

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at:
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275431511>

Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework

Article *in* Critical Sociology · January 2014

DOI: 10.1177/0896920514524604

CITATIONS

5

READS

174

2 authors:



Anna Johansson

Högskolan Väst

3 PUBLICATIONS 8 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Stellan Vinthagen

University of Massachusetts Am...

24 PUBLICATIONS 47 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Ethics and resistance studies [View project](#)



The links between resistance and social change [View project](#)

All content following this page was uploaded by [Stellan Vinthagen](#) on 11 November 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework
Anna Johansson and Stellan Vinthagen
Crit Sociol published online 12 May 2014
DOI: 10.1177/0896920514524604

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://crs.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/05/12/0896920514524604>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Critical Sociology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://crs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://crs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://crs.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/05/12/0896920514524604.refs.html>

>> [OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - May 12, 2014

[What is This?](#)

Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework

Critical Sociology
1–19

© The Author(s) 2014

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0896920514524604

crs.sagepub.com



Anna Johansson

University West, Sweden

Stellan Vinthagen

University West and University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Abstract

Since James Scott introduced the concept of ‘everyday resistance’ in 1985, research has grown within partly overlapping fields. Existing studies utilize very different definitions, methodologies and understandings of ‘everyday resistance’, which makes a systematic development of the field difficult. In previous work, the authors have suggested a theoretical and definitional framework where everyday resistance is understood as a specific kind of resistance that is done routinely yet is not publicly articulated with political claims or formally organized. A more comprehensive and systematic exploration of this challenging phenomenon is possible through an analysis where: *repertoires* of everyday resistance are taken into account, together with *relations* between actors, as well as the *spatialization* and *temporalization* of resistance. These analytical dimensions are explained and motivated through illustrations from existing research. Finally, it is argued all four dimensions need to be studied in *intersections*.

Keywords

power, intersectionality, everyday resistance, analytical dimensions, repertoires, spatialization, temporalization, actor relationships

Introduction

Over the last decades research on resistance has grown within fields that partly overlap; mainly subaltern, feminist, cultural, queer, peasant and post-structural studies. Since James Scott wrote *Weapons of the Weak* (1985), a significant part of resistance studies has investigated the area of ‘everyday resistance’; the informal and non-organized resistance that Scott also calls ‘infra politics’. This is the area of resistance we are focusing on.

Corresponding author:

Anna Johansson, Department of Social and Behavioural Studies, University West, Hogskolan Väst, Trollhättan, 46186, Sweden.

Email: anna.johansson@hv.se

As noted by sociologists Hollander and Einwohner (2004), the concept of resistance is today used in a multitude of ways and without much precision. Through a comprehensive and valuable review of sociological literature they conclude that despite the variety and contradictory use there seems to be an agreement of the definition of resistance as an *oppositional act*. It is an activity – a social action that involves agency; and that act is carried out in some kind of oppositional relation to power.

Our ambition is to analyse how a particular section of these acts – *everyday resistance* – is situated in a certain time, space and relations, and how it engages with different (types of) actors, techniques and discourses. This article suggests a theoretical and methodological framework for the empirical study of everyday resistance.

Although there has been a growing interest in the study of resistance, there have so far been few serious attempts to develop a more coherent analytical framework in order to actually study resistance. One of the most ambitious attempts is Hollander and Einwohner's article 'Conceptualizing resistance' (2004). While we find they make a substantial contribution to the field in their literature review, we do not agree with their conclusion and the proposal that they make. Their construction of a clear-cut typology by which one is to decide if the act is *recognized* as resistance and if the act is *intended* as resistance, by *target*, *agent*, and *observer*, contradicts their simultaneous emphasis of resistance as a complex and ongoing process of social construction. Furthermore, their typology privileges consciousness as 'recognition' by or 'intention' of actors, which dramatically limits their scope.

Instead, we would like to hold on to and take our point of departure from their basic premise: acts or patterns of actions are defined as 'resistance' within *ongoing processes of negotiation* between different agents of resistance (the resisters), between the agents of resistance and the agents of power (the targets), and between the two former parties and different observers. Such observers are, for example, researchers who make a contribution to creating 'the truths' about resistance through scientific discourses.

Our theoretical platform consists of some fundamental assumptions that are as follows (Vinthagen and Johansson, 2013):

- (1) Everyday resistance is a *practice* (not a certain consciousness, intent or outcome);
- (2) it is historically *entangled* with (everyday) power (not separated, dichotomous or independent);
- (3) Everyday resistance needs to be understood as *intersectional* with the powers that it engages with (not one single power relation); and
- (4) it is *heterogeneous and contingent* due to changing contexts and situations (not a universal strategy or coherent form of action).

In our view, resistance has the potential to undermine power relations, per definition. However, not all resistance does succeed, at least not always, or in all aspects, but might instead reproduce and strengthen relations of dominance (Lilja and Vinthagen, 2009). This is not only due to the creation of counter forces or new oppositional alliances that explicitly try to capture the state or other entrenched power institutions, but is a more fundamental paradox of inbuilt ambivalence, complexity and even 'irrationality' within resistance (Lilja et al., 2013).

Our intention is to develop a theoretically informed analytical framework that, in contrast to the one by Hollander and Einwohner, does not aim for precision. We think it is too early to be precise. The research on resistance is still developing and is trying to find its basic grammar. Instead we need to relate to basic sociological concepts. We see the need to anchor an analysis of resistance in some of the 'organizing principles' of social action. This article is an attempt to find ways to

analyse everyday resistance through asking the questions: who is carrying out the practice, in relation to whom, where and when, and how?

Another conceptualization that has inspired us is the one of resistance to globalization, which has been developed by Chin and Mittelman (1997). Our interest lies in the same analytical ‘elements’ that they suggest: forms, actors, sites and strategies. These elements serve as a key to an analytical framework of our own, but with a different theoretical point of departure.

Here we try to cover four pivotal aspects of the study of social life – dimensions that are frequently used by sociological research in other fields: patterns and relationships of social action, and how they are organized and conceptualized in time and space. Thus, our framework rests on the dimensions of:

- (1) Repertoires of everyday resistance;
- (2) Relationships of agents;
- (3) Spatialization; and
- (4) Temporalization of everyday resistance.

The analytical dimensions are primarily developed to point out and illuminate aspects of everyday resistance that we find it valuable and necessary to select and attend to, but not to use as precise analytical tools. In actual social life and acts of everyday resistance these dimensions are, we suggest, intertwined and in no way mutually exclusive.

Prior to this work we have carried out extensive literature reviews within the social sciences of other studies on everyday resistance, particularly from the year 2000. We do not present a systematic review of this research but have chosen our empirical examples from this collection to illustrate and support certain points. The text of this article is divided into five sections. The first four sections discuss the four different dimensions (repertoires, relationships, spatialization and temporalization), while in the final section we try to show how all the dimensions are intertwined in a specific context.

Repertoires of Everyday Resistance in Relation to Configurations of Power

During our inventory of the field of (everyday) resistance we discovered that a variety of concepts are used to capture different actions, their shape and how they are carried out. Among the most frequent are ‘form’, ‘types’, ‘techniques’, ‘modes’, ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’. These terms are often used interchangeably and without theoretical distinctions and clarity.

Instead of trying to distinguish the different concepts from each other, or to find one concept that might encompass them, we embarked on another journey – re-discovering the concept of ‘repertoire’, which is inspired by the sociologist of social movements and revolutions Charles Tilly and his ‘repertoires of contentious politics’ (1991, 1995). Among other things, the concept of repertoires allows us to capture contextual and situational bound combinations of everyday resistance, and its complex and dynamic character – all in relation to power. However, we agree with Tilly himself when he states that the concept is more of a ‘suggestive metaphor’ than ‘a precise analytical tool’ (cited in Traugott, 1995: 3).

Relations of Power and Resistance

Scott (1985, 1989, 1990) did not only distinguish the everyday form of resistance – that is, acts that are defined by being disguised and hidden: ‘infra politics’ – in relation to a more conventional

notion of political resistance, but he was also a pioneer in setting out to identify and systematize forms of everyday resistance in relation to forms of power. He identifies forms of material and physical resistance that are used to resist material domination; that is, poaching, squatting, desertion – while the forms practised to resist status domination are defined as ‘hidden transcripts’, rituals of aggression, tales of revenge, and subcultures and myths (1990: 198). In explaining his model and categorization, he argues that the forms of everyday resistance are ‘mirror images’ of the forms of appropriation or power.

The various practices that might plausibly be claimed to represent everyday forms of resistance are legion. To an outside observer it might appear quixotic to assemble them under the same heading. Their variety is nothing more than a mirror image of the variety of forms of appropriation; for every form of appropriation there is likely to be one – or many – forms of everyday resistance devised to thwart that appropriation. (Scott, 1989: 37)

Although we do find it highly valuable how Scott perceives forms of power and forms of everyday resistance as interdependent, by linking them together and making a systematic attempt to connect certain forms of everyday resistance to certain dimensions of domination, his framework has serious flaws. The analysis is based on a more structuralist and Marxist framework, rather than the post-structuralist one (which is more utilized within the field of resistance studies of today and is the framework we ourselves take as our point of departure). In this article, a Foucauldian perspective of power is adopted, where power is conceptualized as ubiquitous rather than located in certain groups; that is, productive rather than merely repressive, and relational rather than reified (Bartlett, 2005: 360–361). What follows this is also a particular notion of power and resistance. Power and resistance are involved in a complex interplay with one another, which emphasizes a more ongoing and open process in contrast with Scott’s model in which certain acts of resistance are viewed as reflections of or mechanical responses to certain forms of domination.

Consequently, the studies we refer to are mainly related to the different forms of power as identified by Foucault in relation to the critique and the later development of parts of the theory, rather than relating the forms, strategies and techniques of everyday resistance to material, status or ideological forms of domination, as Scott did (on control society see, for example, Deleuze, 2011 [1992]).

Within a Foucauldian theoretical framework of power, distinctions are primarily made between sovereign power,¹ disciplinary power² and biopower.³ Here we find the position of the Israeli social scientist Neve Gordon (2008) especially constructive for our purposes, since he combines a strong theoretical interest in Foucault’s concept of power with a systematic analysis of the different power forms in the setting of Israeli occupation. Gordon claims that though the three modes of power tend to be simultaneously deployed, the specific form of governing is shaped by the particular configuration between sovereign, disciplinary and biopower. One form of governing may emphasize discipline and biopower and put less emphasis on sovereignty, while another form may accentuate another configuration.

The particularity of each configuration determines how individuals and populations are managed, while no configuration is fixed, so that certain processes modify the relation and emphasis among the different modes of power and consequently change the way society is governed and controlled. (Gordon, 2008: 14)

We assume that both discipline and biopower, as modes/forms of power, are implemented through strategies/techniques such as surveillance, normalization and regulation in different combinations (for eight major techniques of power within pedagogy see, for example, Gore, 1995). As we bring

resistance into the picture, we need to navigate within a more complex field of research in which it is quite unclear which exact terms to use.

The Concept of Repertoires

We do not argue that one has to subscribe to the power theory of Foucault in order to do research on everyday resistance. There is a more inclusive possibility if we instead opt for the concept of repertoires – a concept we find both dynamic and broad enough for the purpose of linking patterns of resistance practices to specific configurations of power. Tilly defines *repertoires of contention* as a set of culturally learned routines in which larger groups interact in conflict with each other (McAdam et al., 2001; Tilly, 1995; Traugott, 1995: 26). While Tilly is interested in patterns of collective action (that is, carried out in an organized form by larger groups) specifically linking them to certain historical forms of state power, we are interested in individual as well as collective actions that are not organized, formal or necessarily public or intentionally political, and we link them to configurations of power in everyday life. Our use of the repertoire of everyday resistance is the same as when Tilly uses it for the public resistance of movements. It is a combined result of the interplay between social structures and power relations, as well as activists' creative experimentation with tactics and experiences of earlier attempts to practise resistance, together with the situational circumstances in which the resistance is played out. A repertoire is available to a certain set of agents of everyday resistance in a certain social context – whether they are part of a social movement or not. This set of agents might use specific forms/techniques of everyday resistance, as well as strategies and tactics of public resistance.

With the term 'repertoire of resistance' it becomes possible to make the connection between configurations of power. Our loose application of Tilly's concept of repertoires directly connects to historical configurations of power and their related culturally learned repertoires, without having to see such power configurations as only and necessarily tied to state power (Tilly), or for that matter, to sovereignty/discipline/biopower (Foucault). A configuration of power might look different, yet the point is that it has evolved from somewhere, (is historic) and is always related to a culturally learned repertoire of resistance.

As one example of everyday resistance, we will look at surveillance. While the field of surveillance studies has largely ignored the surveilled and their reactions and practices, for example practices of resistance, this is slowly beginning to change (see, for example, Dupont, 2008).

The Power of Surveillance and Repertoires of Resistance

David Lyon, who is one of the leading figures of field surveillance studies, defines surveillance as 'any collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered' (Lyon, 2001: 2). While Foucault's notion of disciplinary power is still at the heart of surveillance studies, with the Panopticon as a central metaphor in the analysis of the technologies of control and surveillance, there are also ongoing debates about new forms of power, which are primarily inspired by Deleuze. As we briefly mentioned earlier Deleuze (2011 [1992]) has, when drawing on Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, argued that a shift has occurred from disciplinary societies to 'societies of control'. According to Kullenberg (2009) disciplinary societies were regulated by watchwords, while societies of control are regulated by codes that mark access to, or reject, information. This 'continuous control' has become widely spread and now permeates all social contexts. Instead of disciplinary power through material or immaterial enclosure, the power in 'control societies' is absent and

dispersive. The precondition of continuous control is an extensive collection of information and a consistent system of surveillance.

In the society of control new conditions of resistance have surged (see, for example, Harold, 2007: xxviii). Gary Marx's (2003, 2009) systematization of forms, as well as of techniques of everyday resistance to, surveillance in the context of computerized workplaces serves as a good example of this. Marx distinguishes 12 different techniques of individual resistance: 'discovery moves' (the discovering of bug detectors), 'avoidance moves' (choosing an employer who does not monitor electronic communication), 'masking moves' (using another person's ID and password), 'distorting moves' (holding down computer keys to appear productive), 'blocking moves' (encrypting communication), 'breaking moves' (for example, adding battery acid to a urine sample), as well as 'piggybacking moves', 'switching moves', 'cooperative moves', 'explaining' and 'contesting' moves, 'refusal moves' and 'counter-surveillance moves'. These techniques are all examples of *behavioural neutralization*, which in turn is defined as 'a form of resistance' (Marx, 2009). This behavioural neutralization is, like the society of control, based on manipulation of information and communication technology, and is in this way utilizing the configuration of the power that it tries to undermine.

Both the form and the techniques of resistance studied by Marx are, we suggest, part of a repertoire; a set of culturally learned routines in which a set of agents interact in conflict with each other – in this case, employees in relation to employers/managers/systems of surveillance. In our understanding 'culturally learned routines' may be the routines of a culture, a subculture or an organization, or refer to a specific discourse; that is, they are neither given nor static, but contextual and changing; and most importantly, in order to capture and define the nature of the repertoires one needs to investigate them in relation to power. A repertoire is a collection of ways or methods of resistance that people are familiar with, know of, understand and are able to handle. These methods, or tactics, grow out of the particular circumstances of the social place and the life experience of the people that do the resisting.

Relationships of Agents

So far we have focused on the conceptualization of acts of resistance, and how these may be clustered in repertoires and linked to configurations of power. Here we will focus on *who* is carrying out the actions of everyday resistance; the different agents and their relationships. In all research on resistance there is a need to identify an agent carrying out the resistance practice, in relation to some kind of target. The agents of resistance are the individuals or groups carrying out the *acts* of resistance (for example: the women, the students, the peasants or gay men) and their relationships with the power holders need to be analysed. In the analytical framework of Chin and Mittelman (1997) the agents of resistance are one of five fundamental categories, seemingly conceptualized as autonomous units (individual or collective). In our own conceptualization an agent is a social identity constructed in relationships that are not singular or fixed (as in Scott's peasant/landowner relationship) but perceived as plural, complex, contextual and situational.

We find Hollander and Einwohner's approach (2004) fruitful since they identify three different and crucial types of agents in the construction of resistance: the actor, the target and the observer; and furthermore, they suggest that resistance is defined in a process of social interaction between the resisters, targets and observers. Understanding the interaction between these agents is 'at the heart of understanding resistance' (2004: 548). This view emphasizes resistance as socially constructed and how different agents participate in this process. As concluded by Hollander and Einwohner: 'Resistance is defined not only by resisters' perception of their own behavior, but also by targets and/or others' recognition of and reaction to this behavior' (2004: 548).

Thus, an act or a pattern of actions is given meaning in ongoing processes of negotiation. In that way it may be argued that a practice of everyday resistance emerges out of a series of relationships and processes of interaction, between agents of resistance (the resisters), between the agents of resistance and the agents of power (the targets), or between the two former types of agents and different observers. Depending on the scientific discourses concerned, and the positioning by and within them, scholars change their points of departure regarding what is considered resistance, and who is to be defined as targets and resisters. As Hollander and Einwohner point out, traditionally one assumes that resistance is directed from an oppressed group towards domination from above (2004: 536), but this has changed. Today, there are a number of writers who argue that resistance can come from agents who, structurally at least, have more power, such as whites that resist residential disintegration. Resistance does not necessarily need to be progressive. For example, in 'Negotiating white power activist stigma', Simi and Futrell (2009) use ethnographic data on the US white power movement (WPM) to describe and analyse the interactional aspects of managing activist stigma in everyday settings. They argue that facing strong cultural codes against extreme racism, white power activists conceal their Aryan identity in order to avoid the constant indignation and conflict they face. The authors choose to define this stigma management as 'a form of everyday resistance'.

The Relationships of Everyday Resistance

Actors of everyday resistance – individuals as well as collectives – both place themselves and/or are placed in various positions. They create various identities that are in relation to one another and in relation to the 'target'. The relationships will not only vary according to the position within different hierarchical orders but also according to a number of other aspects: types of agent (individual/collective); what kind of relation they are in (such as parent-child, friends, colleagues at a work place, etc.); how much contact they have (intensity); in what way they have contact (means of interaction, for example: face-to-face or virtual) and the type of context and situation in which they meet, the pattern of their interaction.

An important and interesting relationship in regard to power and resistance is the one between employees and management at the workplace. During the 1990s organizational scholars began to take considerable interest in the rise of complex systems of organizational control, which is a development that is sometimes described as the process of 'tightening the iron cage' (Prasad and Prasad, 2000). Taking their point of departure in a post-structuralist perspective Prasad and Prasad (2000) reached the conclusion that management has gained new possibilities to control and construct the identities and subjectivities of the employees through pressure by corporate culture and new management discourses such as HRM (Human Resource Management) or TQM (Total Quality Management) and/or with new methods of technical surveillance (computers, cameras, tapped telephones). It has been argued that these new forms of control have more or less eliminated the possibilities for employees and/or their interest in practising resistance. The employees have turned into loyal, flexible, and self-disciplined subjects (Huzell, 2005). However, as Huzell (2005) notes, this gloomy picture has also been challenged and contradicted. Collinson (2000) identifies two very different subjective strategies of workplace resistance that are shaped by particular orientations of knowledge, of information, and toward those in authority. One of them is 'resistance through distance', which is practised by male workers in his study. This strategy focuses on restricting information from getting to management and is an attempt to avoid demands.

Prasad and Prasad (2000) have shown how routine resistance in a health maintenance organization was discursively constructed and how it limited managerial control. According to the authors the resistance was made through the reinterpretations of dominant management discourses,

affirmation of autonomous self-identities and through the re-negotiation of roles and relationships. The research of Collinson (2000) and Prasad and Prasad (2000) are both examples of a shift in interest from organized and collective resistance towards an interest in individual and 'informal resistance' – or what we would define as 'everyday resistance'. What is notable is that the target of everyday resistance in this case is primarily the discourses of the management. One may say that through new configurations of power, the relationship between the agent of resistance and the target has changed, and thus so have the repertoires.

Intersectionality and Everyday Resistance

Resistance is always related to power and power is plural, thus simultaneously creating a difference according to several logics. Since the relationship of power from a Foucauldian perspective is viewed as a multiple process and a dynamic relationship, this is also how the relationship of resistance needs to be viewed. The relationships between dominant and subalterns, whether these are men-women, employer-employees, middle class-working class, or white-coloured, are always negotiated continually in different contexts and interactional settings. And in the same way as there is a multiplicity of power relations played out on the grounds of ethnicity, class, age, sexuality as well as functionality and religion, there is a multiplicity of resistance relations as well.

While it is evident that there has been a development toward a more complex analysis of the relationships of everyday resistance, the challenge is still to integrate an intersectional approach into the field.⁴ This calls for a shift in the study of everyday resistance; a shift that makes it possible to capture the construction of multiple and shifting identities of agents of resistance and the interplay between these, as well as the contradictory positions of being both dominant and subordinate, depending on which system/context/relationship subjects are positioned and position themselves in.

As De los Reyes and Mulinari (2005) emphasize, without an intersectional perspective one tends to become stuck in a notion of one-dimensional, structural power that is fixated around a specific set of relations (such as relations of class, 'race'/ethnicity or gender) and one type of conflict (for example, workers/capital) that is given a higher worth of explanation than others. This, we would like to add, also keeps one stuck with a one-dimensional, structural notion of resistance. This in turn leads to a normative position in which it is possible to decide beforehand which type of relation of domination/repression is most important and which is of less or of peripheral significance. By holding on to dichotomizations, such as of workers/capital, one risks obscuring the complexity behind dichotomous categories, as well as how these construct *each other*. Sometimes, the categories might become fixed essences without history or context (how and when they were produced), and without acknowledgement of their variation in meaning and practice.

Intersectional analysis has so far been focused on the investigation of how different orders or aspects of power are constructing each other. Intersectional resistance analysis is still rare. We find it of importance to focus on how different orders or aspects of resistance are constructing each other in relation to power(s). A way to further develop the analysis is to look at the intersections between gender, age, sexuality, 'race'/ethnicity or class, in the formation of resistance practices.

The Spatialization of Everyday Resistance

We now leave the agents, what they are doing and how, and their relationships with each other; and instead highlight a dimension that we believe is fundamental for the understanding of resistance repertoires and power configurations, as well as for the understanding of relationships of agents: the dimension of *space*.

To highlight space is by no means original. Chin and Mittelman's (1997) conceptualization includes the spatial category *sites of resistance* and illustrates its importance by claiming that since resistance is 'localised, regionalised and globalised at the same time that economic globalisation slices across geopolitical borders' (1997: 35), the public-private dichotomy no longer holds. They also bring forward the development of cyber space, 'a site in which resistance finds its instantaneous audience via the internet or world wide web' (1997: 35).

Site is an important spatial category. Everyday resistance is always situated somewhere and in a particular location: a workplace, the city, the street, the kitchen. In this context sites are *social spaces*; places where social life is structured in a place-specific way; for example, a church or a dock, and is structured politico-legally, socio-culturally and socio-economically.

However, to be able to develop a more complex analysis of how everyday resistance is linked to space – and taking the claim seriously that everyday resistance is contextual, relational and situated – we would like to extend this dimension beyond sites. We would like it to be about how everyday resistance in the form of activities, social relations and identities, is *spatially organized* and how everyday resistance is practised in and through space as a central social dimension. To capture the ways in which the social and the spatial are inextricably interwoven and to indicate how the social produces the spatial (and vice versa), one may use the term spatiality. In a search for a 'fully sociological theory of space', Rob Shields (1991) goes further and defines the social construction of the spatial as 'social spatialization'. This is an ongoing social construction of the spatial at the level of social imagery (collective mythologies, discourses) as well as at the level of interventions in the landscape (for example, the built environment). He sees social spatialization as a fundamental system of spatial *division*; for example, processes of inclusion or exclusion. Space is here political and ideological, which implies that certain social groups have a higher degree of access to or power over space, while others have more limited access to space. As the geographer David Harvey states: 'the assignment of place within a socio-spatial structure indicates distinctive roles, capacities for action, and access to power within the social order' (1990: 419). In conclusion, relations of power and discipline are 'inscribed' into the spatiality of social life (Soja, 1989).⁵

To Foucault, 'space is fundamental in any exercise of power' (Foucault, 1980: 252). The linkage between knowledge, power and space runs through all of his work. The concept of Panopticism as a model for disciplinary power shows the link between spatial orderings and discipline. Discipline begins with division in space, which creates closed territories of order and control (Foucault, 1991). This spatiality of power is also central to Deleuze's notion of the societies of control (2011 [1992]) in which the central forms of power are characterized by being absent yet always present. It is dispersive; wherever and whenever we move around there is a variety of mechanisms of control present that is ready to be deployed when needed, when system 'security' or 'stability' is threatened.

The Body as a Space of Power and Everyday Resistance

Feminist studies have played the role of pioneer in linking space, power and resistance, by introducing gendered analyses of space, both regarding how notions of gender are spatialized as well as how gender relations are organized in space (see, for example, Rose, 1993). Feminists using time-geography have focused on how the responsibility for domestic tasks causes spatial confinement and limited mobility, and how women are, in relation to men, limited in space – enclosed (Rose, 1993). In her early feminist critique and development of Foucault, Sandra Bartky (1993) notes that women are subjected to gender-specific forms of discipline and control; certain disciplinary practices which produce a docile body whose shape, movements and surface is to be

defined as 'feminine'. This body is, per definition, being confined in space: a body that does not take up space, that makes itself small, thin, with its arms close to the body, legs together and hands in the lap.

The 'female' body has been recognized not only as a site or arena of power but also of resistance – and similarly, any arena and site of resistance might be seen as being created through the enactment of the body. Feminist research has highlighted multiple ways in which women practise everyday resistance through the body, in subcultures as well as on an individual basis. One arena of resistance is related to the 'tyranny of slenderness' that particularly aims at the discipline of women's bodies through dieting. Susy Orbach was a pioneer in the field from the end of the 1970s and wrote *Fat is a Feminist Issue* (1998), which focuses on how eating and becoming fat might be a way that women resisted objectification. The resistance by the fat and gendered body was later highlighted by various scholars (Brazier and LeBesco, 2001; Johansson, 1999; LeBesco, 2004). LeBesco (2004) defines the fat body as a 'revolting body' in both senses: being seen as disgusting and being a body of protest.⁶ Embodied everyday resistance has also been identified as performed by the use of clothes, shoes, bags, jewelry, hairdos and certain colours (see, for example, Ambjörnsson, 2009; Wietz, 2001). Yet another arena is resistance through body surface (make-up, tattoos, piercing, being hairy). In her book *In the Flesh: The Cultural Positions of Body Modification* (2003), Victoria Pitts-Taylor argues that non-mainstream body modifiers create new forms of social rebellion through the body. Body art is seen and used by some women as a way to resist male dominance and to 'reclaim' power over their bodies: 'In creating scarred, branded, pierced, and heavily tattooed bodies, they aim to reject the pressures of beauty norms and roles of "proper" femininity.' (2003: 3). For radical lesbians and gays, body modification is a way to fight oppression and assimilation simultaneously. Feminist and queer research has further introduced the embodied performances of female masculinity as resistance (Halberstam, 1998) and the embodied resistance of transgender persons (Na and Choo, 2011).

Marginal Spaces and Third Space

In analysing the spatialization of resistance there are several fruitful concepts available which are frequently used to theorize space, power and resistance within feminist, queer and postcolonial studies – among them that of marginal spaces (hooks, 1984, 1990) and third space (Bhabha, 1994; Soja, 1996). hooks's theorizing of 'marginal spaces' (1990) takes its point of departure in the experience of the marginality of being black in a white America and of being denied access to elite spaces such as the 'white', 'rich' and 'respectable' parts of a city. She argues that this way of living – on the edge – makes black Americans develop a particular way of seeing reality. They focus their attention both on the center and on the margins, looking 'from the outside in and from the inside out'. Thus marginality and marginal regions offer access to other points of reference that are denied by the center; and marginality not only constitutes a site of deprivation and oppression, but also a site of resistance (hooks, 1990: 342).

The concept of 'third space' is used by Homi K. Bhabha (1994) and Edward Soja (1996), both of whom emphasize it as an in-between space; a space of permanent movement that dissolves dualism. While Bhabha (1994) stresses the ambiguity and uncertainty of third space, Soja (1996), who is inspired by Lefebvre's work as well as by hooks's marginalized spaces, defines it as an 'an-Other' space – a space of openness and creativity, and a radical zone created and populated by the marginalized. The concept of third space can be broadly used to highlight the 'othering' of geographical space and social spatiality.⁷

Several scholars have used the concept of third space to analyse the everyday resistance among Palestinian people. Umut Ozguc (2010) argues that the Separation Wall built through the West

Bank by the Israeli Government creates a 'third space'. Its control mechanisms should be seen as both oppressive and productive. The Wall has a strong disciplinary function in making Palestinians into visible and docile bodies, and by creating its own paradoxical effects, the Wall simultaneously produces a space for Palestinian resistance and counter-hegemonic practices.

Under the heading of spatialization of everyday resistance we have mainly moved between the fields of feminist, queer and post-colonial studies using concepts such as body politics, marginal spaces and third space. The way we conceptualize the *spatialization of everyday resistance* allows us to analyse everyday resistance as structured by social sites. Basically, we have argued that resistance is always situated somewhere in socialized space, simultaneously making the social spatialized. Now we will attend to the fourth and last category in our proposed framework: the temporalization of everyday resistance.

A Temporalization of Everyday Resistance

While space is a recognized (albeit undeveloped) dimension in the conceptual framework of Chin and Mittelman (1997), the dimension of *time* is ignored. In our conceptualization time is a central dimension. Just as everyday resistance involves spatially organized activities, social relations and identities, and is practised in and through space as a central social dimension, one may equally talk about everyday resistance as temporally organized, and as practised in and through time as a central social dimension. In the same way we speak about spatialization we may speak about the social construction of the temporal as 'social temporalisation' (Johansson, 1994). In fact, it could be argued that time is even more important to our analysis of everyday resistance since the 'everyday' is based on familiarity and regular social life and everyday resistance does not hold a territory (as does sovereign power) but moves spatially; that is, is temporarily spatial (De Certeau, 1984).

The spatialization and temporalization of social reality are not separate processes, but intertwined; and they are always related to each other. Furthermore, time and space as socially constructed must be, and are increasingly so, linked to *power*. Not only can time be used as an instrument of power and control but also, as Foucault has shown, control of time (and space) is actually fundamental to disciplinary power. Control of time is, for example, practised in working life through time schedules and an efficient use of time (Foucault, 1991). We will return to this entanglement of dimensions later. For now, the question is about the temporalization of resistance (and power).

Power and time have been mostly associated with the introduction of *mechanical clock* time – a new way to conceptualize and organize time that became institutionalized with the emergence of an industrialized capitalist society (Adams, 1990). The Marxist historian E.P. Thompson documents the transition from a society regulated by what he calls *task-oriented* time to a time that is valued in money and is used as an instrument of control over peoples' working lives. The employer must use the time of his labour and ensure that it is not wasted. Time is not passed but spent (Thompson, 1967). Taylorism became a key to the disciplinary development of mass production within industrial capitalism. As Snider notes (2002: 92), efficiency is 'an inherently time-bound term'.

Thus, modern society and its organizing powers utilize certain time structures. On the other hand, resistance is also temporalized: for example, the issue of time control has been crucial in the struggle for improved working condition (Huzell, 2005). Within sociology of work, workers' resistance to mechanisms time control has been 'a fundamental concern' (Strangleman and Warren, 2008: 210). In the following section we shall focus on repertoires of everyday resistance in relation to the control of time in workplaces.

Time Theft

One of the many types of everyday resistance identified by Scott (1985) is ‘foot dragging’ – that is, intentionally lowering your pace of work. In *The Practice of Everyday Life* De Certeau illustrates his definition of ‘the tactic’ by introducing us to the term the wig – *la perruque*. This term refers to when the worker’s own work is being performed at the place of employment under the disguise of working for the boss; as when a secretary writes a love letter on ‘company time’. The worker here diverts time away from producing profit for the employer and instead uses it for private enjoyment, for activities that are ‘free, creative, and precisely not directed toward profit’ (De Certeau, 1984: 25). It also has the effect of resistance: it undermines a system that is meant to exploit and discipline the worker.

According to Snider (2002) this kind of ‘time theft’ is categorized as a ‘new type of crime against capital’ and she points out that this emphasis on the worker as a criminal, as opposed to just slacking off or being lazy, is relatively new. The category of time theft includes a variety of acts (Stevens and Lavin, 2007) such as: arriving late for work or leaving early, making personal telephone calls, taking long breaks, leaving work to run errands, faking illness, falsifying time sheets, sleeping on the job, as well as the unauthorized personal use of company internet systems. Time theft is not only defined as a form of material theft, but is said to be ‘any attempt to subvert the prescribed labor process by intentionally or unintentionally reducing productivity’ (Stevens and Lavin, 2007: 45).

The precondition of ‘time theft’ as a form of everyday resistance practised by workers is of course the rise of new forms of control of their time. In their study at the call center OnCall (2007), Stevens and Lavin note how technologically enabled surveillance techniques are crucial elements of scientific management and of detecting and thwarting time theft. This is reflected in the weekly statistical calculations of employee performance and behaviour at OnCall. These reports indicate a strict adherence to break times, punctual arrival and departure, the average call handling times, the percentage of time spent entering customer details into accounts, the amount of idle time, and the number of calls taken in a particular span of time. If they take more than one minute longer break than allowed, they are made to sign statements in which they acknowledge that they have caused a transgression against the employer. This information is then included in the employee file and can be used to discipline workers at some point in the future.

However, the authors also find that individual and informal collective resistance arises out of the daily work experience. Employees will find ways to slow down the pace. At some call centers workers are given time in-between calls to enter notes into the customers’ accounts, which is referred to as *wrap time*. To get a break between calls, workers can do what is known as the *double wrap*, which is hitting the wrap up button twice to extend the amount of time in-between calls. ‘The double wrap is an example of workers creatively employing the technology required to do the job in order to resist management’s constant emphasis on productivity and “proper” use of time.’ (2007: 51). The double wrap could be considered an example of what Marx (2003) defines as a masking move or a way of distorting, the equivalence of holding down computer keys to appear productive.

Time theft at the workplace is a practice of everyday resistance that challenges the control of time based on a Taylorist discourse; especially that discourse’s concern with efficiency and productivity.

Relationships of Agents and Repertoires in Queer Time and Space

We have argued for the relevance of four fundamental social dimensions of everyday resistance: repertoires, relationships of agents, as well as spatialization and temporalization. Now, in this last

section, we want to show how the dimensions are *intertwined* and have their combined place in our analytical framework. Let us begin with space, and then we will add to the complexity of this illustration.

Queer Space

In the 1990s, ground breaking studies were carried out regarding the spatial resistance of 'queer spaces'. Among them was Myslik's (1996) exploration of the role that queer spaces play in helping gay men to 'cope with the realities of heterosexism and the violence that often accompanies it'. He explored the experiences and perceptions of the white gay men who resided or visited the neighbourhood of Dupont Circle, a territory claimed by the gay men of Washington DC. This neighbourhood has an enormous emotional significance for gay men who are marginalized and have no sense of control in the city. This space is not a safe haven from the threat of violence – quite the opposite; in these areas gay men are especially targeted. However:

queer spaces in many respect alter the traditional power relationship between heterosexuals and homosexuals. In most areas of the city gay men feel uncomfortable or vulnerable and, consciously or unconsciously, alter their behavior to hide their sexual identity. As sites of resistance to the oppressions of a heterosexist and homophobic society, however, queer spaces create the strong sense of empowerment that allows men to look past the dangers of being gay in the city and to feel safe and at home. (Myslik, 1996: 168–169)

The concept of queer space is still used, as in the study *Getting It on Online: Cyberspace, Gay Male Sexuality and Embodied Identity* (2004) where Campbell investigates how and why the gay body is re(produced) in Western gay male digital contexts. His main assertion is that gay male digital culture relies on the body of the user as a point of reference within its digital interactions and virtual spaces. In the narratives of muscle – bears and chubby chasers – Campbell traces attempts to rearticulate the relationship to the physical body and to resist dominant models of beauty and the erotic. That leads him to suggest that queer online spaces, or 'cyber queer spaces', offer a space for formation of new and alternative discourses of embodiment and beauty.

However, as Browne (2006) points out, the concept 'queer space' is usually considered equivalent with lesbian/gay space without including transgender. She argues that geographies of sexed bodies need to be explored beyond sexual orientation and identities. [Halberstam \(2005\)](#) is one of the few who has also included transgender in analyses of queer time and space. As she states:

Queer uses of time and space develop, at least in part, in opposition to the institutions of family, heterosexuality, and reproduction. They also develop according to other logics of location, movement, and identification. (2005: 1)

In line with Halberstam (2005) we therefore think there is a need to analyse the queer use of time and space as a combination, but, for the sake of clarity, we begin with time.

Queer Time/Space

Temporalization of everyday resistance may in this sense be about creating and embodying a different conception of and relation to time than the dominant ones. Lately, the concept of 'queer time' has been discussed among queer theorists, primarily by [Freeman \(2005\)](#) and [Halberstam \(2005\)](#). Freeman calls for a 'deviant chronopolitics' and introduces 'erotohistoriography': 'a politics of

unpredictable, deeply embodied pleasures that counters the logic of development' (2005: 59). Erotohistoriography looks at how enjoyable queer physical practices shape subjectivity and create new forms of temporal or historical consciousness.

Halberstam's work is especially interesting for us since she explores queer time and space in relation to each other. She argues that one way that queer time emerges is from within those gay communities 'whose horizons of possibility have been severely diminished by the AIDS epidemic' (2005: 2). The experience of 'constantly diminishing futures' that developed during the crisis creates a new emphasis on the here and now, and also in a way it expands the 'potential of the moment'.

And yet queer time, even as it emerges from the AIDS crisis, is not only about compression and annihilation; it is also about the potentiality of a life unscripted by the conventions of family, inheritance, and child rearing (2005: 2).

Halberstam explores the queer temporalities that are proper to subcultural activities, and argues that queer subcultures produce alternative temporalities 'by allowing their participants to believe that their futures can be imagined according to logics that lie outside of those paradigmatic markers of life experience – namely, birth, marriage, reproduction, and death' (2005: 2).

Halberstam also highlights the emphasis on flexible desires, practices and identities in sexual subcultures (see Dinshaw, 2007). This dichotomy of flexible and rigid should be conceptualized as temporal. *Mobility over time* is associated with liberation and more fixed identification is seen as being stuck in time. Halberstam regards these as 'temporal aspects of homonormativity':

Many of these characterizations of homonormative desire also presume a white subject and then cast anachronism onto communities of color – for example, as white middle-class queers scurry into gender and sexual flexibility, communities bound by butch-fem, perhaps working-class Latina, or some black communities seem to be 'behind' the curve of history. (Dinshaw, 2007: 190–191)

Halberstam's project goes beyond empirical studies of queer time and space. She delivers a serious critique against the main theorists of 'postmodern geography', among others, Harvey and Soja. While these authors give some attention to the racialization and gendering of postmodern space, they have nothing to say about sexuality and space. Halberstam points out the total absence of a discussion about what she calls 'the naturalization of time and space' in relation to sexuality, and subsequently shows how reproductive time and family time are heteronormative time/space constructs.

We propose that the acknowledgement and analysis of temporalization of everyday resistance is a crucial challenge for studies of everyday resistance to take on. The most productive path, we believe, would primarily be to move towards the connection of time and space – to investigate *the time/space of everyday resistance*, in relation to investigating the intersecting of gendered, queer, classed and racialized practices of everyday resistance. That means we have to combine, not only time/space, but also the intersectional relationships of the resisting agent, and how that resistance is connected to particular configurations of power. This is what we will briefly show in our last section as we carry out an intersectional analysis of the dimensions – with the 'bear culture' as an illustrative case.

*The Bears: Repertoires and Relationships in Queer Space and Time*⁸

Bear culture is a subculture within the gay community that celebrates the big and hairy gay body in opposition to the dominant ideal of the slim, muscular and fit body. Bear culture has created its own bear spaces within the mainstream gay culture in bars, parties, and different forms of gatherings, but it is primarily the bear body that is created as a site of resistance. According to Peter Hennen (2005), the culture not only resists the body ideals of the dominant discourse

of gay culture, but it also disrupts and challenges genital/phallus centred sexuality with sexual innovations; the bear hug, the nuzzling of 'fur' and an emphasis on sensuality. These practices could be understood as part of an embodied resistance that is carried out both as collective actions and as individual acts of resistance outside the queer bear spaces. Taken together these methods might be defined as a repertoire of everyday resistance.

While bear culture has not been studied in relation to the concept of queer time, we suggest that it should not only be seen as creating a different time than reproductive and family time, but also that the bear body as a site of resistance has its own symbolism in relation to time. As emphasized by many scholars, the large male bear body needs to be understood in relation to the skinny, dying male body of the AIDS epidemic (see, for example, Hennen, 2005). As such, this body is symbolizing (long) life and strength in contrast to (imminent) death and weakness.

Bear culture also relates to its own particular configuration of power: both heteronormativity and homonormativity. Simultaneously, it is related to several key social sections such as gender, 'race'/ethnicity, class and obviously sexuality. The acts of everyday resistance practised by men who identify themselves as bears shape their relationship both to gay men of the mainstream gay community and to men identifying themselves as heterosexual. Bears are at the same time embodying positions of marginal masculinity as well as hegemonic positions of masculinity (see Connell, 1995). Their practice of dressing in flannel shirts, ripped jeans and working boots is at the same time a practice of resistance in relation to the dominant gay culture, as well as a practice that reinforces the norm of heterosexual white masculinity. Since the majority of the men in bear culture are middle class it may be said that they enact a fantasy about working-class man, and a stereotypic representation is constructed. Furthermore, as Hennen notes, the identification of the bear with the 'back to nature' image is linked to a 'raced cultural dynamic which equates the return to nature to whiteness' (2005: 33). It is also historically a reaction to presumed feminization. Hennen views the practices of power as well as resistance as an ongoing interactive process of contradictions, multiplicity and complexity, shaped by gendered, class, race and sexual orientation. In their position as gay men the bears are marginalized in relation to heterosexual men, as well as to gay men in a more dominant position within the gay community. At the same time, as whites they are positioned and position themselves as superior to coloured men, as middle class superior to blue collar men and as men superior to women (at least to women in a less privileged position). Through their body shape, dressing and activities, bears both reproduce and even strengthen some power relations at the same time as they undermine others. According to Hennen the 'possibility of subversion' is found in the reorganization of sexuality. 'Bears have been successful in divorcing effeminacy from same-sex desire and creating a culture that looks like a bunch of "regular guys"' (2005: 41). However, that does not mean that the bears challenge normative masculinity. They want to be accepted as 'regular guys', they identify with heterosexual men, only they are gay. They try to re-neutralize gender relations, rather than de-naturalize them. As Hollander and Einwohner point out, 'resistance is not always pure. That is, even while resisting power, individuals or groups may simultaneously support the structures of domination that necessitate resistance in the first place' (2004: 549). Men identifying themselves as bears are an example of that; they are in many ways complicit with the ideals of hegemonic masculinity, while simultaneously resisting it. As the bears are shifting between the positions of being agents of power and of being agents of resistance, the relationships of everyday resistance are dynamic and complex.

Conclusion

We have seen how repertoires of everyday resistance are articulated in contextual ways and organized according to power configurations, time, space and relationships. We are not arguing that

these dimensions are the only ones, but that these are fundamental and necessary to include in order to develop a comprehensive research agenda on everyday resistance. Together with the intersections of power – sections that might be extensive, but at least consisting of gender, sexuality, class and ‘race’/ethnicity – this theoretical framework of everyday resistance might help us to conduct more systematic, coherent and critical empirical studies of how everyday resistance is manifested in various ways, and how it interacts dynamically in relation to historical social change and contextual differences.

The complexity of (at least) four fundamental sociological dimensions of everyday resistance (repertoires, time, space and relationships), together with (at least) four fundamental intersections of power relations (gender, sexuality, class and ‘race’/ethnicity), is demanding for any research agenda. However, the demands of complexity are no real argument against such research, even if we think focused research might sometimes select some dimensions and do in-depth studies of them only, as long as the other dimensions are regarded as relevant and needing to be incorporated, at a later stage, in our understanding of empirical articulations of everyday resistance and its changing relation to power.

There is no reason to think that resistance would be less complex (or less controversial, contested or debated) than power. However, we are convinced that it is now necessary to take the step from the somewhat compartmentalized research on (everyday) resistance and a separate, vast field of power research, and bring them together. This step will be necessary if we want to understand human agency and its limitations, if we want to understand the links between structure and agency, and how the combinations of power/resistance shape historical social change.

We hope our suggested research agenda might inspire further work on the theoretical and empirical framework of systematic everyday resistance research.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to the helpful comments made by the anonymous reviewers.

Funding

The Department of Social and Behavioural Studies, University West, gave the initial funding. Vinthagen was able to complete his part with the help of funding from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet HS-2010-54, *The Globalization of Resistance* 2011–15).

Notes

1. The definition of sovereign power that is in use and is discussed today is that of the Italian philosopher Agamben. The state of exception creates ‘an unprecedented generalization of the paradigm of security as the normal techniques of government’ (Agamben, 2005: 14). Agamben argues that a constant state of emergency or exception enables the state to turn the lives of those under state rule into ‘bare life’, that of ‘*homo sacer*’ (Agamben, 1998).
2. Disciplinary power trains, shapes and controls individuals through institutions, punishments, awards and scientific discourses. It shapes ‘docile bodies’ through careful observation. Discipline enables bodies to function productively within the forms of economic, political, and military organization that emerged in the modern age and are continuously restructured (Foucault, 1991; Lilja and Vinthagen, forthcoming).
3. One of the most influential, and in our view clarifying definitions of the concept of biopower is the one by Rabinow and Rose: ‘one or more truth discourses about the “vital” character of living human beings; an array of authorities considered competent to speak that truth; strategies for intervention upon collective existence in the name of life and health; and modes of subjectification, in which individuals work on themselves in the name of individual or collective life or health’ (2006: 195).
4. The concept of ‘intersectionality’ has been acknowledged as one of the most important contributions to feminist scholarship and has become the ‘buzzword’ for feminist theory and research (Davis, 2008). The

concept has been described as ‘crossroads’, ‘axes of difference’ or ‘the point of contact made between elements, lines or categories’. Intersectionality is thus a particular way of understanding social location in terms of criss-cross systems of oppression.

5. According to Rose (1993) one needs to view the boundaries between real and non-real space, material and symbolic space, as fluid and blurred.
6. This research is part of the growing field of ‘critical fat studies’, in which obesity is challenged as a bio-medical category and instead defined as a socially constructed and contested ‘problem’. See for example Wright and Harwood (2009).
7. See Butz and Ripmeester (1999) for the introduction of the third space concept into the study of everyday resistance; or as they name it – off-kilter resistance.
8. See Gamson and Moon (2004) on queer theory in relation to the sociological analysis of sexuality.

References

- Adams B (1990) *Time and Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Agamben G (1998) *Homo Sacer: The sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben G (2005) *The State of Exception*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ambjörnsson F (2009) En rosa revolution i vardagen. Om femininitet, queera strategier och motstånd. In: Lilja M and Vinthagen S (eds) *Motstånd*. Malmö: Liber, 173–196.
- Bartky S (1993) *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. London: Routledge.
- Bartlett L (2005) Dialogue, knowledge and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review* 49(3): 344–364.
- Bhabha HK (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Brazier JE and LeBesco K (eds) (2001) *Bodies out of Bound, Fatness and Transgression*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Browne K (2006) Challenging queer geographies. *Antipode* 38(5): 885–893.
- Butz D and Ripmeester M (1999) Finding space for resistant subcultures. *Invisible Cultures* Issue 2: 1–16.
- Campbell JE (2004) *Getting It on Online: Cyberspace, Gay Male Sexuality and Embodied Identity*. New York, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Chin CBN and Mittelman JH (1997) Conceptualising Resistance to Globalisation. *New Political Economy* 2(1): 25–37.
- Collinson DL (2000) Strategies of resistance: power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In: Grint K (ed.) *Work and Society: A Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 163–195.
- Connell RW (1995) *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Davis K (2008) Intersectionality as buzzword. *Feminist Theory* 9(1): 67–85.
- De Certeau M (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Deleuze G (2011 [1992]) Postscript on the societies of control. In: Szeman I and Kapozy T (eds) *Cultural Theory An Anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 139–142.
- De los Reyes P and Mulinari D (2005) *Intersektionalitet: Kritiska reflektioner över (o)jämlighetens landskap*. Malmö: Liber.
- Dinshaw C, Edelman L, Ferguson RA, et al. (2007) Theorizing queer temporality: a roundtable discussion. *GLQ* 13(2/3): 177–195.
- Dupont B (2008) Hacking the Panopticon: distributed online surveillance and resistance. In: Deflem M (ed.) *Surveillance and Governance: Sociology of Crime Law and Deviance, Volume 10*. Bingley: Emerald, 257–278.
- Foucault M (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1970–1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Foucault M (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Freeman E (2005) Time binds, or, erotohistoriography. *Social Text* 23(3/4, 84/85): 57–68.
- Gamson J and Moon D (2004) The sociology of sexualities: queer and beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 47–64.

- Gordon N (2008) *Israel's Occupation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gore J (1995) On the continuity of power relations in pedagogy. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 5(2): 165–188.
- Halberstam J (1998) *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Halberstam J (2005) *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgendered Bodies and Subcultural Lives*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Harold C (2007) *Our Space: Resisting the Corporate Culture of Control*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Harvey D (1990) *The Conditions of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hennen P (2005) Bear, bodies, bear masculinity, recuperation, resistance or retreat. *Gender and Society* 19(1): 25–43.
- Hollander JA and Einwohner RL (2004) Conceptualizing resistance. *Sociological Forum* 19(4): 533–554.
- hooks b (1984) *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- hooks b (1990) Marginality as a site of resistance. In: Ferguson R et al. (eds) *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 41–44.
- Huzell H (2005) *Management och motstånd: Offentlig sektor i omvandling. En fallstudie*. Karlstad University Studies 2005:45, Karlstad, Sweden.
- Johansson A (1994) Time, space, modernity and gender: the Nicaraguan Mestizo culture as a case study. Paper presented at a Phd seminar in the Department of Sociology, Göteborg University.
- Johansson A (1999) *Elefant i nylonstrumpor. Om kvinnlighet, kropp och hunger*. Anamma: Göteborg.
- Kullenberg C (2009) Den panspektriska tidsålderns motståndsstrategier. In: Lilja M and Vinthagen S (eds) *Motstånd*. Malmö: Liber, 293–312.
- LeBesco K (2004) *Revolting Bodies? The Struggle to Redefine Fat Identity*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lilja M and Vinthagen S (2009) *Motstånd*. Malmö: Liber.
- Lilja M and Vinthagen S (forthcoming) Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: resisting what power with what resistance? *Journal of Political Power*.
- Lilja M, Baaz M and Vinthagen S (2013) Exploring 'irrational resistance'. *Journal of Political Power* 6(2): 201–217.
- Lyon D (2001) *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McAdam D, Tarrow S and Tilly C (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate.
- Marx GT (2003) A tack in the shoe. neutralizing and resisting the new surveillance. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(2): 369–390.
- Marx GT (2009) A tack in the shoe and taking off the shoe: neutralization and counterneutralization dynamics. *Surveillance and Society* 6(3): 294–306.
- Myslik W (1996) Renegotiating social/sexual identities of places: gay communities as safe havens or sites of resistance. In: Duncan N (ed.) *Body Space: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 155–169.
- Na Y and Choo YH (2011) Becoming a female-to-male transgender (FTM) in South Korea. In: Bobel C and Kwan S (eds) *Embodying Resistance: Challenging the Norms, Breaking the Rules*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 48–57.
- Orbach S (1998) *Fat Is a Feminist Issue*. London: Arrow.
- Ozguç U (2010) Panopticon: the Separation Wall and paradoxical nature of Israeli security imagination. Paper presented at the Australian Political Science Association Conference, 'Connected Globe: Conflicting Worlds'. University of Melbourne, 25–27 September 2010.
- Pitts-Taylor LV (2003) *In the Flesh: The Cultural Positions of Body Modification*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad P and Prasad A (2000) Stretching the iron cage: the constitution and implications of routine workplace resistance. *Organization Science* 11(4): 387–403.
- Rabinow P and Rose N (2006) Biopower today. *BioSocieties* 1(2): 195–217.

- Rose G (1993) *Feminist Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Scott JC (1985) *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott JC (1989) Everyday forms of resistance. *Copenhagen Papers* 4(1989): 33–62.
- Scott JC (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shields R (1991) *Places on the Margin*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Simi P and Futrell R (2009) Negotiating white power activist stigma. *Social Problems* 56(1): 89–110.
- Snider L (2002) Theft of time: disciplining through science and law. *Osgood Law Journal* 40(1): 89–111.
- Soja EW (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso Press.
- Soja EW (1996) *Third Space*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stevens DO and Lavin A (2007) Stealing time: the temporal regulation of labour in a neoliberal and post-Fordist work regime. *Democratic Communiqué* 21(2): 40–61.
- Strangleman T and Warren T (2008) *Work and Society: Sociological Approaches, Themes and Methods*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thompson EP (1967) Time, work-discipline, and industrialized capitalism. *Past and Present* 38(December): 56–97.
- Tilly C (1991) Domination, resistance, compliance ... discourse. *Sociological Forum* 6(3): 593–602.
- Tilly C (1995) Contentious repertoires in Great Britain, 1758–1834. In: Traugott M (ed.) *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 15–42.
- Traugott M (1995) Recurrent patterns of collective action. In: Traugott M (ed.) *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1–14.
- Vinthagen S and Johansson A (2013) 'Everyday resistance': exploration of a concept and its theories. *Resistance Studies Magazine* 1(September): 1–46.
- Wietz R (2001) Women and their hair. seeking power through resistance and accommodation. *Gender and Society* 15(5): 667–686.
- Wright J and Harwood V (eds) (2009) *Biopolitics and the 'Obesity Epidemic': Governing Bodies*. New York, NY: Routledge.