowing within education (Hatch & Roziek, 2022, October 13-15)—is futile in the face of violent systems. The danger here is an unproblematized view of the teacher-as-savior. Listening might be an act of solidarity and it might offer healing, but the act of listening itself is embedded in a series of ongoing and co-constitutive relationships between adults, young people, and the structures and contexts that inform their attachments.

Finally, approaching student voice as inherently sacred can be harmful for students who need adult intervention in cultivating critical awareness of stories they may tell about themselves. One example of the potential harm this framing can cause is found in Delia Baskerville's chapter, "Truancy: Young People Walk Away From Negative School Factors," introduces the author's grounded theory study on youth who truant (YwT) in New Zealand schools.

> YwT experience prejudice in the classroom. They struggle to understand the work set by teachers and need help from their teachers to engage with learning. When teachers do not help them, YwT think it unreasonable. They find it unsettling to be neglected, labeled, minoritized and invisible in class. Resentment builds as some teachers attend to others, who YwT perceive to be unmotivated anyway. They also observe that inattention is a teacher choice. (p. 29)

As a former classroom teacher, I found this analysis myopically focused on the experiences of students without a consideration of what shapes those experiences—including student action and agency. Far from empowered shapers of social change, students in this study are construed as un-agential victims of neglectful teachers. Speaking from a U.S. sociohistorical and political perspective, student truancy follows patterns of social, political, and economic inequity, as well as feelings of exclusion and alienation mediated by race and class marginalization (Morris, 2016; Willis, 1977). On the other hand, blaming a teacher for students' difficulty following material–when those students are rarely at school–doubles down on student voice as whole, formed, and lacking a need for intervention. A more generative discussion of truancy would look beyond classrooms and school buildings and towards a more structural, nuanced understanding of contributing factors to student agency, choice,

and experience. For example, Erica Meiners' (2017) work on troubling the category of the "child" as unavailable to policed and surveilled communities of color helps us think about students as actors who are shaped by, and respond to, racial and economic politics.

Ndini Kitonga's chapter, "Angeles Workshop School: An Experiment in Student Voice," is a useful intervention into simplistic conceptions of student voice as necessarily an opening into political possibility. Kitonga describes her experience as a co-founder of a Grade 6-12 "microschool" of 25 students in Los Angeles, California. Founded with critical humanistic and Freirian values that aim to prepare students to address issues facing their own communities (Freire, 1970/2000), Angeles Workshop School aims to foster student choice "tempered by educators' recommendations of fundamental skills, content, concepts, and values" (p. 198). At AWS, students engage in collective decision-making about norms at school, and, following Dewey (1936/1970), are encouraged to look at both the outcome and the process of these conversations. "We also have ongoing conversations on how to engage in decision-making without imposing conformity culture on each other," Kitonga writes. "What we have found is that through the continual small exercises in 'democracy,' students begin to practice listening to each other's ideas as well as bravely presenting their own" (p. 204).

Further writing into the complexities of centering student voice, Kitonga describes a student who refused to engage in writing classes because they were boring. AWS encourages students to make decisions for themselves as long as they do not interfere with the lives of others. Speaking back to Baskerville's work, students may, for example, opt to skip class, but the activity they choose in lieu of class may not interfere with the learning of others. For teachers at AWS who believe the development of writing skills takes practice, and that building endurance for difficult tasks is a key component of education, this student's refusal to write tests the boundaries of this policy. "How can we listen to Jasper and suspend our own agendas as teachers while ensuring he receives everything he deserves as our student?" Kitonga asks. "We continue to struggle with this question in active dialogue with Jasper" (p. 206).

The above chapter may feel like a relief for educators who tire of hearing that they aren't doing enough—not listening enough—to their students. Kitonga's piece points to the complexity of deciding, as adults, what and how to listen, and how, as adults, to develop student voice in a way that benefits them as individuals and as community members. Of course, that community piece is critical, and may be easier to define in a school of 25 than in one of 3,000. If educators want students to use their voices to improve systems for their community, they will likely need guidance in identifying and building a sense of what that community

is–and this process and outcome will vary tremendously by student experiences of inclusion and exclusion as it is shaped by race, class, gender, and other sociopolitical factors.

Chapters in *Pedagogies of With-ness* that will be most valuable to readers do at least one of the following: center strengths and assets of students and communities; consider pedagogy and voice broadly and creatively; and/or complicate the process and outcome of listening and acting in solidarity with student voice. Michelle Flowers-Taylor's chapter, "Rooted and Rising: The Self-Liberation of African American Female Students," turns to autoethnography and narrative analysis to explore factors that help African American female students to develop positive academic identity. "I had grown tired of hearing about what was not working in education for young African American women and girls," Flowers-Taylor writes (p. 37). By centering student agency, decision-making, and thoughtfulness, and by writing into the complexity of space, place, and circumstance, this chapter provides a critical interruption to those that overlook the simultaneous and multidirectional players that populate assemblages of education.

"Rooted and Rising" stands out in this volume in that Flowers-Taylors accounts for space, place, and the specifics of race histories, literacies, and politics that shape the context for her study. This specification is critical in a volume that aims to highlight opportunities for action in solidarities with students; how can educators think through possibilities for action when structural bounds are left undefined? Locating arguments in a specific cultural and historical moment opens further possibilities for generating action than other works in this volume, like Katherine Lewis's "'The Unnecessary Gendering of Everything': Gender-Diverse Adults Speak Back to their K-12 Schools," in which adult nonbinary, genderfluid, gender non-conforming, agender, and trans students reflect on their schooling experiences twenty years ago using the language and values of the present.

Each chapter of *Pedagogies of With-ness* concludes with reflection questions for consideration, inviting readers to reflect on what possibilities might emerge within their own teaching practices. These questions, developed by the editors, offer starting points for educators to consider "What reflective practices could help you think about students' identity development?" (p. 46). These questions don't always prompt readers to consider the power dynamics that exist between themselves and their students beyond the limits of the classroom. For example, a question following Flowers-Taylor's chapter asks "What can you do to create sacred space for minoritized students?" (p. 46). This question misses the opportunity to acknowledge dynamics of race, class, gender, and other positionalities shape teacher-student relationships and instructional

choices. Michelle Flowers-Taylor is a Black woman writing explicitly about creating sacred spaces for her Black female students. Her work is drawn from personal, political, and professional experiences as a Black woman, and the particulars of the relationships she has built with Black female students in teaching and in research. A question that asks "what can you do?" without also pushing readers to consider their own positionalities, and the positionalities of their students, denies the significance of race and gender that are central to the author's project, and flattens the specificity, and the political urgency, of her work.

Critical Geographies

The volume is organized into three sections: The Identify and Voice Gallery, the Pedagogy Gallery, and the Youth-Adult Partnerships Gallery. The editors have envisioned the sections as galleries for readers to browse at their wills, pausing where they feel drawn and skimming where they don't. In his foreword, Kevin Kumashiro explains that museum galleries can either overdetermine what visitors should pay attention to, or they can allow visitors space to explore and make their own meanings. This metaphor is promising for offering a different mode in which readers can engage with scholarship, as an invitation to look, browse, pause, and consider once they have moved on from the "space." However, the promise of the spatial metaphor is deflated without an acknowledgement of how material gallery spaces come to be, and how visitors and/or "readers" of galleries might grapple with those histories. Kumashiro doesn't mention the long and violent project of galleries as showcases of past and ongoing cultural plunder (Zakaria, 2017), or locate his own youthful discomfort with gallery spaces in histories of one cultural production made possible by the destruction of another. The absence of this critique within the spatial metaphor of the gallery highlights the volume's tentative engagement with history, geography, and context, which dampens its calls for action and change making. Attending to the absence of this critique within the spatial metaphor of the gallery is important, not only because it highlights the volume's tentative engagement with history and with geography, but because it also dampens the very calls made in this text for action and change. With its "gallery walk" layout, *Pedagogies of With-ness* might be expected to attend carefully to issues of space and place. The extended spatial metaphor, unfortunately, highlights the ways in which this volume is weakened by its weakened treatment of political and educational geographies.

Critical geography in education insists that space and place matter materially, not just metaphorically, and that spaces leak, and spaces speak (Helfenbein 2011), as their own curricula that "express ideologies,

affective forces, and power relations, and are ontological processes filled with living politics that shape who we are as subjects" (Helfenbein 2021, p. 7). While critical geography might not be the project of the editors and contributors, a nod to geography without bringing it forward flattens the possibility for "global solidarity" in action. A consideration of why educational experience is unfolding a certain way–to uphold or diminish existing hierarchies, to recirculate, reify, or react to power relations–is stunted without a consideration of when and where it is happening, and how the space and time has been constructed by decisions about the material mattering of place. Critical geography, writes Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2022), offers "ways to contemplate and document the vibrant dialectics of objective and subjective conditions that, if properly paid attention to, help reveal both opportunities for and impediments to human liberation" (p. 92). Steamrolling the specifics of place and space forecloses possibilities for the kind of liberatory action the editors of *Pedagogies of With-ness* call for.

Roughly half of the chapters are written about the U.S., and the other half are written about New Zealand; there is never an explanation about why these two places are paired in the same volume. Editors could have spoken to shared historical reverberations of colonization, indigenous struggle and resistance, and ongoing participation in global trade relations. They could also have attended to the vast differences between these two locations, notably in the form and structure of schooling. Not only do schools in New Zealand publicly fund Maori-language and content education (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2022), they also widely offer restorative justice models (Drewery, 2016) within the context of a justice system that does the same (New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 2022). In addition, the landscape, and thus economies of the United States and New Zealand differ vastly, as do histories of school policy, zoning, housing, and urban, suburban, and rural development. Without a substantive acknowledgement of these material (and thus cultural) differences, the opportunity to leverage the works from New Zealand contexts is lost for U.S. readers and scholars.

One chapter that does acknowledge the complexities of space and place is "Into the Future by, with, and for Indigenous Youth: Rangatahi Maori Leading Youth Conversations" by Huia Tomlins-Jahnke, Joanna Kidman, and Adreanne Ormond, carefully considers the specifics of place and time for the Maori youth at the article's center. "Indegenous peoples share similar experiences of colonial and imperial violence, terror, devastation, and oppression," write the authors.

> We also share similar understandings about our relationship to the cosmos as familial, which suggests worldviews that are compatible and in harmony. Despite this, we cannot assume that the experiences

> of Maori youth in this study necessarily align with those of indigenous youth elsewhere… What we found that may resonate with indigenous communities across the world, however, was that by enlisting the help [of an indigenous youth leader] we were able to…learn how young people might deal with indigenous aspirations in an era of scarcity and austerity. (p. 76)

While this passage does acknowledge how the findings of one study may not easily map onto the context of another, attending to the specifics of how location and history have shaped the experiences of indigenous communities would invite further opportunities for scholars and youth workers to consider action for their own work with young people, particularly young indigenous people as they are centered in this piece.

Nonetheless, this piece is one of the strongest of the collection. The authors reflect on how one youth worker, Pat, engaged Maori youth through traditional Maori epistemologies and pedagogies, and guides readers through the skillset Pat possessed in addition to his own Maori identity and cultural knowledge:

> Pat had the ability to listen, to hear, to observe, and then to interpret how Rangatahi [Maori youth] communicated with each other and with others outside their groups…Pat's ability to communicate in and recognize both 'youth talk' and body language as well as a particular brand of Maori humor heightened his sensitivity to the rhythm and flow of rangatahi dispositions and frame of mind at any given time. This was particularly apparent after meals, when rangathai were most lethargic…Typically in schools, we would have insisted activities start as planned, 'rounding everyone up' with a no-nonsense, 'ready or not' approach. In contrast, Pat patiently watched, listened, and observed the rangatahi, joining in from time to time as they expended restless energy by kicking a ball, strumming a ukelele…until they were ready to engage. (p. 74)

I quote this passage at length because I was struck by the vibrant description of Pat's work, and the humble, curious tone of the writer. I was also grateful for the opportunity to consider more deeply the subtleties of what is assumed to be necessary—uses of time, tone, and communication—in schools where I have worked. This chapter is powerful because in attending to specifics of time, place, culture, and communication, it opens further opportunities for readers to connect and reflect than chapters that work in generalities.

Finally, I was moved by another chapter that deals with the specifics of place, Erin McCloskey's "Applying Gentleness Against the Force: The Dojo as a Site of Liberation for Autistic People." McCloskey describes a judo studio in the United State that serves as an "alternative world" to the oppressive demands of school spaces. She explains that the typical

behavioral intervention plans (BIPs) that are designed to support autistic students in schools by describing inappropriate behaviors and attendant consequences. Following Freire (1920/2000), McCloskey writes, "This system of changing behaviors is oppressive because it constructs Autistic students as people whose actions and thinking needs to be controlled. The implementation of a scripted plan to change one's behavior is akin to the banking style of education" (p. 167). Alternatively, at the dojo, Autistic students are supported through teachings that highlight bodily and emotional awareness of the self and others. Critically, a teacher at the dojo, Sensei Scott, doesn't correct a new student's wiggling, giggling, or hand-flapping, but rather finds meaning in it. Like Pat, Scott follows not just what students are communicating, but how they are communicating. He honors student voices by listening to them on their terms, not on his.

Overall, *Pedagogies of With-ness* would have been strengthened by attention to specifics: the context and geographies of the youth and adults it describes, but also the limitations and possibilities of how youth voice has been imagined. Even a brief mention of the myriad projects scholars, educators, and youth workers have assigned to student voice would be a helpful acknowledgement of the evacuation of meaning from the phrase, and a way to re-instill some specifics to what student voice might mean, and what it can do. The best chapters of *Pedagogies of With-ness* attend to the specifics of place, politics, and people. These chapters hone in on stories that consider contextualized challenges and opportunities; in doing so, they invite readers to expand our consideration of our own work with young people, and the ways in which we might rethink what it means to listen, and to act. As Wilson Gilmore (2022) tells us, "at the end of the day, freedom is a place" (p. 93). The chapters that acknowledge the agency of students, and the particular spaces that shape educational realities, might help readers, educators, and scholars get to that place.

References

Berman, J. & MacArthur, J. (2018). *Student perspectives on school: Informing inclusive practice*. Brill.

Brockenbrough, E. (2016). Becoming queerly responsive: Culturally responsive pedagogy for Black and Latino urban queer youth. *Urban Education, 51*(2), 170-196.

Camangian, P. R., & Stovall, D. O. (2022). Bang on the system: People's praxis and pedagogy as humanizing violence. *Urban Education*, 00420859221092967.

Chukwuere, J. E. (2021). Student voice in an extended curriculum programme in the era of social media: A systematic review of academic literature. *International Journal of Higher Education, 10*(1), pp. 147-156.

Cooper, K., & Anwaruddin, S. M. (2016). *Student voice: A companion to "Democracy and its Discontents."* Brill.

Drewery. (2016). Restorative practice in New Zealand Schools: Social development through relational justice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48*(2), 191–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2014.989951

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.) Continuum.

Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational theory, 50*(1), 25-47.

Gardner, T. W. (2016). *Discipline over punishment: Successes and struggles with restorative justice in schools*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Gershon, W. S. (2017). *Curriculum and students in classrooms: Everyday urban education in an era of standardization*. Lexington Books.

Gilmore, R. W. (2022). *Abolition geography: Essays towards liberation*. Verso.

González, N., Moll, L., Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

González, T., Sattler, H., & Buth, A. J. (2018). New directions in whole-school restorative justice implementation. *Association of Conflict Resolution, 36*, 207-220.

Hatch, S., & Rosiek, J. (2022, October 13-15). *Agency and counter-agency in curriculum studies: Teacher work against the grain of settler futurities*. [Paper presentation]. Bergamo Conference on Curriculum Theory and Practice, Dayton, OH, United States.

Helfenbein, R. (2011). Thinking through scale: Critical geography and curriculum spaces. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment.* (pp. 304-317). Routledge.

Helfenbein, R.J. (2021). *Critical geographies of education*. Routledge.

Hogg, L., Stockbridge, K., Achieng-Evensen, C., & SooHoo, S. (2021). *Pedagogies of with-ness: Students, teachers, voice and agency.* Myers Education Press.

Kahne, J., Bowyer, B., Marshall, J, & Hodgin E. (2022). Is responsiveness to student voice related to academic outcomes? Strengthening the rationale for student voice in school reform. *American Journal of Education, 128*(3), 389-415.

McDermott, M. (2020). On what autoethnography did in a study on student voice pedagogies: A mapping of returns. *The Qualitative Report, 25*(2), 347-358.

Meiners, E. R. (2010). *Right to be hostile: Schools, prisons, and the making of public enemies.* Routledge.

Meiners, E. R. (2017). The problem child: Provocations toward dismantling the carceral state. *Harvard Educational Review, 87*(1), 122–146. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.1.122

Morris, M. (2016). Pushout: *The criminalization of Black girls in schools*. The New Press.

Müller-Kuhn, D., Zala-Mezö, E., Häbig, J., Strauss, N.-C. & Herzig, P. (2021). Five contexts and three characteristics of student participation and student voice: A literature review. *International Journal of Student Voice, 6*(2).

New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2022, August 2). *Education in New Zealand*. Retrieved August 21, 2022, from https://www.education.govt.

nz/our-work/our-role-and-our-people/education-in-nz/#:~:text=New%20Zealand's%20education%20system%20has,education%3A%20higher%20and%20vocational%20education.

New Zealand Ministry of Justice. (2022, August 3). *How restorative justice works*. Justice.Govt.Nz. Retrieved 2–22-08-21, from https://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/criminal/charged-with-a-crime/how-restorative-justice-works/

Van Manen, M. (1988). The relation between research and pedagogy. In W. F. Pinar (Ed,) *Contemporary curriculum discourses*. Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Vizenor, G. (2008). *Survivance: Narratives of Native presence*. University of Nebraska Press.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working-class kids get working-class jobs*. Columbia University Press.

Wozolek, B. (2021). *Assemblages of violence in education: Everyday trajectories of oppression*. Routledge.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.

Yosso, T. J. (2016). Whose culture has capital?: A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. In A. D. Dixson, C. K, Rousseau Anderson, & J. K. Donnor (Eds.). *Critical race theory in education* (pp. 113-136). Routledge.

Zakaria, R. (2017, August 7). Provenance and plunder: What museums won't tell us. *Arts and Culture | Al Jazeera*. Retrieved August 21, 2022, from https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2017/8/7/provenance-and-plunder-what-museums-wont-tell-us