



Poster available at: <http://oursel.elodie.free.fr/> ("Recherche" or "Research" page)

Contact: [elodie.oursel@univ-paris8.fr](mailto:elodie.oursel@univ-paris8.fr)

**An EXTERNALIST, i.e. a NON EGOCEPHALOCENTERED and NON LOGOCENTERED STANCE has an impact...**

**... ON the researcher's VIEW OF MAJOR NOTIONS:**

**KNOWLEDGE:** becomes situated in a given political, historical, cultural context; is granted the status of knowledge via internal AND external factors (the validation by the scientific community with the application of a validated method on validated objects; the trends of mentalities shared among the cultural community, relations of force, dominance and tension between more or less powerful members of said community...).

**COGNITION:** becomes an « embodied, social, relational and extrinsic phenomenon »; « results from historic interactions between an embodied nervous system and its social and material environment » (Andler 2006, p. 313, we translate). The mind is inherently embodied, and thoughts are inherently situated.

**THE OBJECT OF RESEARCH:** becomes the way things happen when situated: the object of research of the field called *situated action* is « the activity of persons acting in setting » (Lave 1988, p. 177), or the « seamless connections » between an item and its environment (Dourish 2001, p. 102); the object of cognitive science is also modified: Mace says « don't ask what's inside your head but what your head's inside of » (1977, sub-title).

**CONTEXT:** becomes an *arena*, a *situation* (actions and speech productions are situated), an *environment*; it does not refer to what is around a text but to a space and the (human and non-human, textual and non-textual) agents evolving and acting in it : it is multidimensional and plurisemiotic.

**COMMUNICATION:** becomes « one of the many resources available to the humans to live and act together » (Oursel 2013, p. 22), one among many other possible resources.

**MEANING:** is not communicated, it is *communicatable* (Jacques 1975) : speech allows for as many potential meanings as there are interpreters, all equally valuable. Meaning is only temporarily and relatively stabilized after the co-speakers have both shown satisfaction about each other's interpretation (Brassac 2001). It is also three-dimensional (Oursel 2013), at once relative to ✦ whatever the speaker is referring to (referential dimension), ✦ the state of the relationship between the co-speakers and more generally between all agents involved in the situation of enunciation (relational dimension) and ✦ the organization of the speech and of the activity in process (structural dimension).

**THE LISTENER/INTERPRETER:** is not trying to match his/her decode what the speaker has encoded in the speech, is building an hypothesis on the most sensible and likely meaning that could be given to the speech. The interpreter can also evaluate his/her satisfaction of their hypothesis and decide whether action should be taken to improve it or not. *Both* speaker and co-speaker are responsible for the success or failure of mutual understanding.

**MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING:** the speaker is not the only one knowing what meaning his/her speech should be given, the interpreter also has his/her say in it : both build an hypothesis whose compatibility with the other one is evaluated. If they are not compatible, meaning is negotiated.

**... ON THE TREATMENT OF RAW DATA:**

**NAMING PARTICIPANTS:** use of pseudonyms that respect the informant's sex, age, culture, etc. as much as possible. Informants are not barcodes or blank slates, they are actual people, with a history, living in places, doing things: they are situated. Their identification can help the readership gather information about them and their situation.

**TRANSCRIBING ACTS BY ALL AGENTS:** even with audio data, transcription can give environmental information (a door opening, a drawer closing, paper being crushed, a phone ringing...). This information can be referred to in the



speech, it can be taken into account in the interpretation process, it can make it difficult for the co-speakers to communicate or justify an interruption in the communication.

... ON THE TERMINOLOGY USED:

~~communicated meaning~~      communicatable meaning / negotiated meaning  
~~interpretation~~      interpretive hypothesis / interactional value (once agreed upon)  
~~literal meaning~~      meaning cut from its situation of production  
~~extended meaning~~      situated meaning  
~~lack of understanding~~      interpreter's dissatisfaction toward his/her hypothesis  
~~retroactive correction, repair~~      negotiation of meaning  
~~irrelevant/inappropriate answer~~      reaction considered irrelevant or inappropriate by...  
~~misunderstanding~~      illusion of mutual understanding / unveiled incompatibility between hypotheses  
~~processing data~~      interpreting clues  
~~compensating strategy~~      face-protecting strategy  
~~the source of a communication problem~~      the item that lead to an unsatisfactory hypothesis  
~~adjusting to the speaker's meaning~~      co-building meaning with the speaker  
~~to mean/communicate meaning (person)~~      to expose/formulate clues that suggest...  
~~to mean (production)~~      to manifest, suggest...

... ON METHOD IN GENERAL:

**IN COGNITIVE SCIENCES:** ✦ opening methods to more authentic, less experimental situations, letting studied subjects behave in an environment that is not clinical or aseptized; ✦ looking at interactions between mind and body, between mind and world; ✦ considering cognition as subjective and as intersubjective and as shared among human and non-human agents...

**IN LANGUAGE SCIENCES:** ✦ language is a resource used to live and act: it needs to be studied in relation to the living and the acting; ✦ inter-subjectivity is absolutely fundamental and it is everywhere in language use (cf. Bres and Nowakowska's 3-dimensional version of Bakhtin's dialogism, 2005); ✦ meaning of a given piece of speech is what people agree upon: the linguist or conversation analyst has some clues about the content of the interpretation that has been agreed upon (such as what they are referring to, what kind of reaction was deemed acceptable, how is the relationship going - trust, spite, dominance, subordination...); ✦ agents, environment, situation and speech are equally important in the analysis of speech : their interactions need to be at the heart of language sciences, and semiotics (not as a part of cultural studies but as the science of meaning) needs to take its proper place in language sciences.

**IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS:** ✦ methods to be promoted: collaborative learning, situated learning, project-based learning, embodied learning, etc.; ✦ teaching contents to be considered: institutional and informational ecological network of the community whose language/culture is studied, how to adapt one's behaviour to the circumstances of an activity, how to actively participate in the co-building of an intersubjective space (evaluate mutual understanding, fit one's reactions to expectations...), how to answer a question like « what does it mean? » (cf. 3 dimensions of meaning), how to choose which communication strategy to use, etc.; ✦ ways to present and use a document: give information about the « context » in which the document was found (so the learners can connect it to an environment, to agents, maybe to an activity), give information about the activity the learners are engaged in before they enter the document so they build a project of production or reception and situate their work.



- ANDLER Daniel (2006) « Cognitives (Sciences) » in *Le Dictionnaire de la philosophie*. Paris, Encyclopædia Universalis, p. 306-341.
- ARMSTRONG David M. (1973) *Belief, Truth and Knowledge*. Londres (GB), New York (NY, US), CUP.
- BAKHTIN Mikhaïl (1929 [1977]) [V.N. Volochinov] *Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage. Essai d'application de la méthode sociologique en linguistique*. Paris, Minuit.
- BANGE Pierre (1992) *Analyse conversationnelle et théorie de l'action*. Paris, Didier.
- BRASSAC Christian (2001) « L'interaction communicative, entre intersubjectivité et interagentivité » in *Langages* n°144. p. 39-57.
- BRES Jacques & NOWAKOWSKA Aleksandra (2005) « Dis-moi avec qui tu 'dialogues', je te dirai qui tu es... De la pertinence de la notion de dialogisme pour l'analyse du discours » in *Marges linguistiques* n°9. p. 137-153.
- CLARK Herbert H. (1996) *Using Language*. Cambridge (GB), CUP.
- DOURISH Paul (2001) *Where the Action Is: The Foundations of Embodied Interaction*. Cambridge (MA, US), MIT Press.
- DUBAR Claude (2001) « À propos de l'individu, du Moi et de l'identité » in *Mouvements* n°17/4. p. 151-159. Available at: [www.cairn.info/revue-mouvements-2001-4-page-151.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-mouvements-2001-4-page-151.htm) (last visit 13/06/2017).
- GIBSON James J. (1977) « The theory of affordances » in Shaw, Bransford (eds.) *Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing. For an Ecological Psychology*. Hillsdale (NJ, US), Erlbaum, p. 67-82.
- HUTCHINS Edwin (1995) *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge (MA, US), Londres (US), MIT Press.
- HYMES Dell H. (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics, An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia (PA, US), Uni. of Pennsylvania Press.
- JACQUES Francis (1985) *L'espace logique de l'interlocution*. Paris, Presses univ. de France.
- KAUFMANN Jean-Claude (2001) *Ego. Pour une sociologie de l'individu*. Paris, Nathan.
- KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI Catherine, TRAVERSO Véronique (dir.) *Les interactions en site commercial. Invariants et variations*. Lyon, ENS Édition.
- KLAGES Ludwig (1929-32) *Der Geist als Widersacher der Seele, Vol. 1 et Vol. II*. Leipzig (DE), J. A. Barth.
- LAVE Jean (1988) *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics, and Culture in Everyday Life*. Cambridge (GB), CUP.
- MACE William M. (1977) « James J. Gibson's strategy for perceiving: Ask not what's inside your head, but what your head's inside of » in Shaw, Bransford (eds.) *Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing. For an Ecological Psychology*. Hillsdale (NJ, US), Erlbaum, p. 43-65.
- MATURANA Humberto R., VARELA Francisco J. (1980) *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Boston (MA, US), D. Reidel.
- MATURANA Humberto R., VARELA Francisco J. (1987) *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of human Understanding*. Boston (MA, US), New Science Library.
- MEAD George Herbert (1934) *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago (IL, US), Chicago Uni. Press.
- OURSEL Élodie (2013) *Des interactions de service entre francophones natifs et non natifs. Analyse de la gestion de l'intercompréhension et perspectives didactiques*. PhD co-supervised by Moirand & Duda, defended at Univ. Paris 3, December 12<sup>th</sup>.
- PAVEAU Marie-Anne (2010) « Une linguistique symétrique pour penser le discours » in *La pensée du discours*. Available at: <https://penseedudiscours.hypotheses.org/95> (online since 23/04/10, last visit 13/06/2017).
- PAVEAU Marie-Anne (2012) « Ce que disent les objets. Sens, affordance, cognition » in *Synergies, Pays riverains de la Baltique* n°9. p. 53-65.
- SCHEGLOFF Emanuel A. (1991) « Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition » in Resnick, Levine, Teasley (eds.) *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*. Washington (D.C., US), American Psychological Association, p. 150-171.
- SCOLLON Ron (2001) *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. Londres (GB), New York (NY, US), Routledge.
- STRAUS Erwin (1935) *Vom Sinn der Sinne*. Berlin (DE), Springer Verlag.
- SUCHMAN Lucy (1987 [2007]) *Plans and Situated Actions: the Problem of Human/Machine Communication [Human-Machine Reconfigurations. Plans and Situated Actions]*. Cambridge (GB), CUP.
- VARELA Francisco J., THOMPSON Evan, ROSCH Eleanor (1991 [1993]) *The Embodied Mind*. Cambridge (MA, US), MIT Press.
- VYGOTSKY Lev Semionovitch (1934 [1997]) *Pensée et langage*. Paris, La dispute.