CHARLES GOODWIN: Okay. I want to start. Maybe actually in terms of, just to begin, I'm not going to begin where I was going to begin because I would actually, how would I say, would like to talk about some of the issues that were raised this morning. And I'll begin by saying maybe like Doug, I share some deep reservations about a notion of trying to standardize in a certain way ahead of time. And I perfectly recognize the different notions of standardization that were implied. Maybe as a way of prefacing this, let me just say when I first started working, my initial work, and I was probably among the very first to work with video, not with film but it was back about 1970 and I was working with some of the collaborators, people who'd been on the Basin Project at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, and we were looking at and I was videotaping family therapy sessions and making instructional videos and training therapists on the basis on the analysis of the sessions. And I was going to do my dissertation on that, and I eventually got quite unhappy with that in the sense that you always had one person in the room who knew just what was going on, and that was the therapist. And you had these other people who were a bunch of dopes. And then everything we were looking at in the interaction was being coded through the category system
that was relevant to the therapist which was, of course, relevant to the education. So what I started to do at that point was this was the time the very first Sony porta pack became available, and my wife and I, we'd just gotten married maybe a year or so before and we hardly had any money but we went off and bought the very first Sony porta pack and just began to record whatever kind of interactions we could find. Family dinners or a bunch of guys talking about cars at a picnic which is perhaps still used today, that film perhaps the most analyzed film ever made in certain ways. Looking at a bunch of other kind of settings without any a priori notion of what was going to be important or what wasn't going to be important. And in this we were quite consistent with two of our teachers, Irving Gaufman and Harvey Sachs. And I think that it was mentioned today, and I see it's worthwhile, the notion that you want to accumulate knowledge. What that really taught me was the importance of ignorance. I mean it seems that as an analyst you want first to start from a position that recognizes your own ignorance and second, seek out fields where very little is known. It was really brought home to me, my wife, Candy Goodwin, Marjorie Godima, it's a printed name, was at that time studying kids playing on the street. And they came back one day, and they had this gigantic
argument. And it turned out to be a thing they called the He Said She Said that's got this incredibly elaborate grammatical structure and all this other stuff. Now, if we had been sitting around in our room we never would have come up with the He Said She Said, and I never would have come up with the things I began to see on the video. So I'm very much in favor of using video to make us aware of things that we wouldn't have even dreamed existed. Now, with respect to that, just one or two other real quick issues. I really do like to film myself because, A, I think that the very first analysis is done with the way in which you frame the camera. Secondly, I get a lot from participating in a situation. I mean I work with video all the time, but I very much like to have been a participant in these settings. I'll work with where I can't, and I've noticed Alan. I can't, I'm not in the surgery, and I think they won't let me do surgery, but nonetheless I think, you know, it's important actually to recognize that. One or two other things, I really think that if you're going to look at what human beings are doing, you've got to take seriously language and not simply language as reporting content. But I think that human language is a primordial form of human social organization. And with all due respect to Brian, it's far too important to be left to
linguists. It's the ways in which we build the social and cognitive worlds that we inhabit.

Just two other very quick points and then get on. With respect to boundary objects, I think that that also can be a distortion. I've looked also in different ways at boundary objects such as the maps that were used by oceanographers, the schedule that was used at the airport we studied. And it seems to me the big issue is not the object but the practices that are used to articulate the object in work relevant ways. And just to take an example of the map, you find some very surprising things. When we were on that oceanographic ship, we'd look at the map to figure out when we might be able to get some sleep. Now, that's not the vision of the map that's eventually going to appear in a scientific journal. And, okay, and a last thing I guess is, okay, and my last example of this perhaps is I look at a lot of different things, and I don't really see many differences between them. I mean some of the stuff I do clearly falls within things that people think of as science and technology. Like oceanographers, archeologists and stuff like that. But I find equally important looking at things like kids playing hopscotch. And I, in fact, did a paper comparing archeologists with kids playing hopscotch in terms of their use of
representations and things. So and a last thing on that is, and maybe with respect, I really want people to be free to go off in ways that haven't been looked at that might seem unusual. So I got for a variety of reasons, it turned out my father had very severe aphasia. I got really interested in aphasia. But instead of then trying to go and get an experiment where you'd put somebody in a white room to look at, just talk, how somebody with aphasia made meaning with the people around him by just taking the camera into whatever ordinary situations he was engaged in. And I actually think that work was important. I recently edited a book with Oxford on Conversation and Brain Damage. But it's the sense that you should be able to explore in new ways, even if there's already a large literature such as the literature on aphasia that would tell you what seemed to be important. And a last thing about that, perhaps with respect to human subjects and some things, sometimes, and I think it's ludicrous, they treat people with something like aphasia as though they're impaired or cognitively impaired, and they're certainly not cognitively impaired. But the crucial thing that I've always found valuable from a moral and ethical point of view and not just theoretical is to be able to show actual tapes of him interacting. Because he can only speak three words. You
tell that and people think he's an idiot. But when you can actually show the tape, you see how expressive and powerful a conversationalist he actually was. So I think there's tremendous value for the video.

Now, what I'd like to look at today just to maybe get some demonstrations of this is a bit about archeologists and what I'm interested in is obviously, okay, well, I'm really interested in how people construct the social cognitive world same habit. And I start with a notion. I first of all start with a notion I think that what I find most useful to look at is human beings building the actual events that make up their world in concert with each other while attending to each other, the language in process, and the environment in process. And let me just say as a preface to this, one of the things I'm not so much critiquing but in a dialog with is some other traditions. So there's an awful lot of work, say, in the analysis of talk and interaction that focuses largely on the talk. There's other work including a lot of my own earlier work that focuses just on the bodies of the participants. And I'll mention one thing, work I respect very much is the work of David McNeal on gesture. But in a sense, most gesture studies drew an invisible boundary at that skin of the actors. And I'm going to talk a little bit here about
what I call environmentally coupled gestures, and that's then to try to build models of human cognition that take into account language, embodied structure, and not just the experience of the person but the ways in which other parties analyze the bodies of others and structure the environment in order to build up these consequential actions. So I've talked about professional vision that distinctive communities have ways of seeing. And I think that the crucial thing to begin to analyze this vision is the notion of collaborative action which we saw on the surgery. In other words, seeing the body in terms of how you're actually going to act upon it in order to do the things that are proper surgery, to cut in the right places. And one thing, not primarily from an interest in education but rather from an interest in how it's possible even to have something like culture, and that is how do human beings, separate human beings have a shared vision of the world and a shared social organization? I found it useful to look at apprenticeship situations that, first of all, involved the actual work in the settings where the work's accomplished. And I typically just because of my own ignorance, once you've got two experts, they always take for granted stuff. But I really like, this is the person who's running an archeological field school and this is a
beginning graduate student, her first day out in the field school, and I like looking at situations like that. And what I would lay out at least, and these are perhaps some generalizations I would make, but I find it particularly important (inaudible) aside is a situation in which a senior practitioner can observe the environment they're working in. We saw the surgeon looking at that complicated body. Here we can see the senior archeologist looking at the dirt they're charged with excavating, but simultaneously watch the actions of the newcomer on that environment. And third, and this was very visible in Ken's data, to participate with her in consequential collaborative action. Okay. And I've looked at this kind of stuff in lots of different settings and things like that. And one of the things again, and don't limit everything to video. Something, and I guess one of the things I'm trying to do in a way is to try to bring together, say, the insights of people like Harvey Sachs on the social organization of language with the insights of people like Ed Hutchins on the ways in which human beings sediment cognitive structure into that environment and use that structure as resources for building relevant action frequently on historical time. Very, very quick I want to say real quick I was in an anthropology department I wish I
still worked for. You know, about 20 years, I think of myself as an anthropologist, but we always had these big debates. You know, we had a bunch of archeologists come in. The archeologists kept saying, oh, you linguists. It's all just (inaudible). There's nothing really there. And the archeologists, you know, they say, oh, it's not just (inaudible). What is this stuff? But I think that each of these professions had a partial insight into what's crucial about human beings. I think it's central human beings, language and equally central is our ability to sediment this structure in the world. So one of the things I've looked at is things like architectures of perception, the way in which, you know, things like Munsell charts are used to provide as a form of public practice a way of classifying color, an alternative to things that Berlin and Kaye would look at. And among the interesting things about these artifacts is the way in which they have multiple sign systems, quite different sign systems. And I'd argue the reason, and I have the paper if anybody wants, but the reason there's these different sign systems is that you've intertwined in multiple courses of activity and different kinds of signs make different things particularly useful. You can't compare the color of a piece of dirt with a name. On the other hand, you don't want to actually have to
publish all those colors in a journal. Now, what I want to look at here is some of the work of archeologists. Now, what archeologists do is they excavate. And, you know, you get some stuff you put in museums, arrowheads, whatever you want to call them or something. But a lot of the stuff they look at is just color patterning in the dirt. Like the remains of a fire or a post mold will just be visible as color stains in the dirt. And the very process of excavation, of digging further is systematically going to destroy it. So one of the things that you've got to do is make maps. Okay. How do you go around and make those maps? One of the intermediate and I think a really interesting intermediate step in a map is what's called defining a feature. Well, they will go and use a trowel to outline the shape that they see in the midst of that color patterning on the dirt, and that's one of the things we'll look at is the senior archeologist is now commenting on what should be seen in the dirt with the Nikon. And one of the things I'm really interesting in are these gestures tied to the environment, and we'll see a couple of them right here real quick. Here we go. Make a double.

(Playing video clip.)

CHARLES GOODWIN: Oopsy daisy. And, okay, we can look again. If you notice again, the point I want to make is
that as she's talking when she says really nasty and
disturbance, the senior archeologist on the left is
gesturing at stuff in the dirt. And the point I simply
want to make is you cannot understand what she's saying by
listening just to the words, by looking at her fingers in
isolation or by looking at the dirt in isolation. It's all
of those. Oops, I'm almost getting -- okay. So I'm
getting low on time so I need to show those. Well, I mean
show that again. So the point I'd want to make then is
that what you've got with these environmentally coupled
gestures are these multimodal complexes that are built
through structuring different kinds of sign systems in
which each individual sign system is partial. But it
elaborates and it is elaborated by the others to which it's
tied. And the crucial thing for education I think is that
environmentally coupled gestures bring together categories,
disturbances, post molds, whatever you want to call them
and the phenomena of being categorized as part of the
consequential activities that make up the life world of a
(inaudible). A second issue on this and I guess again part
of the recent, one of the things it wouldn't in video is to
disentangle things. There's a lot of people that have
argued that gestures aren't communicative. Well, you take
a little thing like she says forget the -- it doesn't
matter. She says toward you, around parallel. And it's a grammatically incomplete sentence, but it's not any way treated as incomplete because, you know, parallel to what. What's it parallel to is being filled in by the gesture. So the question arises, and the fact that she's not making -- she's expecting the person to understand it so the question arises as to how could that expectation be made? And what I would argue is that you have a different kind of sign system being constructed through the body, a participation framework, their embodied mutual orientation toward each other. She's making the gesture right in the dirt and right where her co-participant is looking. And I think a very important part about this is people talk rather loosely about embodiment, but one of the things that's going on here is you've got structurally different sign systems. The referential content of the gesture is what's being talked about, this structure in the dirt. And it has a very short time duration. It's just like a little bit of talk. Whereas the participation framework is not about what's being talked about but the orientation of the parties toward each other, and it has an extended temporal duration and can encompass multiple things.

Now, another very quick thing on this, one of the most common gestures that archeologists make is tracing
where they'll bring their hand over the top of a thing. Okay. But one of the things, what would happen if you lower the point of your trowel or your finger into the dirt itself? You leave a more permanent record in the dirt. You've changed the time structure of the signs that you're using. And by virtue of that, that creates whole bunches of new possibilities for calibrating perception and experience. First of all, say, you had a student doing an inscription. As soon as she does this, she makes public a precise scene in a public arena. In other words, instead of it just being some private experience, she's now demonstrated her scene in a public arena. Now, that thing, that inscription creates a liminal object. On the one hand, this sharp line is a categorization, a precise, humanly made shape that's going to later be transferred to the map. However, it's constructed in the very same field, the patch of color differences as the thing that it's a sign for. So you have this special kind of thing of a sign existing in the same visual environment -- okay, just about up -- as the sign it's a sign for. And what I'd like to point out simply is that that creates new possibilities for calibrating perception. And I'll play this and what we'll see here is is that the senior archeologist is going to draw a second line saying she would have drawn a line
somewhere else in the dirt. And the other woman is going to object saying she can't see that. And let's just take a look at that.

FIRST ARCHEOLOGIST: And I would have put it a tiny bit out there, but that's no big deal. But do you see? Right there? Okay.

SECOND ARCHEOLOGIST: I don't see that one at all.

CHARLES GOODWIN: Okay. And I think I'm out of time, and I am and that's the end of my talk. But, okay, so you had the talk. But basically I've tried to what, talk both about some of the issues and to provide examples of video. Okay. Okay, thank you.