

Early childhood education teachers and leaders becoming the leadership(s)

Virpi Mettiäinen
University of Oulu, Finland Virpi.Mettiainen@oulu.fi

Abstract

Leadership research in early childhood education (ECE), and in education generally, has been burdened with the notion of effectiveness and how this effectiveness relates to the individual leader. Whereas in this paper, the author attempts thinking and becoming leadership assemblage by drawing on Mazzei (2013) use of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Body/Voice without Organs. As this conceptualization is closely connected to the notions of becoming and temporality, these aspects will also be discussed in this paper. Thinking together with these theoretical concepts, the author has worked with ECE teacher interviews and ECE leader discussions. This conceptualization can offer new understandings of temporality and becoming in educational leadership.

Keywords: Leadership, temporality, becoming, Deleuze and Guattari.

It is the reverberations back and forth between past and present, with each folding into the other and both surging toward the future, that make all the difference to life. We participate in at least two registers of temporal experience, action-oriented perception and the slower experience of the past folding into the present and both flowing toward the future. (Connolly, 2011, p.4)

Introduction

There are two strands of thinking, which have allowed me to be(gin) here in the middle of things. First, looking at the unfolding of time in educational leadership, it is often perceived as a linear curve, developing towards the good (and effective) leadership by following certain models or steps (Gronn, 2003; Lord & Hall, 2005). Eacott (2013; see also English & Ehrich, 2015) voices concern over educational leadership research being often focused on leadership becoming an attribute of organizations demonstrating a high level of performance. The research approaches focusing on higher levels of performance are often also linked to researching personal/group traits and individual behaviours or actions which can be traced back to higher levels of performance (Day et al., 2009; Day & Antonakis, 2012; Day et al., 2015). The interest to move beyond the linear, developmental curve of leadership led me to organizational and leadership research utilizing process philosophy (e.g. Tsoukas & Chia, 2002; Linstead & Thanem, 2007) and to the social research done within the posthumanist and post-structural theorizing (e.g. Fox & Allred, 2015). Second, approximately a year ago I engaged in a discussion with my colleague, where we discussed time and temporality beyond education and our research interests, and in that discussion I recalled a paper in linguistics by Rafael E. Núñez and Eve Sweetser (2006) in which the linearity of Western understanding of time was challenged or questioned. The Aymara-Indians, living secluded in the Andes, have been researched partly due to their perception of time and its linguistic expressions. In their language, they describe the past being in front of them using the word (nayra, "eye/front/sight") and the future is referred to with the word for back (qhipa, "back/behind") (Núñez & Sweetser, 2006). This understanding of temporality reminded me of post-

structuralist perceptions of time and becoming as it very distinctly resonated with how time is conceptualized as interrelating syntheses in Deleuze's work (Deleuze, 1994; Williams, 2011). Where, in short, there are three interrelating syntheses of time: the past, present and virtual present (the future), which do not follow each other in linear fashion. With these conceptual tools of perceiving temporality and leadership, I was able to continue thinking leadership both acknowledging the difficult role of the researcher/participant and also the complexity of time I had encountered with(in) my research material.

The interest in this paper is to see the leadership(s) becoming during and with/in the research process, when leadership is understood as not residing in an individual but rather as a conceptualization of bodies without organs/assemblages/desiring machines. In addition, to follow the impetus of the above mentioned post-structuralist/humanist approaches to doing research differently and question the researcher's position/relation to research, I also want to think and ask what it could mean for educational leadership scholars to acknowledge themselves as part of the becoming of leadership?

To work with these interests and questions in mind, I will begin with presenting Deleuzian conceptualization of time and becoming. Following that, I will continue to describe current research in educational leadership and to offer my perception of leadership in this paper. After that I will present the research process and the Body/Voice without Organs becoming and conclude in possible becoming(s).

Becoming with/in Time

To somehow attempt to perceive leadership differently in relation to time than the earlier mentioned linear developmental curve of leadership, time could be discussed and approached in another way, thus I turn to Deleuze in helping me with this task. However, Deleuze's full conceptualization of time extends beyond the scope of this paper and I present it only briefly, following James Williams' (2011) seminal work on this aspect of Deleuze's work (e.g. Myers, 2014). As mentioned in the beginning of this paper, Deleuze's (1994) basic premise on time reminded me of the temporal understanding of the Aymara-Indians (or the other way around).

Deleuze's perception of time works within two realms of time; *Aiôn* and *Chronos*. *Aiôn* is described in the *Logic of Sense* (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 63) as "endlessly subdividing the event and pushing away the past as well as future, without ever rendering them as less urgent." *Chronos* on the other hand stands for the linear clock time¹. In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze (1994) moves on to present time as a concept made in three interrelated syntheses - present, past and futures. Present, past, and futures are continually produced through singular processes drawing events together in processes of becoming that make times (Williams, 2011, p. 5). All of the present include one another and also transform each other, depending on the event that is set as wider inclusion. In addition, there is no past to go back to, nor a future one could escape to. Williams (2011) presents these three syntheses as follows. The first synthesis of time, the living present, is where the future and past events meet, thus unfolding time. The second synthesis of time, past, is constituted through a process of retention as the past events are retained together in the living present. The third synthesis of time, future, is constituted through anticipation and future events which are synthesized by being anticipated, looked forward to or awaited in the living present. Because these times are produced in multiplicity; the past, present, and future do not stretch out in linear, backward/forward fashion nor are they separated by symmetrical units. There is no way back and no way up and out. There is only the demand to be worthy of the complex processes making all things become together, but never as one (Williams, 2011, pp. 18-19). To further clarify this, any specific event in time, if understood as linear or succession of events, could be perceived as already a gathering of multiple agents affecting past/present/futures, as time cannot be thought as singular instants, which could be chronologically placed on a timeline (Linstead & Thanem, 2007).

¹ See further discussion on Deleuze's concepts of *Chronos* and *Aiôn* in Sellars (2007).

To attempt to make sense or grasp becoming, Deleuze (1983) presents everything as becoming together:

...there is no being beyond becoming, nothing beyond multiplicity; neither multiplicity nor becoming are appearances or illusions. But neither are there multiple or eternal realities which would be, in turn, like essences beyond appearance. Multiplicity is the inseparable manifestation, essential transformation, constant symptom of unity and also the affirmation of unity; becoming is the affirmation of being. (pp. 23-24)

Becoming is also the processes of change, flight, movement and transformations within an assemblage and these processes then continue working to destabilise molar forms and relations as they are well-defined, such as identity categories (Jackson, 2013). The process of becoming is more about the relationships between the elements of an assemblage rather than their unity. As in becoming, one element of an assemblage is drawn into the territory of another element, bringing about another assemblage. However, the process of becoming would not be an analogy or imitation, but rather generating a new way of being (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, pp. 258-259). If we were to look at the particular qualities of any being, all of the qualities are emergent and primary to the becoming of any particular being, as becomings dissolve stable identities and they also return to the unfolding of difference in time (May, 2003).

Leadership as assemblages/desiring machines/Bodies without Organs

Educational leadership has been researched extensively as shared/distributed leadership (Tian, Risku & Collin, 2015), but the focus has still remained on the human relations, whereas in educational research there has been a growing body of research shifting the focus of research to the materiality and non-human; places, spaces, objects, artefacts (Youdell & Armstrong, 2011; Blaise 2013; Henderson, 2016). Post-structuralist thought has not been widely used within educational leadership research, despite some exceptions (Blackmore 1999; Mulcahy & Perillo 2011; Niesche, 2011, 2013; Nuttall & Thomas, 2015; Thomas, 2016). This may be due to the relatively conservative nature of the field that is heavily focused on capturing the essence of leadership through the latest model; strongly influenced by the school effectiveness movement and an international leadership industry geared towards selling its new programs for developing leadership (Mulcahy & Perillo, 2011; Niesche & Gowlett, 2015). Still, much of the work in educational administration is about the future and the need to be future focused. As such, the future is conceived as at some distance from the present (e.g. the three-year-plans for the schools), and that the desired future can be achieved through prudent action in the here and now. This thesis carries within itself the rationalization of practice, with direct cause and effect, and the dislocation of practice from time (Eacott, 2013).

In this research, I perceive leadership as assemblages, becoming in the relations and practices taking place in the organizations and with/in the research. In one of his later publications, *Two Regimes of Madness*, Deleuze (2007) describes assemblages consisting of: “states of things, bodies, various combinations of bodies, hodgepodes; but you also find utterances, modes of expression, and whole regimes of signs” (p. 177). Words are colliding and connecting with things on the same ontological level, and therefore language cannot achieve the distance and externality that would allow it to represent – i.e. to stand over, stand for and stand in for – the world. In place of the representational ‘logic of INSTEAD’, things are relating in the material-discursive manifold in a ‘logic of AND’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004).

However, as visible in the title of this section, assemblage is used alongside desiring machines and Body without Organs. Deleuze and Guattari discuss desiring machine in *Anti-Oedipus* (1983), and refer to a similar concept as an assemblage in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987). Mazzei (2013; 2016), has developed Deleuze’s concept of Body without Organs towards a Voice without Organs in working with research data. The concept of Voice without Organs (VwO) is used in looking at how leadership becomes in my working with the research material. Mazzei (2013, p. 734) describes desiring machine in relation to assemblages, as it can be perceived as a hub of connections and productions for plugging in forces, flows and intensities, as a “BwO that deterritorializes and offers the possibility of transformation, proliferation and becoming”. It does not require human agency nor is there any subject behind the becoming and to think of a voice on the BwO only exists outside the subject as the connections and simultaneous lived times can only ever exceed the traditional notion of the individual and linear time (Mazzei, 2016).

If BwO is conceptualized in research as an Voice without Organs (VwO), it is then an ontological voice, not a voice of privileged instants but voice as duration. It would not be an expression of what the researcher or the participant would perceive in any given instant. VwO then is ontological voice, in it is contained the past in general, within the third synthesis of time (May, 2005; Mazzei, 2016). If the BwO describes a disarticulated, dismantled organism that is an assemblage of forces, desires, and intensities, then voice without a subject, not reliant on the human being as the ontological unit of inquiry, could be similarly thought to describe such an assemblage of “conjunctions, levels and thresholds, passages and distributions of intensity” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.177)—not a disarticulated organism bound to the humanist subject but collectivity on the plane of consistency. Although, to work with Deleuzo-Guattarian ontology of becoming, “voice” is also a problematic concept as it cannot be thought to emanate from an individual person as there is no individual person to which is voice could be linked and there is no present, conscious, coherent individual who speaks the truth of her present or her past (Mazzei, 2013; Mazzei, 2016). In the following section, I make attempts in describing how leadership as a VwO became/becomes in my research.

Leadership(s) becoming in the research process

The research process began. AND it continued in finding new pathways and avenues in the various ways I have been finding and gathering material and data with which to work. In this paper, I work with data from two different sources. First, there is material from a set of five peer group mentoring sessions for nine ECE leaders where I was also one of the participants. The second part of the data is from a research project² focusing on early career teachers, where I was also a research interviewer. From this project I have taken three interviews³ of beginning ECE teachers.

There is no sense in trying to go back and trace the moment of beginning for my research, as it began when I started my Master’s thesis, it began during my work as an ECE leader and it began today and every day. Nonetheless, the actual research process resulting in the writing of this paper has evolved through reading the data iteratively, attempting to make sense of the whole, going back to the theoretical concepts of time and becoming and what has been previously written of/with them. Eventually, in reading the data of the ECE teachers’ interviews, I focused on what they say about their leaders and the leadership practices, as the interviews with the teachers also included discussing their experiences with the children in their schools and their private life, which I considered to be out of scope for my research interests. After that, I turned back on to the data on the leaders and what they talked about their leadership practices. This resulted in an on-going ebb and flow with the data, attempting to perceive how leadership is done in ECE, not necessarily to provide critique or straightforward answers on how leadership should be done, but rather consider how it can emerge and become (cf. Huuki & Renold, 2015).

The episodes related, discussing or referring, to leaders or leadership from the ECE teachers’ interviews, were then placed side to side with parts of the leaders’ discussion. These texts began to entangle, and I also allowed them to untangle to see what type of questions they might produce. For one, to attempt thinking with theory and data is to seek that which is simultaneously materially and discursively produced (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 120). This mutual production of the material as discursive and the discursive as material further pushes the researcher to consider how such an orientation might function to produce knowledge differently from a material vs. discursive stance (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 120).

Looking at the texts side by side, then attempting to view them as a discussion, putting the teachers’ interviews first and then leaders’ discussion after, seemed to create an unnecessary sense of tension between the teachers and leaders, which was something I attempted to avoid, to not juxtapose. In addition, it would also have emphasized there being different subjects discussing their pasts (e.g. Mazzei, 2016). In this paper,

² EMOT-Disentangling the emotional dimension in beginning teachers work (2014-2018) is a research project funded by the Academy of Finland.

³ There is also discussion on interviews evolving into intraviews (cf. Reinertsen 2014; Kuntz & Presnall (2012)).

I have placed episodes from the interviews and discussions without any reference to their “origin”, as the focus is not on the individual subjects but on the becoming of leadership(s).

The interviews, discussions and the continuous going back to them kept working within and affecting me, resurfacing as bodily memories of past/present/future. This relates to how Huuki & Renold (2015) describe in their article on the gender and sexuality in children's play- the episodes from the interviews not only connected to my main research interest, but they were also affectively charged for me. The becoming leaderships are becoming in my own experiences, in memories and dreams, but also with/in the experiences and memories of the participants of my research. I have felt, experienced and sensed bodily the episodes presented in the interviews. Mazzei (2013) describes the becoming of her own leaving of small town, when experiencing another person telling of the same experience and Deleuze (1994, p. 112) refers to this as the present being only the most contracted degree of the past coexisting with it. Thus the leaderships become part of my becoming leadership(s) through haunting me daily, as I have carried them while teaching at the university, walking in the corridors, being at home. Leadership is something I have not left anywhere throughout this research process, as it has always been with me and in me, but at the same time it has been in the participants of this research and their simultaneous lives. As this is not an attempt to portray this research process as a type of romanticized auto-ethnography, but to describe how the researcher is involved in the process (e.g. Mazzei, 2010).

The research process involved reading the data through multiple theoretical insights, also in attempt to move qualitative analysis away from habitual normative readings (i.e. coding) allowing thought to become in unpredictable ways (Mazzei, 2013; St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). Knowing can never be done in isolation but it is always affected by the different desires “knowing is a matter of part of the world making itself intelligible to another part of the world” (Barad, 2007, p. 185). The reading of data with particular theoretical concepts (and/or multiple theoretical concepts) produces an emergent and unpredictable series of readings as data and theory make themselves intelligible to one another.

Barad (2007, pp. 22-23) also discusses on how the entanglement of agencies require the researchers to question how we conceive of agency, subjectivity and their mutual enactment: not as an analysis enabling us to theorize social and natural together, but as an assemblage of agents or more of a dynamic and shifting entanglement of relations, which in this paper would be the teachers and leaders intra-acting with their worlds. However, we are still left to consider how it is possible to take into account “the fact that the forces at work in the materialization are not all social and the bodies produced are not all human” (Barad, 2007, p. 23).

As Mazzei (2013) considers the interview to be thought as an assemblage, she makes a parallel to Deleuze and Guattari's (1987, p. 25) perception of authorship in that there can no longer be a division between a field of reality (what we ask, what our participants tell us, and the places we inhabit), a field of representation (research narratives constructed after the interview), and a field of subjectivity (participants and researchers). Instead, these are to be thought as acting on one another simultaneously. In doing this, as a researcher of educational leadership, I am required to shift the focus also on the force or flow of desire between offices, spaces, and leader/teacher bodies working together, into perceiving what becomes in this intra-action (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 126).

On the other hand, if we see the researcher and data (along with many other relations) as a ‘research-assemblage’ with its own affect economy, we begin to recognize research as a territorialisation that shapes the knowledge it produces according to the particular flows of affect produced by its methodology and methods (Fox & Allred, 2015). Interviewing an individual human makes it already an assemblage, an entanglement, a knot of forces and intensities that operate on a plane of immanence and producing a voice that does not emanate from a singular subject but is produced, as noted above, in an enactment among researcher-data-participants-theory-analysis (Mazzei, 2013).

A challenge for posthumanist researchers using Deleuzian ontology of entanglement and assemblage is to avoid reproducing the same methods with a different language, but to try attending how being, doing and

living are different (Mazzei, 2013). As an attempt to provide insight on how this reading of material is actualized, I will present short episodes from my material to present the entanglement of material and discursive bodies emerging and becoming as leadership in ECE. In the following, I will go straight to what leadership is in practice and what happens in the daily life through the episodes taken from the discussions and interviews with teachers, leaders and myself. Lather and St. Pierre (2013, p. 630) urge researchers continuing (and/or beginning) with the posthumanist/new materialist approaches, to question all the existing categories within humanist qualitative research. Through questioning these categories and the actual beginning of research, it might be possible to focus on inventing practices, which actually attempt to account for life that has a thickness and to also begin with the things that will not let go (May, 2005).

Beginning in the middle

We've really made an effort with the daily encounters and now the whole staff pays attention to them; with colleagues, children and so on. It's about how the adults set the example on how you are with other people. We made a point of it in each weekly meeting as it was written down on the agenda, and I think that it began to show as like this appreciation of others. It felt good to be working with this type of theme, like thinking is it part of the curricula, to think about humanness and others.

What I've been thinking is that, I've thought of myself as this easily approachable person, and nearly all of the substitutes were afraid of coming to me. I couldn't imagine that it would be difficult to approach me, it felt really strange.

In looking at the above, I am also taken back in time and taken back in my body in a particular room, sensing the situation where the above discussion took place. It is partly taken from a particular peer group mentoring session of a group of ECE leaders that was videotaped. As that particular temporal event was in the beginning of the December, it was already dark outside in the early afternoon, but in that room the lights were dimmed and there were tea lights placed on the table. As a researcher (AND a leader/participant), I am already entangled with the different flows and forces of desire (e.g. Lenz-Taguchi and Palmer, 2014). Thus, the entanglement is also crucial for the kinds of knowing and the realities that research can produce.

Despite myself being taken back in time, it is no particular past, nor is it a particular beginning. Not the beginning of an interview, nor the beginning of my career as an ECE leader. As Deleuze (1988, p. 123) writes in his book on Spinoza: "One never commences; one never has a tabula rasa; one slips in, enters in the middle; one takes up or lays down rhythms". In the middle of somewhere, these encounters have occurred, each affecting and becoming part of the leadership assemblage in that particular event, but also in becoming with the assemblage including myself, as I was there to hear this being said at a certain time and also now in reading these words again. Certain desires have affected those people in making a difference in their organization, making an effort with the encounters. There is also a temporal dimension on the level of discourse as there is repetitive action of making an effort 'in the weekly meetings'. As in Jackson and Mazzei (2012, p. 121), it is the re-insertion, the repetition of a material practice i.e. the meeting agenda, that continues to contribute in the becoming of a leadership.

The encounters in that kindergarten were both enacted as bodily encounters, the adults making an effort to encounter, and also in making them a point written down on the agenda of weekly meetings. These encounters, the leader's body, teacher bodies, child bodies and the physical spaces join in the becoming of leadership. The actual articulation of the importance of encounters during weekly meeting becomes a part of the assemblage as it was written down on the meeting agenda as something to be discussed and considered every week. These also become material in considering the relation to the curricula as a policy document which takes on material force as it works in the daily life of an organization and affecting the doings and practices of the leaders (e.g. Fenwick & Landri, 2012; Landri, 2015; Oborn, Barrett & Dawson, 2013).

The material discursive practices; the curriculum and the meeting agendas as words written down or typed and printed on a paper, affect the practices that create new intensities in the becoming leadership assemblage(s). As Mazzei (2014) discusses a case of a female academic and the thrill of her engaging in an affair with her intellectual work, "the pages and thoughts take on a material force. They are no longer merely

words, and school is no longer merely a place of affirmation but a space in which affect and intensities are produced, both producing Brenda in a mutual becoming." (p.743).

Becoming leadership in past/present/future

It's a funny process, when you've started in a bigger place,
like when I close the office door, they'll just want to come in and tell every little thing.
When I go to the group and someone's in the middle of something with the kids,
I try not to fuss with my own business.
I think it's sort of the whole attitude towards the children...
It's the same thing when you call the groups and ask if it's a good time.
Yeah, I think it [the location of the office] really started to bug me and the staff as it had to be
a big thing to come all the way to the other end of the building.
As the physical presence is really important, there's no more of those different interpretations and
things don't get out of hands anymore.

In the beginning, I was rather afraid of the staff and how the adult relations would work out, when it was actually the relations with the children that were more difficult.

And like last week, it felt good when we brought it up with the leader that we're getting quite tired and she really took it and immediately began to think about solutions, like she'd come in and observe our work and we might change groups for a few days, it's how she didn't just shrug it off, but took it seriously.

Our leader comes in two or three times a week, I think it's good that she has a calendar on the office door, where you can check where she is. She has this habit of coming to each group in the mornings, just to greet everyone and to chat with us and also with the children. It might not have anything to do with work, or maybe if there's something topical, just that she's approachable.

As mentioned in the beginning of this article, leadership is often perceived as a developmental process, closely related to the idea of change and leadership being an agent of change in an organization (Gronn, 2003; Lord & Hall, 2005; Eacott, 2013). However, looking at the account of leadership presented above, temporality of leadership is more varied than just the future-oriented understanding of it. In the above, temporality is multiple things; the repetitive action of doing something, i.e. the leader calling in two or three times a week creating sameness through repetition (e.g. Williams 2011, p. 115). The calendar becomes also part of the assemblage in noting the presence/absence of the leader. In reading these interviews and discussions, I also join in being in the past becoming future, in all the past mornings when as a leader I called in on the groups to greet them, hear the laughter of a one teacher, remembering how it feels to hug certain person and so on.

There are also beginnings, which do not occur in any absolute beginning, as there is always the sense of starting over. People change work places and join in becoming leaderships, which are not devoid of past(s), pasts that are not visible or accessible to us. This evokes memories of both knocking on office doors to be let in but also memories of being in the office and hearing the knock on the door (cf. Mazzei, 2013).

Whereas in perceiving leadership as an assemblage, it changes constantly, as the rhizomatic organization is in a constant flux and movement; there are knocks on the door, different physical settings that all become and join in the leadership(s). This is why Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pp. 40-41) are able to claim that instead of individual statements, there are only statement producing machinic assemblages and we all are caught up in an assemblage reproducing its statement, 'we speak in our own name when we produce its statement. For Deleuze, emergence and creation occur in becoming. To think in this way is to think time, progression, and duration differently, as "the movement of becoming, is not a movement from a transcendent reality (one that is merely possible in terms of our own reality) to its realization, but a movement from the virtual to its actualization" (May, 2003, p.148).

The undeniably material object, a calendar, joins in the leadership as entangled in the leadership affecting it as an object literally producing the anticipation of the futures (Williams 2011, p. 26). The calendar presents where the leader is at a certain time and in what space. The calendar affects the leadership both in

the sense that the leader is someone different from the other staff members and that her/his working hours are of an importance to the staff. As difference can be considered to rely on an ontological separateness between identified categories, positions or identities, most often being in an asymmetrical relation to each other, the calendar can be perceived as a difference affecting other bodies (Barad, 2007, pp. 86-87).

In seeing what is discussed in the episode with the calendar, I plug myself in the data, visualizing and recalling all the times I have seen calendars hanging on office doors and walls. At the same it is my past, a psychological memory, but also the past (May, 2005). Often I have looked at the calendar in one of the offices in which I have worked and I can vividly recall seeing the red plastic frame pointing the current date moving ever so slowly towards future, as the anticipation of future. At this point of reading/interacting with the data, I also join in the assemblage that is the becoming leadership.

Deleuze (1966/1991), in his reading of Bergson, offers an alternative to the voice of a subject in which the researcher plots the movement of time according to privileged instants, predictable and determined. Instead, we have possibility to perceive beyond the individual as the unit of inquiry in the voice that is not bound to it. In the same way that we do not perceive things in ourselves, but at the place where they are, we only grasp the past at the place where it is in itself, and not in ourselves, in our present (Mazzei, 2013). There is therefore a “past in general” that is not the particular past of a particular present but that is like an ontological element, a past that is eternal and for all time, the condition of the “passage” of every particular present. It is the past in general that makes possible all pasts. According to Bergson, we first put ourselves back in the past in general: He describes in this way the leap into ontology (Deleuze, 1966/1991, pp. 56-57). Voice on the BwO speaks that which “would never be constituted if it did not coexist with the present whose past it is” (Deleuze, 1966/1991, p. 59). Becoming-voice cannot be traced to a particular instant or place, nor does this voice “belong” to a subject. The connections and orderings resist a “rigid tracking . . . of inquiry that fixes and fixates on that which is presumably within a specific context” or at an isolable moment in time (Mazzei, 2016, p. 8).

Going back to the episode in the beginning of this section, opening up to the leader resulted in immediate actions and practices in the past/present/future event, which also affect(s) the working conditions of the teachers AND it also continuously reminds me of what I have done, what I am doing and what I will do. The becoming-voice requires simultaneous lived times in a movement back and forth, folding and unfolding (Mazzei, 2016).

To conclude and begin and continue

In forcing and pushing the research data and also myself in this research process, leadership definitely requires more of this teasing and poking in the leadership phenomenon and its different aspects to see if there is something more/else. I think this has just begun and it should be continued to see what could emerge from working with the becoming leaderships and temporality.

As Mazzei (2013) discusses interviewing and interview data transcribed into transcripts as “only one agential force in the assemblage that one plugs into as one does something called “research”” (p. 739), thus interviews should not even be considered as the only method or even the primary method of data collection. Traditional methods would have us present the past of an individual human being that is merely a particular perspective on the ontological past, a version of psychological memory that is bound to the individual in a classic view of time as “atomistic, predictable, and timereversible” (Olkowski, 2008, p. 5). Becoming-voice in simultaneous lived times adheres to an ontology of openness, complexity, and temporal irreversibility.

I have attempted to present my being and working with the data as clearly as possible, but the becoming and intra-actions extend already beyond this paper. As my current work also consists of the training future teachers; the ideas, memories and experiences trickle into the teaching I have done during this process and also onto future work. As researchers are already such strong agents intra-acting the research process, it is necessary to ask again and again: “What can I do?” to be productive of positive desire in the production of knowing that might have material consequences of a flourishing and positive kind for the agents involved? (cf. Fox & Allred, 2015). However, in working with the post-structuralist theoreticians (if they would even

succumb to being labelled as such), and attempting to think with their concepts, one is always walking on a minefield of sorts, as St. Pierre (2016) cautions of not using Deleuze's and Deleuze and Guattari's concepts too casually in an empirical sense. There is also the ongoing discussion on the impossible escaping of humanist research tradition (see also St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014).

Thus in turning to Barad (2007, p. x), she points out the importance of ethics, or what she calls justice, requires an openness and attention to the details of the present moment, to "the ongoing practice of being open and alive to each meeting, each intra-action, so that we might use our ability to respond, our responsibility, to help awaken, to breathe life into ever new possibilities for living justly". I have brought up only tiny fragments from the interviews and peer group mentoring sessions, but I would argue that through these episodes I have attempted to convey leadership in ECE in all its messiness, while preserving the anonymity of the participants and still presenting the reader with the different possibilities of being/becoming leadership, which may happen in different past/present/future events. The research space is both experimental and it is a space of encounter and it does not set out to represent objects and subjects that pre-exist the research (Mazzei, 2013).

The different possibilities of leadership being/becoming do not operate on the binary of good/bad leadership and it would be irrelevant to point out the actions of the different leaders in the data, affirming them as good or bad. The logic of AND in considering leadership as an assemblage can be useful in perceiving how the power and responsibilities are divided between different agents. As in looking at the flows of desire at work in leadership assemblages, it can be also possible to map the flows of desire within organizations. Thus, it could be helpful to question whether these flows of desire could be resisted or approached in a different way to remind the organizational actors of the basic function of the educational organization.

In addition, I consider it to be more relevant for the field of ECE to perceive the importance of the material dimension, not only the learning environments but also on the organizational level. Where and when in the physical organization does leadership become? To go back and continue from the beginning of this paper, it is as Linstead and Thanem (2007) put it rather eloquently; the possibilities to become and be realized in the future depend upon what is realized in the present – the real and the possible may be consequentially or even causally connected.

As Nietzsche (2012) rightly discusses, in the field of educational leadership there is a definite need to have more nuanced and diverse accounts of the everyday work and lives of the leaders to perceive the realities and pressures they are facing in the work. In working with the concepts of becoming and temporality, further research could help to open new possibilities in the form of what educational leadership could be in its multiple ways of becoming.

Acknowledgements

The research for this article was supported by The Finnish Work Environment Fund under grant no. 115472 and also by the Academy of Finland under grant no. 265974. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewer and the editors Louise M. Thomas and Anne Beate Reinertsen for their supportive comments and suggestions concerning this paper.

References

- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128>
- Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Blaise, M. (2013). Activating micropolitical practices in the early years: (Re)assembling bodies and participant observations. R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and research methodologies*, (pp.184–200). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tsoukas, H. & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13(5), 567-582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.5.567.7810>
- Connolly, W. (2011). *A world of becoming*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). An integrative theory of leadership development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise. New York: Psychology Press.
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. D. V. Day, & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 3–25) (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928309.013.0022>
- Day, D.V., Fleenor, J.W., Atwater L. E., Sturm, R.E., McKee, R.A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, (25) 63–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004>
- Deleuze, G. (1983). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1966/1991). *Bergsonism*. New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: A practical philosophy*. (Rober Hurley, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1969/1990). *Logic of sense*. New York: NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. (P. Patton, Trans.). London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2007). *Two regimes of madness*. (Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina, Trans.). New York: Semiotext(e).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (Brian Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eacott, S. (2013). "Leadership" and the social: time, space and the epistemic". *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(6), 91 – 101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541311289846>
- Fenwick, T. & Landri, P. (2012). Materialities, textures and pedagogies: Socio-material assemblages in education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 20(1), 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2012.649421>
- Fenwick W. E. & Ehrich, L.C., (2015). Innovatus interregnum: Waiting for a paradigm shift. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(7), 851 – 862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2015-0055>
- Fox, N.J. & Allred, P. (2015). New materialist social inquiry: Designs, methods and the research-assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 18(4), 399-414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2014.921458>
- Gronn, P. (2003). Leadership: who needs it? *School Leadership and Management*, 23(3), 267–290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1363243032000112784>
- Henderson, L. & Nuttall, J., Kriegler, L-A. & Schiele, H. (2016). A spatial re-consideration of the early childhood-school relationship. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(6), 716-728. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1158960>
- Huuki, T. & Renold, E. (2016). Crush: Mapping historical, material and affective force relations in young children's hetero-sexual playground play. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 37(5), 754-769. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1075730>
- Introna, L. (2013). Performing & becoming of sociomaterial assemblages. In F-X. de Vaujany and N.Mitev (Eds.), *Materiality and space: Organizations, artefacts and practices* (pp. 333-343). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Jackson, A.Y. (2013). Data-as-machine: A Deleuzian Becoming. R. Coleman and J. Ringrose (Eds.) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 111-124). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 629-633. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788752>
- Lenz Taguchi, H. & Palmer, A. (2014). Reading a Deleuzio-Guattarian cartography of young girls' "school-related" ill-/well-being. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 764– 771. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530259>
- Linstead, S. & Thanem, T. (2007). Multiplicity, virtuality and organization: The contribution of Gilles Deleuze. *Organization Studies*, 28(10), 1483–1501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840607075675>
- Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 591–615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.06.003>
- Mazzei, L.A. (2010). Thinking data with Deleuze. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 511-523. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.497176>
- Mazzei, L.A. (2013). A voice without organs: interviewing in posthumanist research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 732-740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788761>
- Mazzei, L. A. (2014). Beyond an easy sense: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 20(6), 742-746. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530257>
- Mazzei, L. A. (2016). Voice without a subject. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16(2) 151–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636893>
- May, T. (2003). When is a Deleuzian becoming? *Continental Philosophy Review*, 36, 139-153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026036516963>
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165419>
- Mulcahy, D., & Perillo, S. (2011). Thinking management and leadership within colleges and schools somewhat differently: A practice-based, actor-network theory perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39(1), 122-145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143210383895>
- Myers, C.Y. (2014). A "terribly inefficient" production: Unsettling methodologies with children through Deleuzian notions of time. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 5(2), 34-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/erm.1219>
- Niesche, R. (2011). *Foucault and educational leadership: Disciplining the principal*. London: Routledge.
- Niesche, R. (2013). *Deconstructing educational leadership: Derrida and Lyotard*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2012.688874>
- Niesche, R. & Gowlett, C. (2015). Advocating a post-structuralist politics for educational leadership. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(4), 372-386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2014.976930>
- Núñez, R.E. & Sweetser, E. (2006). With the future behind them: Convergent evidence from Aymara language and gesture in the crosslinguistic comparison of spatial construals of time. *Cognitive Science*, 30, 1–49.
- Nuttall, J. & Thomas, L. (2015). Time and temporality in early childhood educators' work. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 23 (4), 512-523. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2014.970851>
- Oborn, E., Barrett, M. & Dawson, S. (2013). Distributed leadership in policy formulation: A sociomaterial perspective. *Organization Studies*, 34(2), 253–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840612473552>
- Olkowski, D. (2008). Deleuze and the limits of mathematical time. *Deleuze Studies*, 2, 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/E1750224108000135>
- Sellars, J. (2007). Aíôn and chronos: Deleuze and the stoic theory of time. *Collapse*, 3, 177-205.
- St. Pierre, E.A. & Jackson, A.Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 715–719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800414532435>
- St. Pierre, E.A. (2016). The empirical and the new empiricisms. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16 (2), 111-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636147>

- Thomas, L. (2016) Data as constant becomings: Collapsing dichotomous divides of data and researcher in identity construction work. A. B. Reinertsen (Ed.), *Becoming earth - A post human turn in educational discourse collapsing nature/culture divides* (pp. 41-52). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Tian, M., Risku, M. & Collin, K. (2015). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future research focus. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 44 (1), 146-164.
- Williams, J. (2011). Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of time: A critical introduction and guide. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Youdell, D., & Armstrong, F. (2011). A politics beyond subjects: The affective choreographies and smooth spaces of schooling. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 4, 144–150.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2011.01.002>