

# Resistance in Education

## An Empirical approach to a pedagogically relevant concept

MICHAEL PENZOLD

*ABSTRACT: In Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Liberation, the often underestimated concept of resistance is already significant in terms of argumentation. Based on this, this essay asks the question of the extent to which this concept can be reclaimed for pedagogical discussion under today's conditions. On the basis of an empirical survey of student teachers at a German university, the thesis is first put forward that the concept of resistance today is multidimensional and emotionally charged in a way that goes beyond Freire. Based on this, the categorical analysis of the students' statements opens up the field for further pedagogically relevant references to the understanding of the concept of resistance and its dimensions. As a result, resistant action and thinking as a form of learning comes into view again today.*

*KEYWORDS: Paulo Freire, teacher education, grounded theory, resistance as an educational concept, social cognition*

The global and local changes to which many societies have been exposed in recent decades have led to collective and personal irritation and aggressive conflicts almost everywhere in the world. Many of the changes that can already be felt in everyday life appear to be irreversible and overpowering. The global climate change for which humans are responsible and its catastrophic consequences should be mentioned above all. This is linked to the exploitation of nature by an unleashed global economy, pandemics such as corona, digitalization, the resurgence of anti-Semitism and the power of unpredictable, despotic regimes and their wars. All of this is a burden for people all over the world, and not just when they find out about the world situation on internet portals or television. From this perspective, the world is becoming increasingly unmanageable, threatening and incomprehensible. It has long been observed that people feel threatened by the resulting risk to their lives (Beck, 1986, 7-11). However, there is also a growing feeling that the consensus on basic values is faltering even within relatively homogeneous societies and that the "loss of a common world" is imminent (Welzer, 2023, 254-279). For pedagogy, this raises the question of how a life of self-determination is possible and can be learned in the face of these impending or already actual forms of heteronomy (Kesselring, 2014, 29). Here, pedagogy can focus on the emancipatory and resistant character of education (Ode, 2017, 66), which opposes subordination to authoritarian power

relations, the limitation of the subject's free development opportunities and the entanglement of the individual in illegitimate economic contexts (Ode, 2017, 68-85). Such a conception of education can be seen represented in the work of pedagogical thinkers such as Paulo Freire. A pedagogy of liberation inspired by Freire attempts to transform a "limiting situation" (Freire, 1996, 31) in such a way that even the "oppressors" themselves are transformed (Freire, 1996, 38) by overcoming the "climate" of oppression (Freire, 1996, 40) through the communication of authenticity (Freire, 1996, 58). The German educationalist Hans-Joachim Gamm (1925-2011), who refers to Freire (Gamm, 1974, 87), develops his emancipatory pedagogy against the background of his analysis of the repressive National Socialist pedagogy of "seduction" (Gamm, 1964, 7-44), which excludes any form of resistant action. For him, pedagogy is committed to describing and overcoming social antinomies as the basis of pedagogical emancipation processes (Gamm, 1974, 89). Gamm, who considers himself committed to dialectical hermeneutics (Gamm, 1979, 230), places the individual under obligation when defining his concept of education, because "freedom can only ever be anticipated by the individual" (Gamm, 1979, 250). Paulo Freire builds on a similar idea by stating that freedom is worthless if it does not imply the conviction "that change is possible" (Freire, 2008, 71). His argumentation then culminates almost confessionally in the concept of resistance:

It is [...] important that in the resistance that keeps us alive, in the apprehension of the future as a problem and in the vocation to be more, as an expression of human nature [...] we receive foundations for our recalcitrance [...] in the face of the challenges that destroy our existence.  
(Freire, 2008, 73)

Seen in this light, the concept of resistance is a key pedagogical concept that is considered vital, at least in liberation pedagogical theory. In view of the current destructive challenges to existence, the concept of resistance should also be central to contemporary pedagogy. Before approaching this question theoretically, it makes sense to first examine empirically how the concept of resistance is constructed today by pedagogically informed people. Can traces of the pedagogy of liberation still be reconstructed here?

The following considerations can, therefore, be understood as a contribution to the clarification of latent attitudes on the subject of resistance. They are part of empirical analyses of concepts that can be used during empirical work to critically clarify an everyday understanding of actors in the social world. (Aghamiri / Streck, 2016, 203-205)

## Student teachers and the concept of resistance: two samples

In order to find a way to describe a latent understanding of resistance, two small surveys were conducted at LMU Munich in the summer and fall of 2021 among student teachers in the Department of German as a Second Language. This group of people is particularly interesting for determining the concept of resistance. This is because the respondents aspire to a profession in which they have to deal with migrants. Accordingly, it can be assumed that they are particularly open to pluralistic approaches. It can also be assumed that they are concerned with the issue of integration and the refusal of integration.

The data presented in this essay has another advantage. They were all created before the Russian invasion of Ukraine and before the Hamas attack on Israel on October 7, 2023, and thus before the associated massacre. Both events, the war in Ukraine and the military conflict

in Gaza, would have dramatized the data situation due to their topicality and possibly obscured the latent, everyday understanding of the concept of resistance. On the other hand, no future discussion of the history of the concept of resistance is conceivable that does not include these two events.

The first sample of interviewees (n=12 / 4 groups; 14.7.2021) consisted of student teachers who had taken a seminar on Holocaust education in GFL lessons. The survey took place at the end of the semester. The assignment that elicited the students' responses was clearly related to the culture of remembrance. The reference to forms of resistance against historical National Socialism in Germany was therefore obvious. The question to all course participants was as follows: "Write down here [meaning: the Etherpad] what 'resistance' means to you today. What could trigger 'resistance' for you? How far would you go? What role could the memory of the period 1933-1945 play in this?" The students were first asked to reflect and discuss in four groups and then write a short statement together. The fact that the students were initially asked to come to an agreement in small groups was intended to pave the way for a more detailed seminar discussion.

At the same time, however, a common, consensual definition of the term should also be initiated. Unfortunately, the evaluation discussion cannot be considered empirically as it was not recorded. However, the results of the group discussions noted in the Etherpad fulfill the prerequisite of meaningfully collected data insofar as they can be understood as associative and thus also open attempts at self-clarification. As such, they are interesting in the sense of "social cognition" (Augoustinos, 2014, 6-7). The traces found in this material are, therefore, valuable as spontaneous, not yet smoothed, albeit written intermediate products of reflection processes. This is because they unconsciously and consciously make evaluations. After all, the respective group had to agree on an at least partially consensual composition of the resulting text. It is regrettable that thoughts and concepts not expressed in the respective group are also excluded. However, the questioning here is not necessarily aimed at the completeness of a spectrum but rather at basic constellations that are considered relevant to the concept of resistance.

Another objection could relate to the task itself. Due to the seminar topic, a connection between resistance today and the historical resistance against National Socialism was suggested. Of course, this connection could also have been denied. However, the reference to National Socialism is not artificial in the German historical context and in view of the current literature, but results from the self-image of the Federal Republic of Germany and its Basic Law, which documents "learning processes from the mistakes of the Nazi past" (Jaraus, 2004, 178). The question here is, among other things, whether the students, like Gamm (Gamm, 1964), connect historical experience with their current construction of the concept of resistance.

The second sample consisted of a group of student teachers of German as a second language (n=18; 17.9.2021) who were in an internship phase at the time of the survey. These students were asked to define the term "resistance" without alluding to historical resistance to National Socialism. They were asked what they generally understood by the term "resistance", how they used it and where they had encountered it before. As with the first sample, the results were recorded in an Etherpad visible to all participants on the Moodle learning platform. The setting may have resulted in the contributions being roughly the same length: 8 times two lines with about 12 words were written, 6 times three lines, three times only one line and only once nine lines. It can be assumed that the students compared the length of their definitions.

This means that the writers prioritized more than was the case with the first sample. With only 10 minutes of reflection and editing time, the time here is also only half as long as in the period available for sample A.

The evaluation of these two, unequal and yet, as will be shown, closely related samples cannot, of course, lead to representative statements. However, they are sufficient to help gather suspicious facts for the purposes of a more extensive research project.

## Resistance as a multidimensional concept

From an empirical point of view, it was initially striking how complex the concept of resistance was constructed by the students. Resistance seems to be less of an abstract concept arising from thought. Rather, it combines calculations of weighing up its effectiveness and its significance. Unlike in pedagogical theory, the concept of resistance thus seems to be generated more in the suggestion of contexts of action. On the other hand, there seems to be hardly any knowledge of various historical forms of resistance. The explanations of resistance to National Socialism are also very rudimentary.

The first question that could be asked of the material would be to what extent specifics are mentioned here, i.e. to what extent a referential approach is taken. Expectations should not be too high here, especially as no specific reference has been requested. Sample A is the most likely to be expected here. In fact, a few observations can be made here.

On the one hand, one member of group A states that he "attended many events on the topic and the White Rose" (A/8)<sup>1</sup> during his school days. One group member went to a "Christoph-Probst-Gymnasium" (A/7), a school named after a prominent member of the resistance. According to the student, this created a connection to the "White Rose resistance group" (A/7). The topic of resistance seems to be important for the students, "especially in connection with history lessons and the treatment of the Nazi era and the Holocaust" (A/39). The teacher not only "particularly emphasized and thematized the White Rose" (A/41), but also asked the class to consider "what would motivate us to resist" (A/42). Otherwise, apart from a rather vague reference in brackets to "cf. Honkong, Berlarus etc." (A/38), no concrete references are made. On the one hand, this is probably due to the rather definitional interest of both interviews.

However, it also seems to be the case that the group surveyed does not have any resilient and associable knowledge on the subject of resistance. Nevertheless, the memory of the Munich resistance movement of the "White Rose" (Benz 2018, 302-354), which is now firmly anchored in the German school curriculum and also reinforced by film adaptations, should not be underestimated here.<sup>2</sup> However, this media presence of a resistance group does not appear to have awakened interest in resistance movements in general. Rather, the students otherwise only mention phenomena that do not go beyond the realm of current daily news. But why is this the case? Another survey could be conducted here with some justification, which could examine precisely this knowledge more closely for its origin and resilience.

<sup>1</sup> The abbreviations refer to the data material. A and B denote the samples, the numbers behind the capital letters refer to the lines of the data material. The individual pieces of information usually fit into one line.

<sup>2</sup> Here are the very successful films: "The White Rose" (1982) by Michael Verhoeven and the award-winning film "Sophie Scholl. The Last Days" (2005) by Marc Rothemund.

However, the statements on the individual perception of what resistance can mean for the individual can be systematized in interesting ways. The statements made in the survey can be categorized into two four-field schemes.

The first of these can be described as follows: On the one hand, the vertical fields of determination contain statements that refer to subjective reference values. Here you tend to find statements that associate resistance primarily with sensitivities and feelings. These refer to the individual, potentially resistant person. They are therefore linked to the subject of resistance itself in the sense of a self-referential experience. The second vertical column provides space for statements that tend to describe objective circumstances that can be associated with resistance. The horizontal fields distinguish those factors that are cited as causes of resistance and, in the second row, those factors that are cited as consequences of resistance. Double citations of ambivalent statements are largely avoided in the following schemes so that the presentation remains clear. The so-called four-field scheme chosen here is a very common methodological element of the methodological repertoire of Reflexive Grounded Theory (Breuer et al., 2018, 193-194) as part of the diagram work. In the present case, it serves on the one hand to structure the material, which is a step towards a theoretically valid typology to be developed in the sense of a dimensioning of the sample (Kelle / Kluge, 2010, 71-74). However, experimental work with the four-field scheme also has the advantage that the material allows different readings and dimensions of the utterances precisely because it is assigned to several schemes to be compared. To a certain extent, the keyword-like presentation that the students chose to express their thoughts also suggests a tabular overview. This is because the individual statements and fragments of statements are sometimes very brief. For this reason alone, they fit well into a tabular structure. In addition, the language style of the students' statements facilitates translation from German into English. In view of the two samples, the first scheme is then filled out as follows:

*Table 1: Subjective and objective causes and effects of resistance*

	A. subjektive	B. objektive
I. cause	Expressing an opinion that differs from the norm (B/4) Differences of opinion (B/12) Opinion (B/39) Speaking out (B/42f)  Dissatisfaction (B/8) I am denied opportunities for free choice and critical debate (B/19f)  My own values (B10) Own moral expectations (B/30) Moment of pause and reflection (A/16) Personal and individual decision (B/34)  Observing a situation (B/22)	Disagreements (B/12) Things that do not seem right (A/10f) Something you don't agree with (B/16) Something (B/30) Something (e.g. an action) (B/38) Various conditions (B/37)  Eliminate or change a "problem" (B/13)  Unjust system (B/1) Violent access by the state (B/18) Social norm (B/28) Existing system, existing way of thinking or order (B/42f)  Aggressive argumentation structure (A/19)

	Courage, courage, a piece of heroism that everyone has to find for themselves (A/45) You need one, then several people (A/35)	
II. effect	Standing up for your own opinion and fighting for it (B/5) Acting out a counter-attitude (B/14f) Consequently, one does not participate (B/34) Actively speaking out (B/39) Counteracting by talking about and refusing certain views or practices (B/44) Defending different thinking (B/48f)	Proposed solutions (B/3)

The result of this first, organizational analysis is remarkable in several respects. Firstly, it is noticeable that field BII (objective / effect) is almost empty in contrast to the other fields. And the one statement that could be recorded here basically manifests a very cautious type of statement. According to this, acts and expressions of resistance should primarily bring up suggestions for solutions - for whatever reason. Resistance therefore has the heavy duty to always "deliver" solutions (B/3). Here, resistance seems to be cast in a strikingly pragmatic light. Those who resist, one could add, are basically obliged to do something better than what their resistant behavior is directed against. Resistance is thus possibly very strongly understood in terms of a neoliberal social optimization strategy.

In order to be able to evaluate this almost empty space more precisely, it is necessary to subject the other quadrants to a more detailed analysis. If this is done, some conspicuous features in the construction of the concept of resistance also emerge here. In quadrant AI, a linguistic or rational reason is named the cause of resistance or resistant action. The articulation of an opinion is thus linked to a personal need to express subjectively perceived conditions. Resistance is also intended as a reaction to a norm or convention of a majority. One's "own" seems to be a key concept here. Of course, the "own" is initially still an empty formula. Resistance is seen as a consequence of a heightened self-perception, which on the other hand, however, establishes a new view of others or the other. The subjective "observation of a situation" (B7, l. 22) appears here to be an activity that is just as subjective as it justifies the view of the objective, which is already thought of as resistant as a process of self-positioning. It is also to be thought of as a subjective justification of resistance. This is remarkable and becomes tangible in the search for "courage, bravery and a bit of heroism" (A4, l. 45), which is also described as a process of self-discovery. A subjectively perceived restriction that can be related to the individual subject and caused by others could be named as a further cause of resistance. This is partly because, interestingly, it is not primarily consumer or future opportunities that are at stake, but the "possibilities of free choice, of critical debate" (B/7). This intellectual restriction goes hand in hand with violations of "one's own values" (B/4) when it comes to the intellectual causes of resistance.

In the upper right quadrant, the inaccuracy of the data is striking. Here, state interference or violations of norms seem to be of particular importance. The state, which grants itself too much influence over the individual, must therefore be countered. The statement that an "aggressive argumentation structure" (A/19) justifies resistance is also interesting. Resistance is therefore legitimate if it is directed against specific types of communication or the denial of

communication. When selecting the objective causes of resistance, it should be noted that the students express themselves on a relatively abstract level. Resistance to the destruction of nature, for example, or resistance to unjust economic conditions are not addressed directly, although this would be expected from the current generation of students.

## Resistance as an expression of subjective claims to validity

If the students' statements are sorted according to a different classification scheme, the subjective and expressive aspects emerge more clearly. Here, emotional statements are sometimes more clearly recognizable than in the previous classification scheme. This is striking, for example, against the background of Freire's conception, which recognizes rational empathy (f.ex. Freire, 1996, 30), but hardly takes the emotionality of the resistant person into consideration.

The subjective experience of the resistant, as revealed in the two small surveys, can be differentiated in another four-field scheme, thereby making the observations from the first differentiation more precise. The starting point for this is the observation that the AI field, which is already very easy to fill and almost overcrowded, contains surprisingly heterogeneous statements. However, the second scheme is not just a differentiation of AI, but a revision of the entire material on the basis of new differentiation possibilities. The heterogeneity of AI in the first scheme suggests that there could be another meaningful sorting of the material, which could at least be complementary to the observations of the first scheme. The two vertical columns of the second scheme distinguish between vital and discursive determinations of resistance from the subject's point of view. This distinction emphasizes the fact that resistance can be experienced both as something physical in the broadest sense and as something connected with life's accomplishments and life development measures. Under both headings, a distinction can be made between statements that refer more to suffering and others that refer to an intervention that is to be determined in any way. They can also refer to an intention to intervene. It therefore makes sense to use the very formal categories of active and passive here. The division into active and passive behavior also occurs in the AI field according to the first scheme, for example when we read in contribution B2 that expressing an opinion other than that of the "norm [...] can be done actively and passively" (B2, l. 4-6).

A second reading of the material would result in a classification like the following:

*Table 2: Vitality, personality, and discursive practices as the basis of a second ordering scheme*

	Vital	Diskursive
1. active	Idealistic idea: immediate resistance in the event of unjust treatment (A/21f)  Dependent on situational conditions and individual personality (A/25)	When you actively and consciously oppose/speak out against something (B/7f) Speaking out against things that don't seem right (A/10f)

	<p>Not being like everyone else (B/47)                  Very personal and individual decision (A/34)                  Taking the first step (A/35)                  Standing up (A/44)                  Showing courage, bravery, and a bit of heroism (A/45.47)                  Will...to stand up (B/1f)</p> <p>To fight against something unjust (B/9)                  To rebel against something, to want to fight something (B/11)                  Adopting or living out a counter-attitude against an (apparently) prevailing majority (B/14f)                  Rebelling against the norm (B/28)                  To rebel (B/30)                  Resisting (B/31)                  Resisting someone or something (B/ 35)                  To actively oppose (B/33)                  Actively refusing something (B/41)</p> <p>Dynamic phenomenon (B/36)                  Reluctance (B/26)                  Power (B/16)                  One's own strength and will, to oppose something (B/25)                  As a physical concept... it is a force (B/35f)                  Reaction to an action ... struggle against the violent grip of an institution (B/18)                  Power of disposal over body and life is not conceded (B/20f)                  Actively working against it (B/43)</p>	<p>Raising your voice against such actions (A/44)                  Standing up for your own opinion and a different way of thinking (A/48f)                  Standing up for your opinion (B/5)                  Speaking out against an existing system, way of thinking or order (B/42f)                  Standing up for your own interests and the interests of society (A/32)                  Actively expressing one's opinion to the outside world (B/39)                  By talking about it (B/43)</p> <p>Legitimization ... arguments (B/22ff)                  Depending on many previous experiences Losses - gains (A/23f)                  Everyone should define the term resistance for themselves (A/33f)                  Process that deals with the active action of a person or group (B/13)                  Knowledge of an injustice must exist (A/43f)                  Awareness that many people have a different point of view (B/39f)                  Provide suggestions for a solution (B/3)                  Eliminate or change a problem (B/13)</p> <p>Indispensable to deal with the issue of resistance (sic!) (Hong Kong, Belarus) (A/36f)</p>
2. pas- sive	<p>Refusing certain views or practices (B/44)                  Not participating (B/33)                  One does not participate (33f)                  Opposing a situation that causes dissatisfaction (B/8)</p> <p>Mostly observing the situation first (A/22)</p> <p>Moment of pausing and countering (A/16)</p>	<p>Aggressive argumentation structure of another person (A/19f)                  When you realize that someone is being treated unfairly and no one intervenes (A/19)</p> <p>Events on the subject of the White Rose (A/8)                  History lessons (A/9)                  Was dealt with at school (A/39)                  Remembrance of the period 1933-45 plays a role (A/26)</p>

The scheme used in Table 2 demonstrates, in continuation of the thoughts in Table 1, the subjective experience dimension that was brought into play in the definition of the term resistance. Through the dimensions active and passive, terms from the data material are taken

up in vivo, so to speak (e.g. B/33; B/43 etc.). The distinction between vital and discursive relates primarily to content-related aspects of the statements. On the one hand, the material contains numerous statements that combine resistance with communicative practices. For example, expressing one's own opinion (B/39) and expressing or "voicing" it (B/39) is a central component of the concept of resistance. The field of vital / active is more difficult to grasp here, but brings together statements that link resistance with personality traits (A/25). These also focus on the individual reason for offering resistance. Metaphorical expressions such as "rearing up" (B/1) or "getting upset" (B/11) basically describe self-experiences here. The students do not recognize resistance primarily as the result of discursive considerations. Rather, they grasp it as a pre-reflective impulse. The statement that resistance requires "courage, bravery and a bit of heroism" (A/45; A/47) plays a role here. With the term courage, a personal, psychologically describable quantity becomes the inventory of the resistant. It expresses the fact that a specific disposition is to be expected from a resistant person. Courage and, in a similar form, "courage" are linked in this quadrant with other terms that also presuppose dynamism, such as "strength" (B/16) and "will [...]" (B/25). Resistance is also a "physical concept" (B/35). Consequently, it is also relevant in a situation in which "power of disposal over body and life is not conceded" (B/20f). The vital connotation of the concept of resistance is therefore essential. In this context, the description of resistance as struggle is relevant. Struggle, especially when it is understood as "living out a counter-attitude" (B/14), fits well with the vitalistic idea of the struggle for survival or life in which people are placed. This is another reason for the attribution category "vital". Resistance in the sense of a struggle means that the person who resists opposes something relatively concretely, possibly only selectively, but in an exceptional physical and psychological situation (B/33). The fact that resistance is also conceived as a "rebellion against [a] norm" (B/28) suggests that a somewhat longer course of various acts of resistance is to be expected. After all, norms cannot be overcome ad hoc and in a single action. They are ultimately consolidated through life experiences, ethical systems or customs and are strongly anchored in social practices. As a rule, they can only be modified or forgotten over longer periods of time. The concept of resistance with its active and vital connotations also seems to have a counterpart that is somewhat difficult to define alongside norms. Among other things, it takes action against an "(apparently) prevailing majority" (B/14). The "majority" is a term in which the mistrust of who one is dealing with on the occasion of resistance is clearly evident. In this quote, the world is probably not what it seems to be. This applies at least to the assessment of what the not-so-irrelevant "majority" wants. In the verb "dominate", the term "rule" also comes into play in an initially rather inconspicuous place, almost casually. This casual use of the word draws attention to the fact that neither statement in the two surveys mentions specific institutions, such as a government, a parliament or an authority, against which resistance could be directed. Nor do they mention any groups or organizations that organize resistance themselves, such as NGOs like Greenpeace or Amnesty International. Here, "state" (B/18), "unjust system" (B/1), "existing system, existing way of thinking or order" (B/42) remain the only designations of institutions or organizations that mean something at the same time. Due to their generality, however, these statements are difficult to categorize. Nevertheless, a politicisable basic potential of the respective concept of resistance can be seen here. It is interesting to note that the naming of institutions does occur in the discursive / passive quadrant. This is where the allusions to German history can be found. However, the institutions against which resistance could have been directed, such

as the National Socialist state leadership, are not mentioned. Instead, the institution that imparted knowledge about historical resistance is mentioned: the "school" (A/39). Much more clearly than the institutions, the collected material presents rather vaguely constructed potential opponents. Thus, "aggressive argumentation structure[s]" (A/19), "undeserved unfair treatment" (A/19), "certain views or practices" (B/44), "a situation that causes dissatisfaction" (B/8) or simply "someone or something" (B/35), "something wrong" (B/9) or just "something" (B/41). This type of diffuse description of the opponents of resistance is found scattered throughout the material. Interestingly enough, resistance does not seem to be associated with clearly defined opponents in the present material, not even in the references to historical resistance, which is mostly modelled in the mode of remembering school events. This could now be suspiciously criticized as institution-blind. However, this would already be an early evaluation of the statements. A more plausible interpretation of the material is that vital and discursive resistance must first construct its opponents. This is particularly striking where the opponents of resistance could easily be named, for example in the "memory of the 1933-45 period" (A/26).

Another important observation is that the discursively active field of defining the term resistance is also filled with relatively differentiated statements. Several statements reflect a rather everyday notion according to which the act of resistance is already given by expressing and weaving in one's "own" opinion. It is interesting to note that a very subjective understanding of justification and justification is often put forward. This culminates in the request that everyone should "define the term resistance for themselves" (A/33). In addition to this subjectivist trait, a rather pragmatic twist on the question of legitimacy is also noticeable. While on the one hand the subject is the starting point of the definitional turn, a further legitimization of resistance seems to be needed. This is seen in the fact that the resisters are even required to "propose solutions" (B/3) and that "knowledge of an injustice" (A/43f) is seen as a legitimizing prerequisite for resistance. On the discursive-active level, resistance is also regarded as a topic that one should "inevitably [...] deal with" (A/36-37), regardless of whether one is planning or carrying out resistant action. This could indicate that knowledge of historical or current resistant formations can be a good basis for orientation knowledge of the contemporary world. This concept would then be understood as complementary to passive-discursive memory, which primarily refers to the remembered transmission of information in an institutional framework (A/39): The topic of resistance is exemplified as resistance against National Socialism "treated in school" (A /39). At this point, the talk about school learning is strikingly passive. However, one should not hastily give a negative assessment of this passivity. Because an assessment of school knowledge as passive means that it can be activated and does not have to be actively acquired in the first place. In any case, it can be assumed that the knowledge referred to in this way extends into the interpretation of the present. Incidentally, both history lessons in their institutional form and more diffuse "events" (A/8) are mentioned here. This probably refers to encounters with the topic outside of school. This can also be an indication that school knowledge is understood as at least part of all available knowledge and is linked to it. That is at least true in this case.

## On the construction of a contemporary pedagogical concept of resistance

Are the surveyed and categorically developed aspects of the future teachers' concept of resistance suitable for more comprehensive surveys? Can they form the basis for an updated form of a pedagogical concept of resistance? The following systematization can help to tackle these questions.

The attempt made here to reorganize the respondents' statements certainly needs to be supplemented, but through intensive review of the material base, a conceptual scheme can be determined that can be helpful in the further methodological development of surveys. At least codes can be inserted through which the collected statements can be specified again.

*Table 3: Codes for determining ideas of resistance*

	Vital	Diskursive
Aktive	Spontaneity (immediately) Courage and will Fight Strength	Opinion Definition Legitimization Information
Passive	Refusal Being against Perception	Aggression Argumentation Memory

By conceptually processing the data material in such a way that is oriented towards coding, the students' implicit understanding of resistance gains in profile. On the one hand, it becomes clear once again how heterogeneous the active/vital field is. Here we seem to find deterministic ideas about a spontaneous and instantaneous reaction. Ethical-vital terms such as courage and will are also mentioned here. Combat as a kind of social category, which can be understood in the concept of force as an almost physical quantity, is also an essential part of this conception. Resistance is therefore an element of the struggle for existence and the assertion of vital interests. From the codes of the four different fields, concepts can now be formulated that summarize the four fields of imagination into sentences and thus enable abstractions from the material that are memorable in view of the subject's current situation in society. After these attempts at collecting and assembling, the codes could now be reformulated into definition sentences that relate to the respective field of the schema. These four sentences, each of which implies a field-related thesis, could be used to generate the basis for further surveys. In the context of this essay, they are result sets and abstractions from a survey of a specific target group. It remains unanswered whether similar understandings of resistance can be found in other professional groups or age cohorts. It is also unclear to what extent a specifically European perspective is expressed here. Nevertheless, it is interesting to see the conceptual implications that arise from the four dimensions of the understanding of resistance discussed here as a whole, so to speak, as a conceptual sculpture.

*Table 4: Experimental transfer of the codes into sentences*

	Vital	Diskursive
aktive	(a) Active resistance requires personal courage, will and willingness to fight, which unfolds as a dynamic force on the basis of a disposition for spontaneous action.	(b) Active resistance is expressed in the communicatively binding positioning of one's own opinion, which, on the basis of knowledge, is linked to the question of the legitimacy of the resister.
passive	(c) Passive resistance is characterized by the refusal of certain practices and views and is based on a specific self-perception (e.g. dissatisfaction) and the execution of a specific situation observation.	(d) Passive resistance finds a point of reference in the perception of aggressive discursive practices and can draw on memories of learned knowledge about other epochs.

The tabular experiments presented here show that the latent understanding of resistance among the students surveyed is very much determined by a formalistic and highly subjective view of things. This is particularly clear from fields F4a and F4c. The individualistic view is also expressed in F4b by emphasizing the binding nature of one's own opinion. Another special feature is that learning comes into play explicitly in F4d. This is done on the basis of data that

express the primarily passivity and discursive contexts. Learning could also have been addressed in F4a: as learning from a role model that is subjectively considered relevant and not just rationally convincing, for example. However, this is apparently not conceivable for the group examined in the case of the concept of resistance. In other words: the study of the biographies of people who have committed themselves to the resistance is not present in the two samples. It is impossible to say why this might be. However, one could assume that the concept of resistance first addresses the people interviewed in their own biographies. This subjective side of the concept of resistance seems to be a central result of the investigation. The fact that the students also have a more pragmatic and very sober and less heroic view of things underlines the consistently pragmatic tone of the statements. Resistance doesn't seem to be immediately obvious to them because of their situation in life. Resistance is a concept that, viewed this way, occupies a relatively unproductive, but nevertheless existing place in their lives. That's why the question of resistance is kept very much in the background here and optionally does not seem to primarily capture the students' relationship to the world. It can also be assumed that the question of resistance among the group of people surveyed is in tension with the question of violence. Since violence in the context of teacher training tends to be problematized, if not openly rejected, the students surveyed do not seem to have a reliable idea of the nature of violence. The understanding of resistance, which is clearly conceived as resistance to violent attacks and violent actions, also suffers from this.

## The students' statements regarding current scientific uses of the concept of resistance: an outlook

Are the aspects of the future teacher's concept of resistance that have been identified and categorized compatible with existing trends in using the term? Can they be the basis for an updated form of a pedagogical concept of resistance? These questions can no longer be answered in this essay. However, the following remarks can once again show how the students' statements raise the question of how the concept of resistance in current modifications helps to describe pedagogical reality in pedagogical and political contexts.

On the one hand, the empirical findings presented here can now be compared with other findings. The concept of resistance, which the students surveyed reveal, can also be understood as a sensitizing concept (Kelle / Kluge 2010: 28-30) regarding the educational-philosophical debate about this concept.

The discursive position of the concept of resistance developed in this essay will be clarified by using three examples:

1) The question must be asked whether there is an alternative to the idea of a strong ego as a basis for resistant action, which is so prominent in F4a, for example. In her essay "Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance," Judith Butler points out that articulating vulnerability can be a good, if not unproblematic, basis for resistant action: "[V]ulnerability is not exactly overcome by resistance, but becomes a potentially effective mobilization force in political mobilizations." (Butler, 2016, 14) The concept of freedom is also central to Butler's conception of resistance. She sees the deprivation of freedom as a sufficient reason for resistant action, especially since vulnerability always implies the violation of freedom rights by others:

We are [...] familiar with the idea that freedom can be exercised only if there is enough support for the exercise of freedom, a material condition that enters into the act that it makes possible (Butler, 2016, 14).

Butler proposes to be aware of “performative bodily resistance” (Butler, 2016, 25). The fact that knowledge of stories about resistant bodies significantly advances the perception of what vulnerability means in the context of the concept of resistance. This can be impressively demonstrated by Zeynep Gambetti's observations on the protest in Istanbul's Gezi Park. (Gambetti, 2016, 37-47)

2) The differentiations that the discussion of the concept of resistance in psychoanalysis brought with it also do not seem to have left any traces in the students' statements. This is somewhat surprising, because the curriculum of the students surveyed requires attending courses in educational psychology. The starting point is the question of whether resistance only defends neurosis (Seiffge-Krenke, 2017, 16). Resistance here is primarily resistance to therapeutic treatment, which is expressed in specific symptoms. (Seiffge-Krenke, 2017, 18-19) As a specific form of psychological defense, overcoming resistance is a task that the therapist and the patient must tackle together. (Storck, 2021, 107-119) However, recent discussion seems to indicate a positivization of the concept of resistance, which is remarkable. Timo Storck can write this thesis:

“Psychoanalysis is to a large extent resistance analysis. [...] Resistance is a potential source of knowledge and is fed by both sides of the analytical pair” (Storck, 2021, 175).

The idea that resistance can have such an epistemological function is very important for the further development of a pedagogical concept of resistance. The question of what knowledge resistance leads to and what experience resistance builds on goes far beyond the concept of students, but also the concepts of Gamm and Freire.

3) This kind of positivization of resistance seems to be leaving its mark even in economics. Erik Nagel (2021) recently compiled and analyzed a number of examples of resistant behaviour in commercial companies in an impressive publication. In doing so, he identified and discussed a whole series of “surprising manifestations of resistance” (Nagel, 2021, 8). He criticizes the often “blanket negative assessment of resistance” (Nagel, 2021, 15) as an anti-innovation disruptive factor in operational processes. For example, he shows that often “the real problem is not the resistance, but the understanding of change and the change practice of those responsible for the project”. (Nagel, 2021, 42) Without idealizing resistance within companies, he advocates learning, on the one hand, to “counter resistance artfully” (Nagel, 2021, 165), but also to “provide resistance artfully.” (Nagel, 2021, 173) The interesting thing here is that the recognition of resistant actions initiates a dialogic process that focuses on an innovative concept of corporate management in the sense of a communicative corporate culture.

Of course, one could make further comments here about the discussion of the concept of resistance in political theory. The students' interest in when resistance is sensible and legitimate points to the further question of whether in certain cases there is a right to resistance (Höntzsch, 2016, 83-85) or even a duty to resist (Tiedemann / Eisleb, 2018, 124-126). In their statements, however, the students surveyed are essentially on the way to such a debate, which - as we conclude here - can probably only be conducted successfully if the concept of

resistance and the potential of resistance are raised based on the debates from feminist theory (Butler, Gambetti), psychoanalysis (Seiffge-Krenke, Storck) and economics (Nagel) should be rethought in an integrative and appreciative way. This in turn is a promising educational task that is particularly worthwhile for future teachers in a pluralistic society.

## Literature

Aghamiri, Kathrin / Streck, Barbara (2016). Von der Arbeit am Begriff. Die Bedeutung des Suchens, Findens und Bearbeitens von kategorialen Begriffen in der Grounded Theory. In: Equit, Claudia / Hohage, Christoph (eds.). Handbuch Grounded Theory. Von der Methodologie zur Forschungspraxis, Weinheim / Basel: Beltz Juventa, 201-216.

Agoustinous, Martha / Walker, Iain / Donaghue, Ngairé (2014). Social Cognition. An Integrated Introduction. 3rd edition. London et al.: Sage.

Beck, Ulrich (1986). Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Benz, Wolfgang (2018). Im Widerstand. Größe und Scheitern der Opposition gegen Hitler. München: Beck. <https://doi.org/10.17104/9783406733611>

Breuer, Franz / Muckel, Petra / Dieris, Barbara (2018). Reflexive Grounded Theory. Eine Einführung für die Forschungspraxis. 3., vollständig überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, mit einem Beitrag von Antje Allmers. Wiesbaden: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-22219-2>

Butler, Judith (2016). Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance. In: Butler, Judith / Gambetti, Zeynep / Sabsay, Leticia (eds.). Vulnerability in Resistance, Durham: Duke University Press, 12-27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11vc78r.6>

Camus, Albert (1997). Der Mensch in der Revolte. In: Camus: Der Mensch in der Revolte. Essays, aus dem Französischen von Julius Streller. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 19-31.

Freire, Paulo (1996). Pedagogy of the Oppressed, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. London: Penguin.

Freire, Paulo (2008). Pädagogik der Autonomie. Notwendiges Wissen für die Bildungspraxis, übersetzt von Ivo Tamm in Kooperation mit Dirk Oesselmann und Peter Schreiner, herausgegeben von Peter Schreiner, Norbert Mette, Dirk Oesselmann, Dieter Kinkelbur. Münster/ New York/München/Berlin: Waxmann.

Gambetti, Zeynep (2016). Risking Oneself and One's Identity. In: Butler, Judith / Gambetti, Zeynep / Sabsay, Leticia (eds.). *Vulnerability in Resistance*. Durham: Duke University Press, 28-51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11vc78r.7>

Gamm, Hans-Jochen (1964). *Führung und Verführung. Pädagogik des Nationalsozialismus*. München: List.

Gamm, Hans-Jochen (1978). *Einführung in das Studium der Erziehungswissenschaft. Erziehen als Beruf. Grundlagen, Probleme, Ziele*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Gamm, Hans-Jochen (1979). *Allgemeine Pädagogik. Die Grundlagen von Erziehung und Bildung in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Hellinger, Alf (2018). Das Materialismuskonzept Hans-Jochen Gamms und der Gedanke einer realhumanistischen Erziehung und Bildung. In: *Pädagogische Korrespondenz* (2018) 58, 100-114 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-211102 - DOI: 10.25656/01:21110

Höntzsch, Frauke (2016). Widerstand - (k)ein Menschenrecht. In: Reheis et al. (eds.). *Kompetenz zum Widerstand*, Schwalbach: Wochenschau, 82-89.

Jarausach, Konrad (2004). *Die Umkehr. Deutsche Wandlungen 1945-1995*. München: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt.

Kelle, Udo / Kluge, Susann (2010). Vom Einzelfall zum Typus. Fallvergleich und Fallkontrastierung in der qualitativen Sozialforschung, 2., überarbeitete Auflage. Wiesbaden: VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92366-6>

Kesselring, Thomas (2014). *Ethik und Erziehung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lysgaard, Jonas Andreasen (2019). Denial. In: Lysgaard, Jonas Andreasen / Bengtsson, Stefan / Laugesen, Martin Hauberg-Lund. *Dark Pedagogy. Education, Horror and the Anthropocene*. Cham/CH: Palgrave, 23-36. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19933-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19933-3_2)

Medina, José (2013). *The Epistemology of Resistance. Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice and Resistant Imaginations*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199929023.001.0001>

Nagel, Erik (2021). *Glücksfall Widerstand. Vom produktiven Umgang mit ganz normalen Ausnahmen*. Zürich: Versus. <https://doi.org/10.24096/9783039097739>

Ode, Erik (2017). Unterordnung - Begrenzung - Verstrickung. Anlässe und Formen des Widerstands im Pädagogischen und Politischen. In: Burchardt, Matthias / Molzberger, Rita (eds.). *Bildung im Widerstand. Festschrift für Ursula Forst*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 65-90.

Oettingen, Alexander von (2005). Det pædagogiske paradoks. Et Grundstudie i almen pædagogik. Copenhagen: Klim.

Reheis, Fritz / Denzler, Stefan / Görtler, Michael / Waas, Johann (eds.) (2016). Kompetenz zum Widerstand. Eine Aufgabe der politischen Bildung. Schwalbach/Taunus: Wochenschau.  
<https://doi.org/10.46499/518>

Sant, Edda / Davies, Ian / Pashby, Karen / Shultz, Lynette (2021). Global Citizenship Education. A Critical Introduction to Key Concepts and Debates. London: Bloomsbury.

Seiffge-Krenke (2017). Widerstand, Abwehr und Bewältigung, unter Mitarbeit von Frank Kollmar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666405792>

Storck, Timo (2021). Abwehr und Widerstand. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.  
<https://doi.org/10.17433/978-3-17-037931-2>

Thompson, Christiane / Weiß, Gabriele (2008). Zum Widerständigen des Pädagogischen. In: Thompson, Christiane / Weiß, Gabriele (Eds.). Bildende Widerstände - widerständige Bildung. Blickwechsel zwischen Pädagogik und Philosophie. Bielefeld: Transkript, 7-22.  
<https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839408599-001>

Tiedemann, Markus / Eisleb, Lea (2018). Recht auf Widerstand. Zur Theorie politischer Verweigerung. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. <https://doi.org/10.17433/978-3-17-034356-6>

Welzer, Harald (2023). Zeiten-Ende. Politik ohne Leitbild, Gesellschaft in Gefahr. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.