



Hipatia Press  
www.hipatiapress.com



Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://qre.hipatiapress.com>

## Disrupting Ethnography through Rhizoanalysis

Diana Masny<sup>1</sup>

1) Educational Department, Université d'Ottawa (Canada) / Queensland University of Technology (Australia).

Date of publication: October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014

Edition period: June 2012-October 2014

---

**To cite this article:** Masny, D. (2014) Disrupting Ethnography through Rhizoanalysis. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 3(3) 345-363. doi: 10.4471/qre.2014.51

**To link this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.4471/qre.2014.51>

---

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC-BY\)](#).

# **Disrupting Ethnography through Rhizoanalysis**

Diana Masny

*Université d'Ottawa / Queensland University of Technology*

*(Received: 29 May 2014; Accepted: 2 September 2014; Published; 28 October 2014)*

## **Abstract**

---

This article interrogates principles of ethnography in education proposed by Mills and Morton: raw tellings, analytic pattern, vignette and empathy. This article adopts a position that is uncomfortable, unconventional and interesting. It involves a deterritorialization/ rapture of ethnography in education in order to reterritorialize a different concept: rhizoanalysis, a way to position theory and data that is multi-layered, complex and messy. Rhizoanalysis, the main focus of this article is not a method. It is an approach to research conditioned by a reality in which Deleuze and Guattari disrupt representation, interpretation and subjectivity. In this article, Multiple Literacies Theory, a theoretical and practical framework, becomes a lens to examine a rhizomatic study of a Korean family recently arrived to Australia and attending English as a second language classes. Observations and interviews recorded the daily lives of the family. The vignettes were selected by reading data intensively and immanently through a process of palpation, an innovative approach to educational research. Rhizoanalysis proposes to abandon the given and invent different ways of thinking about and doing research and what might happen when reading data differently, intensively and immanently, through Multiple Literacies Theory. Rhizoanalysis, a game-changer in the way research can be conducted, affords a different lens to tackle issues in education through research.

---

**Keywords:** Deleuze, Guattari, reading, immanence/becoming, assemblage, affect

**T**his article examines ethnography in education in order to disrupt/deterritorialize ethnography and proposes to experiment research differently through rhizoanalysis. What is rhizoanalysis? How does it function? What does it produce? The questions create a potential of what is yet to become. Becoming is a rhizomatic process. A rhizome has multiple horizontal shoots that take off in unpredictable ways. It has no beginning, no end. It spills out in the middle. This article is a rhizome. It spills out in the middle as we enter what has been a research study. There are multiple entries. As each entry is explored, the sense that emerges will take readers in unpredictable directions. This article might take readers into a familiar paradigm if this paradigm is Deleuze-Guattari related. On the other hand, the reader might be in unfamiliar territory with words we commonly share yet the concepts linked to these words differ. The article is organized in the following way: one entry introduces the problem that led to the questions posed in this article. It also provides an introduction to a Deleuze-Guattari perspective of ontology and how the latter drives doing research/reading data. Another entry in this article brings us to consider the rhizome, how it functions and what it produces. A next entry follows with a presentation of rhizoanalysis and Multiple Literacies Theory both conceptual frameworks operating in the current research in order to study the lives of a family of newcomers to Australia. Then an intermezzo (not a conclusion) focuses on concept creation emerging from lines of flight.

### **Entering in the Middle**

The call for proposals at an ethnography conference gave rise to a question: what is ethnography?<sup>1</sup> Ethnography in the educational field according to Mills and Morton (2012) can be summarized as follows:

To weave the immediacy and rawness of educational experiences into a context from which analytical patterns and insights can be discerned. The ethnographer uses literary genres – stories, vignettes and portraits – as part of this process. These stories are ethnographic narratives rather than raw retellings. They convey the vitality of those experiences within a framing that allows the reader to make connections and comparisons. If education is always risky,

always unsettling, then ethnography is the perfect method to capture its dynamism and power...

They go on to propose three ethnographic principles:

- 1) ethnography is a way of being, seeing, thinking and writing
- 2) ethnographic work should aim to be an ‘uncomfortable science’ (cited in Mills and Morton, Firth 1951), an approach to research that is a little unconventional, a little exposed.
- 3) ethnography demands empathy, understood as the ability to understand and be attentive to the feelings of another on their term.

In addition, Mills and Morton (2012) provide guiding principles in doing ethnography:

- “rawness of educational experience” establishes a context to deploy “analytical patterns and insights discerned
- the use of literary genres (stories, vignettes, portraits, etc.) in order to develop ethnographic narratives rather than raw retellings. The stories allow the reader to make connections and comparisons.

This perspective on ethnography constituted an untimely rupture, a deterritorialization of the concept/territory ethnography and a reterritorialization happened: becoming-rhizoanalysis. “Becomings belong to geography, they are orientations, directions, entries and exits.” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007, p.2). Deleuze and Guattari (1994) work with the concepts territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Within their view of reality (ontology), earth and territory are closely linked. Earth and territory produce problems from life and concept creation becomes a response to problems in the world (Masny, 2012a).

Territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization participate in a process of virtual-actual interaction. Both virtual (potential) and actual are real, for example, there is the “potential to think, which is then actualised in any single thought” (Colebrook in Parr, 2010, p. 10). The concept/territory of ethnography deterritorializes in the virtual when a problem arises: in this particular setting, how could doing research/reading<sup>2</sup> data be “different, new and interesting” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 111)? Deterritorialization undoes a territory. During the deterritorializing/virtual phase, becoming happens. How ethnography deterritorializes is not pre-

given. Moreover, since deterritorialization is virtual, it is pre-personal and asignifying. It is pre-personal because virtuality is not attributed to any particular body<sup>3</sup>, time or space. Virtual consists of unconscious thought (virtual thought of what might happen; potential). The language/discourse is structured in the following way: An infinitive introduces timelessness and the pre-personal with the absence of subject and object. Once virtual becoming assumes a presence in time and space, it actualizes/reterritorializes. The actual becomes virtual only to actualize again. In an interaction, what it once was could be no longer. It is different. It is difference/ immanence (virtual) that allows for creation and invention to happen continuously (Dufresne, 2002).

### **Entry - Rhizome**

Since this article focuses on rhizoanalysis, it is important to return to the concept of the rhizome briefly explored in the introductory paragraph. Crab grass or an iris is a rhizome. A rhizome has neither beginning nor end. Its shoots spring from the middle and grow horizontally. “There are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or [vertical] root. There are only lines”, molar lines, molecular lines and lines of flight” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 8). Molar lines are rigid/fixed and often refer to ways of being of institutions. When a molar line ruptures, it emits lines of flight/becoming. For example, the characteristics of ethnography put forward by Mills and Morton (2012), produced a deterritorialization of ethnography, a line of flight /becoming, a deterritorialization of ethnography and a reterritorialization: rhizoanalysis.

The characteristics of a rhizome included in this article are: non-hierarchy, connectivity, heterogeneity and multiplicity. Since the shoots of a rhizome spread horizontally, they do so by producing through connectivity heterogeneous and multiple shoots that rupture unpredictably and not in any pre-given direction. The rhizome in so doing creates a map (Masny, 2013a; St Pierre, 2004). A class could be a rhizome consisting of multiple heterogeneous non-hierarchical trajectories of experiences, some that rupture unpredictably and others that don't and that connect with each other in an assemblage (more on the assemblage in the next section).

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)

### Entry – Rhizoanalysis

How does rhizoanalysis function? What does it produce? Its function is machinic.

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 itself ... A mechanism is a closed machine with a specific function. A machine, however, is nothing more than its connections; it is not made by anything, is not for anything and has no closed identity. (Colebrook, 2002a, p. 57)

Take the example of a painting. In a visual arts class, an exchange on the function of color (blueness, greening), lines (paint strokes) and texture (brushes, flat instrument) in art produced impressionism. In social studies, social scenes (dresses, outdoor, hairstyle, body language) produced a certain impressionist society. Finally, in a science class chemical composition of oil paint becomes an important consideration that produced an impressionist work of art. In sum, impressionist painting is an assemblage of “socially and politically coded affects” (Colebrook, 2002a, p. 93).

Different machinic connections produced impressionism. The connections do not operate in isolation. Take the painting in the visual arts class. It makes connections/links with the students, art teacher, the classroom, the lighting and equipment in an assemblage (*agencement*). The latter example of an assemblage consists of discursive and non-discursive elements, connecting relations that de- and reterritorialize non-linearly and non-hierarchically. In an assemblage, the human subject is no more no less important. The subject is decentered (St. Pierre, 2004). There is no *a priori*

or pre-given relationship in the assemblage (Masny, 2013b). The relations in an assemblage connect through sensations (percepts and affects) deterritorialize/become different through the power to affect and be affected.

Percepts are no longer perceptions; they are independent of a state of those who experience them. Affects are no longer feelings or affections; they go beyond the strength of those who undergo them. Sensations, percepts, and affects are beings whose validity lies in themselves and exceeds any lived. They could be said to exist in the absence of man is himself a compound of percepts and affects. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p.164)<sup>4</sup>.

What is 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, 2006; Eakle, 2007; Leander & Rowe, 2006; Perry, 2013; Waterhouse, 2011, Sellers, 2013). Most of these have been reviewed in Masny & Waterhouse (2011). However, the ontology of rhizoanalysis is subject decentered and anti-representational. It is subject decentered; hence the importance of an assemblage that consists of connecting relations in sensations and affect/becoming that deterritorializes and reterritorialize relations in an assemblage. Moreover, rhizoanalysis is anti-representational and it refers to a stance against a present world out there that is re-presented (St. Pierre, 2013). Representation limits experience to the world as we know it, not as a world that could be, a world of production, invention and experimentation.

## **Study**

The objectives of this project are to examine:

- 1) how immigrant families (children and adults) learn a second language and literacy and
- 2) how learning a second language and literacy interrelates with their first (heritage/community) language and literacy in the context of school and home.

The research questions are:

- 1) how do immigrant families (children and adults) learn a second language and literacy?
- 2) how does the interrelationship of the first language and literacy with the second language and literacy function in the context of the school and home?
- 3) what does this interrelationship produce?

This study focuses on one family from South Korea, a family of two adults (mother and father) and their twin daughters. They have lived in Australia for a year. In South Korea, the mother stayed at home while the father worked in information technology. According to the father he could not get a position in information technology in Australia because he was not fluent enough in English. In school, the twins were in year 7 (age 13 approximately). The adults attended English second language classes for newcomers. During a six-month period, the adults were filmed twice in class and interviews followed. In addition, the family received flipcams and they were asked to film their experiences of Australian life inside and outside the home particularly with regard to language and literacy. What follows is an interview with the mother following a viewing of a flipcam recording taken by her in the home (vignette 1). Then there are two vignettes. The interviews with the children were based on the viewing of two flipcam recordings that took place in the home (vignette 2) and in their neighborhood (vignette 3).

A rhizoanalytic approach to observations and interviews, while guided by the research questions, is not-pre-given from an interview protocol for instance; rather what is filmed and what transpires at the interview is the sensation of connecting relations and affect/becoming that come together in the assemblage (ex. research questions, video recoding, interview, researcher). Reading data in rhizoanalysis becomes transgressive eschewing categorization (St. Pierre, 1997).

In this rhizoanalytic approach, there are neither coding nor ethnographic narratives but the “rawness of experience in context [read assemblage]”. Moreover, while ethnography operates with literary genre such as vignette, rhizoanalysis works with vignettes (presented below) in a conceptually different way. In the current setting, vignettes are part of a research assemblage. They constitute raw tellings in an assemblage. Vignettes could be video clips, transcripts, websites, sounds, in other words, bodies.



We know nothing about a body until we know 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, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body". (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 257)

The study presents three vignettes: the first with the mother alone and the remaining two vignettes with the twin daughters interviewed together.

(1) What follows then is an exchange between the researcher and the participant mother who spoke in Korean:

What I recorded we our daily life especially about my family. Everyday life with my kids and my husband, I put it in it. While I was recording it, I noticed the life in Australia, using, speaking English. I noticed that we speak Korean usually. *I realized that when we are at home we communicate speaking Korean. Mostly the kids are studying, eating and going to Korean church, worshipping together and eating at Korean church. Also my kids are attending institute, also here there are institutes, so the kids go there. Also watching Korean channels, and I put those things in the recording.*

In this vignette, after one year in Australia, and through the taping with a flipcam, the mother stated in an interview that while life in Australia takes place in English, most of the oral communication occurred in Korean at home, at church, at the institute where the children were learning Korean and finally watching Korean TV channels. In the current rhizoanalysis, could the filming have created an untimely rupture/ a deterritorialization of the research event, Korean life in Australia? In what direction reterritorialization happens could not be predicted? Even if the family continued life in Korean, it would not be the same. It is different. Could there be resistance to becoming/change/transform? Is it a question of maintaining a "belief in the world "and thereby creating forms of resistance to becoming (Marks, 2010)? Vignettes form an assemblage with the researcher, interview transcripts, video, participants, computer, etc. Intense affective highlighted/underlined passages disrupt as connections happen in the body of the researcher and produce thought. The researcher is not controlling thinking, for man cannot "limit thinking's power" (Colebrook in Parr, 2010, p. 186.).

Vignettes are foregrounded based on their power to affect the assemblage and be affected by the assemblage. Vignettes rupture, deterritorialize, and take off in unpredictable rhizomatic ways. Vignettes become a way to experiment and to create concepts through question forms to encourage a variety of ways of thinking about the vignette, as there is no one way to look at it (Bastien, 2013; Masny, 2013b). Reading data through palpation becomes a form of connecting with data that cannot be directly experienced. To palpate is to be able to feel (touch, see, hear) an approximation of what, could be in an open system (May, 2005). Sense emerges in the form of purposeful and not pre-given questioning that propels thinking in the unknown. It is a process in which there is an investment in reading data in a broad sense: reading, reading the world and self, through affect in an assemblage (Masny, 2012a).

Reading, Reading the World and Self are intricately intertwined but distinct. Reading is intensive and immanent. Reading the world is post-Freirean (Masny, 2005). It consists of a deterritorializing process of discursive and non-discursive elements that reterritorialize and sense actualizes *in situ*. Reading Self in an assemblage consists of reading connecting relations through sensation and becomings that emerge (in an assemblage). Here is an example. An assemblage might involve two persons, a conversation, a hallway at work, a coffee shop, a clock, and sunshine. The body reads the sounds, the sight and smell of coffee. There is an untimely interruption: a rhizomatic rupture (reading intensive). The clock on the wall says it is 4 o'clock: a visual and printed reading. At that particular moment, connecting relations deterritorialize and create a reading immanently, a becoming that creates difference (what once was could be no longer, a relay in the assemblage of what once was and a yet to become). There is a reterritorialization of reading self and the world (discursive and non-discursive) that flows through the assemblage and the assemblage reconfigures. The rupture potentially brings on virtual thought not in any pre-given way. Might thought (thinking's power) actualize in a coffee break, a time to go home, or considering a next vacation. Where reading the sight, sound and smell of coffee could lead to is unpredictable.

In rhizoanalysis, reading transforms the research event (Masny 2012a). An event (Deleuze, 1990; Daignault & Masny, 2011) consists of ruptures and differences that allow for creation to take off along untimely trajectories, a rhizome. Instead of considering interpretation and what a text

means, the questions are how vignettes function and what they produce. The subject is decentered and interpretation by the subject is abandoned. The data in the words of St. Pierre (1997) become transgressive. They defy categorization. What transpires is an ability of vignettes and power's affect to bring forth the virtual thought of what might happen in an analysis.

(2) Some of the filming in the home revolved around homework. The twins were interviewed together:

T: *I have trouble with writing. But, like, friends help me very much, so, I think, um... when I want to write something, I, I don't know how, how to, ah, um, say that in English, 'cause, ah, I didn't know many words, English words.*

R: Okay. How long have you been studying English?

T: Um, ah, I started learning English from year, *year three?*

R: Right, in Korea? Yeah. Korean primary school?

T: Right.

R: *And how do you learn it there. Had you learned from a textbook, do you just chant out words, what do you do to learn English, do you do conversation?*

T: We have an English teacher thing, the school, so we, we *learned English with the textbook. Ah, first of all we learned how to translate the sentences into English. So, ah Very... simple sentences. Like, how are you? Things like that, and we learned very simple words, like apples and bananas, and things like that and then alphabets... from about year six we started learning, I mean, learning English grammar. Um, then we started to memorize the English words...for example, um, I didn't learn how to (like), learn to write something in English, I have trouble with writing it.*

R: How about the speaking. When people speak in English can you understand them, or...

T: Ah, I can understand but I can't say, re--, can't say well? (R: Mm hmm.) Mm... *I was nervous when I came here first,* (R: Mm hmm.) but I went to the language school (R: Yeah.) and I learned ah, *just speaking, how to speak in English, and now I'm not very nervous.* (R: All right.) *My English is still not very good.*

R: Okay. Do you get in school, do you get extra help, (T: Ah...) do you get English, intensive English or..

T: Yes, we, we have ESL teacher... Right.

T: *So, in English and History, so the ESL teacher comes when we have English and History subject and they (R: Mm hmm.) he sits with us and they help us, like, for when we can't understand, he, he says one more time to us, so we can understand. So we can follow them, classwork?*

In this second vignette, the twins spoke of experiences learning English in Korea and in Australia. In Korea learning English was related to translation, simple sentences, simple words and finally English grammar and the memorization of English words. Once in Australia the twins were nervous speaking English. They went to language school and then had assistance from an ESL teacher during English and History classes. In this vignette, might the highlighted/underlined sections relate to how social production is constructed? Could a deterritorialization of life experiences that included language and literacy in the home language create flux and uncertainty? At the same time, would learning English produce “new orders of enslavement captured in new social formations” (Roy, p.32)? In reading, reading the world in an assemblage intensively and immanently, how might different social formations emerge? Rhizoanalysis in this way could provide the conceptual space to explore a research event and data provoking questions about what the different new relations in the assemblage might produce (Masny, 2012b).

(3) The twins also filmed outside the home, in particular the commercial streets in their neighborhood. This part of the interview, the responses were in Korean. Based on what they filmed, the researcher asked if this was different than in Korea.

T: *[IN KOREAN]* In Korea, you can only experience this environment only when you go to the countryside. Here, there atmosphere is good. But *there is no fun in the environment*. When I saw it the first time, the atmosphere was so different from Korea. It was a little inconvenient. *There is no care about public transit here. Korea is developed*. Sometimes it is inconvenient [she doesn't specify]

T: Um, well, *yes, I will speak in Korean*.

T: Um... (2s) *[IN KOREAN]* The first time what I felt was that it's like the country side. I saw many things that Korea doesn't have. The night culture in Korea is splendid [or dazzling]. Everything is

very quick. On the other hand, Australia is a kind of idle and relaxing city. Even the biggest city where we came is a very relaxing and leisurely effect on people. The night was very quiet and lonely which I've never been accustomed to. *The Korean night culture is really killer[awesome/cool]. The downtown and the neighborhood in Korea are very similar, but here those are very different.*

In this vignette, there was a comparison between night culture in Korea and in Australia. Was there a preference for life in Korea (ex: Korea is developed)? Might there be zones of intensity traversing and connecting relations affectively in the assemblage (life in Korea, life in Australia, the flipcam, the research, the twins)? Bodies can affect each other with great intensity in unpredictable ways (the affects of/by which a body is capable?). Bodies and affective intensities can reduce as well as amplify the power to act (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007). "...thought and affect can be transformed and extended in previously unthought-of ways by taking into account sensations and intensities that were previously excluded" (Roy, p. 87).

While an important criterion of ethnography is to bring forth empathy (an ability to understand and be attentive to feelings of another on their terms), such a perspective requires a centered subject and the ability for the subject to interpret/judge. Rhizoanalysis is interested in percept and affect, a bloc of sensation that flows through connecting relations in an assemblage (Masny, 2014). In this way, there is no appeal to interpretation, simply raw tellings. In other words, to interpret/explain is to judge (Deleuze, 1997).

...Actually, there is no longer any need to interpret, but that is because the best interpretation, the weightiest and most radical one, is an eminently significant silence ... (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.114)

Scheurich(1997) remains unsatisfied and apprehensive that "what was once raw, polyvocal, and above all different (Other) becomes through the research /theory process cooked, unified and above all the same" (p.86). Scheurich's response: "simply present raw data and leave the researcher stunned into silence – literally, into silence" (p. 90).

### Entry – Intermezzo

What is rhizoanalysis? How does it function? What does it produce? Through this article, might rhizoanalysis transform a way of living, writing and becoming with the world rather than an ethnographic experience in a way of being? Rhizoanalysis becomes an untimely experiment precluding comparisons for they validate the existence of binaries of what one is, what one is not through categorization. With the becoming of this article, different concepts within rhizoanalysis have emerged: assemblage, vignettes, raw tellings, reading data intensively and immanently, palpate, provoking questions, to think differently about qualitative research.

**Assemblage (*Agencement*):** Rhizoanalysis works with assemblages, to disassemble and to reassemble, to form different assemblages. Rhizoanalysis invites conceptual experimentation in a research event that consists of reading data, raw tellings, provoking questions and producing through becoming/affect different and new connecting relations in an assemblage (Masny, 2013b).

**Vignettes:** Vignettes are considered "...creations that need to be selected and assessed according to their power to act and intervene" in the assemblage. (Colebrook, 2002b, p. xliv). Vignettes rupture, deterritorialize deploying a rhizomatic cartography, that is, rhizomatic shoots (lines) take off in unpredictable ways to create concepts, a way to respond to problems. The highlighted/underlined parts open up the vignettes to deterritorialization and becoming/affect happens in the research assemblage. The combination of deterritorialization and affect is a rhizomatic process in becoming in the assemblage.

**Raw tellings:** Raw tellings are crucial in rhizoanalysis. Raw tellings in rhizoanalysis emerge from an assemblage including vignettes that affect and are affected in an assemblage. Raw tellings deploy intensities that resonate with flows of affects engaging multiplicities, complexities and out-of-boundaries messiness.

**Reading data intensively and immanently:** Reading intensively is the moment at which there is an untimely deterritorialization and reading immanently sets off unpredictable potential connections in an assemblage.

**Palpate:** In rhizoanalysis, reading data becomes intensive and immanent through a process of palpation. Palpating data cannot be directly experienced. To palpate can be challenging, ambiguous and difficult.

Reading data through palpation is: “to embrace uncomfortableness that comes with loss of certainty, transparency, and fixed images” (Mazzei, 2010, p. 521).

Provoking questions: Provoking questions implies a move away from interpretation and an openness to the potential/ immanent responses that questions produce, that is, to think. From the emergence of thinking, thinkers are effected (Parr, 2010). Questions provoke and deterritorialize along lines of flight to engage creation, innovation, and power’s thinking.

While there are different approaches to rhizoanalysis, each is a singular research event. In this article, raw tellings are presented in order to read data intensively and immanently in the process of palpating data, to provoke questions, to propel thinking untimely through an “encounter with relations, potentials and powers not our own” (Parr, 2010, p.4). In sum, might rhizoanalysis entail the interaction of forces with what a body can do and what it is capable of with affect/becoming that happens in reading connecting relations intensively and immanently in an assemblage?

Acknowledgement The research study was funded by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> This article is a revised version of a presentation given at the Ethnographic and Qualitative Research Conference (Las Vegas, January, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> The concept of reading flows from Multiple Literacies Theory, a construct developed by Masny (2010). In Multiple Literacies, literacies consist of words, gestures, sounds, that is, human, animal, and vegetal ways of relating to the world: ways of becoming with the world. They are texts, broadly speaking (for example, mating rituals, music, visual arts, physics, mathematics, digital remixes). Literacies can be 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. There is an investment in reading data in a broad sense: reading, reading the world and self, through an affective lens in an assemblage (Masny, 2011). Multiple Literacies Theory is a conceptual framework both theoretical and practical. It is a theory of becoming and at the same time, in becoming. From a theoretical perspective, in asking questions, Multiple Literacies Theory is interested in concept creation, deterritorialization, and how difference that comes about through experimentation transforms an assemblage. From a practical perspective, Multiple Literacies Theory is the ability to do. It has to be able to work, in other words, how literacies function and what they produce. Multiple Literacies Theory connects with a toolbox to invent concepts not pre-given but emerge *in situ* (Deleuze 2004). Moreover, reading is intensive and immanent (Masny, 2012a). Reading deterritorializes (intensive) and sets off a process of becoming/immanence.

<sup>3</sup> A body can be anything: animal, sounds, mind, idea, linguistic corpus, social collectivity (Deleuze, 1988, p.127)

<sup>4</sup> The quote in the article is taken from *What is Philosophy?*, and in particular, the chapter on percept and affect in relation to art and the independence of a work of art from the painter and the materials themselves. While Deleuze and Guattari were creating concepts of percept and affect in an art setting, "...Affects, percepts, and concepts are three inseparable forces, running from art into philosophy and from philosophy into art" (1995, p.137).

### Acknowledgements

This qualitative study is part of the larger project on, "Immigrant Families & Multiple Literacies: Policy, classroom, and community connections across Australia and Canada."

### 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.
- Colebrook, C. (2002a). *Gilles Deleuze*. New York: Routledge.
- Colebrook, C. (2002b). *Understanding Deleuze*.Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Colebrook, C. (2010). Actuality.In A.Parr (Ed).*The Deleuze Dictionary* (revised edition, pp. 55-57). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Daignault, J. & Masny, D. (2011).A conversation with Jacques Daignault and Diana Masny. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(4), 528-539. doi: [10.2304/pfie.2011.9.4.528](https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.4.528)
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (R. Hurley, Trans.). San Francisco: City Light Books. (Original work published 1970).
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *The Logic of Sense* (M. Lester, & C. Stivale, Trans.) (C.V. Boundas, Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1969).
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations*. New York, Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1990).
- Deleuze, G. (1997). To have done with judgment.In G. Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical* (pp.126-135), (D. W. Smith & M. A. Greco,



- Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1993)
- 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) (M. Taormina, Trans.). 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, & G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1991).
- Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (2007). *Dialogues II*. (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1977).
- Dufresne, T. (2002). *Through a lens of difference OR when worlds collide*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa. Retrieved from <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. doi: [10.1598/RRQ.42.4.3](https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.42.4.3)
- Leander, K.M. & Rowe, D. W. (2006). Mapping literacy spaces in motion: A rhizomatic analysis of classroom literacy performance. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 428-460. doi: [10.1598/RRQ.41.4.2](https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.4.2)
- Marks, J. (2010). Control Society. In A.Parr (Ed). *The Deleuze Dictionary* (revised edition) (p. 55-57). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Masny, D. (2005). Multiple literacies OR beyond Freire. In J. Anderson, M. Kendrick, T. Rogers & S. Smythe (Eds.) *Portraits of Literacy Across Families, Communities and Schools*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Masny, D. (2010). Multiple Literacies Theory: how it functions, what it produces. *Perspectiva*, 28, 2. Retrieved from <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/perspectiva/article/view/2175-795X.2010v28n2p337>

- Masny, D. (2012a). What is reading? In D. Masny and D.R. Cole, *Mapping Multiple Literacies: An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies* (pp. 69 – 92). London: Continuum.
- Masny, D. (2012b). Cartographies of talking groups. In D. Masny and D.R. Cole, *Mapping Multiple Literacies: An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies* (pp. 15 – 42). London: Continuum.
- Masny, D. (2013a). Becoming thousand little sexes: this is not my father's paradigm. In D. Masny (Ed.), *Cartographies of Becoming: A Deleuze-Guattari perspective* (pp. 221- 236). Rotterdam: Sense
- Masny, D. (2013b). Rhizoanalytic pathways in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(5), 339-348. doi: [10.1177/1077800413479559](https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413479559)
- Masny, D (2014). Multiple Literacies Theory: Discourse, sensation, resonance and becoming. D. Masny & D.R. Cole (Eds.) *Education and the Politics of Becoming* (pp. 113–128). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Masny, D. & Waterhouse, M. (2011). Mapping territories and creating nomadic pathways with Multiple Literacies Theory, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27, 3, Retrieved from <http://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/155>
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: An introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazzei, L.A. (2010) 'Thinking data with Deleuze'. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 511-523. doi: [10.1080/09518398.2010.497176](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.497176)
- Mills, D., & Morton, M. (2013). *Research Methods in Education: Ethnography in Education*. London: SAGE.
- Parr, A.(Ed.). (2010). *The Deleuze Dictionary* (revised edition, pp. 55-57). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Patton, P. (2010). *Deleuzian Concepts: Philosophy, Colonization, Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Perry, M. (2013). Devising theatre and consenting bodies in the classroom. In D. Masny (Ed.), *Cartographies of Becoming: A Deleuze-Guattari perspective* (p. 93- 110). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Roy, K. (2004). *Teaching in Nomadic Spaces*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Sellers, 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. (1997). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 10(2), 175-189. doi: [10.1080/095183997237278](https://doi.org/10.1080/095183997237278)

St. Pierre, E. A. (2004). Deleuzian concepts for education: the subject undone. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(3), 283-296. doi: [10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00068.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00068.x)

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

Waterhouse, M. (2011). *Experiences of multiple literacies and peace: A rhizoanalysis of becoming in immigrant language classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10393/19942>

**Diana Masny** is Emerita Professor in Educational Department at the University of Ottawa (Canada) and adjunct professor at Queensland University of Technology (Australia). ORCID id: [0000-0002-4955-0973](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4955-0973)

**Contact Address:** Faculté d'éducation. Université d'Ottawa, 145 Jean-Jaques-Lussier Private, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada. email: [dmasny@uottawa.ca](mailto:dmasny@uottawa.ca)