Problematizing qualitative educational research: reading observations and interviews through rhizoanalysis and multiple literacies

Diana Masny dmasny@uottawa.ca

Abstract

This article problematizes conventional qualitative educational research through a process of reading observation and interview in rhizomatic research. Such an approach to doing research brings together Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis, innovative practices with transdisciplinary implications. This article contributes to on-going research regarding the emergence of multiple literacies and rhizoanalysis as a way to experiment in disrupting conventional research concepts, in this case, observations and interviews. Rhizoanalysis is proposed because of its non-hierarchical and non-linear perspective to conducting qualitative research. In a similar manner, Multiple Literacies Theory seeks to release school-based literacy from its privileged position and unfold literacy as multiple and non-hierarchical. This theoretical and practical stance to educational research is deployed in an assemblage that includes a study of multiple writing systems with 5- to 8 –year- old multilingual children. Reading observation and interviews through the lens of rhizoanalysis and Multiple Literacies Theory becomes an exploration in reconceptualization of qualitative research.

Key words: multiple literacies, rhizoanalysis, observations, interviews, assemblage, Deleuze, Guattari.

…there is no sense in trying to oppose these dominant paradigms because we will never lack the things they prescribe… (Mozère, 2012 p.2)

Historically, qualitative research adopted what could be considered according to St Pierre (2013) a "conventional approach" to humanist research with its emphasis on epistemology and methodology while other approaches inspired by Derrida and Foucault were marginalized (for more details cf. St. Pierre, 2013). Today, qualitative research has produced several critiques of conventional humanist research. They have been published in recent journal issues (Qualitative Inquiry, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, Qualitative Studies in Education, International Review of Qualitative Research, Cultural Studies-Critical

Methodologies)n addition, the writings of Deleuze and Guattari have cast a gaze on the importance of ontology (May, 2005) that has disrupted conventional humanist perspective on knowledge, representation, binary logic and the centered subject. This article seeks to disrupt conventional notions of qualitative research such as observation and interview through concepts emerging from Multiple Literacies Theory (reading, text, sense, toolbox, theory and praxis), and rhizoanalysis (de- and re territorialization, assemblage, lines[1] of social formation: molar (rigid), molecular, lines of flight). Concepts do not operate in isolation or one independent of the other. Rather, they cross-pollinate during a process of becoming other. Accordingly, Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis are taken up to produce thinking differently qualitative educational research.

Research in the social sciences is often positioned to think about a problem in terms of solutions (May, 2005). In many cases, a problem is constructed that a solution will rectify/fulfill. This article brings an alternative way to think about a problem that generates a response emerging from virtual pre-personal and non pre-given connections for the purpose of opening up lines of creativity in research through reading the rhizome. An iris, unlike a tree, is a rhizome with multiple horizontal shoots that grow in unpredictable ways. They have no beginning, no end. They spill out in the middle. This article can be considered a rhizome. Its multiple entryways create potentialities for problematizing and questioning conventional ways of observing and interviewing. Readers enter in the middle of what has been a research project.

Entering in the middle

This article deterritorializes a conventional humanist approach to research in order to experiment doing qualitative research through rhizoanalysis. Deleuze and Guattari elaborated the concepts of territorialization, de-and re-territorialization. Within their view of reality (ontology), earth and territory are closely linked (1994). Earth and territory produce problems from life and concept creation along rhizomatic lines (see section on the rhizome) becomes a response to problems in the world (Masny, 2014c). While there are many aspects of doing research that potentially deterritorialize, this article's focus is on a rhizomatic approach that de- and re- territorializes observation and interview in a research assemblage. An assemblage consists of content (human/non-human bodies), expression (collective assemblages of enunciation, order-words[2]) and de- and re- territorialization. Content refers to relationships between bodies in an assemblage that takes into account that we never know in advance how a body will respond in the process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization (Masny, 2014c).

The article maps multiple entries as it introduces Multiple Literacies Theory, a theoretical and practical framework in the process of becoming. It is also a framework on becoming while engaged in the process of thinking differently about reading, text and sense.   Then the concept of the rhizome, how it functions and what it produces follows. A next entry is devoted to rhizoanalysis, the role of assemblage (*agencement*), that flows through and plugs into the reconceptualization of qualitative research, in particular, observation and interview, concepts of inquiry/for experimentation. A research study on the simultaneous acquisition of multiple writing systems in multilingual children comes next. It becomes a site to problematize, deterritorialize and reterritorialize observations and interviews through becoming-vignette. Different concepts will emerge and readers will experience these concepts unfold. A final entry (not a conclusion but an intermezzo) considers lines of flight (deterritorialization) in doing

rhizoanalysis.

Multiple Literacies Theory

Multiple Literacies Theory and Reading (Masny, 2010, 2014b).   They consists of words, gestures, sounds, that is, human, animal, and vegetal ways of relating in reading the world and self: ways of becoming in the world. Reading self refers to a relationality of elements in an assemblage in the process of becoming (affect). Accordingly Multiple Literacies Theory creates potentialities for transforming life.

Text and Sense

Literacies are texts, broadly speaking (for example, mating rituals, music, visual arts, physics, mathematics, digital remixes) and taken up as visual, oral, written, tactile, olfactory, and in multimodal digital. They produce different vegetal and animal mutations, speakers, writers, artists, and digital avatars. Each text is a machinic assemblage. It is not fixed; rather it is formed with the environment in which it finds itself. Flowers brought to someone's home take on different sense from flowers as part of an installation in an art gallery. Text is a sense event. It is asignifying. Sense emerges differently in different settings (Masny, 2014a). Multiple Literacies produces becoming, that is, from continuous investments in literacies literate individuals (human and non-human), and communities are formed. Reading and reading the world and self through text influences the text one continually becomes (Masny, 2010).

Multiple Literacies Theory, theory and practice

From a theoretical perspective, Multiple Literacies Theory focuses on problems, questions in order to engage in creating concepts flowing from de- and re-territorialization. In addition, Multiple Literacies Theory is interested in how difference that comes about through experimentation transforms an assemblage in rhizoanalysis. From a practical perspective, Deleuze likens a theory to a toolbox: 'it has to be used, it has to work '(Deleuze, 2004, p. 208). The toolbox is practical for it consists in creating non-pre-given concepts. How are concepts practical? Concepts are not definitions. Concepts provide new directions for thinking. A concept becomes " this power to move beyond what we know and experience to think how experience might be extended" (Colebrook, 2002. p. 17). Accordingly, Multiple Literacies Theory is interested in praxis[3], the ability to do, to practice when asking questions about how literacies function and what they produce. Questions and concepts create "possibilities for thinking beyond what is already known or assumed" (Colebrook, p.19).

Literacies as processes: reading intensive and immanent

The concept of reading most often referred to finds its roots in psychology. The problem is that this concept cannot be incorporated in Multiple Literacies Theory on the basis of ontological incommensurability. Reading-psychology focuses on the centered subject, linearity, hierarchy and representation. Reading is defined an endpoint, fixed. The problem of reading constitutes an untimely[4] rupture. Reading becomes intensive. Moreover, reading becomes immanent. Reading-in-psychology has molarised and emitted a line of deterritorialization: a becoming-reading that reterritorializes as subject decentered, non-representational, non-interpretative. Literacies conceptualize as processes-in-becoming, constantly deterritorializing and re-territorializing in an assemblage. In addition, a different approach to reading involves plugging in

to text, sense-as-an-event and in untimely ways. How reading is taken up in each situation is unpredictable.

Rhizome

It is important to return to the concept of the rhizome briefly explored earlier. A rhizome has no tree-like vertical roots. There are o: molar lines (rigid), molecular lines (supple) and lines of flight (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Molar lines are rigid/fixed and often refer to ways of being of institutions. When a molar line ruptures, it emits line(s) of flight (becoming). For example, St Pierre's (2011) encounter with the conventional (received) view of research methodology (data, method, member check, peer debriefing) brings to this article a conceptual deterritorialization (transformation) of methodology and a reterritorialization of a research concept: becoming-rhizoanalysis.

The characteristics of a rhizome are: connectivity, heterogeneity, multiplicity, rupture, unpredictability and mapping. A class, for example, can be considered a rhizome consisting of multiple, heterogeneous, non-hierarchical trajectories of experiences, some that rupture unpredictably and others that don't and, nevertheless, connect with each other. A rhizome is neither metaphor nor figuration:

> Deleuze's renunciation of metaphor flows from some of the most fundamental commitments upheld throughout his philosophy: his rejection of the representational image of thought, his pragmatism, and his long-standing interest in the mobility of philosophical concepts (Patton, 2010, p.21).

Rhizoanalysis

Rhizoanalysis is not a method; in other words, there is no one way to do rhizoanalysis. There are a number of approaches to rhizoanalysis in the literature (Alvermann, 2001; Dufresne, 2002; Eakle, 2007; Olsson, 2007; Waterhouse, 2011; Sellers, 2013). What is rhizoanalysis? What does it function with? How does it function? What does it produce in becoming? Its analytic orientation to research is based on the rhizome (multiplicity, connectivity, heterogeneity, rupture and mapping). It is subject decentered. While another aspect of rhizoanalysis is non-representation, there is divergence when non-representation is connected to interpretosis[5]. Moreover, in its movement of horizontal lines, a rhizome is non-hierarchical. In other words, every element (connection) is equally important. One element enters into a relation with another element. The relationality is one of affect, becoming in the process of mapping connections of lines (trajectories) molar (rigid), molecular (supple) and lines of light. Finally, there is immanence a core concept to Deleuze. The concept plugs in in many fields including rhizoanalysis and multiple literacies. Through immanence, a different way of doing research emerges., What was a particular form of doing research could be no longer. It is different. It is difference that allows for creation and invention to happen continuously (Dufresne, 2006).

What does rhizoanalysis produce? The arborescent nature of conventional research attempts to fix (pin down) and predict what research observations and interviews mean through representation and interpretation. When there is an unpredictable event, ruptures in conventional research happen and emit lines of flight whereby rhizoanalysis through reading a

research assemblage creates new connections of becoming (transforming). In this way, rhizoanalysis functions machinically. In other words:

> "it[a machine] has no subjectivity or organising centre; it is nothing more than the connections and productions it makes; it is what it does. It therefore has no home or ground; it is a constant process of deterritorialisation, or becoming other than it…" (Colebrook, 2002, p.57).

Reading a Research Assemblage

In this article, reading research as text in an assemblage provides the impetus that de- and re-territorializes content and expression and that includes observation and interview in the research assemblage. It is a research perspective in which observation and interview flow non-linearly in a study on simultaneous multiple writing systems with multilingual children in the context of home, school and community. This project questions (1) how learning of multiple writing systems function and (2) what learning multiple writing systems produces through becoming.

Participants

A two-year longitudinal qualitative study was conducted in a French language minority setting in Canada. Children whose parents or grandparents went to French-language schools have constitutional rights to attend school where French is the sole language of instruction (Government of Canada, 1982). The five girl-participants aged 5 to 8 years old were filmed in class (language arts, mathematics, science, and social sciences) at home (meals, homework, reading, real time), and in the day care center (where applicable). Each filmed observation was followed by an interview. Each of these activities happened twice during the school year. The vignettes that follow involve one of the five children. Eight-year old Cristelle (self-selected pseudonym) lived with her mother, a bilingual civil servant and with her father, a unilingual English-speaker in Ottawa. At home there were selected spaces and times when French was used (homework, story time). The family lived in a pre-dominant English-speaking neighborhood. The teacher agreed to being filmed. In addition, students might accidentally appear in the film especially if they were doing group work with the student-participant. There were restrictions imposed by institutional rules of ethics: what could be filmed, when and where (cf. Honan, 2014 for challenges to the role of institutional ethics in qualitative research).

Observations and becoming-video-vignettes

As part of a research assemblage there were the research questions, researchers, research assistants, parents, and physical spaces (classroom, home). The assistants and the researchers filmed continuously during the 40-minute class period. It might be a video session where students were performing (for example, students lay on the floor and with extended arms and legs practice the concept of directionality: north, southwest). It might be a drawing from a social studies class, a written activity involving spelling in a language arts class, and a mathematical narrative on the board (Cinderella is more popular than Snow White based on the amount of votes each one got). Meanwhile at home, filming by the parents involved the

participating parents without the intrusion of the research team since filming took place at meal times, during homework and leisure time. Furthermore, untimely events brought on deterritorialization. For instance, in class, there was the filming of a student participant in a group activity when suddenly the student got up and went off to do another activity. At home, a sibling left the dinner table and conducted an exchange at a distance with the student-participant at the table. Meanwhile a disagreement picked up between another sibling and the student-participant. How is this all part of reading observations for the study? Might reading the relationality of the elements including the researcher in the research assemblage speak to the unpredictability of what might happen? What emerges is a reconfiguration of the assemblage (the interactions of reading intensively and immanently bodies and expressions).

Boldt and Valente (2014) experienced filming a student participant in the following way. They instructed their graduate students to film routines focusing on a particular child in the classroom. The purpose of the study was to work with an autistic child integrated in a regular school based on educational principles developed and adapted from Deligny[6.] In the course of filming:

> children changed spaces, groups and teachers constantly…. Somehow capturing the constant movement of teachers, children, materials, and waves and bursts of affective tensions and energies happening among and within spaces began to seem more important than following the arc of a given event. In fact many of the things the children were doing did not have discernable beginnings, middles and ends, but seemed, in the language of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), to be all middles. (p. 204)

In an assemblage there are affects/becomings that enter into a composition with affects of another body.

> …you never know what a body will do what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body… (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 257**).**

While debriefing with research assistants and researchers the filmed observations, the mind is not responsible for selecting video vignettes even though the experience of connectivity takes place in the mind[7]. Rather it is within a research assemblage, including reading observations that rhizomatic ruptures happen and with the power of affect flowing through the relationality of elements in the assemblage, video-vignettes emerge. New concepts such as video-vignette emerge from the toolbox, a feature of Multiple Literacies Theory. The toolbox itself is also created as a concept to convey the practicality of Multiple Literacies Theory. A concept emerging from the toolbox is considered practical for it is a response to a problem (undoing conventional qualitative research). Filmed observations becoming video-vignettes plug into the potentiality of literacies as processes by extending experiences of what is to what might be. Might then video-vignettes produce a process of becoming (affect) through the relationality of the elements in a research assemblage and reconfigure the assemblage?

Connectivity: Video-vignettes, interviews, transcripts

This section on interviewing, reading transcripts and vignettes for analysis consists of non-linear connections with other elements in the research assemblage (for instance, equipment to

conduct interviews, research assistants, student participants, filmed observations…). The video vignettes of activities filmed in class and at home the previous day became the springboard to how exchanges within the interviews might happen. At the interview there are no pre-set interview questions. Rather the interview consists of questions and comments in conjunction with affect flowing through connecting relations in the research assemblage at that moment in time and space. During the interview the student participant and parent might comment on the video vignette, ask questions, address experiences of what it is to draw, to do math, to learn a second language, to write in one's home language. What happens at the interview is unknown *apriori*.

The interview is often perceived as inequitable (Honan, 2014). It is positioned within a binary logic with the assumption that the power of dominance resides with the researcher. However in a research assemblage, the interview can be a power relationship that operates through the different elements in an untimely manner. Power of dominance (*pouvoir*) emits a line of flight and transforms through power of creativity (*puissance*). At times it might be the researcher and at other times, a video, a piece of equipment, and other times a student participant in an exchange that creates unfamiliar trajectories. For example, there is a change of topic that leads to a dance performance or an invitation to draw. Rhizoanalysis, through its multiple, heterogeneous, non-linear and non-hierarchical trajectories, undoes the binary relationship and opens up a potentiality of what might happen through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory. Sense emerges in reading intensively and immanently, the world and self (the relationality of the elements in an assemblage). The centered subject has dissipated in a research assemblage. Scheurich (1997) proposes to undo the binary in the following way:

> the interview interaction is fundamentally indeterminate. The complex play of conscious and unconscious thoughts, feelings, fears, power, desires, and needs on the part of both the interviewer and interviewee cannot be captured and categorized. In an interview, there is no stable "reality" or "meaning" that can be represented. The indeterminate totality of the interview always exceeds and transgresses our attempts to capture and categorize (p. 240).

Reading transcripts

There are critiques regarding the transcript as a methodological tool (Kuntz & Presnall, 2012; Denzin cited in Kuntz and Presnall). For instance, Honan (2014) refers to transcription as representing interview data. The interview-transcript binary seems to privilege the transcript. It might be the case today if the importance of transcription is linked to coding data. However, if coding of transcripts is not its purpose, then how does transcription function and what does it produce? From a Deleuzian perspective, the ontology of Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis is non-representational. In other words, the transcripts are not representations or a copy of the interview. Transcribing is not an isolated activity. Within Multiple Literacies Theory, transcribing participates in an intensive and immanent reading of the world and self as text. The transcription is a text. It is a sense event in which sense emerges: to become-vignettes. While it may appear putting pen to paper in a conventional manner, transcripts are part of a non-hierarchical rhizomatic research assemblage. In this study, research assistants within the assemblage, filmed, participated in and transcribed the interviews. Reading content and expression that include interviews, transcripts, observations and video-vignettes in the research

assemblage, produce lines of flight through blocs of sensation and analytical-vignettes emerge. A new concept is created through the toolbox, a feature of Multiple Literacies Theory in practice. Becoming analytical-vignettes go beyond experiences of the elements in the assemblage to extend the potentiality of experience through analytical-vignettes.

Connectivity: transcripts, analytical-vignette and *interpretosis*

In rhizoanalysis, vignettes operate in specific conceptual way. To summarize: A theory has to be seen to work (to be used). Multiple Literacies Theory in practice calls upon the use of a toolbox. Filmed observations and interviews plug into the toolbox and concepts happen, becoming vignettes positioned as texts and sense-events. It is a process of literacies becoming when reading intensively and immanently the relationality of elements in the assemblage that deterritorializes and reterritorializes content and expression (interviews, transcript, video, participants, computer). Vignettes emerge based on the power of affect to flow through the assemblage and be affected by the assemblage. Vignettes deterritorialize, and take off in rhizomatic ways and reterritorialize creating new territories (ex. concepts). The exchanges in the next paragraphs (Stories and Drawing and Riddles, Reading, Drawing and Recess) deterritorializes as connections happen in the mind and produce thought untimely.

Stories and Drawings

Cristelle moves on to another activity in class: writing a story. The object of this activity is to unscramble five sentences into an appropriate order followed by a drawing to go with the story. Here are the five French sentences in the order they appear on the worksheet *Deux poussins en sortent. La poule couve trois oeufs. Deux coquilles s'ouvrent. Les trois poussins se promènent avec leur mère. Le troisième oeuf se brise enfin.* The translation is: Two chicks are coming out. The hen broods the three eggs. Two shells open. The three chicks follow their mother. The third egg cracks open at last. I asked Cristelle if she liked this activity. She responded affirmatively and I asked her what she liked especially about this activity. Her response was: drawing. The video depicts Cristelle drawing after writing the story. And she affirmed that she always drew after writing a story. I asked her what would happen if she drew first.

Riddles, Reading, Drawing, Recess

One activity filmed the day before the interview involved the class doing a riddle activity [*une devinette*]. The original French*: J'ai une grande classe. N'oublie pas ton costume lorsque tu viens à mes cours. Qui suis-je?* In English: I have a large class. Don't forget your uniform/costume when you come to my classes. Who am I?

R: did you enjoy this activity?
C: No
R: What do you like (about school)?
C: Recess. I can play
R: What activities do you like to do in class?
C: None
R: What happens when you have to do an activity you don't like

C: I must do it.
R: Do you like to write?
C: No. it's boring
R: What do you find boring?
C: Everything

With these vignettes, how do blocs of sensation flow through connecting relations that include Cristelle in the assemblage? The assemblage consists of content (Cristelle, the researcher, the video, the activities, the teacher, classmates, curriculum, the physical layout of the classroom, etc…), expression (collective assemblages of enunciation, order-words such as drawing after writing), deterritorialization (becoming) and reterritorialization (new/different concept). The coming together of connecting relations in an assemblage is unpredictable, not pre-given and formed at a particular moment in time and space. Reading, reading the world and self effects a different formation through untimely encounters of bodies coming together in a non-predetermined relationality of affect.

In learning to write in Stories and Drawings, there is a normative view of drawing in relation to writing. Order-words such as writing first and drawing second are frequent. When it was suggested that writing could come after drawing, the response was: 'I don't know". When asked if Cristelle would like a story of drawings, she agreed. However, when asked if she would put together a story with drawings, the response was 'I don't know". At times in this vignette, a frequent response has been "I don't know". In most cases it was a response related to what could be done to make things happen differently especially in an assemblage where writing is boring, where classroom activities are deemed not interesting and nothing could seemingly be done to change that. A bloc of sensation resonates through the assemblage. Perhaps would it be a resonance with flat amplitude that reduces the power to act (Masny, 2014a)? Recall a quote earlier stating that "we never now in advance what a body can do, how its affects enter into composition with others affects…" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 257) When affects of one body enter into composition with affects of another body, it can involve destruction, but also "to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body (Deleuze, 2004, pp. 39). In other words, sensations vibrate and resonate (Deleuze, 2004). Resonance can produce a peaked amplitude, a flat amplitude or somewhere in between. A peaked amplitude can refer to bodies affecting each other with great intensity in unpredictable ways, whereas a flat amplitude is the product of bodies and affective intensities that reduce the power to act (e.g. sadness, in Deleuze & Parnet, 2007). To say, I don't know?

Cristelle stated that she must do the activities even though she does not like them. Is it the power of domination (*pouvoir*)? Reading institutionalized power (pouvoir) in a rhizome consists of a molar (rigid) path that nevertheless ruptures and emits a line of flight. It is a power (puissance), a potential for transforming and becoming. There is in this movement according to Colebrook (Parr, 2010, p.15) "powers that connect with other powers and produce relations, but nothing in the power itself determines how it will be actualised, and any power has the potential to be actualised differently". Herein lies perhaps the imperceptibility (render the familiar unfamiliar) and the untimely of power and becoming. Do order-words take on the form of school-based literacy? Order-words constitute rigid institutionalized spaces (molar lines). They emit lines of flight (becoming). How might the assemblage-as-text reconfigure differently? Through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory and its connection to the toolbox, might a

different concept emerge (become): to write-drawing? to draw-writing? What is the potential for reading disruptively and immanently writing /drawing?

In Riddles, Reading, Drawing, Recess, to draw and to recess appear to be two favourable experiences in the school schedule. They are part of an assemblage that consists of school and collective assemblages of enunciation that include order-words (e.g. writing). Might reading drawing and participating in recess affect different bodies differently with intensity and in unpredictable ways (Masny, 2014c)? It appears that collective assemblages of enunciation and order-words such as planned curriculum that position recess and drawing relate to a power of domination (*pouvoir*). However, there is also the relation of elements in an assemblage that through the power of becoming (*puissance*), recess and drawing become differently (undergo transformation). What might happen?

From the familiar to the unfamiliar?

Might recess and drawing become an experience as spaces of (for) learning? With the relationality of recess and learning in an assemblage, might recess and learning transform? Becoming recess-learning and the direction of becoming is unpredictable and non-pre-given. At work is the concept of literacies as processes; there is no endpoint at which one is considered literate. Literacies are an on-going process of continuous de- and re-territorialization. How might experiences in reading, reading the world and self extend beyond the known?

Affect and the Assemblage

Cristelle is an assemblage and an element of the research assemblage. From the perspective of Multiple Literacies Theory she is a text that consists of sensations (affects and percepts). Recall a quote earlier stating that "we never now in advance what a body can do, how its affects enter into composition with others affects…" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 257). Referring to the exchange between Cristelle and the researcher in an assemblage (interview in school), affects (sensations) seize each other and resonate. And might the relationality of affect flowing through recess and drawing constitute molecular lines, more supple, less rigid? "No becoming-molecular escapes from a molar formation without molar components accompanying it…" Deleuze & Guattari 1987, p. 303). With Multiple Literacies Theory, concepts create and emerge untimely and non pre-given from a toolbox. They are practical. They are used to provide new directions for thinking and thinking might not happen without problematization. The role of text, reading and literacies in education extend beyond what is defined by learning outcomes and planned curriculum, Reading rigid lines have to be recognized for their institutional position and the ability for it to reduce the power to act, to become. Nevertheless, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), a society is defined by its lines of flight. It is not enough, however. There is more: progress in society happens along rigid trajectories while becoming along lines of flight. Reading, reading the world and self with resonance, amplitude and the power to affect and be affected rhizomatically have important implications for educational practice.

Intermezzo

This article presents potentiality for research inquiry by problematizing, questioning and engaging in concepts of inquiry that Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis deploy. Both Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis propose to push experience of life to its limits and beyond to becoming/deterritorialization and to reterritorialization. Problematization becomes multiple. Rhizomatic shoots proliferate: from filmed observations to becoming-observation-

vignettes and from transcribed interviews to becoming-analytical-vignettes. In other words, concepts of inquiry have through reading, reading the world and self intensively and immanently emerged from a toolbox that is seen to work and produce new conceptualizations of research inquiry. Recall that the toolbox consists in creating concepts for the practical purpose of thinking differently about reading and doing research. A concept is always in movement through deterritorialization (becoming/affect). A concept creates momentum when it is interesting, remarkable or important (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 82) all the while asking how one might see what one did not see before, the imperceptible.

In this research assemblage, might becoming-imperceptible (rendering the familiar unfamiliar) involve a process of disengagement in coding? In conventional research the familiar is the problem stated at the beginning of a research project followed by research questions. Questions are formulated with the aim of finding solutions. In rhizoanalysis, conventional coding, problem and research questions become unfamiliar through deterritorialization only to reterritorialize as problematization and questions formulated as responses in order to disengage from interpretation (interpretosis) and encourage concept creation.

In the two analytical vignettes, concept creation emerged: becoming drawing-writing, becoming recess-learning are two examples. Multiple Literacies Theory is practical Concepts are practical; they constitute new directions for thinking. What thinking took off in becoming drawing-learning? Multiple Literacies Theory is interested in practice when asking questions about what literacies function with, how literacies function, and what they produce in becoming. "Theory does not express, translate, or serve to apply practice; it is practice" (Deleuze and Foucault, 1977, p.207).

Clarke and Parsons (2013) invited researchers to become rhizomatic and take up a nomadic stance in the middle of a research project or problem. In this article, concepts such as the assemblage, text, sense, toolbox and praxis connect with reading and rhizoanalysis. Through the lens of affect, reading and rhizoanalysis disrupt binaries with multiplicities and engage in immanence. Reading intensively and immanently the relationality of elements in an assemblage deterritorialize and reterritorialize content (bodies relating to one another) and expression (social nature of language).

Taken-for-granted assumptions of humanist research tools merit problematizing. Deleuze made problematization a significant aspect of experimentation and doing research. He (1994) proposed pedagogic experiments to allow even young children "to participate in the fabrication of problems". In multiple ways of reading and rhizomatic forces, Cristelle, through observations and interviews in the research assemblage, contributed to problematizing qualitative research. While Deleuze recognized that problems are important, problems are not merely "provisional movements destined to disappear in the formation of knowledge…" (p.159). Problems must be considered as "possessing their own sufficiency". In other words, problems are asignifying in becoming. In reterritorialization, a problem is effected and deploys literacies and rhizoanalysis with their non-hierarchical and non-linear trajectories of experimentation. Might what produces in becoming is thinking? And thought emerges through problematizing? Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis become an unfamiliar encounter to provoke thinking differently in doing qualitative educational research. This is an intermezzo with unknown research encounters at the interstices

Acknowledgement

Endnotes

1. All societies are segmented according to lines and differ in their social formation and how the lines operate within that social formation. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 8)

2. Order-words in this particular moment reflect a certain dominant social order. Order-words concern commands, questions, promises, and are linked to statements by a "social obligation". The notion of social obligation implies that order-words are connected to the dominant social order. Order-words are part of a network that code, overcode, direct, and restrict movements. Order-words are instruments of state (Masny, 2014c, p.96).

3. Praxis is "a system of relays in an assemblage, in a multiplicity of bits and pieces both theoretical and practical. For us, the intellectual and the theorist have ceased to be a subject, a consciousness, that represents or that is representative…who speaks? Who acts? It's always a multiplicity, even in the person who speaks or acts. We are all grupuscles. There is no more representation. There is only action, the action of theory, the action of praxis, in the relations of relays and networks" (Deleuze, 2004. p.207).

4. Untimely: "… affect opens the line of time to disruption, giving an 'untimely' time or a time 'out of joint' " (Colebrook, 2002 . p. 61). Untimely enables problems to transform thinking.

5. Another aspect of rhizoanalysis for which there is less agreement is non-representation combined with interpretosis. Non-representation refers to a stance against a present world out there that is re-presented, something that stands in place of the real item. We imagine that there is some meaning or truth awaiting interpretation, revelation or disclosure (Colebrook, 2002). Interpretation is more interested in what a text means rather than how a text functions and what it produces through becoming

6. Ferdinand Deligny was an educator and social worker creating his own form of cartography with autistic children. Deligny's cartography was influential in Deleuze and Guattari's development of the concept of the rhizome.

7. The different elements in an assemblage come together to produce thought in the mind. In producing thought, there is agency but the subject is decentered. In addition, Deleuze (1994, cited in Parr, 2010) points out that "no containment of thought within the mind of man should limit thinking's power" (p. 186).

References

Alvermann, D. (2001). Researching libraries, literacies and lives: A rhizoanalysis. In E. St.Pierre & W.S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp.114-129). New York: Routledge.

Bastien, M. (2013). Mapping family literacies through Home Instruction for Immigrant families with Preschool Youngsters - HI(I)PPY. Unpublished doctoral seminar.

Boldt, G. & Valente, J. (2014). Bring back the asylum: Reimagining inclusion in the presence of others. In M. Bloch, E. Swadener, G. Canella (Eds.), Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Care and Education. (p. 201-213). New York, Peter Lang.

Clarke, B. & Parsons, J. (2013). Becoming rhizome researchers. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodologies.* 4, 1, 35-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/rerm.685

Colebrook, C. (2002). *Gilles Deleuze.* New York: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203241783

Daignault, J. & Masny, D. (2011). A conversation with Jacques Daignault. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9,4, 528-539. http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.4.528

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition.* (P. Patton, Trans.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1968).

Deleuze, G. (2004). Intellectuals and power [an interview with Michel Foucault]. In D. Lapoujade (Ed.), *Desert islands and other texts: 1953-1974* (pp.206-213) [Trans. M. Taormina]. Los Angeles & New York: Semiotext(e).

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980)

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994). What Is Philosophy? (H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell trans.) New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 1991)

Deleuze,G. & Parnet, C. (2007). Dialogues II. (H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam trans.) New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 1977)

Dufresne, T. (2002). *Through a lens of difference OR when worlds collide*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa. Available on line at http://hdl.handle.net/10393/6111

Dufresne, T. (2006). Exploring the processes in becoming biliterate: The Roles of resistance to learning and affect. *International Journal of Learning*, 12, 347-354.

Eakle, A. J. (2007). Literacy spaces of a Christian faith-based school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(4), 472-510. http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.42.4.3

Government of Canada (1982). *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Ottawa: Department of Justice. http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/charter

Honan, E. (2014). Disrupting the habit of interviewing. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology* 2014, 5(*1*) http://journals.hioa.no/index.php/rerm http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/rerm.929

Masny, D. (2010). Multiple Literacies Theory: how it functions, what it produces. *Perspectiva.28, 2, https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/perspectiva/article/view/2175-795X.2010v28n2p337*

Masny, D. (2014a). Multiple Literacies Theory: Discourse, sensation, resonance and becoming. In D.Masny and D.R. Cole (eds), *Education and the Politics of Becoming* (p.113 – 128). New York: Routledge.

Masny, D. (2014b). Cartographies of talking groups. In D. Masny and D.R. Cole, *Mapping Multiple Literacies: An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies* (p. 93 – 124). London: Bloomsbury

Masny, D. (2014c). What is reading? In D. Masny and D.R. Cole, *Mapping Multiple Literacies: An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies* (p. 93 – 124). London: Bloomsbury.

Masny, D. & Waterhouse, M. (2011). Mapping Territories and Creating Nomadic Pathways with Multiple Literacies Theory, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27, 3, http://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/155

May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: An introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165419

Mozère, L. (2012). Is experimenting on an immanent level possible in reconceptualizing early childhood education? *The indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 12, 2-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.2989/IPJP.2012.12.1.8.1116A

Olsson, L. M. (2009). *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood education*. New York: Routledge.

Patton, P. (2010). *Deleuzian concepts: philosophy, colonization, politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Parr, A. (Ed.) (2010). *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sellars, M. (2013). *Young Children Becoming Curriculum: Deleuze, Te Whariki and curricular understandings*. New York: Routledge

Scheurich, S. (1997). *Research in the Postmodern*. London, UK: Falmer Press.

St. Pierre, E. A.(2011). *Qualitative data analysis after coding*. Paper presented at The American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans,

St Pierre, E. (2013). The posts continue: becoming. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 6, 646–657. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788754