Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 33
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 14

Towards a minor bilingualism

Exploring variations of language and
literacy in early childhood education

Anna Martín-Bylund

Faculty of Educational Sciences
Linköping 2017

Anna Martín-Bylund

Towards a minor bilingualism:

Exploring variations of language and literacy in early childhood
education

© Anna Martín-Bylund 2017

Cover design: Andrea Klintbjer

Cover photo: Mazzur, iStock

Printed in Sweden by LiU-tryck, Linköping 2017

ISBN 978-91-7685-478-5

ISSN 1653-0101

Distributed by:

Department of Social and Welfare Studies

Linköping University

S-581 83 Linköping

SWEDEN

Till Quim, Henning och Laia

Acknowledgements

There was a time in my life when I was obsessive about Swedish phrasal verbs and their translation to Spanish. This was the topic of my Master thesis and I could recall many mesmerizing translations. In its place, I want to thank my supervisor Johan Falk at ISPLA, Stockholm University. Tack Johan! Thanks also for asking if I would be interested to continue an academic career as a PhD student. I decided to move in a different direction at that time, but you planted a persistent thought that eventually, in a different time and space, brought me back to academia. I am still devoted to grammar and comparative linguistics, a fact that perhaps is not very clear in this thesis. There are some connections for those open to seeing them, but the present is a thesis in educational practice and so...

I could not have written it without the children and teachers who formed important parts of the preschool practice where I conducted the study. My most important thank you all for so bigheartedly receiving me and interacting with my work. Thanks for your questions and curiosity and willingness to participate. Tack alla ni! ¡Gracias a todos ustedes/vosotros!

My warmest thank you to my dear supervisors Polly Björk-Willén and Eva Reimers. Thank you both for always believing in me, for providing me with a safe space, where I was free to grow with this project and this project to grow with me. Thanks Eva for alert and wise readings and for teaching the importance of passion in work. Thanks also for your guidance in hard decision making. Thanks Polly for opening doors to interesting contexts, for critical questions and your warm, caring support in everything and everywhere.

Thanks to the readers of the manuscript at different stages. Thank you, Jakob Cromdal for giving me a lot to think about at my first grading seminar. It pushed me forward. Thank you Liselott Olsson! Your affirmative, constructive reading at the half time seminar made a huge difference and has been crucial for the rest of the process. Thanks also to Tünde Puskás and Mathias Martinsson in the committee who provided thought provoking comments. Thanks to Barbro Johansson as

the reader at the final seminar. Thank you and to Carina Hermansson, Cecilia Lindgren, and Linnéa Stenliden for your careful, positive readings, encouraging questions and necessary suggestions.

The research environment of Educational Practice at Campus Norrköping, Linköping University: I am grateful to all who during these years have formed a bigger or smaller part in building a productive, experimental, interdisciplinary, inquisitive and encouraging research culture from which I have benefitted. Thanks Polly and Tünde for organizing the seminars, to Eva for your central role and to Jakob for taking over. I hope the environment will continue to flourish in the future.

I have had superb colleagues during this journey. Kirsten Stoewer: thanks for your willingness to always help. Lina Söderman Lago: thanks for being so cool and smart and calm. You rock! Thanks Linnea and Linnéa, for being the ones I could always contact in very and less beautiful moments. Bodén: thanks for being always affirmative, always generous, always excellent and simply the best. You know I am forever in love with you, and truly happy over your absent presence in my space and time. Stenliden: thanks for having become my brilliant accomplice and personal coach in academia and life. Nothing really works without you! A particular thanks for your distant support during this last year and for good fun and great work in Shanghai, Hongkong and Macau. I am also warmly thankful to Anders Albinsson, Mats Bevenmyr, Daniel Björklund, Sara Dalgren, Katarina Elfström Pettersson, Kristina Fredriksson, Martin Harling, Linda Häll, Josefin Rostedt, Rizwan-Ul Huq and Lars Wallner with whom I shared, at different stages of this process, the everyday life of being doctoral students together. Thanks for coffees, seminars and (pep) talks. In the hallways: thanks Karin Krifors and Sara Ahlstedt for always sharing a caring word. Thanks Ulrika Bodén, Ellinor Månsson and Ayaz Razmjooei who started their respective journeys when I left for China and I bet have added new energy at Bomull during this last year. I also want to thank Kristin Ungerberg in Karlstad for the good, fruitful Skype talks during our Deleuzian reading course. Apart from doctoral student fellows, I am grateful to Susanne Severinsson for always reading and constructively commenting on my work and for kindly and repeatedly offering to help a mother of three. Katarina Eriksson Barajas, thanks for inviting me to the inner circle of the cultural elite, for formally being my mentor and informally being great and fun.

Thanks Tünde Puskás for always welcoming me into your office, for company and running at workshops and conferences and for interesting chats about bilingualism and life. Thanks Thomas Dahl for enabling for me working at a distance from China and Anna Ericsson for always helping out. Thanks Anita Andersson, Per-Anders Henmark, Ingrid Karlsson, Bitte Palmqvist and Birgitta Plymoth for having kept track on me and my time in relation to research, teaching and parenting.

Running has played a significant role in this thesis since it makes me constructively mechanical. Cheers to my shoes, beautiful trees, (un)clean air, hills, asphalt and forest paths. Good things happened with this work thanks to my panting involvement with you.

Thanks to important people outside academia. In Shanghai: Thanks to the teachers, friends, neighbours and children who made my kids feel safe and happy so that I could concentrate on being a boring academic. Thanks XiaoLi! I could not have finished this work this year without you. 谢谢 你很棒!

In Europe: My dear old pal Andrea Klintbjer who has made the front page of this thesis. I love it! Thank you for this, for the Koster-trip and all these years. The rest of the Strängnäs gang: Thanks Britta, Christina, Katrin and Teja for (un)blessed times in the passed and for still being there as good old ones. Karin: thanks for everything we've shared before, around and with 'torrisarna'. Thanks for your super long text messages. Besos mojados para ti, fresón. Tienes un rincón especial en mi corazón. Camilla: thanks for your energetic, warm and open personality and thanks to the whole Fackt family for being our own 'dalmasar'. Etina: thanks for past and future stimulating chats, no unnecessary cleaning and the best 'fika' in the world. The entire Deniz family: thanks for being our perfect play-date! Thanks Katarina S. for good run-talks, sometimes leading to great decisions. Gracias Nati, en aquellos tiempos, por enseñarme la belleza del lenguaje castellano, por recordarme que hay que levantar la vista para ver y que siempre hay algo que elude lo presente. Thanks to Heidi and the rest of the Wetell's. Thanks for being our Norrköping 'relatives' who help us with basic things like giving birth and getting married. We all love you all! Thanks Heidi for reminding me to be practical (even if I never really manage) and for never failing in anything.

Thanks to the Martín-Callizo family for bilingual inspiration and for taking such good care of the whole family in Catalonia, Sweden and elsewhere. Gracias Teresa y Salvador por ser los mejores 'avis' del

mundo. Gracias a Daniel, Clara, Rita, Jordi, Foc y Pruna, por ser todos tan buenos, guapos, inteligentes y majos.

The Bylund-family. My parents: my most profound thanks for your love and unconditional devotion. Thanks for always being there, looking for ways to help with all sorts of things and for being the most loving, caring and compassionate ‘mormor’ and ‘morfär’ my kids could have. Thanks for having Rons when we are away. Tack mamma och pappa för att ni finns! My big brother Henkan: thank you for being everything I am not, for having treated me (almost) always with love and respect. Thanks for ‘45-mjolk’ and never forgetting to call☺. Thanks Tessan for being easy-going and a lovely ‘faster’. Tack Max och Cornelia för att ni är mina underbara brorsbarn och Niko för att du aldrig har bitit mig☺

To the five astonishing beings I love: Thank you all for making me feel a range of different things. You make me real. Thank you Rons for company, warmth and for being the funniest, smartest cat. Laia: thank you for your happiness ever since you arrived to this world, your crazy will and never ending kisses in the morning. Life is never boring with you. Henning, högljudda honung! Thank you for having the cutest personality and most incredible ways of thoughts. Thanks for opening my eyes for different, parallel dimensions of this world to explore. Quim: thanks for telling me this last year “hoppas du får mycket gjort på boken idag” and for showing me how to write a fantastic book in only one day. Thank you for those many late moments in the evening of reading, talking, laughing, whispering and not wanting the day to end. Thanks for challenging me as a mother: in this I am not older than you so forgive me my mistakes! Claudi: thanks for the “running heads”=half a thesis and, more importantly, for having never asked for a straight, flat path but just a bit of luck. Thanks for still being interest(ed)-ing and more socially competent than me. No eres mi media naranja porque si te quiero es porque sos mi amor mi complice y todo y en la calle codo a codo somos mucho más que dos. Förresten så är du rosor och en tulpan.

Anna Martín-Bylund
Gröna huset, Norrköping, 2017-07-25

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Ways of putting apple in your mouth: a minor introduction</i>	2
<i>Why engage with apples in a study on bilingualism in early childhood education?</i>	4
Bilingualism and early childhood education: an initial problematization	4
<i>Aim</i>	11
<i>Introducing minor</i>	12
<i>Arrangement of the rest of the text</i>	14
 PRACTICES	 14
<i>An educational practice</i>	17
A productive connection	17
Moments of difference and repetition	19
Entwined policies	21
Things and words	28
<i>A theoretical practice</i>	30
Sensibility of theory-practice	31
A material-semiotic pragmatics	37
A minor theorizing: a bilingual approach	43
<i>A political practice</i>	45
Responsibility	46
Choices	48
Murmurs of literacy: a minor politics of language	51
 UNDERTAKINGS	 55
<i>Ethical undertakings</i>	56
Research practices involving young children	56
Conceptualizations of children in research	63
Becoming (child)	65
<i>Methodological undertakings</i>	67
Fieldwork in the making	68
Extending to off fieldwork	72
Extending to written text	78

<i>Summarizing the partial studies</i>	80
Article 1: Language policy and material creativity	80
'Article' 2: Reading and not knowing	82
Article 3: Things and words and (il)literate expertise	83
Article 4: Mapping silence	84
PROPOSAL	86
<i>Towards a minor bilingualism</i>	87
Three temporal suggestions	87
<i>Embracing messiness: minor exits</i>	96
SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING	98
<i>Bakgrund</i>	99
<i>Syfte och frågeställningar</i>	100
<i>Forskningsprocessen: tre intrasslade praktiker och dess göranden</i>	100
<i>Resultat och diskussion</i>	104
BREVE RESUMEN EN ESPAÑOL	106
REFERENCES	109
PAPERS INCLUDED IN THIS THESIS	
APPENDIX I-IV	
<i>Information letters and forms for informed consent</i>	

Introduction

“The difference between minorities and majorities isn’t their size. A minority may be bigger than a majority. What defines the majority is a model you have to conform to: the average European adult male city-dweller, for example ... A minority, on the other hand, has no model, it’s a becoming, a process. One might say the majority is nobody. Everybody’s caught, one way or another, in a minority becoming that would lead them into unknown paths if they opted to follow it through.” (Deleuze & Negri, 1990).

“I claim the term falsifier for myself, being an idea thief and shuffler of second-hand concepts.” (Guattari 1995a:38)

Ways of putting A_p**p**L_e in your mouth: a minor introduction

How many ways are there to put an apple in your mouth? To answer this question, some might start with thinking of the apple in itself. Perhaps it does not matter much whether it's green, yellow or red, but its shape does. The way you put the apple in your mouth depends on if it is, for instance, an entire apple or if it is cut into fine slices. If it is a whole apple you have to open your mouth more widely, and the crunch of putting your teeth in the apple is perhaps more noisy compared to when you take a bite of a thin slice. Not to talk about the liquid that might splash on your nose if the apple is big and really juicy, compared to if it is a mealy one. There are of course all sorts of different apples that modify the ways in which they will be put in the mouth. Some are for instance more suitable for apple sauce and for that you might need a spoon.

But let's now think for a moment of putting 'apple' in your mouth. Try it! Savour it for a short moment. And now try

APPLE and then apple. And after that you try a **P_pL_e**

and all other sorts of variations you might come up with on your own. What do they do with your mouth? Think about it, and do also try 'manzana' or 'pomme', 苹果 ('píng guǒ') or 'Apfel', 'äpple' or 'poma', 'omena', 'elma' or any other word you know for it. If you are good at phonetics you might be able to give a theoretical description of the physical differences in the pronunciations of these words, but this is not necessary. Experiencing the difference is enough for the further reading.

As the reader has hopefully experienced, there are many different ways to put an apple in your mouth, different ways to eat apples, and different ways to say apple. You probably do not object to the differences between the two overarching acts: eating apple and saying apple. They are indeed not the same thing. However, in both cases, apple passes through the mouth and in both cases there are many different ways by which this can happen that form, shape and make the mouth experience apple in various ways.

Introduction

To make this even clearer, take a bite of any variation of apple you like and try to say any variation of apple you like simultaneously. This is indeed difficult, since the mouth experiences a material conflict between eating and speaking¹. This conflict takes place at a fine boundary between things and words. This is not, at all, *all* that happens there but it is a good way to experience the boundary. Starting to think with, as well as to challenge, this boundary is necessary for the work and the reading of this thesis. So I hope you are with me. Now, even if you are, this boundary is not the principal issue addressed in this work. It is only something to force you to think differently with the bilingual situations in focus.

¹ The example of the apple is elaborated on with inspiration from Deleuze and Guattari (1986). See also Mol (2008).

Why engage with apples in a study on bilingualism in early childhood education?

This thesis is an engagement with Deleuzio-Guattarian philosophy and a range of bilingual, Spanish-Swedish, early childhood situations of which some have to do with eating and all have to do with an intimate relationship between things and words. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) inspire the thesis' use of bilingual situations to explore a physical dimension of language and a linguistic dimension of bodies. Similarly, Mol (2008) proposes an engagement with philosophy in experimental situations related to eating. She writes that many things, among them subjectivity, will change when engaging in metabolic experiments of theorizing with eating. She states that "[t]he appreciation of apples is a physical matter. But for that, it is no less historical and social" (Mol 2008:33). In adopting this statement, I also argue that the appreciation of language is an historical and social matter, but for that it is no less physical.

Along these lines I problematize the phenomenon of bilingualism in this thesis. The choice to work within an early childhood educational practice was based on an exploratory thought that educational spaces involving very young children may help to shed new light on the physical presence of language and literacy practices that have been minimally dealt with elsewhere in bilingualism research. Nevertheless, even though this research specifically involves young children, I want to underline that this thesis is an engagement with bilingual *situations* where single 'subjects', such as children, are only a few of multiple constitutive parts.

In the following section I employ different fragmental voices articulated in different media in recent times to outline an initial problematization of bilingualism in connection with early childhood education. The rest of this thesis is a continuous interaction with this problematization.

Bilingualism and early childhood education: an initial problematization

First of all: why *bilingualism*? The term itself was originally composed from an understanding of languages as autonomous formal systems. Bilingualism in this sense can be described in relation to a monolingual

understanding of language where bilingualism is obtained through a mere duplication (triplication, quadruplication...) of monolingual systems or competencies (cf. Haugen 1956). In seeking to problematize such a view, several other prefixed terms have been employed (i.e. multilingualism, plurilingualism, polylingualism, translanguaging). Makoni and Pennycook (2007) have argued against prefixed notions of language or 'linguaging' in relation to bilingual practices (i.e. *translinguaging*). If linguaging is itself described as sensitive to environmental and situational factors it should also involve any situation of bilingualism without prefixing the term.

In this thesis I seek to stick with bilingualism for three main reasons. Firstly, the particularities of a *bilingual* situation and its possibilities of linguistic variation as discussed by Deleuze and Guattari (1986, 1987). Then there is the fact that this thesis is written in close interaction with an articulated *bilingual* Spanish-Swedish educational institution. And finally the argument made by García and Wei (2014) that even if bilingualism should not be considered exceptional, there is still something specific about *bilingual* situations that implies a deviation from the norm. In societies extensively guided by monolingually informed standards, *bilingual* practices (involving two or more standard languages) produce different and differentiating experiences.

In the following outline of the problematization, other terms such as multilingualism are also included through different voices. This is inevitable. My study concerns bilingual situations, which are composed of a range of elements including at least two standard languages. These might be productive of different practices, which can be labeled using different terms, depending on taste or what is at stake. To avoid confusion, I will clarify what is meant in each case as necessary. But now, what is the issue with this thing, which I label bilingualism?

There is an ancient controversy around the phenomenon of bilingualism. In the Old Testament, the multitude of different languages spoken in the world is described as God's penalty. The language problem, or the people of the world not being able to understand each other, was God's way of preventing humans from getting too powerful and completing the Tower of Babel. The existence of different languages in the world emerges in this part of the Old Testament as a setback for the humans. When the xeno-glossic

phenomenon and ability to speak and understand several foreign languages while in a trance is brought up with the Pentecost miracle in the New Testament, the curse related to the Tower of Babel seems to be broken. As a miracle though, this ability emerges as unbelievable, a spiritual and otherwise unattainable phenomenon.

It might seem inappropriate or even anachronistic to bring up the Bible in writing about bilingualism in early childhood education in the 21st century. However, the notion of bilingualism as punishment or setback on the one hand and as a gift and an almost unattainable competence on the other, remain as powerful bodies in today's discourses on bilingualism, and significant when discussing very young children and their education. The dichotomy of 'setback-strength' is predominant in discussions on bilingualism both in research and elsewhere. In the following I will provide some examples of this.

In an article from 2015 in the newsfeed at Uppsala University's webpage the linguist and expert in minority languages, Professor Leena Huss, states that "[m]ultilingualism is not a problem, it is a gift" (Bergström 2015, *my translation*). She cites metalinguistic awareness, aptitude for learning other new languages, and creativity as benefits for children growing up with two or more languages. The problem with multilingualism in nation states like Sweden where the norm 'one country – one language' is strong, lies, Huss argues, not in the phenomenon itself but in monolingual societies' frequent lack of an open attitude towards minority and other languages.

Elsewhere, bilingualism emerges as a problem in somewhat different ways. In November 2016 I attended a seminar at an international primary and pre-primary school in Shanghai on how parents can support their children's bilingualism. The speaker, a specialist in the area of parent and teacher bilingualism education, was competent, well-read, research based, and with an own experience she definitely knew what she was talking about. She killed some of the myths regarding bilingualism in the early years, for instance, 'children being sponges' when learning a (second) language, but also reaffirmed the idea of bilingualism as salvation by citing the advantages of being bilingual (earlier metalinguistic awareness, cognitive creativity, social-emotional benefits, and a more open mind towards social differences). Nevertheless, she also emphasised that bilingualism is not something that just happens or that you can get for free: you have to set goals,

make a plan and work hard. With reference to Baker (2000/2011) and Cummins (2000) she described different levels of bilingualism on a ladder and made us all understand that we do not want our children to stay at the lower level, without age appropriate competence for learning in any language. We want them at least in the middle of that ladder.

As a parent I agreed with all that she said. Nevertheless, it is also obvious that even the ‘gift’ of bilingualism implies a certain risk. To enjoy the benefits of bilingualism you must work hard. If not, you or your children will suffer as a result. Aspects of social class fell outside the scope of this seminar, but it goes without saying that if children’s desirable and beneficial bilingualism requires parents’ and teachers’ awareness, time and effort, then not all children growing up with several languages will enjoy the appropriate conditions for reaching the middle or highest level of the ladder. Hence, bilingualism as a setback will potentially be more emergent in specific groups. Related to this is an extended although debated idea in Western educational discourse that bilingualism is a good thing for the rich but bad for the poor (Strauss 2014).

In the Swedish educational context, the Swedish curriculum for preschool, *Lpfö* 1998 (The Swedish National Agency for Education 2010/2016), requires that “children with a mother tongue other than Swedish have the possibility to develop both the Swedish language and their mother tongue” (The Swedish National Agency for Education 2010:7). The curriculum does not indicate *how* to achieve this, and the planning and organisation in relation to policy is left up to each preschool (cf. Grüber and Puskás 2013). In comparing today’s situation with that in the 1970s, Grüber and Puskás (2013) conclude that the fact that policies previously gave more explicit remarks about how to work with children’s bilingual development, and that these questions seemed more manageable and transparent in the seventies, was due to a reduced number of languages covered by policy and the relatively small number of bilingual children enrolled in Swedish preschool at that time. Today the majority of children in Sweden over the age of one attend preschool and the number of mother tongues spoken among these children is more than a hundred (Grüber and Puskás 2013:38). Due to this the setback of bilingualism emerges with yet a different value.

In 2013 as a way of meeting the demand for guidelines from practitioners around the country, the Swedish National Agency for Education produced a supporting document called *Several Languages in Preschool – Theory and Practice (my translation)*. As stated in this text, the ‘multilingual preschool’ has been extensively discussed both by researchers and practitioners in Sweden during the last decade. Multilingual has been used in numerous contexts when referring to institutions containing many bilingual children but where both educators and children use mainly Swedish in their daily activities, thus making the institution itself strongly monolingual (The Swedish National Agency for Education 2013:7). The term multilingual, rather than referring to competencies in more than one language, has been used extensively in relation to origin and foreign background, and by extension, to a lack of competence in Swedish. Subsequently, the multilingual preschool has many times been categorized as deficient rather than as an asset. Somewhat contradictorily, the existence of many different languages in preschool emerges as an obstacle to working in accordance with the bilingual ambitions of the educational policy. It looks like God’s punishment at the Tower of Babel makes itself felt in ages of migration.

The discourses of bilingualism as setback on the one hand and asset on the other, as briefly introduced above, might appear as a puzzling and somewhat contradictive issue. Nevertheless, in this thesis they are not seen as opposed, but as entangled and continuously reaffirming an ideal picture of bilingualism, as well as producing a longing for ideal knowledge, methods, conditions and circumstances applicable in educational practices that strive towards this goal. My work here will not help to produce answers on how to meet this longing. Rather, the potential contribution of working towards what I have come to theorize as a minor bilingualism, lies in the production of a more chaotic or messy picture of the phenomenon, and thereby brings new challenges, questions and wishes to the surface. Hopefully this can help change thinking about bilingualism in early childhood education in the 21st century. But, is there a need for this? To elaborate on these thoughts, I now turn to early childhood education as the chosen space for engagement with bilingualism in this thesis.

In an article titled *Does the Swedish National Agency for Education Know Nothing about Children’s Development? (my translation)* published in the Swedish evening newspaper *Expressen* in December

2016, Granström (2016) writes critically about a suggestion for change in the curriculum for preschool². In general terms she writes that preschool, from a societal perspective, is “a place for production, a fabric of the citizens of tomorrow. The curriculum for preschool is therefore a testimony on today’s values as well as the presumptions about tomorrow’s needs” (*my translation*). The preschool curriculum can indeed be read as a condensed version of greater challenges of society as a whole. My intentions here are not to question either the beneficial potentials of education or the inclusion of the Swedish preschool in the general educational system. In Sweden this happened at the end of the 1990s and since then the debates on the tensions between care and learning have been frequent. There have been several arguments put forward by both practitioners and researchers against what has come to be known as the ‘schoolification’ of preschool. Professor of Pedagogy Critical to ‘Early Schoolification’ (*my translation*) is the title of an article in the Swedish daily newspaper *Sydsvenskan* in December 2008. Professor Ingegerd Tallberg-Broman said that children’s play must be a central part of childhood. Children learn through play and not through practicing reading and writing skills (Fjellman Jaderup 2008). To ‘let children be children’ and ‘safeguard play’ have become slogans against doing ‘schoolish’ things in preschool. One frequent argument is that preschool children are immature and introducing certain things too early may be counterproductive. However, it is also argued that there is a risk involved where things are not introduced or worked with soon enough and has implications for second language learners of Swedish and the democratic aspects of language (Strömqvist et al 2010). It appears that there are no easy answers.

In the Swedish trade union based journal for preschool teachers *Förskolan*, the Danish professor of pedagogy Dion Sommer says in an article from 2006 that “to teach preschool children to read, calculate and write has no long term knowledge effects. It only creates performance anxiety and fatigue” (Claesdotter 2006, *my translation*). The arguments against early schoolification have been influential in

² While this is written, a revision of the Swedish preschool curriculum is in progress. Apart from the inclusion of digital competence, the notions of ‘care’, ‘teaching’ and ‘education’ will be defined more clearly. A proposal for the revision will be completed in March 2018 (The Swedish National Agency for Education, webpage, 2017).

defining what Swedish preschool, as an educational (rather than a solely caring) practice should be, as well as redefinitions of the term 'teaching' when used in relation to early childhood. Despite this and the many voices of preschool teachers and others working in early childhood education who seek to safeguard an engagement of play and learning as preschool practice in its own right, there is a continuous struggle against policy documents and other political forces of society seeking a future oriented evidence based 'best practice' in preparing children for school.

In relation to the topic of this thesis, it is worth thinking about how this general orientation towards the future might affect early childhood practice, children's and teachers' everyday life, particularly when the future is predefined by standardized models or ideal pictures. In 2010 the preschool curriculum was revised to strengthen the requirements for preschool teachers to actively work with language and literacy in preparing children for school and lifelong learning. Once again, the curriculum did not indicate *how* preschool teachers were expected to do this, leaving room for a variety of possible interpretations. However, when preschool is seen as preparation for school, the association with traditional school-based literacy skills like reading, writing and numeracy, as well as with standardized versions of language(s) –familiar to anyone who has been to school – is not farfetched. As argued by Masny and Cole (2009), a lot of research has been done on school based literacy skills and how they are, technically, best acquired. More research is required in order to produce new productive insights into the pluralities and multiple aspects of different literacy practices (Masny and Cole 2009, 2012) and the situations where these emerge. What do we (or don't we) know about language and literacy if we unlearn standardized, school-based dimensions of it?

With the example of eating/speaking apple I have already stressed that thinking with a close, qualifying and sometimes conflictive relationship between things and words is crucial for this work and the reading of this thesis. Another way to phrase this is that the study of bilingualism in preschool in this thesis is conducted within a relational, *material-semiotic* practice. This means that physical and social aspects of the world, things and words, content and language, bodies and expressions are simultaneously and non-hierarchically associated. Material-semiotic relations are produced as symmetrical and attributive, in that it is impossible to say what comes first or last,

because the corporeal and the social-semiotic features of a specific practice are always potentially equally important, equally present, equally concrete and equally formal. Both things and words are as much bodies as they are expressions and it is through attending to the semipermeable line that both separates and merges them that my work on language and literacy with a bilingual early childhood educational practice evolves.

I tentatively assume that a good place to explore alternative dimensions of language and literacy is in a bilingual practice where most participants have not yet been to school and thus might, to some extent, relate to language in non-standard ways. Having said that, what is studied in this thesis are not the single participants' use of language but the bilingual situation as an entwined practise of things and words.

In the following I will define the aim of the research and the research questions. Thereafter, I will clarify the notion of *minor* as it works in the title and the rest of the text. Finally, an overview of the arrangement of the rest of this thesis is provided.

Aim

This thesis seeks to problematize standardized, systemic and future-oriented versions of language and literacy, including monolingually inclined and otherwise idealized models of bilingualism. I contend that this potentially clouds the vision towards presence oriented and material dimensions of language and literacy that could produce a different, more chaotic and messy, but also more varied and affirmative, version of bilingualism in general. I also examine the influence that the accepted versions of these phenomena have, both in general and specifically, on early childhood educational practice.

To interact with this problematization I install bilingualism at the fine boundary between things and words. By this I claim that today's standardized, systemic and school-based versions of language and literacy have dealt quite a lot with social semiotics but not so much with materiality and thus, they have overseen the physical presences of both things and words. Seeking to work at the boundary between these two is a way of approaching bilingualism in early childhood education by simultaneous and non-hierarchical corporeal and social measures. This means that rather than exclusively focusing on children or teachers as individual or social language users, the study accentuates

practices by which children as well as adults constitute one of many social and material equally important parts.

The aim of this thesis is thus to explore variations in bilingualism with the help of daily specific situations at a Spanish-Swedish early childhood institution in Sweden, and by means of a ‘material-semiotic theorizing’. The latter means that material and semiotic elements are treated equally, entwined and non-hierarchically. Through studying entangled practices of bilingual early education, theory and politics, this thesis produces knowledge on language and literacy as socially and materially divergent, transformative occurrences. To do this, the following questions are asked:

1. In what ways does bilingualism emerge in an early childhood educational practice?
2. What dimensions of language are at work in this emergence and how?
3. How do relationships of language politics appear within a bilingual early childhood educational practice?

Introducing *minor*

In closing this introduction, I will dedicate a few lines to clarify the notion of *minor* as it works in this thesis. Put simply, minor implies the focus on singular, unique language and literacy practices of the bilingual situations studied.

Being a study on bilingualism it is important to emphasise that minor should not be confused with minority, as in minority languages, which are related to a lower number of speakers of one language in relation to speakers of another language in the same social context. Minor in the sense that it is employed here, in working with a bilingual, Spanish-Swedish, early childhood institution in Sweden, has nothing to do with numbers or size. When Deleuze and Guattari (1986) discuss a minor literature as often emerging in some sort of bilingual situation, they do so because the bilingual situation provides good opportunities and examples of a ‘minor functioning’ of language, but not because of a minoritarian societal or contextual status of any of the

languages involved. Thus the status and numerical relationship of Swedish and Spanish in Sweden is not the main concern of this research. The way minor is described by Deleuze and Guattari (1987, 1986) and the way I employ it is in terms of variation within major standardized models of bilingualism. Such standards are frequently produced as an addition of two or more sets of languages with a name (in this case Swedish and Spanish). The relationship between minor and major is not that they are opposites. As put by Deleuze and Guattari:

“The minor and the major mode are two different treatments of language, one of which consists in extracting constants from it, the other in placing it in continuous variation.”

(Deleuze and Guattari 1987:106)

Thus, major and minor are different modes of language intimately related to one another. The minor mode is the continuous and inherent variation of any major generalisation, norm, ideal or standard.

In this thesis minor movements in the bilingual situations are all those unique examples of language and literacy that do not fit with the idea of a repeated standard. Whereas major is a model, minor is a becoming. In this thesis I discuss models of (Spanish-Swedish) bilingualism in terms of standardized versions, ideal pictures, bad portraits, etc. I treat these models as real in the sense that the phenomenon of bilingualism and the way it emerges in this thesis is related to these models or standards which also have certain material effects or consequences. However, and as put by Deleuze (1990), the majority is nobody since everyone and everything in the world is caught in becoming. Becoming – coming into being – is a process without a defined model or goal, since it works through continuous difference and variation in a specific, material and semiotic practice. The major mode or model of bilingualism is an abstraction of repeated similarities and experiences of sameness from such processes. However, such abstraction is always condemned to falsification. This does not mean that it is not true or valid, but that it is not materially *real*-ized as a movement of becoming. I will occasionally add the word *molecular* in relation to minor, which can further clarify the measurement of such real-ized material movements of becoming. Becoming is never large-scale but always molecularly minor as it happens in the singular and particular situations studied.

In working with this thesis towards a minor bilingualism, I choose to relate to majoritarian and standardized understandings of the phenomenon of bilingualism as well as of Swedish and Spanish as factual in the sense that these have social and material effects. In exploring the minor processes of becoming, emergent in different, singular and particular processes of language and literacy, major models do also play important roles. However, writing a thesis towards a minor bilingualism is a work with differences in their becoming. These are emergent in what will be described as three simultaneous, symmetrical and entwined practices of research. Emitted signs of language and literacy appear differently and come into a different being, as a part of Spanish-Swedish bilingual situations in early childhood education (an educational practice). Attending to and developing upon the material and semiotic differences of these signs is a sensible interaction of and with concepts (a theoretical practice) and concerns in producing bilingualism differently (a political practice).

Arrangement of the rest of the text

The rest of this thesis is arranged in three different parts. First, in *practices*, the entwined practices of education, theory and politics that altogether constitute this thesis are individually described and produced in their entangled and simultaneous relations with each other. In writing *practices* I also make connections with existing research related to the research questions.

In extension, the next part is *undertakings* which deals with the important actions related to ethics and research methodology produced in the interplay of the three main practices. The processes and products linked to these actions in the form of partial studies are also summarized in this section as condensed variations of undertakings.

Finally, *proposal* is an attempt to sum up and discuss how this thesis contributes to a movement towards a minor bilingualism. I formulate three temporal suggestions as elusive answers to the research questions. These suggestions create the potential to feed further thinking without attempting to arrive at firm conclusions about what a minor bilingualism definitely *is*.

Practices

Bilingualism is defined in this thesis through its continuous becoming in the relations of different but simultaneous and entwined practices. A particular bilingual educational practice, a particular theoretical practice, and a particular political practice guide the evolution of this thesis. This part of the text describes each of these main practices and by continuously producing the bilingual situation in the center of the text, I seek to provide concurrency and entwinement between them.

An educational practice includes a presentation of the specific bilingual early childhood institution in which the research evolves. A specific episode, the Peanut-poop moment, is worked with throughout this practice. This enables a glimpse of how myriad features are in constant interplay. Apart from an early introduction of fieldwork and data production, the episode also enables descriptions of the entwinement of different policies in the educational practice (language profile and curriculum). In relation to these policies I make connections with relevant existing research related to language learning and ideas of children's and adults' competence in early childhood education. I also connect with research related to the bilingual situation. The Peanut-poop moment furthermore sheds light on the central relationship between things and words, and in relation to previous research this produces a knowledge gap, which this thesis seeks to confront. Raised as the final part of this section, 'things and words' is also an opening towards the second main practice. What is brought up as 'things and words' in *an educational practice* comes back as 'a material-semiotic pragmatics' in *a theoretical practice*.

A theoretical practice works with an episode called the Bilingual moment and presents *sensibility* as a general principle for how I engage with theoretical concepts and the relationship *theory-practice*. The connection with *Deleuzio-Guattarian philosophy* and the foundational idea of connected assemblages is introduced as a source for thinking with theory-practice throughout this thesis. The association and attribution of things and words in connected assemblages is elaborated upon in what I label a *material-semiotic*

pragmatics where the point of connection with *Actor-Network Theory (ANT)* as worked with in one of the partial studies is also further clarified. Thereafter I discuss *different dimensions of language* and the possibilities of *sense*, as a material dimension of semiotics. In summing up *a theoretical practice*, I discuss a minor theorizing as a bilingual approach to theory, which enables diversified ways of experimenting in engagement with the bilingual situation, and producing bilingualism otherwise. This is also an opening towards the third main practice.

A political practice connects with the movement of languages over national borders and the implications and concerns of this for educational practices, specifically for early childhood education in Sweden. The requirements for working with bilingualism stated in the preschool curriculum and related dilemmas are brought up, as well as how the technical practices of measuring and controlling the work of single institutions are encouraged by political ambitions. Responsibility and possibilities in the bilingual educational practice for making alternative, transformative choices are discussed in relation to this. In connecting with *sense* as a material dimension of language, *murmurs of literacy* closes the section, in providing an example of this thesis' political practice as a minor politics of language in education.

An educational practice

When I started my work with this research project in 2010-2011, my interest in studying bilingualism led me to connect with a pre-primary early childhood institution in Sweden that followed the ordinary national curriculum for preschool but which additionally worked with an integrated Spanish-Swedish profile and a specific bilingual language policy. According to this policy, fifty per cent of the educators should speak Swedish with children and the other half of the staff should speak Spanish. The organization of teachers working in each class (year group) was planned to fulfill the 50-50% language policy which, according to the head teacher of the preschool, was to give the two languages equal importance and space. Children could choose whether to speak Spanish or Swedish but were also encouraged by the teachers to use the language used by the teacher.

In Sweden, institutionally bilingual preschools (cf. Swedish National Agency of Education 2013) are not very frequent. Connecting with this type of institution was related to my interest in language policy and politics which I thought would operate more explicitly within a preschool with an institutionally bilingual policy than in a preschool without such a policy. My own language competencies and academic background made me specifically interested in a preschool working with Spanish and Swedish and when connecting with the institution in 2010, I was fortunate that they were interested in receiving me and happy to help me with my work.

The details of the processes *in* and *off* field in my work with this institution will be further elaborated upon in the section on methodological undertakings. For this part of the thesis, I want to emphasize that the reasons for choosing to work with this particular institution are important, but the actual connection has been productive of a becoming of the study in ways that were not possible to foresee or plan for in advance.

A productive connection

I will further discuss the productive connection of the research in this particular institution, with the help of a specific instance from my time at the preschool in my yearlong fieldwork in 2011-2012. The data produced during that time consists mainly of video recordings and field notes. The episode I bring up here is composed as the Peanut-

poop moment and is constructed from the video recording of the situation and field notes related to the same situation:

The Peanut-poop moment

It was the afternoon and I was with the group with the four year olds. I was sitting with the camera in a room where one of the teachers and a few children were making drawings of elephants. Suddenly, one of the children asked the teacher if she knows what elephants eat. The teacher asked the child to tell her and he said they eat peanuts. However, the teacher did not understand what the child said since, differing from the rest of the conversation that is in Swedish, the boy said peanuts in Spanish, 'cacahuetes', and this teacher did not speak Spanish. She asked for the Swedish translation of the word but the boy did not come up with one and instead started to explain in Swedish, that it is something with a peel and you only eat what is inside. The teacher tried with banana but this suggestion was quickly abandoned when two other Spanish words for banana came up among the group of children, 'banana' and 'plátano', which are obviously not what the boy wanted to say. Suddenly the boy said that 'cacahuetes' means poop and when he said this he smiled at me. I think I didn't smile back because I was, as far as I remember, not quick enough to get the hilarious connection between poop and the initial part of peanuts' 'caca', the Spanish word for poop. When the teacher asked, surprised, if elephants eat poop with peel on it, the boy said they don't, because once again, they eat 'cacahuetes'. They did not arrive at an answer about what the word means in Swedish and the teacher said she would have to ask someone adult how to say it in Swedish. Nevertheless, she did not ask me and I did not say anything before she continued, saying that the boy might remember it later. The boy asked if one can bring 'cacahuetes' to the preschool and the teacher said that since she still did not know what it means, she cannot promise that he can bring it.

By describing the Peanut-poop moment, a situation produced during my work with this particular institution, I intend to provide the reader, at an early stage, with one out of many interactions with the bilingual educational practice as I have experienced it in my work. By constructing bilingualism in and as an educational practice, it emerges as heterogeneous, constituted by the relations of myriad different elements. Bilingualism in early childhood education is not a phenomenon of isolated separated entities. Even if it included them all, this is not a study of any single subject or object, whether it be a child, an adult, a teacher, a policy, a method, a mind, a word, a language, a translation, a drawing, a peanut, a smile, poop, or an element of

surprise. In this work, bilingualism as educational practice is a matter of inevitable heterogeneity that involves all of the above mentioned entities, and more, in tangled interplays with each other. Practice is continuously actualized through this multiplicity of entwined and dynamic relations, making moments, such as the Peanut-poop moment, possible.

Moments of difference and repetition

The Peanut-poop moment is one among different, what are called, 'moments of wonder' in this thesis. These moments are produced in the interplay of research in and with the educational practice and expounded upon in the writings of the partial studies (3 articles and 1 book chapter) and the present cover text. The processes by which these moments of wonder have become substantial parts of this thesis are described in more detail in the methodological undertakings section. It is, however, crucial to highlight the way by which these moments interact with the rest of the situations produced in the educational practice that are likewise part of the research.

The initial lines of description of the Peanut-poop moment, enables a glimpse of the process by which this happens where I, as a researcher in and out of the field, experience an entwined relationship of what I, with the help of Deleuze (1994), choose to phrase as *repetition* and *difference*. From my first attempt to establish a contact with the preschool in 2010 until the end of my fieldwork almost two years later, I paid frequent visits to, and spent a substantial amount of time in, the educational practice. During this time I also produced almost 60 hours of video recordings of the daily activities I joined. This, together with the re-involvement with the video recordings after this time, in what I will call *off* fieldwork, enables me, as a researcher, to abstract from this involvement a sense of revolving situations, or even some sort of an extensive orderliness of how different things regularly happened. I stress that this sense of extensive orderliness is a result of a research process where I as a researcher – initially new at the preschool – get familiar with and in the educational practice where the fieldwork was conducted. I do not intend by this to say that such orderliness was actually lived, or shared by others in the very same way. The abstraction of revolving, circular situations is a result of my own

entwinement and interplay within the practices of research (educational, theoretical, political) in this thesis.

As an example, the opening of the Peanut-poop moment is only one of many situations in which similarities can be abstracted and productive of a sensed orderliness:

It was the afternoon and I was with the group with the four year olds. I was sitting with the camera in a room where one of the teachers and a few children were making drawings of elephants.

Similar situations were frequently repeated in the fieldwork: myself with the camera in a room with a few children and a teacher doing something they did on a daily basis. Describing this as repetition is not to say that things always happened identically. Deleuze (1994) distinguishes between two sorts of repetition. The first form is extensive, ordinary and revolving, while the second is intensive, distinctive and evolving. Both forms of repetition are interdependent and related to one another through difference.

In the first form of repetition, difference emerges “between objects represented by the same concept, falling into the indifference of space and time” (Deleuze 1994:23). As I see it, it is a difference that falls into sameness as picked up within a concept that, in turn, turns difference into indifference. In the fieldwork materials, this form of repetition is produced through a sometimes conscious, and sometimes unconscious, labelling of different situations through their similarities in space and time. For instance, the Peanut-poop moment could be labelled as one of several different, but nevertheless similar situations involving practices of creation with pencils and paper: ‘drawing’. The initial lines of the Peanut-poop moment exemplify such additive, extensive repetition. While the situation was different from other similar situations in its uniqueness, its similarities to other situations made it productive of sameness and a sense of circular or extensive repetition, as well as indifference.

In the second form of repetition Deleuze (1994) describes difference as internal and as “pure movement” (Deleuze 1994:23). This repetition does not merge differences to produce similarities and sameness, rather, it is productive of difference in itself because it *makes* a difference. In the continuation of the Peanut-poop moment, its similarities to other situations of ‘drawing’ are somewhat eclipsed or shadowed by the difference of the moment in itself. Rather than further

adding to an extensive orderliness, the situation makes difference in that it produces variation:

Suddenly, one of the children asked the teacher if she knows what elephants eat.

From the question of what elephants eat, the rest of the Peanut-poop moment evolves with a value of difference, and rather than aligning its similarities with a circular sense of order or sameness, it is creative of rareness and novelty.

In my involvement with the educational practice *in* fieldwork and with the video recordings and field notes *off* fieldwork I thus experienced two forms of repetition: *extensive repetition* and *intensive repetition*. Extensive repetition produced a sense of sameness in the materials and similarities between all the unique and different situations of varying practices like ‘drawing’, ‘making pottery’, ‘book-reading’, ‘meals’, ‘nursing’, ‘games’, ‘free play’, ‘assemblies’, etc. In relation to the aim of the research, this kind of repetition provided me, as a researcher, with a sense of indifference. Rather, it has been through the questions and wonder produced by the situations of intensive repetition around which the thoughts and the writings of this thesis have grown. Nevertheless, it is imperative to also keep in mind that there is an interdependence between the two sorts of repetition and that the relation between them is constitutive of how moments of wonder emerge in this thesis. These are elaborated only as a few examples of situations productive of difference and variation in itself. It is, however, important that the functioning of these moments in the text is not in terms of their numbers but in terms of their qualitative interaction with the three different practices of research. The questions – the wonder – that emerge in the situations of intensive repetition are a product of the entwinement of the educational, theoretical and political practices, and as such it also emerges in relation to the indifference produced by the circular movement of extensive repetitions.

Entwined policies

There are two instances in the Peanut-poop moment that make it tune into different and perhaps merged policies: on the one hand the general educational policy of preschool in Sweden, and on the other, the

specific language policy of the institution. When the boy asks the teacher if she knows what elephants eat she straightforwardly redirects the question back to the boy without telling him whether she knows what elephants eat and, if so, what they in fact eat. There could be many reasons for this which I do not intend to examine, but this act, disregarding its cause, can be understood to harmonize with the undertakings of the preschool teacher, as stated in the curriculum for preschool (Swedish National Agency for Education 2010/2016). Redirecting the question to the boy encourages and challenges him to develop upon his own thoughts and ideas and to use his own language. Not providing the boy with an answer of her own is an act that is also specifically an idea of preschool as preparative for school: answering questions that others might already know the answer to is what school, in some ways, is largely about (cf. Heath 1982, Mehan 1979, Sinclair and Couthard 1975).

Furthermore, the act harmonizes with a predominant sociocultural model of learning, where the more competent participant – the adult – scaffolds the less competent participant – the child, towards own knowledge construction (cf. Bruner 1986). But in the Peanut-poop moment, this idea of competence also crosses another one when the child introduces another language that the teacher does not understand. This modifies her assumed scaffolding role. When the teacher asked the child what ‘cacahuetes’ means she really did not know what it meant, thus this question appears with different potentials in this practice, in comparison to the previous one. The situation triggered me to think about how the language policy of the preschool is entangled with the general educational policy in the curriculum, a factor that produces the educational practice in differing and unlike ways.

This was a way of trying to introduce several substantial aspects related to the different policies of this practice in one single instance. Before moving on, I will try to provide a more nuanced picture of this. With the help of previous research on children’s language learning that also involves different educational ideas of the competent child and the competent adult, I will shed more light on the two different policies as they might work in practice.

The competent learning child and the competent teaching adult(?)

In the Swedish preschool curriculum, emphasis is placed on play and social interaction as important for children's development, learning and "conquering of knowledge" (Swedish National Agency for Education 2010/2016:6, *my translation*). As discussed by Björk-Willén (2006) and Lindgren (2006), a romantic ideal of the free and playing child emerges in the curriculum as combined with a view of the child as competent and social (Björk-Willén 2006:28). The relationship between learning and language and learning as social interaction is further stressed in the program, which signals a sociocultural learning ideal. "Learning should be based both on the interplay between adults and children and on children's learning from each other. The group of children should be considered an important and active part in development and learning" (Swedish National Agency for Education (2010/2016:7, *my translation*). Interpersonal relationships are emphasized as a breeding ground for language learning and adults should engage in interaction with children to stimulate, challenge and guide children in their language and communicative development.

The curriculum obviously has bearing in modern research on children's language development and socialization. Sociocultural theories of children's language and learning influenced by Lev Vygotskij, have been put to work in various important research (Bruner 1986, Lave and Wenger 1991, Rogoff 1990, Wertsch 1991). In Sweden this perspective on learning in general has had its own front figure in Roger Säljö (2000), whose work has had a great impact in teacher education since the beginning of the new millennium. Similarly, a predominant perspective in multilingual educational contexts is systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday 1993) that highlights the importance of adult support and stimuli in children's second language learning (Derewianka 2004, Gibbons 2006, , van Eerde and Hajer 2008, Wong-Fillmore and Snow 2000, Schleppegrell 2004) as well as peer-learning (Cekaite et al. 2014). When it comes to language learning, the influence of sociocultural perspectives is a response to the previously narrowing focus on grammatical competence as studied within more traditional theories of children's linguistic development (Krashen 1982, Swain 1985). Sociocultural theories, as well as systemic-functional linguistics shed new light on other competencies that the child needs to develop, such as the ability

to use and produce longer texts as well as pragmatic competence such as the ability to adapt language to, and in, different cultural contexts (cf. Wedin 2011).

Within sociocultural theory emphasis is placed on the collective, social construction of these competencies in interaction with other persons in natural environments. As discussed by Gjems (2009), sociocultural perspectives' emphasis on the social can be understood as a response to other imperative approaches to learning focusing on the individual dating back to Skinner (1974) as well as Piaget (1952). Some sociocultural researchers have, moreover, been criticized for focusing too much on the environment and the collective, thus forgetting the individuals' effort (Gjems 2009). Interactional and socio-cognitive approaches (Nelson 1996) can be seen as a balancing of the collective and the individual perspectives, in focusing, for instance, on intersubjectivity and the details of dialogical processes as well as conversational activity. In studies on dialogue emphasis is placed both on its social, collective potentials for language learning and also on what conversational skills a child needs to acquire to be able to take part in conversation in the first place and eventually to become a full-featured participant in communicative activities (cf. Corsaro 1997, Ninio and Snow 1996).

Connecting back to the Peanut-poop moment and the different questions mentioned above, sequences of questions and answers between adults and children are one aspect of conversation that has been studied with an emphasis on the different learning potentials produced by the different ways an adult can approach these sequences (cf. Dalgren 2017). Building on Vygotskij, Hasan (2002) brings up assumptive versus prefaced questions as contrasting methods for adults' interaction with very young children. The latter approach is valued as less challenging and with less developmental capacity for children's speech since the question seems to indicate that the adult already knows the answer, and the child only needs to confirm it, thus requiring very little language use. The assumptive question instead invites the child into the conversation by showing an interest in the child's experiences and thoughts. It has been argued that if children are invited into conversation and meaning construction through the use of assumptive questions, they are offered not only the possibility to use and practice more language, but they might also experience that their

own contribution to conversation is important and that their voice is of value (Gjems 2009).

In the Peanut-poop moment the teacher's first question, where she redirects the question of what elephants eat to the child, can be read as an assumptive question. The second question, when she asks what 'cacahuetes' means is, however, not as easily categorized by this model. Whereas it could be argued that in this case, the teacher shows interest in what the child knows, the situation is different as the teacher has nothing else to rely on but what the child says. This seems to induce a conflict, where she is at once affirmative of what the child comes up with (do they really eat poop with peel on it?), but when not arriving at what seems to be a correct Swedish translation, she also says that she will have to ask an adult. Nevertheless, she does not immediately ask – even though there are several nearby adults who could help – and she says that the boy might remember it later. It looks like there are some particularities of this specific bilingual situation that might challenge conventional, socioculturally theorizing perspectives on the competent learning child and the competent teaching adult.

Before turning to these particularities of the bilingual situation, the general idea of distribution of competence in the relationship between children and adults in education in recent years has been further developed upon and problematized by both researchers and practitioners seeking to produce a more multifaceted picture of the child in education (Olsson 2009). 'Truths' about what the child is and what it must become are being deconstructed (Biesta 2014, Dahlberg and Moss 2005, Kohan 2015, Prout 2005) and different theories are put to work as a means of involving other faculties than the human body and mind and other relations and materialities than those that are conventionally thought of as social (see, for instance, Hultman and Lenz-Taguchi 2010, Hultman 2011, Murris 2016, Palmer 2016). In literacy research into early childhood practices there are a few examples of researchers putting similar, what I refer to as material-semiotic, ways of theorizing to work (see, for instance, Hermansson 2013, Kuby et al. 2015, Masny and Cole 2009, Olsson 2012, 2013, Roy 2005). However, when it comes to research on bilingualism in general, and more specifically in the early years, these are perspectives that are rarely developed upon (but see Bylund and Björk-Willén 2015, Dufresne 2006, Masny 2006, 2010). This is perhaps due to the fact that

research on bilingualism in the early years has traditionally been more focused on individual development and second language acquisition (see, for instance, Anderson 2004, Bosch and Sebastián-Gallés 2003, Döpke 1998, Paradis 2007, Tabors 2008). A range of studies, building on language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin, 1986a, b) also provide insights on bilingualism and second language learners in the early years with a broader focus on the social and cultural environment and its impact for acquisition and learning in educational contexts. Furthermore, as will be discussed in the next section, there are some studies dealing with specific bilingual interactional practices in preschool.

The bilingual situation

The language policy of the preschool, being a bilingual 50-50% approach means that half of the staff are expected to use Spanish and half Swedish in interaction with the children. The planning of policy primarily concerns the educators and can be understood as harmonizing with a traditional method frequently recommended for bilingual parents when raising bilingual children, known as the ‘one parent/person-one language’ approach (Barron-Hauwert 2004, Döpke 1992, Grammont 1902). The idea behind this method is that the adults close to the child speak different languages and each of them always sticks to speaking only ‘his’/‘her’ language with the child and thus avoids mixing languages. The intention of the method is to balance the input of each language so that the child will also (eventually) adapt to each parent’s/adult’s language, using the same language and thus creating separated, monolingual channels of communication. If the parent also speaks, or at least understands, the language of the other parent/adult, they can choose a more extreme application of the method and pretend not to understand if the child uses the wrong language and thus encourage the child to speak the right language. At the preschool in this study, children were not ‘forced’ to speak the ‘right’ language but teachers tried to encourage children to use the teacher’s language. The policy accompanies an idea of bilingualism as composed by two (or more) monolingual competences that are added together in one person. This idea is generally reflected in pedagogical contexts in Western countries where bilingualism is promoted (Jaspers 2011). Understanding bilingualism in this way is often described as

additive or separate bilingualism (Creese and Blackledge 2011, Gafaranga 2000) or as double or parallel monolingualism (Heller 1999, Holmen and Jørgensen 1997).

The fact that the language policy at the preschool is articulated and planned foremost in relation to the educators further harmonizes with research on educational language planning and policy management which often stresses the responsibility of the teacher as a modifier of children's language use (Shohamy 2006, Spolsky 2004, 2009, 2012). During the time I spent at the preschool the planning of policy to fulfill the promised numerical distribution of teachers speaking each language was a matter prioritized by the headmaster. At the same time different practical matters seemed to complicate this planning on a daily basis. An uneven total number of teachers working in a class, the challenge of finding substitutes (even more so one with the right language) when ordinary teachers were sick, as well as the layout of the preschool and each of its classes and how these influenced the organization of different groupings in time and space are some examples of this. Nevertheless, when policy was brought up among staff it was in relation to teachers' and children's language use. For instance, the importance of teachers sticking to speaking their mother tongue (or the language they were hired to speak) was emphasized in notes from staff meetings, and the fact that Swedish was the dominant language among children in both child-child and child-adult interaction was discussed as problematic in relation to policy. The practical, spatial, temporal or material circumstances were never held responsible for the way policy emerged in practice, rather, the teachers and children were. Furthermore, planning of policy was related to the teachers' speech but not to their understanding of the languages. The fact that all ordinary teachers understood Swedish but not all understood Spanish played a part in the way policy emerged in the educational practice. However, this was not explicitly considered in the planning of policy, which can also be related to practical circumstances as well as to the location of the institution in Sweden.

In conclusion, the way the language policy emerges at the preschool seems to be potentially constitutive of different and varying constructions of bilingualism even if it is based on an idea of separation. The very existence of more than one language at the preschool implies a 'risk' of the two languages figuring together, producing bilingual situations in unplanned ways. The fact that actual

language practices (Spolsky 2004) where several languages coexist seldom supports strict separation but reveals hybrid practices is not new and there are many examples of dialogical and interactional studies that highlight these hybrid practices and contest monolingual and structurally influenced understandings of bilingualism (Auer 1984, 1999, 2005, Blackledge & Creese 2014, Bailey 2007, Canagarajah 2013, Creese & Blackledge 2011, Cromdal 2001, Garcia 2009, Garcia and Wei 2014, Grosjean 1982, Jacquemet 2005, Jørgensen 2008, Rampton 1995, Wei 2011a). There is also a growing body of research that has put forward such hybrid practices in early childhood education (see, for instance, Björk-Willén 2006, 2007, 2016, Björk Willén & Cromdal 2009, Boyd et al. 2017, Grøver Aukurust 2004, Karrebaek 2010, Kultti 2012, 2013, 2014, Kyratzis 2014, Mourão 2012, 2015, Paugh 2005, Puskás & Björk-Willén 2017) and the Peanut-poop moment could also be analyzed as an example of this. What I turn my attention to in this thesis on bilingualism in relation to this specific early childhood practice is what was asked in the research questions in the prologue: I ask *how* bilingualism emerges, what dimensions of language that are at work, and how relationships of language politics appear.

In relation to these questions I am interested in how the Peanut-poop moment and the bilingual situation in which it was actualized seem to trouble established ideas of competence as related to both the child and the adult. The idea of an at all times competent adult as responsible for policy and in control of language use does not fit with the Peanut-poop moment, because the teacher did not exactly know what they were talking about. But the competent child did not emerge either, since the child was not capable of a reasonable translation to Swedish and adapting to the teachers' language use. Furthermore, the teacher seemed in doubt about whether to trust the child's competence or not. This unsure moment of doubt triggered me to think that there must be something more to it than just an adult and a child and the semiotics of two languages. And so I chose to develop this 'more' in writing from the boundary between things and words.

Things and words

The bilingual educational practice, with two different languages continuously figuring alongside each other was productive of a general

language issue. With this I do not mean to say that there was nothing specific to the bilingual situations of value or interest in itself or that the study could have been conducted equally well in a situation with only one language. On the contrary, the bilingual situations I experienced appear as specifically opportune for working at the boundary between things and words, and for studying the relationships that construct the practice as simultaneously corporeal and social, material and semiotic. On the one hand, the presence of two languages, Spanish and Swedish, and children and adults speaking them with very different levels of competency, produced a lot of translating practices as well as conventional treatments of language as signifying, representative systems. However, as in the Peanut-poop moment, there were also ruptures in these treatments that required a shift in focus and an exploration of a material and intense dimension of language.

The word ‘cacahuètes’ as it appears can of course be understood as representative of a specific snack – peanuts – that is not present. But this is external to the moment, since this specific translation is never actually done, and even if it is by me or by you as a reader, it is definitively not all there is to it. ‘Cacahuètes’ also relates in this moment, in more productive than reproductive ways to other things/words, like banana and poop as well as to a gaze and a smile. Thus, this specific educational practice enables disturbance by relationships that cut across both words and things, and balance in movements on the fine line between them.

In the moment where peanut means poop the momentary translation of peanut to poop is a rupture in the semantic rules of meaning between systemic or standardized versions of Spanish and Swedish. This rupture further opens up an opportunity to experience at the same time material and semiotic relationships that both establish and are produced by the connection between ‘cacahuètes’ and the Swedish word ‘bajs’ for poop.

Moments, such as the Peanut-poop moment, emerge in the process of this research as affirmations of a close material relationship between things and words, where words do not merely represent things, but where words and things may be attributed to one another in other ways and are equally, although in different ways, materially present. I will now turn to the second practice of research where the relationship of things and words will be further elaborated upon as a material-semiotic pragmatics.

A theoretical practice

There are obviously different possibilities for working with theory in qualitative research, and different embodiments of what could be referred to as operationalization of theory in academic writing. When writing about theory and seeking to give the reader a picture of how it is connected with this research – that is, how bilingualism within early childhood education emerges as theoretical practice – I have to produce what I call a language of theory, a narrative construction. I recognize that in formulating a specific section to write about theory – even if it is as a practice, with both entangling and clarifying intentions – there is a risk that the writing and the language in themselves end up abstracting theory to a distance from both problematization and the educational practice, giving it a life of its own, as if it was not always already part of these two from the very beginning. Hence, when narratively constructing a theoretical practice, I commit to mapping experimentation in contact with the real (Gough 2008) rather than locating or tracing the study in a space of predefined and distant lines of theorization. In seeking to operationalize theory as a practice that does not speak of another practice, but as a practice that only works in interaction with other practices in a mutually productive relationship (Lenz-Taguchi 2010, Olsson 2009), I will continue to produce the bilingual situation within these practices.

Accordingly, as a continuation of, and in interaction with, the previous practice, in the following section I seek to include theory as an existing, ever present part of the educational practice, the entwined policies or thinking practices, as well as of things and words. In this I also seek to produce theory as practice as an unceasingly theorizing practice. This is an alternative, varying, dynamic practice of multiple options. Rather than working with, and sticking to, fixed units of theory or previously defined clusters of theoretical concepts, theorizing alters thinking practices. This includes activating, falsifying and (re)producing concepts in interaction with the situations of the specific educational practice as well as specific political concerns. This will also be discussed a minor theORizing and a bilingual (cf. Deleuze and Guattari 1986, 1987) approach to theory in that it follows a principle of variation and continuation rather than unification and conclusion. In interaction with problematizing the phenomenon of bilingualism in early childhood education, language of theory-practice emerges as a bilingual story. What this bilingual approach to working with theory-

practice embodies in more exact terms will emerge within the following sections of writing.

For the following discussion I will introduce another episode from my time at the preschool. In interaction with the recording and field notes taken while this situation occurred I compose this instance as the Bilingual moment.

The Bilingual moment

It's one of the first days I am filming with this group. I am with a group of four or five children who are supposed to tidy up before going out to play. I put the camera on the table to help them and one of the children asks me if I am a new teacher. When I answer that I am not his next question is why I am here. I say I am here to see how they work at the preschool and, if they agree, to video record some of their activities. I say that I am interested in languages. He asks me if I speak Spanish, code switching from Swedish to Spanish as he says 'Pratar'u español'? I answer 'sí, y tú' [Sp. yes, and you?] He says 'sí' [Sp. yes] as another child asks me twice in Swedish if I have any children of my own. I say I have one little boy who is two years old. I say this in Spanish and the child who asked the question translates to Swedish 'han är två' [Sw. he is two]. The first child repeats the Spanish word 'dos' as a third child asks me my name. I say my name is Anna. Then the first child says: 'Vet du, min, min, min pappa, han pratar spa- han kan prata, han kan prata sueco å, å, å, å, å svenska' [Sw. Do you know, my, my, my dad, he speaks Spa- he can speak, he can speak sueco (Sp. Swedish) and, and, and, and, and Swedish]. The teacher, who has just joined us, and I laugh shortly and I repeat 'sue- sueco y, sueco y svenska' [Sp. Swe- Swedish and, Swedish and svenska' (Sw. Swedish)]. The boy affirms and I say 'qué bien' (Sp. how good!). The teacher interrupts by asking in Spanish what we are doing and explaining that the kids need to finish tidying up. Later on, the teacher explains that children often use the Spanish word 'español' when talking about the Spanish language.

I will use this episode in discussing a principle of sensibility of theory-practice in the next section.

Sensibility of theory-practice

In his article on material-semiotics and Actor-Network Theory (ANT), Law (2007) writes that to abstract theory and try to explain it in general terms is *possible*, and repeatedly done, for instance, in textbooks, but it is at once, and inevitably, a betrayal since "theory is embedded and extended in empirical practice, and practice is itself

necessarily theoretical” (Law 2007:2). Accordingly, writing about what a specific theory *is* in general and nonconcrete terms is always condemned to miss the point. Rather than a theory, a word that easily associates explanatory, foundational practices, the [actor-network] approach is better described as “a sensibility to the messy practices of relationality and materiality of the world” (Law 2007:2). In adopting this definition in the present work, theory as sensibility is, of course, also included as part of the same relational and material world. Otherwise it would still be a way of creating a distance between practices of theory and practices of the (empirical) world. It would be impossible to describe the completeness of messy interactions and relations of the world constitutive of theory-practice, but I will use sensibility as a working principle in the Bilingual moment, to highlight some aspects of this.

Sensibility as a working principle for theory-practice is useful in problematizing the divide that continues to separate theory on the one hand, and practice on the other, into a binary logic (cf. Lenz-Taguchi 2010). The art of theorizing easily slips into this binary in the same way that it slips into a series of other binaries that separate, for example: language from matter, the written from the spoken, the text from the context, the sense from the nonsense, the adult from the child, and the researcher as a subject from the researched as an object. I use the Bilingual moment to show how these binaries are always already challenged. It is indeed difficult to define any boundary between me, as a researcher, and the research object in this instance. Bilingualism as it emerges in this thesis is produced as much by the presence of myself taking part in practices of the researched. Obviously, I am at the preschool and able to form part of this moment for very specific research related reasons. My interest in bilingualism also makes me specifically sensitive to the specific *bi*-lingual ingredients of the moment, such as translation and other ways of switching between different languages, comments and questions about language, which are sometimes labeled together with the prefix of meta- (i.e. metalinguistic awareness). At the same time, I am part of the research object and practice is influenced by my presence, as I am drawn into talking about languages, my own language competencies, and my attendance at the preschool in the first place. Even if this was not always the case, and even if most of the time I had a more silent (which is not the same as passive) presence, this instance helps, in a

very distinct way, to shed light on the more general phenomenon and the impossibility of abstracting and separating the (theoretical or theorizing) researcher from the (practical or practicing) research object of educational practice. Rather these two co-occur as a whole in multidirectional sensibility.

The multi-directionality of this sensibility further emerges in that it is not exclusively *my* theoretical interests in bilingualism that makes the Bilingual moment a moment of as much theory as practice. Practice is already both theoretically and politically linked and impregnated with different bilingualisms. The idea of bilingualism as a valuable and desirable competence is there already, for instance, when the boy talks about his dad who can, as he wants to inform me, speak two languages. Code-switching, as a simultaneously practical and theoretical idea is also there, in the 'pratar'u español', with diverse potentials of thinking with it not only for me but for everyone taking part. The teacher's statement that children normally use the Spanish word 'español' when talking about the Spanish language is a sensibility to ways of theorizing already there. Accordingly, and as yet another example, when the teacher and I laugh at the child's statement of his dad speaking both 'sueco' (Sp. Swedish) and 'svenska' (Sw. Swedish) we practically unite in forming part of an already standardized, theoretically circular, and extensively repeated version of language(s) that is also part of producing bilingualism in this thesis.

All the instances composed as examples, scenes or moments that I have sometimes called 'empirical' in the work with the partial studies, are so only so long as the word empirical is used as always derived from practices of both education, theory and politics. The moments are not 'recordings' of a reality that exists, or existed, somewhere else, outside of research or in any pure sense of natural and theoretically untouched practice. Rather, the recordings that I made during my fieldwork are seen as constitutive of the moments, as much as these moments are constituted by a specific theoretical practice. This is as much an ontological, epistemological statement as an ethical statement and, as such, a theoretical practice of sensibility in multidirectional relations.

Furthermore, the statement continuously made in this thesis, that bilingualism in early childhood education is emergent from a penetrable boundary between things and words, can be paraphrased. Bilingualism in preschool is also emerging from a semipermeable

boundary between theory and practice. It is, moreover, at once both a theoretical, a practical and a political statement based on a specific, philosophical way of becoming with, in and of the world. In the next section I will continue to discuss which specific practices of thinking that emerge from this becoming of bilingualism.

Connected assemblages as a slippery source for thinking with theory

In *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research*, Jackson and Mazzei (2012) describe a “language and way of thinking methodologically and philosophically together” (Jackson and Mazzei 2012:vii). The authors describe thinking with theory as a means of directly ‘plugging in’ theory to data. Apart from criticizing traditional forms of data analysis within qualitative research, which are seen as reductive of complexity, this is also an approach to merging theory and method and doing away with theory as foundational in favor of a theoretical practicing. Hence, in working with bilingualism in preschool as theoretical practice, I adopt the method of thinking with theory as described by these authors. Like Jackson and Mazzei (2012) my thinking with theory is inspired by a Deleuzian approach to philosophy. According to Hardt (1995), the major contribution to philosophy made by Deleuze is his substantial descriptions of the rhizomatic entanglements between philosophy and the work and creation of everyday life, where everyone is a philosopher (cf. Colebrook 2002). This contribution to philosophy has also turned out to be a productive source for a variety of educational studies (see, for instance, Semetsky, 2013, Semetsky and Masny, 2013).

Accordingly, the theorizing practice of this study can further be described with reference to Gregoriou (2008). When writing about a minor philosophy of education and the motives for the mourning of philosophers of education, he states that the Deleuzio-Guattarian concept of the rhizome is not to be represented but implanted in theoretical thinking. The effect these philosophers aim for, Gregoriou writes, “... is not the understanding of the rhizome but its’ functioning, the enabling of a whole apparatus that connects disparate, linguistic and non-linguistic things” (Gregoriou 2008:98).

When I adopt the statement that everything happens at boundaries (between things and words, between theory and practice) it is a means

of thinking and writing with the philosophy of Deleuze (1990, 1989, 1986) and his co-works with Felix Guattari (1994, 1987, 1986). It is important that the idea of a boundary in itself is also productive of a binary judgment. It has been argued that Deleuze and Guattari's thinking is a, somewhat paradoxically, logic of dualisms. In Deleuze and Parnet (1977/1996) Parnet criticizes the way Deleuze and Guattari seek to challenge old binaries, by, as she claims, introducing new binaries. For instance, when questioning the linguistic idea of the growing, arborescent tree and its internal dualisms, and favoring the alternative of the rhizome, this is just a proposal for yet another dualism. Parnet argues that language is relentlessly "locked into dualisms, and just by adding a third or a fourth term, one does not do away with the binary" (Stivale 2003:28). Her alternative is to use the multiplicity inherent to the 'AND' between the two opposites. This can nevertheless, as argued by Stivale, also result in yet another binary productive method when occupied with the dividing rather than the merging properties of the AND. Turning toward the collective assemblage of enunciation is a strategy of thinking otherwise that might be – due to the limits of language – as dependent on binaries in its description but not as productive of them in its functioning

. Thinking with the idea of expressions as collectively assembled as well as connected and attributed to bodies, that is the diagrammatic description of connected assemblages in Deleuze and Guattari (1987) has been productive throughout this thesis. Thus, in the following I will briefly resume this philosophical idea as a source for the theory-practice of thinking in this work.

In *Postulates of Linguistics (A Thousand Plateaus)* Deleuze and Guattari (1987:75-110) make some conclusions on the nature of assemblages:

"On a first, horizontal, axis, an assemblage comprises two segments, one of content, the other of expression. On the one hand it is a *machinic assemblage* of bodies, of actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another; on the other hand it is a *collective assemblage of enunciation*, of acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies. Then on a vertical axis, the assemblage has both *territorial sides*, or reterritorialized sides, which stabilizes it, and cutting edges of *detrterritorialization*, which carry it away." (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:88).

The collective assemblage of enunciation and expressions is connected to the machinic assemblage of bodies not in any kind of representational or embodying or causal way since it is an attributive relationship of ‘incorporeal transformations’. As argued by Deleuze and Guattari (1986), the [machinic] assemblage does not produce statements as a collective subject. The statement or the expression is always itself :

“an assemblage of enunciation in a process that leaves no assignable place to any sort of subject but that allows us all the more to mark the nature and the function of the statements, since these exist only as the gears and parts of the assemblage[s]” (Deleuze and Guattari 1986:84).

When I problematize bilingualism in preschool as a theoretical practice it is by constantly plugging it into this idea of connected assemblages. The boundary between things and words, which I frequently pull into writing this thesis, emerges in this theoretically practical relation to connected assemblages. The potential to connect disparate linguistic and non-linguistic phenomena results from the matter of all life that is a red thread through the works of Deleuze and Guattari. The close relationship between things and words is foremost a matter of matter, since matter has the potential to appear both as form and content, expression and body. There is always a form of the body and a body of the form but this does not make things and words all the same. It is however to move too fast to say that the form of expression reflects the body of content or that the body produces the form, and establishes internal order between them. The relationship between expression, form and words with content, bodies and things is not as obvious and much more complicated. It is adhesive, horizontally attributive as it moves in several and *a priori* non-hierarchical directions.

Furthermore, the constant movement and productivity of the assemblages on the vertical line (that simultaneously separates and merges non-linguistic actions and passions with linguistic acts and statements) implies and enables change both in the constant creation of multiple variations of language and as a political potentiality. The latter will be further elaborated in the third main practice in terms of a minor politics.

The idea of connected assemblages and how they function is not effortlessly grasped, and consequently, even more challenging to

briefly sum up as I intend to do here. Nevertheless, in my reading of Deleuze and Guattari's works I have come to the conclusion that this is what makes their philosophy make *sense* (cf. Deleuze 1990) as a slippery source for productive thinking with theory-practice. Hence, rather than opening up for explanations of the meanings of different ideas and concepts, the slipperiness opens up possibilities for doing pragmatic readings and connections in experimenting with the potentialities of concepts as they are put to work in practice. In the following I will elaborate on this in what I call a material-semiotic pragmatics.

A material-semiotic pragmatics

In *Postulates of Linguistics*, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argue that pragmatics is not, as within traditional linguistics, to be placed as a branch or a discipline among other branches and disciplines like phonetics, lexicology, grammar, semantics, etc. Pragmatics is rather to be an omnipresent principle of language since the connection of assemblages troubles any distinction between text and context. Deleuze and Guattari write that "there is a primacy of the machinic assemblage of bodies over tools and goods [and] a primacy of the collective assemblage of enunciation over language and words" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:90). But the perpetual interaction of the two assemblages makes the variables of content (tools and goods) inseparable from the variables of expression (language and words). When language is treated in terms of code as 'abstract machine' (a phonological, syntactical, semantic machine) it is capable of producing variables of content as the signified and variables of language as signifiers. Deleuze and Guattari argue that the problem is that the abstract machine of language is not abstract enough since it does not pertain to the diagram of assemblages in its entirety:

"We get nowhere until the pragmatic, but also semantic, syntactical, and phonological determinations are directly linked to the assemblages of enunciation upon which they depend."

(Deleuze and Guattari 1987:91).

Problematizing an idea of language as code and representation is part of how the interaction of theory-practice in this study has contributed to produce the moments of wonder. When, in several fragments from my fieldwork, the relationship between expression and content seemed

often not to fit into familiar logics of representation or signification (like in the Bilingual moment above, when the boy states that his dad speaks ‘sueco’ and ‘Swedish’) I searched for alternative ways of working with this relationship.

The connection of assemblages, as described in Deleuze and Guattari’s writings, has been one of the crucial entries into working differently with the relationship between words and things. These authors describe this relationship as chromatic, amalgamated and asynchronous. There is an attributive, continual, mutual and reciprocal passage from the machinic assemblage of bodies to the collective assemblage of enunciation. Their interdependence is characterized by a parceling distribution as they both slip into and introduce themselves to the other by intervention. Together with the incorporeal transformation attributed to bodies, as brought up in the description of the assemblage above which can be related to the productivity and performativity of language, Roy (2008) discusses corporeal transformation as yet another transformation that occurs between language and bodies. The corporeal transformation picks up on the materiality, or the body, of words themselves. As previously described, the assemblage of enunciation speaks at the same level as the assemblage of bodies. As stated by Roy (2008) “the enunciation is more than just a linguistic phenomenon; it is a body confronting other bodies” (p. 165) and “while it is a material confrontation, [content and expression] ceaselessly pass into each other” (p. 166). Deleuze and Guattari, arrive at what they call ‘a generalized chromatism’ that places elements of any nature (linguistic or non-linguistic) in continuous variation. They argue that there is no need to make prior, principled distinctions between different elements since

“[p]lacing elements of any nature in continuous variation is an operation that will perhaps give rise to new distinctions, but takes none as final and has none in advance” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:97).

This last quote describes the association with another important entry of this study in seeking to practice the relationship between expression and bodies differently. This is the material-semiotic relationality applied within ANT as already introduced in the introduction to the theoretical practice when referring to Law (2007). The enterprise of placing elements of any nature into the same line of variation and

following the transformations that occur, at the same time as material and semiotic relations building this line, is picked up within ANT (Latour 1999). The analytical language of ‘translation’ and its implied ‘principle of general symmetry’ (Callon, 1986, Callon & Law 1993) emphasizes the importance of not making an a priori distinction between different elements and thus using the same language for all the elements (actors/actants). Law writes that both Bruno Latour and John Law himself explicitly note the points of connection between ANT and the nomadic philosophy of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. “Latour has observed that we might talk of ‘actant-rhizomes’ rather than ‘actor-networks’ and John Law has argued that there is little difference between Deleuze’s ‘agencement’[‘assemblage’] and the term ‘actor-network’” (Law 2007:6 with reference to Law 2004). Without a complete or concluding comparison or search for equivalences between nomadic philosophy and ANT (an enterprise that would, indeed, be working with theory at a distance, and thus cutting off any theory-practice sensibility) I will, for now, agree to state that these are two different entries that I have made in the process of this research and that they are both capable of producing similar relational, onto-epistemological research practices.

A material-semiotic relationality as practiced within ANT does not speak explicitly about language with references to linguistics, as is the case in Deleuze and Guattari (1987) (even if Latour (2000/1993), in his text on the Berlin Key, draws on Austin’s performativity (1962), as do Deleuze and Guattari 1987). Nevertheless, reading Latour (2005) Callon (1986) and Law (1999) as well as different productions with ANT within a range of educational and childhood studies (for instance, Fenwick and Edwards 2012, Hultman 2011, Stenliden 2014, Prout 2005) have been productive in generating bilingualism in early childhood education as theoretical practice, perhaps specifically since these are studies that do not deal with language (language learning) in the first place. The more general reworking of the social, the troubling of and undoing of boundaries between the human and non-human, meaning and materiality, big and small, social and technical, enabled when practicing ANT, have helped in putting pragmatics to work in this thesis as a general principle for both bodies and language, as well as to differentiating code as only one aspect to language.

In discussing communication and language as abstraction (code) in relation to Postulates of Linguistics, Roy (2008) concludes that

language *also* does function sometimes as code. But supposing there is nothing else but code to language is a misconception. In the following I distinguish some variation among principles of language in discussing four possible dimensions.

Different dimensions of language

A material-semiotic pragmatics in the present study is produced alongside as well as in interaction with other principles that guide the way language is generally thought of and worked with. At the time when Deleuze (1986, 1989) wrote *Cinema 1* and *Cinema 2*, in the mid-1980s, structuralist, modern linguistic models based on Saussurian semiology still influenced film theory and the scientific approach to the cinematic sign (Dawkins 2003). Deleuze claimed that the structuralistic approach reduced creativity and the possibilities for thinking, and instead he declared “a real, material element of the image that is meaningful in its own right” (Dawkins 2003:155). In Deleuze and Guattari (1987) matter is put forward as the material element of all life, and as such also the general principle of all expression. A sign, thinking with Deleuze and Guattari, is consequently a matter of materiality.

As discussed in Taylor (2013) Saussurian semiology is one of two main approaches within the science of signs. For Saussure, semiology is based on a dyadic relation between the expression (the signifier) and the underlying social, cultural or unconscious structure (the signified). This makes of interpretation the practice of an independent subject, uncovering the signified, underlying the signifier.

Quite differently a triadic semiotics was claimed by Charles Peirce in studying the triangular and intensively material relations between the sign, the object and the interpretant (Taylor 2013, Dawkins 2003). As discussed by Dawkins, Deleuze was attracted by the semiotics of Peirce specifically because of its claim of a material reality of the sign other than its linguistic value (Dawkins 2003:160). The interpreter in the triadic relation is not the user of the sign independent of their relations but can be described rather as a concept that expresses the relationality of the meaning of the sign (Taylor 2013 with reference to Fiske 1990). Thought, in this philosophical reasoning, is also an extension of matter as it works or acts intensively through

perceptual/affectional contact with the rest of the world. Dawkins writes that:

“[f]or Peirce, all thought and formalized expression is based on the *interpretation* of an existing stimulation. Yet this stimulation is never known, it is only given, meaning simply that *what we know is based only on what we get*.” (Dawkins 2003:161).

I find these glimpses of Peircian philosophy together with the more conventional Saussurian semiology helpful in that they open up for variation in thinking about language, reference, meaning and interpretation. Among other things, this is what Deleuze (1990) presents in his series building up the *Logic of Sense*. He writes that *sense* is a fourth dimension of language that is needed as a complement to other dimensions described within traditional linguistics. His writings indeed involve quite an amount of critique on traditional linguistics, a critique that is also very explicit in *A Thousand Plateaus* where he, together with Guattari, and in line with many other articulated voices at the time, challenges Noam Chomsky as a representative of systemic, representational, universal models of language. Nevertheless, as far as I can see, the nomadic philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari is also dependent on the critique in itself in building up a contrast yet the same time enabling multiplicities of different accounts.

In my reading this is the case when Deleuze (1990) describes *sense* as a fourth dimension of language. *Sense* is not aimed at doing away with or replacing other dimensions, but rather as a way of opening up language for further variation. First of all, *denotation* is the extension of a concept. It includes all the different phenomena that a concept can refer to ‘in real life’. The denotation of a concept is the process by which it indicates a state of affairs. For instance, denotation of the word ‘bilingual’ implies its potential indication of all different persons, situations, practices, institutions, policies, books, films, schools, etc., in the world. Related to denotation is what is sometimes called ‘connotation’, which interplays with denotation in being the abstract definition of a concept that you can find in a dictionary. *Manifestation* is the subjective dimension of language, the relation of a concept or an utterance to an active subject, as in ‘*she* spoke to her mum in two languages’. The relation of the subject to the act of speaking two different languages manifests the person, perhaps as competent in two

languages or perhaps as incompetent in both of them or perhaps something completely different depending on situation. *Signification* is a conventionalized logic and a universal conceptuality of language that links to both denotation and manifestation together. If a person is bilingual they speak more than one language and a person who speaks only one language is not bilingual. Quite differently, *sense*, as a materially intense dimension of language breaks with conventional, universal logic in that it is sensitive to the given stimulations of a specific state of affairs. Sense is produced in the materiality of expression itself and in its connections with other materialities. Thus, bilingual, bi-lingual, BILINGUAL, (bi)lingual, bi(ling)ual or bi-bi-bi-bi-lingual are sense-productive in different ways dependent on their extensions and connections with different elements – bodies and other expressions – in specific settings or, as put by Deleuze, with different *sense-events*.

Returning to the Bilingual moment I will use one of its expressions to help with describing how the four different dimensions of language as in *denotation*, *manifestation*, *signification* and *sense* might enable different statements and or questions. The expression I use for this purpose is when the boy tells me:

‘Vet du, min, min, min pappa, han pratar spa- han kan prata, han kan prata sueco å, å, å, å, å svenska’

[Sw. Do you know, my, my, my dad, he speaks Spa- he can speak, he can speak sueco (Sp. Swedish) and, and, and, and, and Swedish].

With denotation, I might conclude that speaking ‘sueco and Swedish’ is a state of affairs that can be related to an external or underlying phenomenon of bilingualism. With manifestation, the boy claims or demonstrates an underlying competence of bilingualism of which he might as well include himself indirectly in his relation to his father. Nevertheless, there is a slip of the tongue (or is it not?) that somehow troubles denotation and manifestation and, most definitely, signification. Universal principles and referential logic of language have difficulty explaining or making sense of how one claims to speak both Swedish and Swedish. Rather, it produces, as was the case here, laughter and then you move on. It looks like both the bilingual situation and the possible tongue slip, turns the whole semiotic relationship inside out. If you speak Swedish AND Swedish, are you then bilingual or monolingual? This is obviously a nonsense question,

which urges me to move on to the fourth dimension of language that is sense.

Working with Peirce's triadic semiotics, as adopted by Deleuze, allows the engenderment of the boy's statement as an event that is sense productive. This requires the material sounds in 'sueco' and 'svenska' as well as in the stammering of 'å, å, å, å, å' to be perceived. Pulling these sounds or these signs into the same line of variation as the variables of matter in the entire web of relations where this statement is enabled, permits a different kind of meaning: sense. Sense is produced outside the parallel meaning defined by the possible relationships between the signs and the underlying (social, cultural, universal or perhaps unconscious) structure. Rather, sense is an effect of the material encounter between different sounds coming together differently. Thus, sense enables a perhaps more affirmative and perhaps more curious reading of the non-sense of someone's dad speaking 'sueco å å å å å svenska'. And it opens up for bilingualism being produced in various, different, not only separated or flexible ways, but also merged, confusing and surprising ways. This brings me to finalizing this part of the text on bilingualism as a minor theorizing practice in terms of a bilingual approach to theory.

A minor theorizing: a bilingual approach

The bilingual situation is described in Deleuze's and Guattari's writings (1986, 1987) as a specific opportunity for treating language intensively by setting the major language in continuous variation: a becoming (minor). Here, I bash the concept of a minor or even bilingual theorizing rather than a monolingually distant and monologically abstracted major language of theory. I have already described sensibility and material-semiotic pragmatics as guiding principles for the work of theory-practice in this thesis. The bilingual approach of a minor theorizing picks up on these principles as it can be described as continuously being sensible to the potential of different languages of theory or philosophy in the encounters of research. Gregoriou writes that:

"If philosophers of education are bilingual, it is not by mixing, intermingling or bridging the languages of the disciplines into a comprehensible discourse which educators can understand or perhaps join; it is by creating an unformed philosophical expression, which in pedagogy's encounter with philosophical ideas sustains a

field of experimentation, a field that is non-translatable against the barren rationality of representationalism.” (Gregouriou 2008:107)

I read this as a minor and bilingual approach to working with theory-practice that seeks to experiment with different philosophical or theoretical languages or concepts in contact with the real. This is not about translating different concepts into each other and making them inter-comprehensible but, rather, a theoretical and practical process of variation and a creation of what could always be otherwise. Alternatives and possibilities are seen as simultaneous and amalgamated.

This opens up the possibility to play with the word theorizing as theORizing. As previously discussed with reference to Stivale (2003), the dualism of language is not escaped or solved by just adding a word like AND or as I do in this word play with OR. Both ‘and’ and ‘or’ have dividing and merging qualities. ‘And’ is additive whereas ‘or’ is alterative but both are synchronizing conjunctions and, as such, they tie other words or concepts together while simultaneously keeping sight on the variation that they provide. As conjunctions both ‘and’ and ‘or’ require more than one option. They might, but mustn’t, add more than two. Thus, their functioning does not per definition escape binaries or dualisms inherent to language, which is sometimes a problem, but more importantly, they do avoid the exclusiveness of only one monological option. Thus, theORizing as a bilingual approach is a way of further describing the sensibility of theory-practice as a working principle in this thesis. Theory cannot, in such a sense, be described as one predefined and pre-labeled tool kit since what works and becomes in the relations of theory-practice is the result of encounters and experimentation that provide a multitude of theORizing pathways of which little can be said before carrying them through.

I now turn to the third practice of this research. The choice of different theorizing pathways and of producing bilingual versions of bilingualism is the practice of a (minor) politics.

A political practice

Since 1940, immigration to Sweden has been higher than emigration. The highest number of immigrants to Sweden was recorded in 2015-2016, primarily due to refugees from the Syrian war seeking asylum (Statistics Sweden 2017). In 2016 1.7 million people, around 16% of the Swedish population, were born abroad. Prior to 2014, the majority of immigrants have always been people born in Sweden or Swedish citizens who previously have emigrated. Since 2014, this group is the second largest group of immigrants after Syrians (Statistics Sweden 2017)

Flows of people in the world are connected to the flow of languages. In an article written by the Language Council of Sweden for the webpage of the Swedish Institute (Svenska Institutet), Sweden is described as a ‘nowadays’ multilingual society (Swedish Institute 2017). Apart from Swedish and the five official minority languages (Finnish, Sami, Meänkieli, Yiddish and Romani) there are almost 200 other languages spoken in Sweden. Some examples are Albanian, Arabic, Greek, Kurdish, Persian, Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian, Somali, Spanish and Turkish (Swedish Institute 2017). Spanish is an important immigrant language in Sweden due to an influx of refugees fleeing Chile’s Pinochet regime between 1973 and 1990. The approximate number of native speakers of Spanish in Sweden is 75,000 (Parkvall 2016). Spanish has also gained a specific status in Sweden as the second most common foreign language taught in Swedish schools, after English (Statistics Sweden 2017).

Since 2009 Sweden has had a language law (Swedish Parliament 2009:600) that aims to safeguard both the Swedish language and linguistic plurality. The articulations in the Swedish curriculum for preschools harmonize with this idea of protection of Swedish on the one hand, and other mother tongues on the other.

In a recent local newspaper article a woman was presented as an immigrant refugee to Sweden, educated as a language teacher, married to a Frenchman and working with second language learners of Swedish. The title of the article was Language is the Key to Integration. When searching for the article on the web with the title in Swedish, I got 97,000 results related to the topic and hundreds of published newspaper articles from recent years with the same headline, as well as some hundred more where the logic is reversed: integration is the key to language. Not surprisingly, language is an extensively

debated issue in relation to migration. The woman in the article tells that she and her siblings quickly came to grips with the Swedish language when they came to Sweden as young children whereas it took her parents a longer time. This is a story that repeats itself. Anecdotal evidence suggests that immigrant children often learn the new language more quickly than their parents do. From this, however, the general conclusion that children learn new languages like sponges is often drawn. This is a myth that has been repeatedly killed off in different research (Lindberg 2002) but still makes its way through, for instance, in discussions I have had with students in preschool teacher education in relation to the undertakings of the curriculum. Nevertheless, it seems as if teacher students are struggling with the HOW-questions for bilingual development. How to “contribute so that children with a mother tongue other than Swedish have the possibility to develop both the Swedish language and their mother tongue?” (Swedish National Agency for Education 2010:7). How to deal with this burden of responsibility?

Responsibility

As discussed by Runfors (2013) there is a general tendency in Swedish preschools for staff to feel great responsibility and pressure when it comes to children’s language and communicative competence and making children ‘ready for school’ (Runfors 2013:139). Furthermore, she states that the curriculum for the preschool is an expression of political visions about what preschool *should* be. This effectively makes Swedish preschools target-oriented institutions where the responsibility for moving towards the objectives is moved from politicians to the preschool staff, where the staff are expected to make the politician’s visions come true. What is more, Runfors concludes, “the goals emerge as much less problematic at the policy level than in everyday preschool practice. Thereby one can say that overarching political questions are put in the knees of the hired staff” (Runfors 2013:148, *my translation*).

During the autumn of 2016 a project was initiated by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate aimed at evaluating 35 Swedish preschools’ contribution to the language development of bilingual children “as much as possible” (Swedish Schools Inspectorate 2017). The project’s main question was whether the preschools worked to support bilingual

children's language development³. This overall question was broken down into two partial questions: 1) Are there bilingual children's language development strategies and prerequisites at the preschool?; and 2) Does the preschool create possibilities for the enhancement of bilingual children's use of both Swedish and their mother tongue(s)? The evaluation was made by inspectors visiting the preschools and observing daily activities, interviewing preschool teachers, other staff and principles and assessing documents provided by the preschools.

For the purpose of producing bilingualism in preschool as political practice it is of relevance to think about how this specific evaluation, and similar evaluations contribute to producing bilingualism in preschools in certain ways and disabling other ways. The questions raised by the inspection imply that bilingualism is something that does not concern children that have Swedish as a mother tongue, and perhaps even more importantly, that bilingualism is yet another goal to be assessed. One might ask, in the first place, what it really means to contribute to someone's development "as much as possible"? Importantly, due to the way that these questions are formulated, they have the potential to make preschools and preschool teachers busier producing formal documented strategies that can be easily observed from the outside, than attending to how bilingualism is continually produced in different, evasive ways that are perhaps not even possible to grasp from the exclusive point of individual development.

When it comes to language use the question raised is too simplistic as there are only two possible answers, either you do or you don't enhance children's speaking. There is no question addressing the qualities of the language use or the actual knowledge or shared competence among staff for attending to and working with a linguistically and physically multifaceted, impregnated and entangled messy practice, which continuously challenge general, standardized and normative models. Thus, there is a risk with the evaluation per se due to its potential to produce feelings of guilt, blame, pride, success or fatigue, and, more importantly, its tendency to cloud the vision and other senses to variations in what is actually going on.

³ The Swedish Schools Inspectorate (*Skolinspektionen*) provides supervisory and quality auditing activities as well as advice and guidance as to what a school needs to rectify on the basis of the requirements of legislation (skolinspektionen.se).

Choices

Dahlberg and Moss (2005:2) write that “there is more than one way in which [institutions for children and young people] can be thought about and exist. They confront us with choices”. Dahlberg and Moss criticize the predominant, naturalized view with deep historical roots, of these institutions as sites for technical practice, which seek “the best methods and procedures for delivering predetermined outcomes” (Dahlberg and Moss 2005:2).

The goal orientation of the preschool curriculum and external assessments (of which the Swedish Schools Inspectorate project is one) are examples of such technical practices. Olsson (2009) relates the way these technologies seem to be working to what Deleuze, in his work *Difference and Repetition* (1994), calls “orthodox thinking”. Such thinking is reproductive and circular in that it seldom enables seeing anything new since what is to be known or thought of, what is often referred to as meaning, is defined in advance (Olsson 2009:96-97). This technical practice could be understood as one way of dealing with the chaotic, heterogeneous and messy practices of life that constitutes any educational reality, but it is a runaway method, that “installs thinking in a safe place” (Olsson 2009:97).

As an alternative to early childhood institutions as technical practices, Dahlberg and Moss suggest “the institution as a locus for ethical and political practice” (Dahlberg and Moss 2005:2, see also Reimers and Martinsson 2017). This is a source of inspiration in producing bilingualism in preschool as political practice and which simultaneously links to a Deleuzio-Guattarian understanding of a minor politics (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) and “molecular revolution” (Guattari 1995a). In *Chaosophy* when talking about molecular revolution Guattari states:

“Changes do not have to come about from large scale socio-economic conditions. All these systems [of organization and hierarchization] leak from inside, as systems of defense, but also as systems of mutation. Molecular mutations do not always assert themselves on a large scale, and they must be gauged differently in the short term. But this does not mean that they do not exist. We do not have the same relations to reading, writing, images, space, sex, the body, the night, the sun, pain, as we only had ten years ago. Profound and irreversible mutations are underway in all these areas.

In other words, the molecular substratum on which all large social collectivities are inscribed has become a sort of bubbling soup [...]”
(Guattari 1995a:47)

In conclusion, Guattari argues that the molecular and the social-global levels of political intervention are impossible to separate from one another. Molecular mutations thus carry great potentials for change and even liberation. The messiness of entwined polices, and other heterogenic at once material and semiotic occurrences by which bilingualism as educational practice emerges in this thesis, can, with help of the Guattarian writings above, be furthermore described as a bubbling, machinic as well as molecular soup. Through this, I will, in the following, get back to discussing and problematizing Runfors’ (2013) statement above that with the goal-oriented curriculum the responsibility for making politicians visions come true is put in the teacher’s hands.

With inspiration from Guattari (1995b), Olsson (2009) argues for a paradigmatic change in relation to educational political-ethical practices in the early years. By viewing life as collectively creative it is possible to move from technical instrumentality, predefined results and effective methods towards intensive and unpredictable experimentation (cf. Taubman 2009). Furthermore, working within what is called an ‘ethical-esthetical paradigm’, as a teacher or researcher, is an ethical and political choice. It involves ethical and political responsibilities and requires creativity and taking responsibility for what is created (Olsson 2009).

The teacher’s responsibility for realizing politicians’ visions can, from the perspective of early childhood education as technical practice, be seen as a burden, particularly when the vision involves what seem to be contradictory goals. As an alternative, from the understanding of practice as creative, it can be seen as a possibility. This might include preschools and preschool teachers making their own original interpretations and policies in relation to the undertakings expressed in the curriculum, but this is not my main point. My principal concern is that the responsibility is first and last collectively constructed and can only be ethically defined and defended, in sensible interaction and experimentation with the real. The preschool curriculum, even if it is the result of large scale political decisions, it becomes connected with other policies and decisions, ideas and thoughts, things and words in the interplay of practices. All the continuous and unpredictable,

material-semiotic encounters that this implies are, in one way or another, creative and transformative. Thus, any definite conclusion, or even intention to arrive at a final answer, will pull early childhood practice back into technologies and instrumentalism. As put by Olsson (2009) this gives ‘us’ quite a lot to do.

To be able to perceive and attend to molecular movements of transformation and thus enable the possibility for something new to be thought and created, teachers and researchers need to continuously escape the impact of ‘orthodox thought’. This is indeed tricky since it requires a simultaneous becoming *with* the constitutional movements of orthodoxy as well as a moving away from them in attending to that which eludes its presences. Reimers and Martinsson (2017) discuss how political subjectivities are also possible under the hegemonic repetition of (neoliberal) normative thinking. Norms – a form of orthodox thought – are never stable, rather they are transformative as they come into being by repetition in plural and messy assemblages. There is always something that escapes a standardized repetition because repetition always involves movements of difference. Both in the descriptions of the *event* made by Deleuze (1990) and writings on *lines of flight* in Deleuze and Guattari (1987) the philosophers emphasize the importance (political, ethical, linguistic) of attending to that which eludes the present, that which flies in between fixed positions ephemerally and that might, at a first sight, make completely no sense at all. A political practice defined as a minor politics is a way of producing bilingualism in early childhood education in concerning what it is, as a phenomenon, continuously escaping.

To summarize, I will return to the language legislation implemented in Sweden in 2009, which is aimed at safeguarding both the Swedish language and Sweden’s linguistic plurality. What this means is not clearly stated (Swedish Parliament 2009). In fact, the law has no specified language planning intentions. This, as with the law harmonizing parts of the preschool curriculum, can be read as vague, confusing and lacking management. Conversely, and at the same time, it can be read as a beautiful crack that opens up for creativity and experimentation. What if no one really knows what it means to safeguard Swedish language and linguistic plurality? What if this is yet to be invented? What if the flows of people and languages that pass through the world as well as through educational practices provide fantastic opportunities for exploring this?

Before closing this part of a political practice I will turn to the discussion of literacy as a concrete example of the politics of language in educational practices, and how listening to murmurs of literacy in a bilingual situation may be a way of doing things and words otherwise.

Murmurs of literacy: a minor politics of language

Sense, previously discussed as a material dimension of language and the understanding that words and bodies pass into one another, is also the point of engagement that I take with literacy⁴. The reason for raising literacy in relation to politics, as I do here, is due to the political debates around the phenomenon in recent decades. If it were not for the impact of the very notion of literacy in relation to schooling, I would perhaps have seen no reason for bringing it up as anything additional to language as it emerges in the practices of this research. However, I find it of value to clarify the connection to literacy that this thesis may have, in order to contribute to a differentiation of the debates specifically in relation to early childhood education.

When Colebrook (2012) discusses the work of Deleuze in relation to literacy, she writes that it is perhaps foremost an engagement with illiteracy. If aiming to arrive at an answer for how increased literacy levels are best achieved in societies and how literacy skills such as reading and writing are successfully acquired, such affirmative engagement with illiteracy might seem untimely. I have nevertheless chosen to align my work with a Deleuzian approach to (il)literacy, using the same argument employed by Roy (2005) in his work on the relationship between sense and nonsense. Engaging with (non)sense and (il)literacy is a means of nurturing a discussion that moves beyond best practice of basic literacy acquisition and (re)explores different or new variations of language use and bilingualism. Thus, rather than providing any specific answers for how children learn to read and write or otherwise function properly with a world of texts (important skills I do not intend to disvalue), this thesis' warrant to literacy is different. It provides some insights on the potentials of a greater commitment to a world or a life of stories yet unknown. For this, it is considered less

⁴ In Article 3 I discuss the concept of biliteracy. The engagement with literacy is related to the bilingual situation with which the entire study is conducted. In this section I choose to discuss literacy in general terms, in seeking to avoid a jungle of prefixes.

relevant to start from or arrive at a definition of what literacy is, whether it be: 1) a set of autonomous reading and writing skills; 2) the application of these skills in relevant ways in situated practices; 3) an active and broad-based learning and sense-making process; or 4) as texts in terms of multimodal and socio-political communicative practices. Of greater value, for this study, is to focus on the corporeally and linguistically entwined practices and *sense*-ual processes where various aspects of literacy – impossible to define in advance – emerge and come into being in diverse material and semiotically unforeseen ways. In other words, it is an (il)literate approach in that it requires an exploration of the unknown.

The four different understandings of literacy described above are categorized as such in a paper on international literacy statistics from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2008). In connection to these four understandings the organisation also brings up what has come to be known as *New Literacy Studies*, NLS (Gee 1990, Street 1996, Barton 1994, Barton and Hamilton 1998), a field that emphasises the local, practical, everyday experience of literacy in particular communities. NLS, however, is not included in UNESCO's categorisation, since it is argued that these scholars' "unfinished business" concerns, among other things, the clarification of the definition of the concept of literacy and how to deal with the limits of the local. Above all, it is stated, "they need to show how these insights can be incorporated into findings, measurements and comparisons that can be useful for policy" (UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2008:26).

It is not surprising that an organisation whose aim is to provide measurements and international comparisons provides such critique. There is no doubt that distinct definitions are required to measure, assess, generalise and compare. There is a risk, however, as argued by Masny and Cole (2009, 2012) for instance, that if this transforms into a goal in itself, the concept of literacy – as well as the way it is worked with in educational practices – gets narrowed down to defining only that which can be measured. The problem with this, I argue, is not so much the potential reaffirmation of, for instance, technical reading and writing skills – these are probably also important – rather, it is its potential to cloud the visions for parallel, entangled and – even if not measurable and perhaps not yet invented – equally important aspects of literacy. In this I share the view of Roy (2008) who writes that it is not upsetting that language is sometimes treated as code: "[t]he trouble

starts when we *equate* language and code. That is, when we lose sight of the ongoing slippages and interchanges between the order of things and the order of words” (Roy 2008:168). He calls these slippages and interchanges an ongoing activity of differential murmurs and, building on Deleuze (1994) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987), his critique of mainstream education concerns its illusion of the very existence of apolitical language and unproblematic communication (Roy 2008:160). As put by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), grammar rules are not only syntactical, they are also political in that they produce hegemonic linguistic practices of communication. Such practices gloss over differential murmurs and suppress alternative knowledge (Roy 2008).

When I choose to attend to what I could also call differential murmurs in early childhood in terms of literacy, it is through a belief that random and unforeseen encounters and interchanges between things and words in this specific bilingual educational practice can bring about such alternative knowledge and thus expand the concept of literacy. It is important to emphasize that by this I do not intend to shed light on any sort of specific childhood literacy. It is by no means an approach towards a future literacy nor is it a way to authorize or price childhood literacy in its own right. The whole idea of any kind of childhood literacy inevitably creates a fiction that even if childhood literacy might (eventually) have something to do with adult literacy, it is never the other way around. Such fictions risk blinding educators and researchers to pure movements of real literate expertise from which adults, as well as children, can learn.

The word ‘literate’ in English (also to be found in other languages) carries a historically broad definition that refers to a person who, perhaps due to a lot of reading, is well educated, learned or knowledgeable. I find it fruitful, in relation to my work here, to temporarily align with this thought. To become literate, the basic, and perhaps technical, abilities of reading and writing are definitely required as well as a greater engagement with previously unknown parts of the world. Such engagement does not come about through mere decoding. An affective relationship with texts that triggers motivation, imagination, curiosity, openness, (im)patience, (dis)pleasure, criticality and creativity is certainly also needed.

In choosing to discuss (il)literate educational spaces or practices rather than persons and attending to the murmurs of literacy in these

bilingual spaces, I have been inspired by Multiple Literacies Theory, MLT, as developed by Diana Masny (Masny 2006, 2010, 2011, Masny and Cole 2009, 2012). Among plural approaches to pluralizing literacy in past years, MLT is an entry that does not stem from how a rational human subject engages with texts. Rather, MLT analyzes reading as a minor becoming and as such, a heterogenic activity and a collective, productive, differentiating engagement with things and words.

Deleuze (1995) discuss two different ways of reading a book. The first is about seeking to explain, understand and interpret the book as a signifier, thus, it is to treat language as code. The second is to plug into the text and attend to what that physical encounter in space and time produces. Bilingualism as a minor politics involves listening to murmurs of literacy and engaging with those unforeseen encounters and stories yet untold. It is believed that through this something new may actually be learned.

Undertakings

In *practices* I describe education, theory and politics as simultaneously productive practices of bilingualism and of this research. This section, which I call *undertakings*, is an extension of the previous ones concerned with the ethical as well as methodological processes and acts in the interaction of the three main practices. This makes any sharp distinction of method from theory (as well as from the educational practice and politics) impossible. *Undertakings* is structured in three sections as follows:

Ethical undertakings includes a discussion on this research in relation to its inclusion of very young children. I bring up general research ethical recommendations and seek to problematize, in relation to my research, specific roles ascribed to children in relation to competence, vulnerability and control. Moreover, I discuss the importance of a critical stance towards different conceptualizations of children in research and of avoiding research practices that may cement children's position in society. I finally argue for the ethically defensible potential in studying the becoming (child) of a bilingual situation rather than individual children.

Methodological undertakings is a presentation of the extensions and intensifications of data production as a continuous work both *in* and *off* field throughout the entire process of this research. Starting with the *in* fieldwork methods, extending to analytical *off* fieldwork procedures and finally to the intensifications in the writing process, I seek to describe the undertakings of theory-method in interaction with the previously outlined practices of research.

Summaries of the partial studies are included at the end of this section. The partial studies can be seen both as the results of the undertakings and the undertakings themselves since they constitute condensed variations of the acts and processes of this research as a whole.

Ethical undertakings

In discussing bilingualism as a (minor) political practice I have connected the study to what has been labeled an ethical (and esthetical) paradigm. I now turn to discussing the research ethics and seek to do so by continuing to problematize bilingualism in preschool as a collectively creative phenomenon. Research ethics can easily be treated in abstracted terms as a generalized ethics produced by a set of principles, laws, rules and guidelines that anyone conducting qualitative research needs to follow in one way or another. Nevertheless, there are different ways of doing this. The ethical guidelines for research within the social sciences and the humanities as formulated by the Swedish Research Council (2002) can and might tend to be treated in many studies as a mere checklist (Aarsand and Forsberg 2010). Thus, it seems as if the guidelines are productive of acts and statements in forms of different documentations primarily aimed at demonstrating that the researcher has done what they should in accordance with requirements. I believe, however, that this is not all there is to it and that the ethics of research are also always specific and unique to each project since they are working with its particularities. In the following I will describe how what could be phrased as ethical undertakings are applied when working within this thesis, and how, as they are part of a political practice, they are transformed in this process.

Research practices involving young children

Linköping University's Ethics Committee approved the application for my dissertation project in 2011. In evaluating the project the committee concluded that the risks associated with the research were small/very limited in relation to the value of possible results for both preschool practices in general and for the research community.

In continuation, I will turn to a broader discussion on research ethics in relation not only to the question of getting access and thereby being able to work with my project together with a specific educational practice, but also in relation to other practices which are part of producing the project in intertwined ways. I consider the committee's approval as just one initial opening to the further work with the research project. Ethics are continuously produced in relation to a

principle of mutual sensibility in the interactions producing the project as it is conducted. Below I will highlight some aspects of competence, vulnerability and control when doing research with children.

Competence

The question of children's competence is central to the notion of informed consent. All research involving children under the age of 15 is required under Swedish law to inform parents or other legal guardians of the research and requires their written consent.

I worked with the informed consent procedures in this study as follows. Information letters (see appendix) were written based on the ethical guidelines for research within the social sciences and humanities formulated by the Swedish Research Council (2002). One letter was directed to legal guardians of children attending the preschool I was interested in working with and another to the staff. The information provided included the initial aim of the study and the planned shape of the fieldwork and how and by whom the produced materials would be used and stored. The voluntariness and anonymity of participants were pointed to. A consent form was attached to both letters. I distributed one Swedish and one Spanish version of each letter at an initial parent meeting at the preschool where I introduced the research project and myself. Thus the information was expressed in both an oral and a written form. Parents and staff also had the possibility to contact me by e-mail or telephone before deciding to participate in the project. The completed form could be handed in to me in person or sent by post. I also provided information on how I, as a researcher, was going to proceed in the event that someone did not want to participate or did not want their child to participate in the study.

In relation to children's competence, even if informed consent from parents/caregivers is obtained, children are to be informed of the research in a way appropriate to their age and research could not be conducted if a child chose to oppose participation (CODEX). This somewhat more informal agreement by children to research is sometimes referred to as 'assent' (Morrow and Richards 1996). Grouping 'children under the age of 15' is assembling a wide range of age and other differences. It is clear that information needs to be adapted differently depending on the age of the participants. When it

comes to very young children, under the age of 5, as is the case in this thesis, it is questionable to what extent it is even possible to adapt information at all, and/or to what extent the adapted and transformed information still can count as valid. Children might be unable to oppose participation because they are cognitively incapable of understanding what the research, in abstract terms, is about even in a very simplified manner, or they might oppose participation for the same reason. So is it possible to conduct ethical defensible research with this group? Are there any research strategies that are fair and respectful to very young children aged 1-5 years?

The (new) sociology of childhood started to develop in the 1990s that switched the focus from child development and socialization to the here and now of children in experiencing their lives. Discussions on children's agency and being (as opposed to becoming adults) have emerged from this field (see, for instance, James and Prout 1990, 1995) and can be historically understood in relation to the acceptance of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989. Since then a significant body of research has emerged that seeks to study children's lives in their own right and creating voices of children within research rather than only about them. In this one can find a strong democratic argument for doing research involving very young children, since it might contribute to conceptualizing children as competent members of society whose experiences are important.

In discussing age related competence in consenting or assenting to participation in this research project, what is at stake is the study subject's ability or disability to understand the information given. The validity of the consent must therefore relate to what consent is given to. Morrow and Richards (1996) state that competence to consent is not defined only by chronological age but also by context and the object of the consent. Thomson (1992) argues that consent to participation in research should be regarded "an interaction of the child, the context and the nature of the (decision-making) task" (Thomson 1992:60).

Here a distinction between research practice in the field on the one hand, and the broader sense of research, specifically research results, on the other, is required. Understanding consent as *in* field interaction is useful in relation to the fieldwork conducted in this thesis. The nature of the decision-making task could be said to be more or less concentrated into being willing or not to interact in specific instances

during my time at the preschool with the camera I used as well as with me as an adult who was not part of the ordinary staff. This (un)willingness was expressed by children both verbally and bodily, where the latter was more dependent on my own sensitivity to, and interpretation of, these expressions. This is perhaps not completely unproblematic since such sensitiveness and interpretations in turn require a more personal relationship between the researcher and the children. The fact that situations in which assent to participating was not obtained from all children were more common at the beginning of the fieldwork than later on might be due to the fact that in the beginning we were strangers to one another, and where in doubt I preferred not to take risks. As I spent more time at the preschool with the children I got to know them better and it became easier for me to read their expressions. This process must also be understood in terms of a transformation of myself as a researcher as well as of the camera in the field: from the initial stranger to a well-known, although perhaps somewhat strange, adult participating in everyday practice at the institution. Another aspect of this process was that talking about the concerns of the research with the children, and explicitly asking for permission to, for instance, use the camera in different situations, seemed to become almost irrelevant or superfluous over time. Oliver (2010) discusses the possible benefits of this in relation to obtaining naturalistic data in ethnographic studies and of not causing any 'disturbance' in the everyday lives of the research subjects. However, even if this could be considered ethical research practice, the difficulties of children giving consent/assent to the broader extensions of research remain. Nor are these difficulties related only to age. More developed cognitive resources might enable thinking about research in more abstract terms but are no guarantee of completely informed consent, not only because of the impossibility of predicting the results of research, but also because information always transforms.

Given that children are considered a vulnerable group in need of protection, the general ethical recommendation (CODEX) is that if research could be done with another group then it should be. This is not an unproblematic view on children in relation to ethical concerns in research. The assumption that children are always potentially vulnerable and research is always potentially harmful is a reasonable starting point, but to conclude from this that research involving children should always, if possible, be avoided is a potentially

undemocratic simplification. Morrow and Richards (1996) discuss the possible negative effects of what they call an overprotective stance towards children, for example by reducing children's opportunities to participate in research meaning that various aspects of children's lives remain unknowable.

Assumptions about children's potential vulnerability in research can be related to children's vulnerability in general, which is due to physical weakness and lack of knowledge and experience in relation to an adult centered world. Lansdown (1994) stresses that children are also structurally vulnerable because of their lack of political and economic power in society, which is often motivated by the general (biological) vulnerability. Problematizing these two aspects of vulnerability in relation to one another reveals a cementation of children as vulnerable by definition: emphasizing one kind of vulnerability (biological) creates another kind of vulnerability (structural) (Lansdown 1994). I believe this is a cementation that operates in both directions and it is important to both recognize children's potential vulnerability and to stay critical to how my own research might function as productive or neglectful of children as vulnerable. However, I find the a priori assumption of children as vulnerable by definition problematic in relation to my research in this thesis.

Vulnerability

Research subjects' vulnerability might be related to their lack of competence in processing abstract information about research but this does not mean that incompetence and vulnerability are the same, as competence per definition does not make one completely invulnerable in research. In the research project discussed here, and also generally within the social sciences, research subjects' lives or physical health are not in danger, and vulnerability could rather be related to unexpected outcomes of the research on the one hand and to unpredictable situations in the process of conducting ethnographic fieldwork.

Aarsand and Forsberg (2010) deliberate that in many video ethnographic studies involving children and adolescents the principle of respect for the person and protection of the individual is treated as a mere checklist and that ethical dilemmas in the field are very narrowly

discussed. The authors stress this as problematic as they argue that ethics is something created and negotiated in the relation between informants and researchers which requires a great deal of reflexivity from the researcher both during and after fieldwork. I chose to work with video recordings of different situations during my fieldwork. This is a method that captures both audio and visual data from a wide range of different unpredictable mundane situations. I reckoned this was a method that would help me in dealing with language as an entangled both material and semiotic phenomenon in everyday activities. Even if the interest of the research is centered to language related aspects of these situations, children, teachers and I had to deal with the fact that there are multiple of other aspects intertwined with this. Preschool is a public institution, but getting access to preschool practice is getting into personal relationships and sometimes, private spaces. Doing research in preschool is navigating at a border between the private and the public. Many situations in preschool are homelike, including children's physical nakedness and emotions. Doing ethnographic fieldwork in such a setting includes the potential for very intimate situations becoming an object of the scientific apparatus. What is more, what is an intimate situation that should not be included in research and what isn't may not always be obvious and might be related to differing personal values.

Research practice is thus more complicated than can be encompassed by ethical guidelines and how to define vulnerability is not always clear. Aarsand and Forsberg (2010) write that the scientific apparatus is always a part of the studied phenomenon and that privacy can be produced by the apparatus itself. Here, from an ethical perspective, privacy is to be understood more in terms of dignity than of autonomy. The authors argue for considering the possibilities for gatekeeping in the interaction of ethnographic research:

“By negotiating [] privacy *in situ*, by producing a private space, participants – researchers, adults and children alike – are able to be gatekeepers who can control what becomes and does not become an object for the scientific apparatus.” (Aarsand and Forsberg 2010:265).

Hultman and Lenz Taguchi (2010) bring up some significant problems in relation to what is often referred to as researcher's reflexivity. With reference to Barad (2007) they argue for the impossibility of a reflexive stand point since the researcher can never position

themselves at a distance from the studied phenomena. Even if this is a relevant point, Aarsand and Forsberg (2010) argue that reflexivity cannot be abandoned and is of crucial importance throughout the research process and for developing research methods and practices that are ethically apt and defensible. In this project the mentioned critique of reflexivity is understood in terms of questioning a traditionally individualistic and generalized approach to ethics and responsibility. In contrast, from an ethical-political standpoint (Guattari 1995a, b, Olsson 2009, Dahlberg and Moss 2005) ethics and responsibility are rather to be seen, as discussed in relation to a minor political practice, as an integral part of multiple at once material and semiotic relations that continuously create the world together. It is a relational ontological, epistemological, and not the least an ethical viewpoint, where responsibility is not positioned within a superior human research subject, but where responsibility must be taken as forming a part of the continuous and differential becoming in the world. Following on from this, ethics and reflexivity are considered in the present study as produced and reproduced in the continuous interactions of producing bilingualism in preschool as entangled with its different practices (educational, theoretical, political). Research ethical issues are viewed as becoming within a range of complicated and intertwined relations upon which I, as a researcher, can impossibly be on top of, but with which I crucially need to seek interaction in performing a responsible research practice.

Control

Doing research involving children, as has been discussed previously, might involve considerable democratic aspects, since it can be a way of giving voice to a marginalized group and including children's experiences in the production of knowledge. It is important, however, to also consider that this is an argument that can be used in favor of other political aims. As in the case with the actual project, the political aspects of language are considerable. Some of these can also be related to the problem of informed consent. In the present study, the gatekeepers (headmaster, teachers, parents) for the children's involvement were generally positive about the research project. This could perhaps be related to the general importance given to language in Swedish curriculum and to the specific educational focus on

bilingualism at this particular institution. A research project focusing on bilingualism in preschool was generally perceived as something good for both the institution and the individual children. The polemics of language as previously discussed might create expectations of specific outcomes from the research project. This might in turn have played a role in the generally positive and optimistic approach to my project and to the fact that the process of getting informed consent from staff and parents was not a struggle. In discussing the potential empowering effects of research I have therefore kept in mind that, depending on the research outcomes, these can be used for different political aims that might sometimes be out of my control as a researcher. However, this makes it even more important to consider from what standpoint children are studied, and which conceptualization of children informs the way this research is conducted. In closing up this part of the text I therefore turn to a further discussion on this as well as how becoming (child) has been a productive concept in working with children as just one of many different entangled parts of practice.

Conceptualizations of children in research

Morrow and Richards (1996) write:

“the methods that we use, the research populations and subjects that we study, and crucially the interpretation of the data collected, are all influenced by the view of children that we take, and there are obvious ethical considerations to this” (Morrow and Richards 1996:99).

In encouraging researchers to engage with the diversity of childhood these authors argue for a view of the child as ‘social’, comparable to any adult involved in research, but with specific competencies. This can be used as an argument in favor of some specific methods, using, for instance, participatory models that involve children in evaluating data in which they are themselves a part. This argument might be of relevance in relation to certain objectives and aims of research. However, as a general recommendation for social research involving children it might be somewhat problematic to argue that children as research subjects per definition require certain methods. This might contribute to a further positioning of children as a group being essentially different from adults. One could argue that choosing

methods in relation to the aims of the research in the first place, no matter the age of the involved subjects, could, at least sometimes, be a more democratic approach.

As has been previously outlined and discussed, in the present thesis the aim does not point to a study of children in an exclusive manner, neither as a group nor as individuals. Rather it is to study a practice of which children constitute one of many important parts. In discussing research ethical concerns in relation to children's participation in the study, children inevitably emerge as more salient than other important parts of the same practice. Related to this is that the emphasis put on children's agency and specific competencies generated, for instance, within the (new) sociology of childhood, might have somewhat clouded the vision of how children's and adult's agency alike are always already connected and intertwined with other active parts of the world. As put by Hultman and Lenz Taguchi (2010) with reference to Lee (2001), an alternative approach to the debate about children's incompetence or dependence in relation to adults is to "turn our attention to the supplements and extensions that the children, just as adults, constantly connect to in different ways" (Hultman and Lenz Taguchi 2010:531), that is, a method that treats children and adults in the same way.

The discussion on agency in childhood studies has been further inspired in the past decade by different relational ontologies. Childhood sociologist Alan Prout (2005) argues for letting these perspectives be further elaborated to deal with the complexity of future childhoods and to study "everyday life in terms of [its] heterogeneous assembly or the manner in which children form alliances with other entities and through which their agentic powers are created" (Prout 2005:116). As discussed by Olsson (2009) an approach to studying a practice as a relational field instead of individual children could be considered as ethically more defensible in the sense that it produces individuals as part of collective processes and arrangements thus rendering both competence, vulnerability and control as decentered phenomena (cf. Olsson 2009). In the next section, I will further elaborate on the concept of childhood in relation to this decentering view and the importance of this in relation to the writings of this thesis.

Becoming (child)

Childhood is often thought of as a transient stage on the way to adulthood. When Deleuze and Guattari write about children it is sometimes in a romanticizing manner that, as discussed by Hickey-Moody (2013), risks contributing to a conservative picture of children as essentially different from adults. She discusses how the potential vulnerability and difficulties of the position of children in society might be obscured by such a conservative and romanticizing image. At the same time this might be a risk worth taking considering that this view also opens up for thinking differently about childhood in itself.

Thinking about childhood not only as a fugitive stage of life but more as non-teleological (Hickey-Moody 2013), omnipresent and collective possibilities and potentials, opens up for attributing the exclusiveness and particularities of childhood not to age, but perhaps, to the non-teleological becoming inherent in the collectiveness of situations, words and things. Childhood, or 'becoming child' is for Deleuze a matter of fluidity or a means of 'occupying a revolutionary space of transformation' (Kohan 2011:342). As with all becoming, becoming child is a minoritarian becoming that escapes standardized and majoritarian unifying models. To 'idealize' childhood as a potentiality inherent in words and spaces opens up for a different ethics in relation to children in research, which is also political since it addresses a question of power.

When, for instance discussing processes by which language change occurs, spaces of early childhood – where such processes might be going on as much as anywhere else – seem to be excluded. Language change is discussed among youths, adolescents and sometimes among foreign speakers of any language. However, language spaces involving young children keep foregrounding learning and fixing language as a future goal. This way the vision for the dynamisms of language itself in these spaces is repeatedly clouded. Any experimentation and new shaping of language among young children is not accounted for as a potential part of language as it counts elsewhere, but classified as an exclusive and perhaps amusing part of a process of language learning. In this thesis on bilingualism, working with practices involving children – by means of age – is not due to any conception of children as more natural or primitive. Rather, it is a political approach in that it takes bilingualism, as it emerges in these practices, as equally (un)real and (un)important as elsewhere.

It has been discussed that children in comparison to adults generally, are perhaps “not yet completely stuck within orthodox thought” (Olsson 2013:251). One possible way to think about this is that due to age children have a more limited experience, in comparison to adults, of living in a world of fixed-bound categories (cf. Hultman 2011). This is possibly the case but it is likewise possible to argue that children, despite a more limited time in this world due to age, are perhaps the one group in today’s society which is most frequently categorized according to age. From the moment a child is born – or even from the moment of conception – expectations of physical, psychological and linguistic development and behavior are neatly ordered in line with weeks, months and years of life. The moment a child enters this world, she also takes a first footstep on one of many predefined stair steps of childhood towards adulthood and in so doing she might fit into that step in more or less smooth or violent ways. Thus, to say that children are not yet completely stuck within fixed categories might, once again, be producing children and adults as different and opposed, and of cementing childhood as an age bounded classification.

I have chosen to approach early childhood educational practice as a potential revolutionary space of transformation. This is not primarily because it involves children, but rather due to the unknown paths produced between fixation and fluidity that any material-semiotic practice produces, and the options to follow these paths open to anyone taking part. If children emerge as more often involved in experimentation along these paths, it might be of value to address the circumstances, the webs of things and words involved in where it happens, rather than quickly falling back to age-related conclusions. Sometimes, a smaller body might provide a different perspective, a thinner finger might not resist the hole where it fits and less overall responsibility might ease the mind. However, these are not individual or age-related aspects, but emerging circumstances in a becoming in the world. Becoming (child) is seen throughout this thesis as an inherent possibility in the collectiveness of the bilingual situations produced in time and space and in their relations with things and words.

Methodological undertakings

This part of the text discusses the methodological undertakings put to work in producing bilingualism as a phenomenon in this thesis. These undertakings include production of data *in* fieldwork, the extension of data production and other analytical procedures in what I call *off* fieldwork, as well as the methods of further extension and intensification into written text in form of the four partial studies and this cover text. My aim with this part of the text is to discuss the physical, spatial-temporal engagements of children, teachers and myself with each other as well as with the more- or other-than-human materialities (localities, facilities, rooms, camera, pens, papers, furniture, books, doors, food, table games, beads, paint, songs, pencils, etc.) forming equally important parts in the makings of research.

Furthermore, the undertakings described are a way to highlight the dynamic processes of thinking with theory or ‘putting theory to work’ as a theoretical as well as simultaneously methodological entry point. Thinking with theory is a way of plugging theoretical concepts into data, but this description is too simple. What needs to be added are the impact and the importance of the constant back and forth movements between ‘data’ and concepts (cf. Mazzei 2010) which make it impossible to establish any hierarchical or chronologically neat order in the arrangement of method-data-concepts-theory. To this the tentative aspect of the entire research process must also be added as a means of moving beyond research design to what Higgins et al. (2016) phrase as *de/sign* and patchwork methodologies with theory. Thinking with theory-method in this thesis has been an exploration in itself, far from a straight journey, where the ‘hows’ are set out in advance. It has been a messy and at times even chaotic practice that nevertheless has been productive of certain choices. In the following I seek to make sense of the messiness and the choices in relation to each other.

Aligning the study with different emergent post-qualitative research methodologies (Lather and St Pierre 2013) is not a means of rejecting established qualitative methodologies but rather to see them as on a continuum (Bodén 2016), where tradition is brought into something new in thinking with relational ontologies (posthumanism). Post-qualitative methodologies work with invention (cf. Lury & Wakeford 2012) both within tradition and simultaneously against it in transforming and “revitalizing familiar frames” (Lather and St Pierre 2013). This is not an unproblematic approach since the principle of

entanglement and decentered agency, as put forward in different ways within relational ontologies, make all the categories of humanist qualitative research difficult since they require individuation of an object, a problem, a research self, a method (i.e. observation), a reality, data, interpretation, representation (Lather and St Pierre 2013). In this thesis, I might argue that data is produced in the intertwined interactions of different constitutive practices described as the three practices of research. I might also stress data are not produced as *about* a pre-existing phenomenon that is independent from the processes and practices of research. The entire phenomenon is the data production itself and its connections and extensions with the different main practices (educational, theoretical, political). This also complicates any clear or exclusive division between research subject and object.

Nevertheless, even if individuation of separated categories (like subject and object) is questioned, individuation is not effortlessly escaped in research, due, for instance, to the limits and habits of expression. Despite this, data production needs to be considered *from the outset* as a collective, non-hierarchical, non-individuated affair that enables production of both a scientific and a potentially influential version of reality; a version produced differently throughout the entire research process. In the following I will give a picture of how this version is produced. In this I seek to work with data production in terms of problems, questions and concept creation (Masny 2013, 2016) and therefore I seek to continuously resist a persistent individuation and get back over and over again to what I call an at once extended and intensified data production that is connected to the educational, theoretical and political practices of research. As in *practices* I start off with the educational practice.

Fieldwork in the making

As initially described in introducing the educational practice, I started the project at the end of 2010. In relation to the tentative aims of the study information about different pre-primary institutions in Sweden with articulated language profiles was obtained from the internet. The choice of contacting a bilingual (Spanish-Swedish) preschool was related both to its specific language policy, to my own academic background and linguistic competencies as well as to Spanish being a vital language both in Sweden and internationally. After some e-mail

and telephone correspondence with the headmaster a meeting with her was arranged at the preschool where she gave a more complete picture of the organization and their language policy.

The preschool is situated in a medium-sized municipality in Sweden. It receives children between the ages of 1 and 5 who are organized in three different year groups. It is an independent institution, which means that the local city is not the mandator. Families do not pay any extra fees and there are no other restrictions or specific requirements. The preschool functions much like any other early childhood institution in Sweden. It follows the national curriculum for preschools and works in a complementary way with the specific language policy that adjusts the bilingual use of language in daily interaction. As already discussed in the introduction of policy on page 26, fifty per cent of the educators should speak Swedish with children and fifty per cent Spanish. The organization of teachers working in each class (year group) is planned to fulfill the policy which, according to the head teacher of the preschool, is to give the two languages equal importance and space. According to the headmaster, children are not to be forced to speak either of the two languages even if it is a desired goal that children eventually align with the language use of the teachers. Those of the educators who understand and can use both languages are allowed to switch language if needed in exceptional cases to facilitate children's understanding and assist communication.

At the time of my first contact with the institution and initial fieldwork in 2010-11 and also when the main part of the fieldwork was conducted in 2011-12, most of staff considered Spanish their mother tongue and conversation among staff was often in Spanish. Nevertheless, there were also Swedish speaking staff, who did not speak or understand Spanish and communication with these teachers was in Swedish. Most of the Spanish speaking staff also understood and could speak Swedish. When talking with both staff and children I used the language in which they usually approached me. The Spanish speaking staff mostly talked to me in Spanish whereas the Swedish speaking staff used Swedish. Children frequently approached me in Swedish but sometimes also in Spanish. In children's peer interaction Swedish was the predominant language but Spanish was also used. Many of the children came from homes where both Swedish and Spanish (and sometimes another language) formed a part of the daily

interaction; some spoke only Swedish or only Spanish at home and a few spoke languages other than Swedish and Spanish at home. This linguistic variety was also considered valuable in relation to the aims of the study.

In the following I turn to describing the makings of data production *in* fieldwork.

In fieldwork methods

The *in* field-method employed to produce data in relation to the aim of the study was participant observation with video camera, recording everyday situations as moving pictures and audio. After having familiarized myself with this method during my initial visits to the preschool during 2010-11, this also became the main method used throughout the entire work *in* field. Additional data were also produced in the form of field notes related to the daily situations I joined and informal talks with children and staff, as well as still pictures of the facilities, rooms, walls, furniture, books, table games, crafting and other materials constituting a part of the educational practice. The use of participant observation with video camera is an established qualitative research method that, it is often argued, delivers the most natural and objective data. This was never my main concern. Rather, the methods were chosen as a means of letting a range of different corporeal and social elements play a part in what could be referred to as an extended and intensified production of data. Recordings of both audial and visual aspects of mundane practice were considered as crucial parts enabling work with language as a not exclusively human, but rather a material-semiotic, more than human phenomenon. The recordings enabled working with the materiality of practice through the materiality of the moving and sounding image (cf. Deleuze 1986, 1989). However, considering these recordings in a vacuum, giving importance only to what was captured in the camera's framing of them, emerged as a limiting option, thus importance was given to also paying attention to what happened around the recorded situations in relation to institutional, political, social, material, discursive, linguistic and subjective/affective elements that form a part of the studied practices.

During the work *in* field, I made periodic visits to the preschool. From September 2011 to May 2012 I was at the preschool once or

twice a month for two to five days. I worked with all the three different year groups in which the children were organized during this year.

The premises of the preschool comprised a one-floor main building with classes distributed horizontally. At the one end, the three to four year old children had their home classrooms: five smaller rooms and a bigger hall in the middle with a huge rug on the floor, which was often used for circle- or rug-time, when all children were gathered at once. At the other end of the building the five years old children had their classroom; one bigger and one smaller connected room. The youngest children had their home classroom in the middle of the building and they had one bigger room for activities and another for sleeping next door. There was a smaller nursing room for changing diapers off the hallway outside the classroom. There was no common area for meals and all groups ate in their home classrooms. All year groups also had their own exit to a common outdoor playground. All groups also had access to a bigger room inside which was mainly used when gathering all year groups which was used, for instance, in singing activities or for activities with smaller groups of children that required more space, such as dancing.

Normally I stayed at least one or two days in a row with a year-group and followed the whole group or part of the group in their different activities. I joined all sorts of activities the groups had such as indoor and outdoor play, different kinds of pottering, crafting, assembly, meals, toilet-visits, nursing room visits, book-reading, singing, story-telling, dancing and excursions to nearby parks, etc. I did not intend to pay more attention to any specific kind of activity but was interested in following the groups both from the teachers perspective in more planned and structured situations as well as in more spontaneously occurring ones. Fieldwork was mainly conducted between 9am and 4pm. Since parents or caretakers were not included in the study I never joined the drop off and pick up procedures in the mornings and the afternoons.

Sometimes I worked mostly with the camera, making longer recordings of consecutive activities. At other times I turned the camera on and off every now and then, and when I did not use the camera, I tended to talk more with the children and the teachers, as well as taking more notes. I also frequently used a tripod, which enabled taking notes parallel to the recordings, as well as sometimes leaving the camera with one group and following another group in person. In

total, the *in* fieldwork produced 59h 7min of video recordings. I will now turn to discussing the extension and intensification of data production in what I call the *off* fieldwork.

Extending to off fieldwork

I use the terms *in* fieldwork and *off* fieldwork as interrelated processes of a both extended and intensified data production. The data produced during a period of working *in* field in collaboration with the early childhood institution and its different constitutive elements can be seen as very distinct and tangible outcomes primarily in the form of recordings, pictures and notes. Nevertheless, the time I spent working *in* field in collaboration with the preschool also provided me with specific experiences that affected me in different ways and that I consider founding a different, perhaps not as tangible as, for instance, the recordings (at least not for others), but despite this, an important and constitutive part of data production as a both extended and intensified practice. In relation to the episodes from the educational practice introduced in *practices* I discuss how these, which I call specific moments (i.e. the Peanut-poop moment), have been expounded in writing this thesis through a relationship between repetition and difference. Both the *in* fieldwork and the *off* fieldwork play important parts in producing this relationship and the different patterns of both repetition and difference. When reengaging with the video recorded situations and the materialities of sound, images and notes in the *off* fieldwork, the involvement with them changed and was consequently transformative of data production. As previously outlined, the constitution of the different moments by which the text evolves is dependent on how difference emerges from repetition in the production of data. Therefore there is a qualitative interaction through the writing up and around moments, with the entirety of data produced *in* and *off* fieldwork. Data production is thus to be understood on a continuum rather than something that stopped when the work *in* field came to an end (Bodén 2015). This is important also in relation to what is in qualitative research conventionally phrased as re-presentation.

If representation stands for seeking to identically, so far as is possible, reproduce a situation, an action, a statement that has happened in a previous space and time, a continuum of data production works with a different logic. Following Deleuze and Guattari (1987)

and including representations as yet another among many parts of connected assemblages, helps one to see the productiveness of (re)presentations. This opens up for what has been referred to as “more than representational” (Lorimer 2005) as well as “more than human” research methodologies (Lorimer 2013, Whatmore 2006) as important parts of thinking with theory in data production. The notion of ‘more than human’ pronounces, as put by Lorimer (2013) “the embodied, affective and skillful dimensions of our multispecies worlds that often elude research methodologies preoccupied with human representations” (Lorimer 2013:61). The ontological alteration to considering the relational and distributed character of different actions and different competencies, as well as the approach to everything as emergent at a balancing in-between of things and words, contents and expressions, has epistemological consequences that require rethinking and adapting established methodologies. Here, this thought will be kept present in discussing the work with the *in* fieldwork produced data materials as more than human and more than representations. Thinking with Deleuze, Youngblood Jackson (2013) discusses “data-as-machine” that moves the methodological focus from how being can be represented to “[h]ow does being become in the act of representation?” (Youngblood Jackson 2013:114).

Consequently, working along these lines *off* fieldwork, the emerging question to the data is not primarily what it represents in terms of what lies below or behind it, but what it presents or offers, how it functions or what becomes of it in its extended connections and continuous reengagements with the different practices of research (educational, theoretical, political). In the continuum of data production *in* and *off* fieldwork, there is continuous interaction between impressions and expressions of data. This interaction is complicated and involves several different parts. Following Lecercle (2002) and thinking with Deleuze and Guattari (1987) such interaction might work in different ways simultaneously and it is therefore possible to recognize both logics, that of (re)presentation and that of connected assemblages (cf. Lecercle 2002). This enables working with the productive forces of what could be labeled (re)presentations as these are connected as parts and gears in connected assemblages of the research.

In the process of working with data *in* and *off* fieldwork I seek to consider every presentation of data an *a*-presentation (Deleuze 1994).

Such *a*-presentation always involves reengagement and is therefore also productive of repetition. The way Deleuze describes repetition is however, as discussed previously in relation to the different situations of the educational practice, through its intimate relationship with difference. Thus, in one way, the video recordings, the photos, the notes produced *in* fieldwork *can* be seen as repetitions of previous moments. Nevertheless, this does not make them identical or exchangeable, but rather different and even transformative and productive of variation and change. In working with and reengaging video recordings, photos and notes *off* fieldwork, when I watched and re-watched, listened and re-listened, read and re-read the notes as well as took new notes and created note-sheets to be able to navigate and re-navigate in interaction with the extensive amount of recordings, these became productive in new ways. Data production thus expanded and re-extended. What is more, emergent preoccupations in relation to the aim of the research grew as intensifications alongside this continuum or extension of data production. These preoccupations and the thereto-related moments of wonder will be discussed in the next section.

Emergent preoccupations and moments of wonder

What I have just tried to give a glimpse of is an entirely shambolic practice, which has been productive in certain ways. Nevertheless, to seek to make sense of it by means of structuring it neatly into different chronological steps, by means of a posterior tracing of its pathways, would be a betrayal which could never give due to the multiplicities of productive and contra-productive connections that constituted this messy process. Rather, I describe this process as a long, slow and chaotic as well as transformative familiarization and engagement with data, and seek to map how certain concerns in relation to bilingualism in early childhood education emerge in this process or, as put by MacLure (2013) how “some things gradually grow, or glow, into greater significance than others, and become the preoccupations around which thought and writing cluster” (MacLure 2013:175).

Rather than conventional practices of categorization and coding in a corpus of data, MacLure argues for wonder as a guiding principle in entangling oneself with data. Working with wonder is attending to those parts of data that ‘glow’ or otherwise attract the researcher in affective ways. Similarly, even if still within a more conventional approach to qualitative data, Wei (2011b) stresses the importance of

attending to the creative and critical moments that stand out from systematic features in data. It is with some inspiration from both these scholars that I have chosen ‘moments of wonder’ as the name for the specific situations that present the critical and creative preoccupations around which my thought and writing have clustered. As previously outlined in relation to the Peanut-poop moment it is through following difference as inherent to repetition (Deleuze 1994) that these moments of wonder are produced. This can also be described as a research interaction of difference in the educational practice with concepts of theorizing as well as with political concerns.

The moments of wonder can be described as being generated in the close relation between repetition and difference. Firstly, this relation is experienced in the educational practice in its connection with this research. As explained when previously introducing the educational practice, two sorts of repetition are experienced in the continuum of *in* and *off* fieldwork. The first is productive of sameness and indifference and the second is productive of difference in itself, as well as of curiosity and wonder. It is obvious that this is a subjective and decentered process that interacts with all the three main practices of the research. Elaborating a writing of the thesis with moments of wonder rather than moments of sameness or indifference is a choice that I, as a researcher, make in order to explore variation and deviation rather than exchangeable patterns. Thinking with Deleuze (1994) the chosen moments of wonder are moments from which something can be learnt because they carry difference through a repetitive space. Rather than gestures of reproduction these moments “emit signs to be developed in heterogeneity” (Deleuze 1994:23). I could also say that they constitute an invitation to do something and hence to learn something new. To clarify the processes of difference and repetition in producing moments of wonder, I will use an example of book-reading.

Book-reading as an example of repetition and difference

For this discussion I will use an example from the second partial study where I work with a situation where a teacher reads a book together with a group of children and I analyze it in terms of a picture-storybook-reading-assemblage.

This situation was one of many daily similar book-reading sessions that I engaged and reengaged with *in* and *out* of fieldwork with the

same particular class of children. In one sense, it could be argued that in the continuum of data production as a whole, book-reading was one of the main themes that I could label, constructing sameness from the repeated pluralities of different situations. There are similarities that can be abstracted from these situations, like the presence of a picture-story-book, a teacher, children and the organisation of the situation in time and space, frequently after lunch and typically away from non-participants and other noises in a more or less isolated space. Plenty of practical organization of the book reading session itself was frequent both before and during the reading. Discussions around who should sit where and how in relation to the other participants, the book, furniture and the rest of the room, were common. Disruptions of the reading related to other issues were frequent. There was always a match between the language of the book and the language that the teacher, according to the language policy, should speak with children. Usually the teacher read the book and the children listened and it was common that a question or two around the content of the book were raised and answered. Many times the teacher asked the children to explain the meaning of some words, or to have a look at the pictures. Translating words in Spanish or Swedish to lexical equivalences in the other language was common. Code switching or other use of both languages was common among the participants when the teacher and the book were Spanish speaking but did not typically occur when the teacher and the book were speaking Swedish. The teachers generally chose the books for these sessions from a set of bookshelves. Expressed excitement among the participants about the book was not ordinary. Normally one book was read from beginning to end in one sitting.

Having abstracted many, but not all, similarities between all the book-reading-sessions it becomes very clear that the general or major picture provided by these similarities is a falsification: a false movement of the abstract (Deleuze 1994). No singular situation actually comes to its right through this abstraction of similarities. This fits well with the words of Deleuze that “the majority is nobody” (Deleuze 1990) and that everyone and every situation is caught in a minority becoming. Even if the abstraction of similarities is a falsification it is a falsification continuously made in the continuum of data production *in* and *off* fieldwork. As a consequence it is also productive: of sameness and of indifference and a shadowing of all the unique variations and differences beyond this sense of sameness.

Moments of wonder have emerged in this thesis from situations that in one way or another eradicate such sense of sameness, and produce difference in itself. The book reading situation worked with in the book chapter is an example of such escape from similarities and eradication of a sense of sameness and indifference. It is significant that when I initially engaged with this situation it provoked a sense of weirdness. There were several things in this situation that could be said to ‘carry difference through a repetitive space’ and perhaps most outstanding is the fact that there is a mismatch between the language of the book and the language of the teacher, that there are non-lexical – weird and funny – translations between languages, that the teacher is out of control of what is said, that only a short part of the book is read and that the participants, both teacher and children, express active excitement and involvement. The situation surprised and affected me, perhaps as much as it also surprised and affected the other participants with a sense of difference and creation of something unlike. Thus, rather than sorting the situation out as non-sense, non-representative, non-serious, I actively chose to follow it through and to develop upon its signs, the questions and wonder that these emitted, in heterogeneity.

Working with concepts and concerns

The production of moments of wonder such as the picture-story-book-reading assemblage forms part of a subjective and decentered research practice that takes place in the entwinement of the educational practice with a minor theorizing (which includes concepts) and a minor politics (which includes concerns).

Thus, concepts have been productive of moments of wonder in a theorizing practice related to difference and plural particularities. Continuing with the book-reading-session as an example, the concept of an assemblage (comparable to how it has later been described as an agentic assemblage by Jackson and Mazzei (2016)) was employed to produce the book-reading situation in a specific language that, in a non hierarchic way, could treat the many distinct material and semiotic elements playing a part in producing and making difference. The wonder and questions generated by the situation furthermore hooked on to the Deleuzio-Guattarian concepts of ‘striated and smooth spaces’, as well as ‘lines of flight’, and these enabled a heterogenic development and sense-productive analysis of the difference as

provided by the situation. Other concepts, such as (un)knowing and Multiple Literacies in the book-reading situation, hooked on or were created in a process, as capable of transforming the emitted wonder and questions worked with into new questions nurturing further thinking and discussion.

Concerns have furthermore been productive of moments of wonder in that difference has been actively attended to, used and produced by means of allowing for creativity and experimentation to make its way into this thesis. Moments of wonder are in this way expressions of the responsibilities for safeguarding variation and linguistic pluralities in early childhood bilingual education in ways yet to be invented. The choice to let deviations, such as a weird book-reading-situation, develop in the centre of this thesis is actively related to such a concern and such a responsibility. Deleuze (1994) writes that there is something both amorous (“we learn by heart”) and fatal about all education. He also writes that humans have acquired/are born with a practical familiarity with signs. I relate the fatality of education to this familiarity when continuous repetition and abstraction of sameness from emitted signs makes one blind to, or insensitive of, the parallel processes of variation and novelty always already there. Thus, a desire to enable escape from such blindness in early childhood bilingual education has also played an important part in producing the moments of wonder in this thesis.

Extending to written text

Writing about the moments of wonder, producing and sharing them in text, has presented a number of challenges. How to write about bilingualism as it emerges in this thesis at the boundary between things and words? One part of this is dealing with the fact that matter, due to verbal textual tradition as well as to the nature of things, has obvious difficulties becoming written text.

Presenting data in text

The question of how the materialities of objects, and also the materialities of the sound and the image and other variations of voice (cf. Mazzei & Jackson 2012), can become printed text in productive ways has emerged and re-emerged during the entire process of writing this thesis. This has made writing a process of experimentation and

different ways of dealing with this question have made their way into the partial studies, dependent on a range of aspects.

The potentials for researching the more-than-human aspects of audiovisual data by the work of moving and sounding image methodologies have recently been extensively considered in several disciplines⁵ (Lorimer 2013). Nevertheless, even if, for instance, both frozen and, more recently, moving images have become a part of academic writing and publishing practices this is not as a way of dealing with the more profound struggle of hierarchies and of placing some materialities (human) at the center or on the top and other materialities(non-human) in the frame. This, I argue, has got less to do with the form of transcriptions or (re)presentation than with the impact of ‘gaze’ of analytical practice.

As argued by Hultman and Lenz Taguchi (2010) educational research has for long been dominated by an ‘anthropocentric gaze’, which places humans at the center of analysis. Analysis of visual data (or visual (re)presentations) therefore customarily starts with the human being thus attributing humans a higher position relative to other matter, an a priori assumption that needs to be questioned (Hultman and Lenz Taguchi 2010). In this thesis the presentation of all data in text is seen as a further extension of data production and as such, closely connected to the educational, theoretical and political practices of bilingualism.

In writing the four partial studies I deal with the challenge of pulling/producing different materialities of data into/in text and balancing different materialities in non-hierarchical, symmetrical as well as a blurring-binary ways. In this I have connected with the *principle* of connected assemblages (a machinic assemblage of bodies and a collective assemblage of enunciation) in a non-unified and

⁵ When it comes to the (re)presentational practices by which the material aspects of visual and moving image data transform in scientific writings much can be learnt from different studies within the field of conversation analysis (CA), which has dealt with what Goffman (1964) labeled the “greasy parts of the social situation”. As discussed within CA there is a contradiction between studying language in action, of aiming to challenge a written language bias (Linell 2011), and reaffirming the same bias through the use of written transcriptions (Jefferson 2004). A growing interest in the multimodal aspects of conversation and the material framing of interaction has contributed to several alternative transcription forms (cf. Goodwin 2000, Mondada 2006, Melander 2009, Björk-Willén 2006, Dalgren 2017) that in turn have produced a further challenging of the divide between text and context.

inconsequential way. This is due both to a process of experimentation and to an affirmative approach to variation, that could, once again, be captured by the concept of a minor theORizing, and, if one likes, a bilingual approach to thinking with theory and methods. Guattari (1995a) writes that he “had to forge [his] own language in order to confront certain questions” and that “to forge a language means to invent words” (Guattari 1995a:37). In relation to the different partial studies I could use the variation of possible meanings of the word ‘forge’. To forge is to ‘mold’ and to ‘invent’ but also to ‘falsify’, ‘hammer’, ‘formulate’, ‘imitate’ and ‘labor’. Different ways of forging language have enabled different presentations of webs and material-semiotic relations in text, in order to confront certain questions. The following summaries of the partial studies will provide examples of this.

Summarizing the partial studies

To finalizing the research undertakings I will now sum up the partial studies. Each of the studies can be seen as condensed versions and variations of what the thesis has dealt with so far. The partial studies provide specific examples of the particular processes of research undertakings as well as the results of the same processes.

Article 1: Language policy and material creativity

Title: Playing the game and speaking the right language. Language policy and materiality in a bilingual preschool activity

The situation worked with in this paper is a table-game-activity in which a group of children and a teacher play the Swedish game *Honey Hunting*, based on the characters from a famous Swedish cartoon. The situation emerges in my involvement with it *in* and *off* fieldwork as a wonder moment in that I get curious about the effects of the game and its different objects on the way language is used during the playing of it, as well as of its relationship with the local language policy. The fact that the game is in Swedish language and that the teacher who joins the activity is Spanish speaking is challenging. Thus, in this paper I work with the material-semiotic relationships between policy and the activity and map how bilingualism is produced in different ways through the negotiation of these relationships.

The employment of ANT enables working with all the potential, human and non-human participatory elements in the activity at the same level, following a principle of general symmetry. Using an analytical vocabulary of ‘translation’/transformative processes, employing the different dimensions of *problematization*, *interessement*, *enrolment* and *mobilization*, four different actor-network scenes are produced with the table game activity. In the scenes, children, teacher, game pieces, die, cards, linguistic and other elements are described and symmetrically drawn together in the same language. I hereby forge a language of ANT to confront the relationship between the activity and language policy as well as mapping how different constructions of bilingualism emerge, transform and depend on each other in this relationship.

This paper allows an understanding of how language policy is under continuous negotiation among both things and words in practice, and how different constructions of bilingualism (i.e. flexible/separate) emerge not as opposed, but as entangled with one another on a continuum. The paper challenges the idea of what plays an active part in language policy and enables seeing how several different elements – human and nonhuman – play equally important parts in the way bilingualism is continuously constructed differently.

It could be argued that when thinking about language policy the material objects – like table games – should be taken into account. However, the results of this study primarily encourage a different thinking around language policy. Rather than implementation and its success, which might be related to a range of unforeseen movements between things and words and therefore always condemned to failure, more attention should be given to the creative, material and semiotic powers of educational practice of which language policy inevitably plays a part. To play a game and to speak the right language is a creative affair through which bilingualism emerges in both known and unforeseen ways.

'Article' 2: Reading and not knowing

Title: Multilingual becoming in reading. A picture storybook-reading-assemblage in early years education

The book chapter connects to a relationship between language policy and creativity as discussed in the Article 1. The chapter's subject emerges as a moment of wonder primarily through the mismatch in this book reading situation, between the language of the teacher and the language of the book, which produces difference and even weirdness. This leads to the question with which the chapter starts of what happens if you read aloud from a book in a language you do not know together with a group of very young users of that language.

In the chapter, the unusual book-reading situation is produced as a picture-story-book reading assemblage. The notion of assemblage that is employed in the chapter is defined with reference to DeLanda (2006) and Youdell (2011) in terms of a heterogeneous configuration or a whole, where the interaction between the different parts or elements is productive. This way of describing the assemblage can be compared to what Jackson and Mazzei (2016) later have called an 'agentive assemblage', aimed at an epistemological/methodological functioning of connected assemblages rather than their ontological principle. Guattari (1995a) insists that connected assemblages do not exist as an ontologically independent idea but are always connected in a factual reality. Agentive assemblages are thus to be understood, as I see it, as temporal appearances or articulations of connected assemblages in, for instance, educational studies. Perhaps they could also be labeled simplifications in that they do not cover all that they could but only what they need. In the book chapter different elements are drawn into acting as a whole in the assemblage where different lines of flight are generated. I use transcription excerpts where the verbal aspects of the lines of flight are highlighted. In this case I forge the more conventional excerpts to function together with the other writings on the assemblage where extra-textual elements are also allowed to be present.

The notions of 'striated and smooth spaces' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) are employed in the chapter to map how the specific assemblage is enabled in this particular educational practice. Diana Masny's MLT also inspires the approach in the book chapter and lines of flight (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) are put to work by means of the creative

and unforeseen outcomes in the encounter of the book with other elements of the assemblage. In the book-chapter, the prefix of ‘multi’, as in Multiple Literacies, is employed in relation to the bilingual reading situation’s production of lines of flight: non-lexical translations between languages, untimely semantic associations, and non-sense experimentations with words across languages. All together these lines of flight are discussed in terms of a *multilingual* becoming connected in the relationships of things and words. The chapter encourages a discussion on what reading is about but also what it means to know and not to know a language as well as the relation between not knowing and creativity.

Choosing the path of not knowing, not being in control might create apparently disparate, confusing outcomes, which can easily be evaluated in terms of right or wrong. In the book chapter an affirmative and different understanding of these outcomes is provided in discussing the creative, amusing possibilities of not knowing in relation to language use.

Article 3: Things and words and (il)literate expertise

Title: Minor (il)literate artworks: Inventive processes of biliteracy and the role of expertise in early childhood bilingual education

In Article 3 I continue and deepen the discussion on the expertise of not knowing. The article is an exploration of the materiality of language itself as well as the creative and literate enterprises of what could be labelled a linguistic estrangement.

In this article I work with three different moments of wonder: dancing, lemon pips and a sand-day, which all engaged me *in* and *off* fieldwork with a particular intensiveness and beauty. Two of these moments emphasize an intimate relationship between eating and speaking. The third moment similarly puts forward the closeness of different bodies and expressions. In the article I work with Deleuze’s and Guattari’s texts concerning a minor literature and the specific, even if not unique opportunities of variation and novel creativity in a bilingual situation (Deleuze and Guattari 1986, 1987). The workings of different dimensions of language are explored as parallel happenings, as are the different possibilities of language that these provide.

In this article I forge, less in the sense of imitating and falsifying and more as a way of hammering, inventing and molding, language in describing the different moments. In this I experiment with the possibilities of verbal language to presence the presence of things. Through the concept of *sense-event* I connect to the principle of connected assemblages, exploring more of the bodies of words and forms of things/food (than the forms of expression and bodies of things).

In different ways, the three moments put forward the material presences of language and how the ways by which things and words continuously pass into each other is a collective enterprise of potential artworks.

The paper discusses the creativity of what could be called an (il)literate expertise: balancing and experimenting on the cutting, and sometimes sticky edge between things and propositions. This involves an intensive, deterritorializing treatment of language, a ‘becoming minor’ with language in passionate, *sense-ual*, experimenting ways, rather than reproducing a standard, already known version of language. The discussion highlights the inventive processes of (bi)literacy and the need to differentiate the notion of expertise in early childhood bilingual education.

Article 4: Mapping silence

Title: The matter of silence in early childhood bilingual education

This article deals with the intricate issue of silence in early childhood bilingual education and discusses how silence might come to matter differently.

A situation arising during afternoon snack time at the preschool is composed in the article as the Water moment. The situation affected me as intense, but rather than beautiful – as was the case with the situations in Article 3 – there was something about the Water moment that disturbed me negatively, at least at the beginning. The moment is composed with the interaction of a child and words in Spanish and Swedish, teachers, tables, chairs, cutlery, oatmeal, water, sunlight and a blue pitcher. In the article I seek to map the moment varyingly producing alternative readings to show how silence can be made to matter differently. In relation to the different readings I elaborate on different dimensions of language (denotation, manifestation,

signification and sense) and use a Deleuzian approach to different temporalities (Chronos-Aion) (Deleuze 1990). Through this practice, which could also be seen a concrete example of theORizing, silence emerges respectively as development, strategy and intensity.

The article shows that silence as development and silence as strategy are individually, chronologically and linguistically productive readings that enable seeing the bilingual child as more or less competent, more or less active and more or less powerful in relation to adults. Furthermore, silence as intensity is collectively produced among things and words, as well as temporally unbounded. Thus it enables seeing silence, as well as the bilingual child, as part of several material-semiotic relations capable of enchantment. I discuss that due to the evasive and inconsistent nature of silence all three mappings are equally (im)possible. Nevertheless, they all produce different effects and raise dissimilar questions and concerns to bilingual educational practice in the early years.

The article is an incitement to take responsibility for the effects of the choice of reading silence in a certain way. What bilingual child subjectivities are enabled? The paper also encourages the asking different questions in relation to silence in order to uncover its mystery. How to deal with silence without actually knowing or seeking to disclose what it means?

Proposal

After having presented the partial studies and their principal results there is now an opportunity to move back to the beginning, recall the aim, answer the questions and close the circle of writing this thesis. With *proposal*, I take this opportunity and make such a circular movement. Nevertheless, and as will also be elaborated upon in this part of the text, the circle is not the final goal for this thesis but rather a means of connecting to both former and potentially upcoming arrivals and new puzzling problematizations. It is tiring to define what a minor bilingualism conclusively and definitely is since it is a process of constant becoming and as such it is evasive. But a definition is not necessary either. Some important things will nevertheless be discussed in relation to encouraging the perception of, and a turning towards, the evasiveness of this becoming.

Now, even if the movement towards a minor bilingualism is a never ending, twirling, twisting story, the writing of this thesis does come to a conclusion. At the end of *proposal*, in an embrace(ment) of messiness, many minor bilingual exits are opened to those who opt to follow them through.

Towards a minor bilingualism

In the following I will elaborate on three suggestions with the potential for providing temporal, evasive answers to the research questions, and arguments for moving towards a minor bilingualism. I discuss how such movement opens novel and previously narrowly explored pathways of bilingualism as a messy phenomenon and how this raises new challenges and questions. I stated initially that standardized, systemic and future-oriented versions of language and literacy occupy entangled discourses of educational practice in a way that clouds the vision for pluralizing bilingual practices. Hence, my aim was to explore variations of bilingualism through an equal theorizing with simultaneously material and semiotic aspects of a specific bilingual preschool practice. I chose to do this by means of what I have called a material-semiotic pragmatics and working with daily specific situations at a Spanish-Swedish early childhood institution in Sweden. Working with entangled practices of education, theory and politics I wanted to produce knowledge on language and literacy as socially and materially divergent phenomena in general and in bilingual preschool specifically. I raised questions about what kind of bilingualism emerges and how it emerges in early childhood situations. I also wanted to study which dimensions of language were at work in these processes and how they work. My interests also related to the relationships of language politics within bilingual early childhood education.

Three temporal suggestions

The suggestions are based on the results and the discussion of the different partial studies. Together they are intended to interact with the research questions. The suggestions can, in the order they appear, be related to each of the three questions. However, the suggestions also overlap temporally and are entangled with one another so should be read as a whole. To put it briefly, this whole produces bilingualism(s) as plural, collective, floating and specific, with multiple dimensions of language at work simultaneously, and as both standardized public and materially private phenomena.

Bilingualism is plural, collective, floating and specific

Bilingualism emerges in this study as plural phenomena. There is no *one* bilingualism, but rather several bilingualisms, which are singular in their particularities while at the same time are interconnected and entangled through the way in which they emerge. In the different partial studies, apart from bi-, I have also labeled emergent occurrences using the prefix of multi-, as in 'a multilingual becoming' as well as attributing the words flexible and separated to bilingualisms being constructed differently. Later on in the process of this thesis, the notion of minor as in 'minor illiterate artworks' and in the over-arching title of 'a minor bilingualism' has been productive of thinking with the dissimilarities of both labels and appearance of bilingualism in the different partial studies, in a simultaneously amalgamating and discriminating way.

The study as a whole inspires thinking of bilingualism as a fluctuating and variable phenomenon emergent in equally inconsistent material and semiotic practices. In this sense, bilingualism always appears in a mutating plural in several ways or directions and never as settled. The very phenomenon is a constantly changing effect of connections between several different, multifaceted and variously combined elements. It is emphasized that this happens by a material and creative force. In the moments studied in the partial studies, picking out single bilingual subjects is of course possible, but it is not done without violence towards several material-semiotic important relations building up bigger and dynamic bilingual webs of and in becoming. It is even complicated to separate language from language (i.e. Spanish from Swedish) or words from words (Swedish from Swedish) as language(s) and words cannot be separated from the things and from the situations where they occur in a constant becoming: always differently, always otherwise, always minor.

The results of the partial studies furthermore encourage contemplating the entangled, mutual interrelationship between different ways or constructions of bilingualism. This implies, for instance, that the separation of different languages, as, for instance, in policy planning, plays a part in producing more flexible and messy versions of bilingualism. Subsequently, the appearance of separated constructions is sometimes accomplished through a flexibility of untimely materially and semiotic connections. This invites one to think of bilingualism in fluid and moving terms where the phenomenon can

only freeze in temporal snapshots or scenes of its movements where, for instance, separateness or flexibility appears to be most outstanding. Nevertheless, as they appear they are also simultaneously in constant transformation, always already moving into something different; a new, ephemeral formation. As freezing snapshots one could thus talk about several different bilingualisms that together form part of a floating and constantly transforming phenomenon. From such a viewpoint, an idea of a separated bilingualism as a desirable but nevertheless almost unreal phenomenon on the one hand, and a flexible phenomenon on the other, as the actual, factual, objective reality is tricky to maintain. Rather, it is possible to think about different bilingualisms as equally real and perhaps equally valuable.

In relation to above, some additional thoughts need to be added. It could be argued, that the prefix of *bi-* in bilingualism is superfluous or perhaps even misleading. If a language cannot be separated from another language what is the point of labeling the phenomenon using a *binary* logic? One could instead argue there is no such thing as bilingualism, but rather, different constructions of ‘lingualisms’ or different ways of ‘linguaging’. As described in the introduction, and despite this relevant critique, I have stuck to using the prefix of *bi-* in discussing the *bilingual* situation. This was initially due to three main reasons: the possibilities as discussed by Deleuze and Guattari (1986, 1987) of a minor treatment of language in a bilingual situation; the articulated bilingual language profile of the specific institution worked with; and the deviation from the norm of monolingual standards that is still repeated in Western societies (García and Wei 2014).

The outcomes of this thesis furthermore provide a view of the bilingual situation as constantly both emphasizing and challenging monolingually informed standards, producing separated languages with (semi)permeable boundaries. The specific opportunity for a minor, inventive becoming of language and literacy emerges as closely connected to this simultaneous emphase and challenge of standards. For further thoughts on this, I will now turn to the next suggestion that deals with the dimensions of language that are at work in this becoming of and with bilingualism(s).

There are many ways of language at work simultaneously

Having discussed different bilingualisms as snapshots of a constantly transforming, fluctuating bilingual phenomenon and having tried not to value any one of the different snapshots as more desirable or ideal than any other, I turn to discussing different dimensions of language at work in this process in similar terms. A minor becoming involves setting the standard in variation and making it vibrate with a different intensity. In different ways and putting different concepts to work, the study describes a creative material force that runs through both human and non-human elements in the tension and transformation of their interactions. In the partial studies, the becoming of a minor bilingualism emerges in the use of words/concepts such as, for instance, creative transformations, lines of flight, minor artworks, and event. The study opens up for valuing this becoming in affirmation of variation and plurality and attending to what a frozen phenomenon of bilingualism continuously escapes. This involves a pluralized understanding of language in terms of different dimensions at work simultaneously. Some dimensions are more known and more easily thought of in that they appear in standardized, ‘coagulated’ versions. Others are relatively unknown and not routinely used and thus are not equally accessible.

The results of this study present a challenge for someone (myself included) caught within customary and recognized ways of thinking about language(s), to reconsider what counts as both knowledge and language expertise, and consequently, what counts as language learning. To put it another way, the bilingual preschool practice where this study is conducted has emerged as specifically helpful in shedding light on and enabling thinking towards otherwise shadowed dimensions of language and literacy in bilingual practices. Subsequently, the bilingual educational situation as it appears in the different moments composed in this thesis, invites to revisit notions of competence in relation not only to what is known and already learnt, but also to the unknown and what is yet to be explored and experimented with in ways that are perhaps not so easily but more necessarily to be grasped as expertise: expertise of not knowing or of knowing things differently.

In the book chapter I discuss the potential creativity of the unknown in relation to the situation studied, where the teacher reads a book in a language she herself does not master. Part of this is of course that she

might in this enterprise, intentionally or unintentionally, provide the children with a sense of competence in that they know something that the teacher doesn't, but this is not the most important part of it in relation to my study. What I want to highlight are the multiple at once material and semiotic movements between the known and the unknown that this catalyzes and the creative machinery that it involves. It is not an argument for the replacement of the expertise of the teacher with the expertise of the children, but rather, a decentering of competence and expertise in a material and semiotic web of relations and untimely connections: a balancing act on the fine line between things and word.

In Article 3 I further develop and deepen the thoughts on this expertise of (not) knowing languages in a conventional sense and how this seems to involve several different dimensions of language. Turning attention towards sense-events and the inventive, intensive and material becoming of words and verbal becoming of things is a means of broadening the possibilities of and with language. It does not entail expunging or denying previously more known, standardized dimensions of language. There is no way to neatly separate standardized versions such as denotation, manifestation and signification from each other or from the material pluralities of sense. Rather, mapping pluralities is an addition and attribution that opens up for more, rather than less, possibilities for knowledge, competence and expertise in relation to language and literacy.

In this line of thinking it seems as if it were more leisurely for many children in general to smoothly form part of and become with this machinery of pluralities, variation and attendance to unknown paths. In the different partial studies I additionally discuss that the children and the adults in the moments tend to pay attention to different dimensions of language, whereby they are somehow directed in typically parallel, or even opposite, directions and seldom 'meet'. Thus, a question that might feed further thinking to extend the possibilities in early childhood bilingual education for working with plural dimensions and unknown paths of language is how to chase that which is continuously out of reach. How to work with the runaway child or stranger in every word or other piece of language (silence?), without any final catching of it, but rather as a following or mapping of its movements, actions, passions, sensualities and life?

The potential answer to this question is inevitably political, and so I turn to discussing the last question attributive with the final suggestion that concerns the political relations and affects of bilingual preschool episodes composed in this thesis as wonder moments.

Bilingualism is *also* a private affair

A minor approach to language politics, as part of this thesis, proposes that the molecular level of political intervention is closely connected at a socio-global level. Thus, how do the results of this thesis inspire thinking politically with the minor mutations of bilingualism in the plural as well as in constant transformation?

The wonder moments as of the partial studies are only some examples of inventiveness that can hopefully inspire further thinking with new, and perhaps broader, opportunities for bilingualism in early childhood. As briefly discussed in Article 4, practice provides several opportunities; there is always more than one way of mapping, reading and becoming within a specific situation. Consequently, it is important to consider the effects of the different choices made. I argue for producing bilingualism as plural and fluctuating phenomena that emerge as entangled within a web of multiple simultaneously material and semiotic relations. This is not to say that other, more individual or interpersonal ways of understanding bilingualism are not also possible and sometimes necessary. However, different ways of producing bilingualism have different effects particularly for the children experiencing the phenomenon. Different ways also raise different questions particularly for the adults working with the phenomenon in educational practice.

For instance, I have discussed that mapping individually focused, developmental readings can raise questions about how to intervene in the developmental process of the child and how to improve methods by means of providing the best practice or opportunities for reaching preset goals. Such a focus might also help in discerning special needs. Furthermore, interpersonal models might raise questions about adults' professional role in relation to children's agency and on how to use language as a tool for both socialization and language learning. Subsequently, individual views trigger thinking about the bilingual child as on the way to something that is not yet there. This not only produces the bilingual child as a constantly language learning subject

and as such, a constant object of evaluation. It also makes it difficult to affirmatively recognize what is, in fact, already present. Interpersonal views might be more receptive to these presences, but only to some of them. In highlighting the social relationships between persons other important relations fall out of the scope. This backgrounds seeing both children and adults, as well as their (linguistic) competencies as part of the complicated multiple relationships that constitute practices by which life takes place as webs. The focus on the single, individual child is broadening but only in the sense of shifted to one type of relation. Evaluation is transferred to focusing on the achievements of both the adults and the children in relation to preset standards and future oriented versions of language.

The general idea of language learning as integrated with all activities of educational practices does not only, as discussed in Article 4, produce children as at all times busy learning language(s). In its interpersonal version it similarly produces adults as at all times busy being language models and socializing children into specific, adult oriented versions of language. I do not argue that it is always a bad thing to embrace such a view, but it is necessary to be able to see and allow for other possibilities.

A reading of bilingualism as continuously changing effects of material and semiotic intensities opens up for eluding evaluation and embodiment of preset rules in favor of interconnected, dynamic and inventive versions of both the phenomenon itself and of both children and adults. I argue that this is a productive, creative and necessary path for both children and adults as parts of bilingual educational practices. In taking this path the first thing to accept is the impossibility of knowing, predicting or defining in advance what will be the outcomes. Thus, it looks like there is a need for a movement other than a circular, repetitive one in order to become with creativity and mutation and to embrace bilingual variations.

To further feed this thinking I will distinguish between public and private in relation to language in general and bilingualism specifically. Perhaps due to an emphasis on its exclusively semiotic rather than both material and semiotic aspects, language is generally treated as a public affair and, as such, an object of continuous evaluation. It can be argued that language is a public affair since it is a tool for communication and bringing people together. Shared language needs standardized, public principles. What happens to communication if language is private? I do

not deny the importance of sharing language, nevertheless, I am convinced that there is no way of doing so if the private character or the private spaces, that is, the very material aspects of language, are not also and simultaneously recognized.

In treating bilingualism as exclusively public only majoritarian and standardized versions of different languages can be accessed and perhaps also, well-known versions of bilingual phenomena such as code-switching and translations. Public accounts of language and bilingualism tend, in their abstracted forms, to move away from rather than towards their minor versions. There are extreme risks associated with this specifically in relation to the intention of the Swedish language legislation and the preschool curriculum to safeguard both Swedish and other languages.

Firstly, if a teacher does not master these public versions of languages, they will be overwhelmed by the task and doomed to failure from the outset. What can I do if I as a teacher do not know these major languages? Moreover, even if I do, leaning exclusively on public versions as the standard might result in negatively connotated nonconformity and the risk (if they are even recognized) of continuously evaluating minor paths as wrong, incomprehensible, confusing or invaluable.

The results of this thesis, and perhaps specifically of Articles 3 and 4, encourage thinking about language as a very personal, even private, matter. This is not by means of aligning with a view of language as a human individual, cognitive or psychological issue, but rather as something equally physical, touchable and unique as a body. As such, language in its many plural forms and mutations needs to be as respected as bodies. A main question that this puts forward to educational practices involving very young children is how to move with, and sometimes into, those private language spaces? How to respect and work affirmatively with difference and variation? How to embrace the plural possibilities of reading different bilingual moments in various and perhaps previously unknown, unexplored ways?

In the book chapter, the teacher chooses the track of losing control. By doing this she unintentionally opens a conduit towards linguistic creativity and variation of standards that she is unable to grasp or capture. Nevertheless, it happens anyway, independently of her awareness, or perhaps, dependent on her unawareness. As a teacher myself I am not specifically attracted to the idea of lacking control and

being unable to attend to what is happening. Nevertheless, it is still an intriguing question: what happens if teachers actively seek to produce such evasive moments of immeasurable outcomes? And what are the possibilities of working with them lacking what is generally conceived of as control?

One answer is that the possibility to go with any impulse to intervene and correct becomes closed. Another answer is perhaps lust and joy. In the book chapter as well as in the moments of Article 3, what stands out is that things and words amuse many of the participants. There is dancing, laughter, play, impressions and experimentation in the moments and many of the children (and at least one of the teachers) seem to be having fun. Even in Article 4, in mapping the last reading of the Water moment, there is a possibility to think of silence as a pleasure and even amazement.

Being curious about languages in their major, standardized and public versions is not the same as being curious about them in their minor becoming and non-standard, private spaces. Both are challenging and both are necessary, but in different ways. What is more, the results of this study show their interrelatedness. This is why encouraging turning towards the unknown and previously unexplored material-semiotic pathways requires much more knowledge than exclusively working with what is already known (by others). Interacting with the molecular, minor, mutating and sometimes amusing or even irritating variations requires a lot from the educational practice. It requires learning and continuously informing oneself (for instance on different linguistic principles and standardized dimensions of language) while simultaneously and continuously unlearning and opening up for the possibilities of what has perhaps never happened before.

This is where I would like to leave the discussion on how professionals in early childhood education might come to think in relation to the suggestions made. I will now move towards minor exits of this thesis in a discussion of what may in more general terms be said about bilingualism as it comes out of this thesis.

Embracing messiness: minor exits

I stated initially that the choice of exploring bilingualism in this thesis in a relation to early childhood was due to an exploratory thought that bilingual educational practice of the early years could also help to shed new light on the phenomenon of bilingualism in general. Thus the suggestions, as described above, emerge from moments of bilingual early childhood education, but are also potentially attributive with other moments, other practices. It is important to keep in mind that bilingualism, as it emerges here (a plural, collective and floating phenomenon with multiple dimensions of language at work simultaneously), is both a standardized public and materially private phenomenon. This is also true when thinking of and discussing bilingualism in more general terms. As an imperative statement this destroys the conventional notion of a language and literacy development 'ladder'. What if the becoming of bilingualism in the early years can be something other than a mere step on the way to an adult centered bilingual goal? What if other practices in life are also potentially impregnated with possibilities for similar expertise, creation and inventiveness as described in the different moments composed in this thesis?

In the section on ethical undertakings, I discussed the possibility to think about childhood in non-teleological terms and as an inherent possibility and fluidity of different situations. This thesis puts forward the dynamisms of language itself in bilingual spaces involving young children and I argue that these should be accounted for in that they show new shaping, transformation and a different expertise, and not *only* as a part of language and literacy learning or language being processed towards a future goal. This argument is not contributive of a romanticizing view of children. On the contrary, it is an attempt to take those bilingual spaces by which both adults and children live, seriously.

It has been argued that everyone is bilingual. I do not deny this possibility but I do not find it to be a very productive statement. There is a risk of watering down the phenomenon and it triggers further hierarchical classification in which specific bilingual competences are more valuable than others. Another reason I do not align with the statement is that it focuses on bilingualism as exclusively attributed to single individuals, something that this thesis seeks to challenge. I would rather tentatively play with the emergence of omnipresent

Proposal

bilingual possibilities among a multitude of elements with (semi)permeable boundaries (like countries, languages, words and apples). Bilingualism could thus be described as a chaotic mess: not as a setback or a penalty but in an affirmative way. It is in one way a concrete proclamation of the many very graspable movements and flows of goods, people and languages in the world, but that is not all there is to it. Moving towards a minor bilingualism involves recognizing how the phenomenon moves and appears as this messiness both in more standard and in previously unexplored variations. I argue that this entails critical, constructive, creative, intriguing and (dis)pleasurable possibilities. It also involves options of becoming differently with the phenomenon of bilingualism at different times and in different places, with different temporalities and different dimensions of language. This does not make everyone bilingual. But, in opening minor exits from this thesis, it is an affirmation of the differences that the phenomenon continuously carries through repetitive spaces, as a challenge for everyone to embrace and be embraced by.

Svensk sammanfattning

Avhandlingen är en förlovning mellan Deleuzio-Guattariansk filosofi och en rad tvåspråkiga, spansk-svenska förskolesituationer som alla lyfter fram ett nära förhållande mellan ting och ord. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) har inspirerat till att utforska språks fysiska och kroppars lingvistiska dimensioner i ett tvåspråkigt sammanhang. Dessa författares argumentation för att den tvåspråkiga situationen erbjuder specifika möjligheter till variationer och nyskapande i gränslandet mellan ting och ord har varit en grund i det material-semiotiska teoretiserande som genomsyrar hela avhandlingen. Avhandlingens politiska ansats bottnar också i dessa författares resonemang både kring lingvistiken som politisk praktik och den materiella och politiska kraften i de små sammanhangens rörelser.

Valet att jobba med förskola grundar sig i en utforskande tanke att utbildningspraktiker som involverar små barn kanske mer än andra platser kan belysa de fysiska dimensioner av språk och litteracitet som avhandlingen avser arbeta med. Samtidigt understryks att avhandlingen inte intresserar sig för barn som enskilda subjekt utan för tvåspråkiga *situationer* där barn utgör några bland många andra viktiga och konstitutiva delar.

Avhandlingens svenska titel är: ”Mot en *mindre* tvåspråkighet. Ett utforskande av språk och litteracitet i utbildningspraktiker med små barn”. Ordet *mindre*, *minor* på engelska, är också det hämtat från Deleuze och Guattari (1986) och har inget med minoritetsspråk att göra. Relationen mellan minor och major bygger inte på storlek utan beskriver avvikelser i relation till en modell. Medan major är en standardiserad, fastlåst modell eller en fårad och steltnad upprepning beskriver minor de rörliga processer av tillblivelse som oundvikligen avviker från och utmanar standardiserade upprepningar genom skapandet av ständig variation.

Bakgrund

Språk flödar över världen, utmanar och omskapar gränsdragningar, samhällen och utbildningspraktiker. När språk och litteracitet diskuteras i allmänhet och i synnerhet i relation till skola och utbildning görs det ofta med standardiserade, fastlåsta versioner av begreppen och med en orientering mot deras framtida funktion. I relation till tvåspråkighet blir detta tydligt då enspråkigt informerade tankar om vad det innebär att vara två-(fler)språkig ofta överskuggar ett myller av olikheter som skapar(-s i) de sammanhang där flera språk ibland samexisterar. Tvåspråkighet beskrivs ofta, aningen motstridigt, å ena sidan som en tillgång och å andra sidan som ett problem. Detta har ofta kopplats till olika socioekonomiska grupper och det finns en utbredd, om än debatterad föreställning, inte minst i den västerländska utbildningsdiskursen, om att tvåspråkighet är bra för de rika men dåligt för de fattiga. Det finns dock nyanser av debatten och inom forskningen där själva fenomenet tvåspråkighet beskrivs på olika sätt inom olika fält, utifrån olika teoretiska perspektiv och beroende på om det kopplas till enskilda individer eller studeras som ett interpersonellt, socialt fenomen.

Forskning kring tvåspråkighet (och relaterade begrepp) som rört sig bort från tidigare individcentrerade, kognitiva och psykolingvistiska perspektiv har i stor utsträckning kommit att beskriva fenomenet i termer av något som skapas i det mellanmännsliga samspelet i utnyttjandet av olika språk som resurser för olika mål i samtalet (cf. Cromdal 2000, Björk-Willén 2006). Denna typ av flexibel tvåspråkighet som utifrån olika perspektiv också beskrivits som exempelvis kodväxling (Auer 1999), crossing (Rampton 1995), polylinguaging (Jørgensen 2008) translanguaging (García 2009, García & Wei 2014) eller heteroglossiska praktiker (Blackledge & Creese 2014) kontrasteras ofta mot en idealbild av olika språk som separata system och tvåspråkighet som en addering av dessa i en person. Praktikerna beskrivs inte sällan som det verkliga och idealbilderna som överklig. Få har utforskat samspelet och kontinuiteten mellan dessa två ”extremer” av tvåspråkig konstruktion i termer av å ena sidan flexibilitet och å den andra separation (men se exempelvis Creese & Blackledge 2011, Bylund & Björk-Willén 2015). De flesta studier om praktiker där flera språk samexisterar har intresserat sig för de mänskliga aktörerna och det mellanmännsliga samspelet i dessa praktiker. Andra sociala och materiella element som också konstituerar

dessa praktiker har framförallt studerats i egenskap av liknöjda resurser som människor använder sig av. Tvåspråkighetsforskning som inte på förhand bestämmer att människan är överordnad och i kontroll över en tänkt, passiv omgivning eller över språk som något människan kan separeras från är ovanlig. I den här avhandlingen studeras tvåspråkighet som producerat i utplattade, icke-hierarkiska, symmetriska praktiker. Det betyder att det språkande tvåspråkiga subjektet ses som icke-centrerat, i termer av ett intrasslat samspel mellan många lika viktiga och aktiva samtidigt både semiotiska och materiella delar. På så sätt söker studien att utforska och lyfta fram överskuggade, alternativa delar av det tvåspråkiga fenomenets mångfald av uttryck och möjligheter. Studien lyfter också fram den språkpolitiska potentialen i detta.

Syfte och frågeställningar

Studiens syfte är att utforska variationer i tvåspråkighet med hjälp av alldagligt specifika situationer vid en spansk-svensk förskola i Sverige samt med ett 'material-semiotiskt teoretiserande'. Det sistnämnda innebär att materiella och sociala, semiotiska aspekter behandlas jämbördigt, sammanlänkat och icke-hierarkiskt. Genom att studera en tvåspråkig förskolepraktik, teori och politik som sammanvävda, intrasslade praktiker producerar avhandlingen kunskap om språk och litteracitet som socialt och materiellt divergenta, transformativa fenomen. Studien utgår från följande forskningsfrågor.

1. På vilka sätt framträder tvåspråkighet i en förskolepraktik?
2. Vilka dimensioner av språk sätts i arbete i detta framträdande och på vilka sätt?
3. Hur uppträder språkpolitiska relationer i en tvåspråkig förskolepraktik?

Forskningsprocessen: Tre intrasslade praktiker och dess göranden

Tvåspråkighet studeras i den här avhandlingen genom sin kontinuerliga tillblivelse i relationer som löper mellan olika men

samtidiga och sammanvävda praktiker. Avhandlingen utvecklas i samspelet och sammanblandningen av en specifik utbildningspraktik, en teoretisk praktik och en politisk praktik.

Den specifika utbildningspraktiken utgörs av en tvåspråkig svensk-spansk förskola i Sverige med vilken forskaren skapade kontakt för videoetnografiskt fältarbete i inledningen av avhandlingsprojektet. Förskolan följer den svenska läroplanen och har därtill en svensk-spansk språklig profil och språkpolicy. Utifrån en konkret episod från fältarbetet, kallad ”Jordnöt-bajs-ögonblicket”, ges inblick i hur den tvåspråkiga utbildningspraktiken konstitueras i samspelet mellan en myriad av olika sociala och materiella komponenter. Genom jordnöt-bajs-ögonblicket och med hjälp av Deleuze (1994) beskrivs relationen mellan fältarbete och dataproduktion där det tydliggörs hur dataproduktion blir en kontinuerlig och förlängd interaktion mellan de olika praktikerna, genom hela forskningsprocessen (cf. Bodén 2015). Därtill beskrivs hur praktiken också konstitueras av två olika intrasslade målsättningar, å ena sidan läroplanens och å den andra den språkliga policyns. I relation till dessa görs kopplingar till tidigare forskning relaterad till språkligt lärande och barns och vuxnas kompetenser i utbildningspraktiker som involverar små barn. Jordnöt-bajs-ögonblicket belyser också den för avhandlingen centrala relationen mellan ting och ord och kunskapsluckan i förhållande till tidigare forskning skrivs här fram utifrån att Jordnöt-bajs-ögonblicket inte kan beskrivas på ett rättvist sätt med hjälp av forskning som fokuserar mellanmänskliga relationer och barns och vuxnas olika kompetenser. Genom episoden tydliggörs också hur den tvåspråkiga praktiken lyfter fram ett generellt språkligt spørsmål då den skapar brott i etablerade och standardiserade betydelserelationer. Dessa brott öppnar alternativa materiella och semiotiska kopplingar mellan ting och ord. Jordnöt-bajs-ögonblicket är ett exempel på den icke-hierarkiska relationen mellan ting och ord som i den teoretiska praktiken beskrivs i termer av en materiell-semiotisk pragmatik.

Den teoretiska praktiken beskrivs med hjälp av en materiell-semiotisk pragmatik som ett mindre teoretiserande. Ordet ”mindre” vill i det här sammanhanget lyfta fram att avhandlingen inte jobbar med ett i förväg definierat teoripaket utan den teoretiska praktiken utvecklas och blir till i forskningsprocessens känsliga samspel mellan utbildningspraktik, teoretiska koncept och politiska angelägenheter. Som en källa till den teoretiska praktiken tas Deleuze och Guattari’s

(1987) beskrivning av sammankopplade ansamlingar (*connected assemblages*) och samspelet mellan en maskinisk ansamling av kroppar och en därtill attribuerad ansamling av uttryck. Detta blir utgångspunkt för en forskningspraktik som tänker med teori (Mazzei and Jacksson 2012) och aktiverar begrepp. Det attributiva förhållandet mellan ting och ord som fångas upp i sammankopplade ansamlingar, sätts i vidare arbete i alla avhandlingens delstudier och beskrivs i vad som kallas en materiell-semiotisk pragmatik. Denna beskriver också hur vissa begrepp från *Actor-Network Theory (ANT)* blivit centrala i artikel 1. I anslutning till en materiell-semiotisk pragmatik och med en fördjupning i Deleuze's texter om *sense* som en materiell dimension av språk (Deleuze 1990) diskuteras hur olika beskrivningar av semiotik (gjorda av Saussure respektive Peirce) hjälper till att producera helt olika berättelser om (två)språk(ighet) med helt olika effekter. Ett mindre teoretiserande sammanfattas i avhandlingen som en tvåspråkig ingång till teori, i det att den möjliggör diversifierade sätt att experimentera i ett teoretisk-praktiskt-politiskt samspel: ett experiment med potential att producera tvåspråkighet annorlunda, vilket banar väg för den tredje huvudpraktiken.

Avhandlingens politiska praktik mynnar i en mindre politik, vilken kan beskrivas utifrån Guattari (1995b) som de molekylära och materiella rörelser som alla storskaliga kollektiv är kopplade till. En mindre politisk praktik är sammanlänkad med större rörelser av språk, människor och gods över nationella och andra gränser och de implikationer dessa får för utbildningspraktiker, i det här fallet specifikt för förskolepraktiker i Sverige. De krav som ställs i förskolans läroplan på att jobba med tvåspråkighet och därtill relaterade dilemman diskuteras liksom de tekniska praktiker för mätning och kontroll av enskilda institutioners arbete med detta, som samhällspolitiska ambitioner ger upphov till. Avhandlingens politiska praktik växer fram i relation till ansvar och de alternativa och potentiellt transformativa val som kan göras i den forskande och lärande tvåspråkiga praktiken. Som ett exempel diskuteras politiska dimensioner av begreppet litteracitet och med hjälp av Deleuze (1994), Deleuze och Guattari (1987) samt med inspiration från Roy (2005, 2008) belyses det förrådiska i en tro på kommunikation och litteracitet som apolitiska fenomen som enkelt kan beskrivas med hjälp av språk som kod. En sådan föreställning skapar hegemonisk kunskap som riskerar att överskugga det som skulle kunna kallas differentiellt

mummel och alternativa kunskaper om litteracitet. Den här studien fokuserar heterogena praktiker och *sense*-uella processer där flera olika aspekter av litteracitet växer fram och blir till på mångdimensionella, material-semiotiska och oförutsägbara sätt. På så sätt är avhandlingens ingång till litteracitet en "illitterat" ingång genom att den förutsätter ett utforskande av det okända. Ett engagemang med (non)sens och (il)litteracitet är ett sätt att nära en diskussion som rör sig bortom det som går att mäta och utforskar annorlunda och kanske nya variationer av språkanvändning och tvåspråkighet. På så sätt bidrar avhandlingen med insikter kring (den politiska och pedagogiska) potentialen i okända, tidigare aldrig gjorda förbindelser mellan ting och ord och den skapande expertis som kan utgöras av att inte veta.

De etiska och metodologiska processer som blivit till i samspelet mellan de tre huvudpraktikerna (utbildning, teori, politik) utvecklas i den del av avhandlingen som kallas för "göranden". Etiska göranden är en diskussion i relation till det faktum att utbildningspraktiken innefattar små barn. Här problematiseras olika roller som tillskrivs barn i forskning i relation till kompetens, sårbarhet och kontroll. Därtill diskuteras vikten av en kritisk ingång till olika konceptualiseringar av barn i forskning samt av att söka undvika forskningspraktiker som cementerar barns plats i samhället. Detta avslutas med en argumentation för det etiskt försvarbara i att studera "barn" som tillblivande processer i en tvåspråkig situation snarare än barn som enskilda, individuella subjekt.

Metodologiska göranden utgör vidare presentationer av de förlängningar och intensifieringar av dataproduktion som ett kontinuerligt arbete både *i* och *utanför* fält och genom hela forskningsprocessen. Metoder i fältarbete (videoobservationer och fältanteckningar) kopplas och förlängs i analytiska procedurer utanför fältarbete och vidare i skrivprocessens intensifieringar av desamma. På detta sätt tydliggörs hur hela forskningsarbetet både skapar och skapas i de praktiker som studien inkluderar. Göranden avslutas med sammanfattningar av de fyra delstudierna som var och en tar upp relationen mellan språkpolicy och materiell kreativitet, möjligheter i att läsa utan att kunna, den "smetiga" relationen mellan ting och ord och (il)litterat expertis samt tystnads olika möjligheter och effekter. De olika delstudierna kan ses som resultat av göranden men också som göranden i sig själva i det att de utgör koncentrerade variationer av de

handlingar och interaktiva processer som skapat avhandlingen som helhet.

Resultat och diskussion

Avhandlingens resultat formuleras som tre temporära förslag. Att slutgiltigt definiera vad en mindre tvåspråkighet är går inte och poängen med avhandlingen är att den utgör en rörelse, i riktning *mot*, som aldrig tar slut. En mindre tvåspråkighet är på så sätt ett flyktigt fenomen. Resultatet handlar därför om att koppla till tidigare och potentiellt nyuppkomna problem och föra en diskussion kring hur tvåspråkiga utbildningspraktiker kan förhålla sig till och utvecklas tillsammans med denna flyktighet. Det handlar också om vad tvåspråkighet i förskolans praktik kan tillföra i forskning om tvåspråkighet också i allmänhet.

De tre förslagen handlar kortfattat om att 1) tvåspråkighet är ett pluralt, kollektivt, både flytande och specifikt fenomen. 2) Detta fenomen skapas på olika sätt i olika sammanhang där flera, samtidiga dimensioner av språk arbetar (språk kan förstås som kod men blir lika ofta materiella, affektiva intensiteter). 3) Tvåspråkighet är också både standardiserat, allmänt, delat och publikt samtidigt som det också är materiellt, intimt, odelat, oförklarligt och privat.

Att vara nyfiken på språk i majoritära, standardiserade, publika versioner är inte detsamma som att närma sig språk i minoritär tillblivelse i icke-standardiserade, materiella, privata rum. Båda har sina särskilda utmaningar och båda är nödvändiga men på olika sätt. Dessutom visar studien hur de också är sammankopplade. En uppmaning till utbildningspraktiker att söka det icke kända och öppna upp för tidigare utforskade material-semiotiska vägar kräver långt mer kunskap och visdom än att arbeta exklusivt med det som redan (genom andra) är känt. Att interagera med materiella, mindre, muterande och ibland underhållande variationer av språk kräver mycket mer av utbildningspraktiker. Det kräver att pedagoger hela tiden läser på och håller sig uppdaterade (till exempel vad det gäller olika språkliga system, principer, strukturer och standardiserade dimensioner av språk) och samtidigt och simultant ”avläär” desamma och öppnar upp för sådant som kanske aldrig har hänt förut. Det kräver både professionellt ansvar och mod att välja möjligheter till nyskapande och förändring, att vara påläst och kunnig och samtidigt också ödmjukt omfamna ett icke-vetande.

De tre förslagen växer fram i avhandlingen i samspel med episoder från en tvåspråkig förskola. Avhandlingen uppmuntrar dock till att tänka kring eller mot en mindre tvåspråkighet som en möjlighet inbyggd även i andra situationer som inte har med förskola eller utbildning att göra. Detta vänder ut och in på en konventionell tanke vad det gäller språk och litteracitet eftersom tvåspråkig tillblivelse i tidiga år kan vara något annat än bara enskilda individers steg mot ett vuxet, tvåspråkigt mål. Den expertis, kreativitet och uppfinningsrikedom som beskrivits i de olika episoderna som komponerats i den här avhandlingen tillskrivs inte barn som enskilda, romantiserade subjekt. Det som avhandlingen lyfter fram är den material-semiotiska tvåspråkiga praktiken som impregnerad med sådana möjligheter.

Det har ibland argumenterats för att alla är tvåspråkiga. Även om det förstås är en möjlighet är det inte ett särskilt produktivt påstående eftersom tvåspråkighet då ses ur ett individperspektiv, en föreställning som den här avhandlingen inte aktiverar. Snarare öppnar avhandlingen upp för att experimentera med överallt, ständigt alltmer närvarande tvåspråkiga möjligheter som växer fram bland en uppsjö av olika element med semipermeabla gränser (såsom länder, språk, ord och ting). Tvåspråkighet kan på detta sätt beskrivas som en kaosartad soppa, men inte i termer av ett problem utan på ett affirmativt sätt. Det är på ett sätt ett väldigt konkret påstående i relation till rörelser och flöden av gods, människor och språk i världen men det är inte allt. En rörelse mot en mindre tvåspråkighet innefattar en förståelse för att fenomenet blir till i denna röra på en mängd olika sätt, både mer standardlikt och på tidigare icke erfarna maner. Detta innebär kritiska, konstruktiva och kreativa möjligheter samt alternativa tvåspråkigheter vid olika tidpunkter och på olika platser, med olika temporaliteter och olika dimensioner av språk. Detta gör inte alla till tvåspråkiga individer. Men det är ett omfamnande av de olikheter som fenomenet hela tiden bär genom upprepning i olika rum, som en utmaning som också omfamnar alla.

Breve resumen en español

El título español de esta tesis es ‘Hacia un bilingüismo menor. Una exploración del lenguaje en prácticas de enseñanza con niños pequeños’. El objetivo es explorar variaciones del bilingüismo con la ayuda de una serie de situaciones cotidianas, específicas de una preescuela bilingüe (sueco-español) en Suecia y con un enfoque teórico ‘material-semiótico’, es decir que trata de manera equivalente, entrelazada y no jerárquica a los elementos materiales y sociales/semióticos. Este enfoque se inspira en la filosofía de Deleuze (1986, 1989, 1990, 1994) y Deleuze y Guattari (1986, 1987, 1994) e implica que la educación (la escuela bilingüe), el trabajo teórico de la tesis y la política del lenguaje se consideran tres prácticas distintas pero entrelazadas, y que los conocimientos sobre el lenguaje que la tesis aspira a desencadenar se producen en la interacción entre estas prácticas. Las preguntas que la tesis busca contestar son:

1. ¿Cómo aparece el bilingüismo en una práctica educativa preescolar?
2. ¿Cuáles son las dimensiones del lenguaje que se activan en este aparecer y de qué manera?
3. ¿Cómo emergen las relaciones políticas del lenguaje en una práctica bilingüe preescolar?

La tesis es un compromiso entre la filosofía Deleuzio-Guattariana y una serie de situaciones preescolares bilingües (español-sueco) que inspiran a explorar una barrera semipermeable entre las cosas y las palabras. Esta es la base del trabajo teórico ‘material-semiótico’ que impregna toda la tesis. El enfoque político de la tesis también se basa en el razonamiento de estos autores sobre lo político de la lingüística, y el poder político y material de los movimientos específicos en situaciones concretas (una política menor).

La elección de trabajar con situaciones preescolares se basa en una hipótesis que las prácticas educativas que afectan a niños pequeños, quizás más que en ningún otro lugar, puedan ilustrar las dimensiones físicas del lenguaje. Al mismo tiempo, quede claro que el objetivo de la tesis no se centra en los niños como sujetos individuales sino en las situaciones en las que los niños igual que los adultos constituyen sólo algunas entre muchas otras partes importantes.

La palabra menor, ‘minor’ en inglés, también viene de Deleuze y Guattari (1986) y no tiene nada que ver con minorías (i.e. lingüísticas). La relación entre menor y mayor no se basa en números o tamaño sino que los conceptos describen la variación y el estándar. Mientras lo mayoritario es un modelo estándar rígido del lenguaje, ‘minor’ describe los procesos flexibles y variables que inevitablemente se desvían y desafían las repeticiones de un modelo estándar.

Los movimientos de personas y lenguas sobre el mundo desafían las fronteras nacionales, las comunidades y las prácticas educativas. En disputas sobre el lenguaje, en particular en relación con la educación y la formación, predominan las versiones estándar (‘mayoritarias’) y una orientación hacia una futura funcionalidad del lenguaje. En relación con el bilingüismo, esto se encamina en una imagen del fenómeno prejuiciada de ideas monolingües de lo que el ser bi- (multi)lingüe significa. Estas ideas ensombrecen los matices de la gran cantidad de diferencias que se crean en situaciones donde varios idiomas coexisten y de los cuales se necesita más conocimientos para poder aprovechar. Un poco contradictorio, el bilingüismo se ha descrito tanto como un recurso a valorar como un problema. En relaciones a distintos grupos socio-económicos, hasta se ha debatido si el bilingüismo es bueno para los ricos pero malo para los pobres. Entre un campo cada vez más amplio de investigación (del discurso y la interacción interpersonal) que se enfrenta a estas simplificaciones del bilingüismo, son escasos los estudios que no predeterminan al ser humano como superior y en control del lenguaje, y al entorno como supuestamente pasivo. Esto hace que varias relaciones en situaciones bilingües queden inexploradas. El enfoque ‘material-semiótico’ de esta tesis ayuda a estudiar el bilingüismo como un fenómeno emergente en relaciones a la vez materiales y sociales, producidas como no jerárquicas y simétricas. La interacción ocurre no solamente entre personas, sino enmarañada y emergente entre una pluralidad de entidades, tanto sociales como materiales.

La recolección de datos se llevó a cabo principalmente durante el año escolar de 2011-2012 en una preescuela bilingüe (sueco-español) en Suecia. Los materiales producidos durante este tiempo (aprox. 59 horas de grabaciones de vídeo y apuntes adicionales de actividades cotidianas) son procesados en interacción con conceptos teóricos y asuntos políticos en un análisis material-semiótico. La metodología involucrada en cada artículo se basa en el mismo enfoque teórico-político, pero se lleva a cabo de distintas maneras, con la inspiración de distintos escolares y en relación a lo que requieren las particularidades de los episodios estudiados. Además de teóricos de la educación inspirados de Deleuze y Guattari, ANT (Actor-Network Theory) ha servido como método de análisis.

Los resultados se resumen en tres sugerencias temporales: 1) El bilingüismo ocurre como un fenómeno plural, colectivamente producido tanto transitorio como específico 2) El bilingüismo emerge con diferentes, simultáneas dimensiones del lenguaje (tanto como código como intensidades afectivas, materiales) 3) El bilingüismo es compartido y público a la vez que es privado y no concluyente. La tesis también demuestra la interrelación entre distintas construcciones del bilingüismo (aditivo – flexible, público – privado) así como la creatividad/productividad de lo incierto y lo que se podría nombrar una pericia (an)alfabeta. La tesis considera el impacto educativo y ético-político de estas sugerencias en relación al trabajo con el bilingüismo en prácticas de enseñanza que afectan a niños pequeños. Al mismo tiempo, el estudio inspira a pensar hacia un bilingüismo menor también en términos más generales.

References

- Aarsand, P. & Forsberg, L. (2010) Producing children's corporeal privacy: ethnographic video recording as material-discursive practice. *Qualitative Research* 10:249-268.
- Anderson, R. (2004) First language loss in Spanish-speaking children: Patterns of loss and implications for clinical practice. In B. Goldstein (ed.) *Bilingual Language Development and Disorders in Spanish-English Speakers*, 187-212. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Auer, P. (1999) *Code-switching in conversation: Language interactions and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, B. (2007) Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach*, 257-274. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baker, C. (2000) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Fifth Edition (2011) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Barad, K. (2007) *Meeting the universe halfway. Quantum physics of the entanglement of matter and meaning*. London: Duke Universal Press.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2004) *The One-Parent-One-Language Approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Barton, D. (1994) *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (1998) *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge.
- Bergström, K. (2015) "Fördelen med flerspråkighet". Newsfeed. Uppsala University's webpage 2015-03-04: <http://www.uu.se/press/nyheter/artikel/?id=4244> Downloaded 2016-12-10.
- Biesta, G. (2014) *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Björk-Willén, P. (2006) *Lära och leka med flera språk. Socialt samspel i flerspråkig förskola*. [Learn and play with several

- languages. Social interaction in a multilingual preschool.] Linköping Studies in Arts and science 376, Linköping: Linköping University (Doctoral Thesis)
- Björk-Willén, P. (2007) Participation in multilingual preschool play: Shadowing and crossing as interactional resources. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39:2133-2158.
- Björk-Willén, P. (2016) Peer collaboration in front of two alphabet charts. In M. Theobald (ed.), *Friendship and peer culture in multilingual settings*, 143-169 Special Volume 21. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Björk-Willén, P. & Cromdal, J. (2009) When education seeps into 'free play': How preschool children accomplish multilingual education. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41:1493-1518.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (eds) (2014) *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (Educational Linguistics 20). New York: Springer.
- Bodén, L. (2016) *Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism*. Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 29, Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 10. Dissertation: Linköping University.
- Bodén, L. (2015) The Presence of School Absenteeism: Exploring Methodologies for Researching the Material-Discursive Practice of School Absence Registration. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 15(3):192-202.
- Bosch, L. & Nuria, S. (2003) Simultaneous bilingualism and the perception of a language-specific vowel contrast in the first year of life. *Language and Speech* 46:217-243.
- Boyd, S., Huss, L. & Ottesjö, C. (2017) Children's agency in creating and maintaining language policy in practice in two "language profile" preschools in Sweden. *Multilingua*: aop.
- Bruner, J. (1986) *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bylund, A. & Björk-Willén, P. (2015) Multilingual becoming in reading: a picture storybook-reading-assemblage in early years education. In Mourão, S. & Lourenco, M. (eds) *Early Years Second Language Education: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*, 78-91. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Callon, M. (1986) Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of Saint Brieuc

References

- Bay. In J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: a new Sociology of Knowledge? Sociological Review Monograph 32*, 196-233. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Callon, M. & Law, J. (1993) Agency and the hybrid collectif. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 94(2):445-465.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013) *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.
- Cekaite, A. Blum-Kulka, S. Grøver, V. & Teubal, E. (eds) (2014) *Children's Peer Talk: Learning from Each other*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Claesdotter, A. (2006) "Skolifiering ger prestationsångest." [Schoolification causes performance anxiety] In *Förskolan 2006-09-05*: <http://forskolan.se/skolifiering-ger-prestationsangest/> Downloaded 2017-01-18.
- CODEx regler och riktlinjer för forskning, forskning som involverar barn [rules and guidelines for research, research involving children] <http://codex.vr.se/manniska1.shtml>. Downloaded 25-05-2015.
- Colebrook, C. (2002) *Understanding Deleuze*. Crows Nest Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Colebrook, C. (2012) Foreword: The multiple, the letter and the theorist. In d. Masny D. & D. R. Cole (eds) *Mapping Multiple Literacies: An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies*, vii-xii. London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Corsaro, W. (1997) *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2011) Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of pragmatics* 43:1196-1208.
- Cromdal, J. (2001) Can I be with?: Negotiating play entry in a bilingual school. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33:515-543.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dahlberg, G. & Moss, P. (2005) *Ethics and Politics in Early Childhood Education*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Dalgren, S. (2017) *Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag*. Linköping Studies in Pedagogic

References

- Practices No. 30. Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 11. Dissertation. Linköping University.
- Dawkins, R. (2003) The Problem of a Material Element in the Cinematic Sign: Deleuze, Metz and Peirce. *Angelaki. Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 8/3:155-166.
- DeLanda, M. (2006) *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage theory and Social Complexity*, London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. (1986) *Cinema 1*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1989) *Cinema 2*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1990) *The Logic of Sense*. Translated by Mark Lester. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994) *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1986) *Kafka. Toward a Minor Literature*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994) *What is philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchill. London: Verso.
- Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (1977/1996) *Dialogues*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Deleuze, G. & Negri, A. (1990) Control and Becoming. Gilles Deleuze in conversation with Antonio Negri. *Futur Antérieur* (Spring 1990) Translated by Martin Joughin.
- Derewianka, B. (2004) Rocks in the head. Children and the language of geology. In R. Carter (ed.) *Knowledge about Language and the Curriculum*, 197-215. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Dufresne, T. (2006) Exploring the processes in becoming biliterate: The roles of resistance to learning and affect. *International Journal of Learning* 12:347-354.
- Döpke, S. (1992) *One parent one language: An interactional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Döpke, S. (1998) Competing language structures: The acquisition of verb placement by bilingual German-English children. *Journal of Child Language* 25:555-584.

- Fenwick, T. & Edwards, R. (eds) (2012) *Researching education through actor-network theory*. UK: Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Fiske, J. (1990) *Introduction to Communication Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Fjellman Jaderup, E. (2008) "Pedagogikprofessor kritisk till tidig skolifiering." [Professor of pedagogy critical to 'early schoolification'] In Sydsvenskan 2008-12-21: <http://www.sydsvenskan.se/2008-12-21/pedagogikprofessor-kritisk-till-tidig-skolifiering> Downloaded 2017-01-18.
- Gafaranga, J. (2000) Language separatedness. A normative framework in studies of language alternation. *Estudios de sociolingüística* 1:65-84.
- García, O. (2009) *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden and Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O. & Wei, L. (2014) *Translanguaging. Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. (1990) *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. London and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Gibbons, P. (2006) *Stärk språket. Stärk lärandet. Språk- och kunskapsutvecklande arbetssätt för och med andraspråkselever i klassrummet*. [Support the language. Support learning. Language- and knowledge developing working methods for and with second language students in the classroom] Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren.
- Gjems, L. (2009) *Barn samtalar sig till kunskap*. [Children converse themselves to knowledge] Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Goodwin, C. (2000) Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10): 1489-1522.
- Gough, N. (2008) Becoming-Cyborg. A RhizomANTic Assemblage. In I. Semmetsky (ed.) *Nomadic Education. Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*, 77-90. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Grammont, M. (1902) *Observations sur la langue des enfants* [Observations on child language]. Paris: Mélanges Meillet.
- Granström, H. (2016) "Vet Skolverket inget om barns utveckling?" [Does the Swedish National Agency for Education not know anything about children's development?] In *Expressen* 2016-12-05.. <http://www.expressen.se/kultur/vet-skolverket-inget-om-barns-utveckling/>. Downloaded 2017-01-18.

References

- Gregoriou, Z. (2008) Commencing the Rhizome. Towards a Minor Philosophy of Education. In I. Semmetsky (ed.) *Nomadic Education. Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*, 91-109. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with two languages*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grøver Aukurust, V. (2004) Explanatory discourse in young second language learners' peer play. *Discourse Studies* 6:393-412.
- Grüber, S. & Puskás, T. (2013) Förskolan i det mångkulturella samhället. Från invandrabarn till flerspråkiga barn. [Preschool in the multicultural society. From immigrant children to multilingual children.] In P. Björk-Willén, S. Gruber & T. Puskás (eds) *Nationell förskola med mångkulturellt uppdrag*, 24-43. [National preschool with multicultural undertakings] Stockholm: Liber.
- Guattari, F. (1995a) *Chasophy*. Edited by Sylvere Lotringer. Semiotext[e].
- Guattari, F. (1995b) *Chaosmosis an ethico-aesthetic paradigm*. Translated by Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1993) Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education* 5:93-116.
- Hardt, M. (1995) "Alla människor är filosofer. Hos Gilles Deleuze föddes ett nytt slags tänkande." [All humans are philosophers. With Gilles Deleuze a new way of thinking was born.]. Translated to Swedish by Stefan Jonsson and published in *Dagens Nyheter* 1995-12-13: <http://www.dn.se/arkiv/kultur/tredje-sidan-alla-manniskor-ar-filosof-er-hos-gilles-deleuze-foddes> Downloaded 2015-12-01.
- Hasan, R. (2002) Ways of meaning, ways of learning: code as an explanatory concept. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 23(4):537-548.
- Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press).
- Heath, S.B. (1982) What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. In *Language in Society* 11(1):49-76.
- Heller, M. (1999) *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.

References

- Hermansson, C. (2013) *Nomadic Writing. Exploring Processes of Writing in Early Childhood Education*. Dissertation. Karlstad University Studies 17.
- Hickey-Moody, A.C. (2013) Deleuze's children. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 45(3):272-286.
- Higgins M., Madden, B., Berard, M., Lenz-Kothe, E. & Nordström, S. (2016) De/signing research in education: patchwork(ing) methodologies with theory. Published online. *Educational Studies*: 1-24.
- Holmen, A. & Jørgensen, J.N. (1997) Aspects of the linguistic development of minority children in a majority school. In J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (eds), *The development of successive bilingualism in school-age children* (Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, 27). Copenhagen: The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies.
- Hultman, K. & Lenz-Taguchi, H. (2010) Challenging the anthropocentric analysis of visual data: a relational materialist methodological approach to educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 23(5):525-42.
- Hultman, K. (2011) *Barn, linjaler och andra aktörer. Posthumanistiska perspektiv på subjektskapande och materialitet I förskola/skola*. PhD diss, Stockholm University.
- Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. (2012) *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: Viewing Data Across Multiple Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. (2016) Thinking with an agentic assemblage in posthuman inquiry. In Taylor C.A. & Hughes, C. (eds) *Posthuman Research Practices in Education*, 93-107. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005) Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication* 25:257-277.
- James, A. & Prout, A. (eds) (1990) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood. Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. London: Falmer press.
- James, A. & Prout, A. (1995) Hierarchy, boundary, and agency: toward a theoretical perspective on childhood. *Sociological Studies of Children* 7:77-99.

References

- Jaspers, J. (2011) Multilingual structures and agencies. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43:1157-1160.
- Jefferson, G. (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the first generation*, 13-31. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Johan Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Jorgensen, J.N. (2008) Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5:161-176.
- Karrebaek, M. (2010) 'I can be with!' a novice kindergartner's successes and challenges in play participation and development of communicative skills. *Pragmatics and Language Learning* 12:325-358.
- Kohan, W.O. (2011) Childhood, education and philosophy: notes on deterritorialisation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 45(2):339-357.
- Kohan, W.O. (2015) *Childhood, Education and Philosophy: New Ideas for an Old Relationship*. New York: Routledge.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kuby, C.R., Gutschall, T.R. & Kirchhofer, J.M. (2015) 'Go be a writer': Intra-activity with materials, time and space in literacy learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 15(3):394-419.
- Kultti, A. (2012) *Flerspråkiga barn i förskolan: villkor för deltagande och lärande*. [Multilingual children in preschool: conditions for participation and learning]. PhD Thesis. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg.
- Kultti, A. (2013) Singing as language learning activity in multilingual toddler groups in preschool. *Early Child Development and Care* 183(12): 1955-1969.
- Kultti A. (2014) Mealtimes in Swedish preschools. Pedagogical opportunities for toddlers learning a new language. *Early Years* 34(1): 18-31.
- Kyratzis, A. (2014) Peer interaction, framing, and literacy in preschool bilingual pretend play. In A. C. Thunqvist, S. Blum-Kulka, V. G. Aukrust & E. Teubal (eds) *Children's Peer Talk: Learning From Each Other*, 214-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References

- Lather, P. & St Pierre, E.A. (2013) Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26(6):629-633.
- Lansdown, G. (1994) Children's rights. In B. Mayall (ed.) *Children's Childhoods. Observed and Experienced*. London: Falmer press.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Latour, B. (1999) *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2000/1993) The Berlin Key or how to do Words with Things. In P. M. Graves-Brown (ed.) *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture*, 10-21. London and New York. Routledge.
- Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lecercle, J. (2002) *Deleuze and Language*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Law, J. (1999) After ANT: Complexity, naming and topology. In J. Law & J. Hassard (eds.) *Actor network theory and after*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- Law, J. (2007) Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics, version of 25th April 2007, available at <http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2007ANTandMaterialSemiotics.pdf>, (downloaded on 18th May, 2007).
- Lee, N. (2001) *Childhood and Society: Growing Up in an Age of Uncertainty*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010) *Going Beyond the Theory/Practice Divide in Early Childhood Education. Introducing an Intra-active Pedagogy*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Lindberg, I. (2002) Myter om tvåspråkighet. [Myths about bilingualism] *Språkvård* 4.
- Lindgren, A. (2006) *Från små människor till lärande individer. Föreställningar om barn och barndom I förskoleprogram 1970-2000*. [From small human beings to learning individuals. Conceptions of child and childhood in preschool programs 1970-

References

- 2000]. Skrifter om utbildningsprogrammets historia nr 16. Malmö: Stiftelsen Etermedierna i Sverige.
- Linell, P. (2011) *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics. Its Nature, Origins and transformations*. London:Routledge.
- Lorimer, H. (2005) Cultural geography: the business of being “more-than-representational”. *Progress in Human Geography* 29:83-94.
- Lorimer, J. (2013) ‘More-than-human visual analysis: witnessing and evoking affect in human-nonhuman interactions.’ In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (eds) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*, 61-78. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lury, C. & Wakeford, N. (eds) (2012) *Inventive Methods: The Happening of the Social*. London: Routledge.
- MacLure, M. (2013) Classification or wonder? Coding as an analytic practice in qualitative research. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (eds) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*, 164-183. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Masny, D. (2006) Learning and creative processes: a poststructural perspective on language and multiple literacies. *International Journal of Learning*, 12:149-156.
- Masny, D. (2010) Multiple literacies theory: How it functions what it produces. *Perspectiva* 28(2):337–52.
- Masny, D. (2011) Multiple literacies theory: exploring futures. *Policy Futures in Education* 9(4):494–504.
- Masny, D. (2013) Rhizoanalytic pathways in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 19: 339-348.
- Masny, D. (2016) Problematizing qualitative research: Reading a data assemblage with rhizoanalysis. *Qualitative Inquiry* 22(8):1-10.
- Masny, D. & Cole, D.R. (2009) *Multiple Literacies Theory: A Deleuzian Perspective*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Masny, D. & Cole, D.R. (2012) *Mapping Multiple Literacies. An Introduction to Deleuzian Literacy Studies*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Mazzei, L.A. (2010) Thinking data with Deleuze. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 23(5):511-523.

References

- Mazzei, L.A. & Jackson, A.Y. (2012) Complicating voice in a refusal to “let participants speak for themselves”. *Qualitative Inquiry* 18:745-751.
- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons. Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Melander, H. (2009) Trajectories of learning. Embodied interaction in change. *Uppsala Studies in Education* 124. Uppsala: Acta universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Mol, A. (2008) I eat an apple. On theorizing subjectivities. *Subjectivity* 22:28-37. doi:10.1057/sub.2008.2
- Mondada, L. (2006) “Video recording as the reflexive preservation and configuration of phenomenal features for analysis”. In H. Knoblauch, J. Raab, H.-G. Soeffner & B. Schnettler (eds) *Video Analysis*. Bern: Lang.
- Morrow, V. & Richards, M. (1996) The ethics of social research with children: an overview. *Children and Society* 10:90-105.
- Mourão, S. (2012) *English Picturebook Illustrations and Language Development in Early Years Education*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Aveiro: University of Aveiro.
- Mourão, S. (2015). Response to picturebooks: A case for valuing children’s linguistic repertoires during repeated read alouds. In S. Mourão, & M. Lourenço, (eds.) *Early Years Second Language Education: International Perspectives on Theories and Practice*, 62-77. Abingdon: Routledge: 62-77
- Murris, K. (2016) *The Posthuman Child. Educational Transformation Through Philosophy with Picturebooks*. London: Routledge.
- Nelson, K. (1996) *Language in Cognitive Development. The Emergence of the Mediated Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ninio, A. & Snow, C.E. (1996) *Pragmatic Development*. Westview Press Inc.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1986a) Language acquisition and socialization. Three developmental stories and their implications. In R.A. Schweder & R.A. Le Vinen (eds). *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*, 276-320. New York: Cambridge University Press.

References

- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (eds) (1986b) Language socialization across cultures. *Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language* 3. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, P. (2010) *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*, Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Olsson, L.M. (2009) *Movement and Experimentation in Young Children's Learning: Deleuze and Guattari in Early Childhood Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Olsson, L.M. (2012) Eventizing curriculum. Learning to read and write through becoming a citizen of the world. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 28(1):88-107.
- Olsson, L.M. (2013) Taking children's questions seriously: the need for creative thought. *Global Studies of Childhood* 3(3):230-253.
- Palmer, A. (2016) Is this the tallest building in the world? A posthuman approach to ethical dilemmas in young children's learning projects. *Global Studies of Childhood* 6(3):283-298.
- Paradis, J. (2007) Early bilingual and multilingual acquisition, in Peter Auer & Li Wei (eds) *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, 15–44. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Parkvall, M. (2016) *Sveriges språk i siffror*. Vilka språk talas och av hur många? [Sweden's languages in numbers. Which languages are spoken and by how many?]. Stockholm: Morfem och Språkrådet.
- Paugh, A. (2005) Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role-play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society* 34:63–86.
- Piaget, J. (1952) *Play, Dreams and Imitations in Childhood*. New York: Norton.
- Prout, A. (2005) *The Future of Childhood. Towards the Interdisciplinary Study of Children*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Puskás, T. & Björk-Willén, P. (2017) Dilemmatic aspects of language policies in a trilingual preschool group. *Multilinguala*.
- Rampton, B. (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. England: Longman.
- Reimers, E. & Martinsson, L. (eds) (2017) *Education and Political Subjectivity in Neoliberal Times and Places : Emergences of Norms*

References

- and Possibilities* (1st edition). London. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-132370>
- Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roy, K. (2005) On sense and nonsense: Looking beyond the literacy wars. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 39(1):99-111.
- Roy, K. (2008) Deleuzian Murmurs: Education and Communication. In Semetsky, I (ed.) *Nomadic Education. Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*, 159-170. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Runfors, A. (2013) Policy, praktik och politik [Policy, practice and politics] In P. Björk-Willén, S. Gruber & T. Puskás (eds) *Nationell Förskola med Mångkulturellt Uppdrag*, 137-150. [National preschool with multicultural undertakings] Stockholm: Liber.
- Schleppegrell, M.J. (2004) *The Language of Schooling. A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate Publishers.
- Semetsky, I. (ed.) (2013) *Nomadic Education. Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
- Semetsky, I. & Masny, D. (eds) 2013. *Deleuze and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2006) *Language policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J.M. & Couthard, R. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, B.F. (1974) *About Behaviorism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Statistics Sweden (2017) <http://www.scb.se/en/> Downloaded 2017-07-10. http://www.scb.se/sv_/Hitta-statistik/Artiklar/Rekordstor-invandring-under-2015/ Downloaded 2017-07-10.
- Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2009) *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2012) What is language policy? In Spolsky, B. (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook on Language Policy*, 3-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References

- Stenliden, L. (2014) *Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. Learning Conditions in the Social Science Classroom*. Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices, 20. Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences, 6. Linköping: Linköping University Dissertation.
- Stivale, C.J. (2003) Deleuze/Parnet in dialogues: the folds of post-identity. *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 36(1):25-37.
- Strauss, V (2014) "Why is bilingual education 'good' for the rich kids but 'bad' for poor, immigrant students?" In Washington Post 2014-10-24. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2014/10/24/why-is-bilingual-education-good-for-rich-kids-but-bad-for-poor-immigrant-students/?utm_term=.25b4e21e3c79 Downloaded 2017-07-23.
- Street, B. (1996) Literacy, economy, and society. *Literacy Across the Curriculum* 12:8-15.
- Strömquist, S., Wagner, Å.K.H. & Uppstad, P.H. (2010) *Den flerspråkiga människan: en bok om skriftspråkslärande*. [The multilingual human: a book about written language learning] Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Swain, M. (1985) Communicative competence. Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, 235-256. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers.
- Swedish Institute (2017) Article written by the Language Council of Sweden for the Swedish Institute: <https://svenskaspraket.si.se/for-studerande/artiklar-om-sverige/artiklar-om-sprak/spraksituationen-i-sverige/> Downloaded 2017-01-18.
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2010/2016) *Läroplan för Förskolan* [Curriculum for the Preschool] Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2013) P. Björk-Willén, T. Puskás & A. Bylund. *Flera Språk i Förskolan. Teori och Praktik* [Several Languages in Preschool. Theory and Practice], Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Swedish National Agency for Education (webpage) (2017) <https://www.skolverket.se/laroplaner-amnen-och->

References

- [kurser/forskola/forskolans-laroplan-ska-revideras-1.260355](#).
Downloaded: 2017-07-26.
- Swedish Parliament (2009) *Språklag* 2009:600 [Language Law 2009:600] by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs.
https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600 . Downloaded 2017-07-23.
- Swedish Research Council (2002) *Forskningsetiska Principer inom Humanistisk-Samhällsvetenskaplig Forskning* [Research Ethical Principles within the Humanities and Social Sciences]. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Swedish Schools Inspectorate (2017) <https://www.skolinspektionen.se/sv/Tillsyn--granskning/Kvalitetsgranskning/Skolinspektionen-granskar-kvaliteten/flersprakiga-barn-i-forskolan/> Downloaded 2017-01-19.
- Säljö, R. (2000) *Lärande i Praktiken. Ett Sociokulturellt Perspektiv*. [Learning in Practice. A Socio-Cultural Perspective.] Stockholm: Prisma.
- Tabors, P.O. (2008) *One Child, Two Languages. A Guide for Early Childhood Educators of Children Learning English as a Second Language*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing.
- Taubman, P. (2009) *Teaching by Numbers: Deconstructing the Discourse of Standards and Accountability*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, C.A. (2013) Mobile sections and flowing matter in participant-generated video: Exploring a Deleuzian Approach to Visual Sociology. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (eds) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*, 42-60. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press.
- Thompson, R.A. (1992) Developmental changes in research risk and benefit. A changing calculus of concerns. in B. Stanley & J. E. Sieber (eds) *Social Research on Children and Adolescents: Ethical Issues*. London: Sage.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2008) *International Literacy Statistics: A Review of Concepts, Methodology and Current Data*.
http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/Literacyreport2008_en.pdf

References

- Wedin, Å. (2011) *Språkande i Förskolan och Grundskolans Tidigare År* [Languaging in Preschool and the First Years of Primary School]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Wei, L. (2011a) Multilinguality, Multimodality and multicompetence: code- and mode-switching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *Modern Language Journal* 95(3):370-384.
- Wei, L. (2011b) Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43:1222-1235.
- Wertsch, J. (1991) *Voices of the Mind*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whatmore, S. (2006) Materialist Returns: Practising cultural geography in and for a more-than-human world. *Cultural Geographies* 13:600-9.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. (2000) *What Teachers Need to Know about Language*. Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics: Special Report.
- Youdell, D. (2011) *School Trouble: Identity, Power and Politics in Education*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Youngblood Jackson, A. (2013) 'Data-as-Machine: A Deleuzian becoming', in R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (eds) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*, 111–24. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Papers included in this thesis

- I. Martín-Bylund, A. (2017). Playing the game and speaking the right language: Language policy and materiality in a bilingual preschool activity. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, DOI 10.1515/multi-2016-0021.
- II. Bylund A. & Björk-Willén P. (2015) Multilingual becoming in reading: a picture storybook-reading-assemblage in early years education. In S. Mourão and M. Lourenco (eds) *Early Years Second Language Education: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice* Abingdon: Routledge, pp.78-91.
- III. Martín-Bylund, A. (in press) Minor (il)literate artworks: Inventive processes of biliteracy and the role of expertise in early childhood bilingual education. *Global Studies of Childhood*, accepted manuscript.
- IV. Martín-Bylund, A. (2017) The matter of silence in early childhood bilingual education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2017.1361820.

Papers

The articles associated with this thesis have been removed for copyright reasons. For more details about these see:

[http://urn.kb.se/resolve? urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-139853](http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-139853)