THE CREATIVE PROCESS:
HOW SOCIOLOGICAL WORK REALLY GETS DONE

RENCONTRE AVEC HOWARD S. BECKER (Cnam, Salle des Conseils, 17 octobre 2014)

Exchanges with Sophie AGULHON (doctoral student, MINES ParisTech) about enactment concept, methodology and the creative process.

S. Agulhon: Hello. My research is about safety and I am really interested in your version of *enactment* to catch my actors' behaviour in a context. Indeed, your version of *enactment* seems to be non-linear, seems to include situations and representations aspects and appears as more dynamic in its expression than what I perceive from Weick's definition in safety management field[1]. So, I would like to know more about your version of *enactment* in order to develop my research in this horizon.

Y. Pesqueux : Je peux reprendre ta question : *enactment* Weick vs *enactment* Becker.

H. S. Becker: Je ne connais pas le travail de Weick donc c'est pas possible mais sur Becker je peux dire quelque chose. My colleague Faulkner aime beaucoup l'idée d'*enactment*. It is about occasions and their people. So the occasion, the event, is what is important. And the event takes its people and animates them. I think he likes to think this way because he is really interested, as I am, in the way things happen. He doesn't say that they happen because somebody says "I want this to happen" so then it happens. No.

I have a favorite story, a favorite remark that was made by a great author of *pièces de théâtre* the American David Mamet. I have never been able to find this citation anywhere. But I know I heard him say it but I could never get the source, unfortunately. What he says is that when he writes a scene in a play, everyone in the scene is there for a reason: they want something. Maybe just to get through the dialogue without any problem. But everybody wants something. And everybody wants something different. So all these people come together; each one once: one wants this, one wants that, one wants this other thing.

What they do is the best they can find to satisfy everybody so the things can move forward. Nobody gets what they want. Everybody gets something. And the result, the activity, the *enactment* is the result of all those negotiations traded by rules: deals, compromises, etc.

That's why, this situation is deals with, which is several people who don't know each other, who have never worked together, who have never rehearsed, now come together. They have no written music, so there is nothing to help them. And now they got to play. And it's 9 o'clock and the boss of the block is standing there with his watch. "Qu'est-ce qu'on joue maintenant?". "Let's gonna do Fall". There a *solution. Pourquoi?* One person says: "Let's play But Beautiful". It is a song of the 1940's. "In E-flat". "Ok? One, Two... "Oh, oh! No." Then he says " Well, how about Let's Fall In Love in B flat? Okay? "Okay!", "Okay". One, two, we play.
That's a kind of model of how things are working in every aspect of life.

Sometimes people know exactly what they are supposed to do. But usually, something intervenes so that is not possible. We know we should do our best but the room we wanted is not available, and this is not the room we were ready to work in. I arrive and there is a piano. It is not tuned. Sounds terrible. I played anyway. Guess so!
So the *enactment* is always a matter of finding a way that we can cooperate for the moment to get to the next step. I don't need to say that everybody is happy with the result. Perhaps nobody is happy. But at least we played. And the boss says "OK, it is not good but what? At least they are playing". So that's what I think of is the model of everything. And sometimes thinks work more easily, sometimes, you know, a million things might happen, might interfere wih my plans. We maybe not know them but at least we've done something. And that's my understanding of *enactment*. That's why Faulkner loves this expression because he says "Everything happens at 2 o'clock when you find out what's going to happen".

And to say, one answer that is very important for people who do the kind of work we all do which is you can't predict. It is not possible to predict with insurance that this is what is going to happen. So if I want my workplace to be safe I make these rules. Everybody wears a *casque*, a yellow vest... Maybe they won't work. And everybody knows this, but then they say "What? We have to!" We've got some plans, don't we? Yes we do, but we should be ready to change them. And this is what Picasso did all this life. There is a story of Picasso that I love to use. You may know that at one point he did a lot of work with ceramic. But he didn't make ceramics

---

[1] *Managing the Unexpected: Assuring High Performance in an Age of Complexity*, by Karl E. Weick & Kathleen M. Sutcliffe, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2001.

because he didn't know how and didn't want to learn but he had great ceramics. But Picasso didn't know anything about the techniques so he often wanted to do something very difficult for a person who knows ceramics. So he said to the man "Ok. This is what I want: this, this, this and this". "*Mais Monsieur Picasso, ce n'est pas possible!* I can't do that". Did Picasso say "Ok"? No. Then Picasso said "Oh. I am sorry. I thought you were really good at ceramics. I thought you would have done everything. I am sorry, I made a mistake". Of course the man was offended. He said "I can do it". And he did. Or he did something that was good enough to Picasso. So does it help with your question?

Sophie Agulhon: I have a question on your methodology with Faulkner. When you decided to do your tune typology: tunes that everyone knows, tunes to be known and tunes to be hired; how did you created it? More specifically, under which criteria did you decided to divide canons that everyone knows from canons that should be known?

Howard S. Becker: The criteria for saying "this is one of those, this is one of those"? That's a good question. We did it by observing how people use these songs. We knew that it was a song that belongs to what. And we didn't use canons in a very strict, theoretically well-defined way. What we meant was a song that I can say to him "You know Sunny Side In The Street?", and he says "Sure, everybody knows it". I think provisionally, for the moment, I accept to say: Ok, this is part of some canons, something that is shared by many people. No matter if I say "Sunny" to nice players in another place or room. I say Sunny Side In The Street", and they say "OK". I find that there is a group of people for whom that's one of the things everybody knows.

Now what happened is that some of the things we learned were very surprising to us, even though we were *habitués* of this *milieu*. That there are things that we thought or understand that everybody knows.You couldn't possibly not know this. Not that it was something that we didn't know but... One of the most important moments in our research came when Faulkner was playing a jam and he was playing with a bass player that was an old friend of his, his age, his generation and among the other players was a young tenor saxophone. And the bass player said or somebody else said "Qu'est-ce qu'on joue maintenant? How about All The Things You Are, A-flat". And this young man said "Do you have a lead sheet?". A lead sheet is a sheet of paper with the melody, the lyrics and harmony. Well, the bass player: "What?!". When you hear somebody do that, show surprise, show that he is unpleasantly surprised, then you know you are witnessing a theoretical category of great importance. Somebody is violating an expectation issue. Something that everyone knows this young man doesn't know.

Ok. I think they found something he could play but they finished to play for that period and they went to the bar and the bass player was very angry, very : "God dammit! That son of a bitch… Everybody is supposed to know All The Things You Are. What's wrong with him?" He transformed this into a moral failure. Not only "he is stupid" but "he is a bad person because he doesn't know this". Now if you want a theoretical basis there is a very old work of William Graham Sumner [2], a very old work that no one reads anymore, *c'est dommage.*

And Sumner describes "Folkways as the ways people develop together, to do something. So it becomes the easiest way to develop it because everyone does have the same references. So folkways turn into moral ways. And what's that? That's a folkway that has a moral component. Not only this is the way we do it but the right thing. An anybody who doesn't do it this way is wrong. They are bad people. They are killer babies. Which is exactly why they were shocked in this jam. He was not only short on this but it was almost criminal that he doesn't know this... So, where were we?

S. Agulhon: We were showing the difference between tunes that everyone knows and tunes worth to be known.

Howard S. Becker: Ok! So the final step in our enlightenment because we were really learning a lot. I know I did a research properly when I am shocked. When something happens that I really didn't expect. And now I have to learn something, to make up an idea to explain this. The investigation.

It is a very interesting situation because Faulkner and I, *nous sommes, disons, d'un certain âge*. The young man was a young man. So the canons of what people know and should know has changed. And it changed in response to circumstances of the environment. So there is a long, historical story because of that event. And the story is: the places were musician played changed. When Faulkner and I started the business, every bar would have a small group. Everybody that have a wedding or a big birthday party or a bar-mitsva, some event would hire a small group. So the need to know those songs was always there because these groups would be formed for the moment, for that play. So people got to know song that it could work. Well, that involved a lot of business.

---

[2] *Folkways* by William Graham Sumner, Boston, Gin and Co., 1906.

Now the bars have screens and televisions which replaces the bands. Televisions, games, sporting events: basket-ball, football, base-ball...That's good because customers are happy. And a television doesn't have to be paid, a television doesn't drink. There is many good things about televisions.

Not for us. Because it meant that the sources of employment disappeared. And for the parties, more and more, the young people didn't like this kind of music because we had also Rock & Roll revolution and it was a completely different world from our which none of us knew. Plus a lot of us were morally outraged. But we should have known this. This is terrible. It is not good. And they didn't know either and they didn't need to know. So the world has changed and there were different systems of training, informal training. So they knew things that we didn't know but we knew things they didn't know. And if you put this together you say "Damn! Big trouble"!

That was why this man had this troubles. There is a long historical analysis behind that. Well, the thing that I tell that story to teach is that there is so much one must know in order to really understand what you are describing. So when you see an event like that it is not just on, over these players. We are hundred too naïve. They are acting, acting people...Damn, no! That's history behind us. And when you see that that's research. So that's the kind of story I tell the students in the class. I don't want you to think that the students hated me forever. They didn't. And finally things were really interesting. But then suddenly a student said "I had this problem". Then they described some problems. But very common one. "I am going to learn to interview, so I am going to do interviews. Can I interview you?" And he said "Yes" but then I didn't know what to ask.

You know, that happens because he was so worried they would say "No". Then he says "Yes", there begins the problem! "What should I have done?"And I say "I don't know. You know much more about this situation you are studying than I do". Does anybody else in the room here had this experience, please?

Few "yes" in the room.

Quite a few. So they began to talk. And between them they discovered a lot: "I thought this way, I did this and I asked him about that…" And they developed a body of knowledge among each other. And then I could say : "Ah! You know, you should read this". I am telling him something to read. "Then how about that? ". Well, that is not exactly what I was doing" No, of course not! Not all these situations are exactly the same! Plus you can learn something. When you see the full range of possibilities you can learn something. That's how it works. But then, the final thing, you know, it's a course. I am going to give a note. And they didn't know I give everybody always the best note. This should be a model. Then...

So I said "Well, I think what you should do is to imagine that you have a friend somewhere else and that you are telling this friend what you did for several weeks: whatever you learned, whatever place you have been, whatever you want to talk. They got puzzled because they did not respect the format for papers, le *genre de chose* where you could say *d'abord, puis, enfin*. So I said "OK. Write a letter and address it to me. Dear Howie, …". So then in our department these became known as "Dear Howies". And by then, they knew. They trusted me by asking them to do this because probably it would be interesting and useful. So they wrote them and there were enormous and very interesting. A lot of people did begin with the research service at the top, other people didn't. And there were all kind of interesting events happening during the class that I could not have predicted, and often I didn't understand the entire, all the things that should be discussed.

For example, about half way of the term, one of the woman in the class said all of the sudden "It's not fair"! "What's about fair?" She said "The boys in the class got to study all these interesting things like firemen, the police, etc. and the girls have to study *école maternelle* and things like that". I said: "Really?" She said "Yes". I asked her "Who told you to study *école maternelle*?". Then I didn't say more. There was a long silence. Well she thought. Then she realized no one told her that. She just assumed that's what a woman in the class should do. And then we get a very interesting discussion about girls. That kind of issue which is very central for a lot of our students. And I realize that there is a certain amount of self-censorship. In fact, no one told her that. She could have gone to fire stations but she didn't think to do that. But everyone in the class learned that day. I think it was interesting. Anything these guys can do, I can do that too. They are not as smart.

That's why I believe you cannot teach anybody else. Anyway you can help them. I think that's a moral thing.

S. Agulhon: Does it come creative when somebody else, a third person listens to this mistake but doesn't think that it is a mistake, appropriates it and then it becomes creative because it is shared ?

Howard S. Becker: Well, that depends how you want to use the term. And I think that would be a good way to use it to see, after I accept it, I made a mistake but it is not a mistake, it's a wonderful invention and I think this how the cases would start. They are always started by someone who thinks they have something wonderful. And then, all questions of history of that mistake : who accepts, Who accepts, who judges it is a mistake? Who incorporate them to what they know and do ? [emerge]. Because, it is true, it is certainly sure that when most people who do this particular activity accept something because it is much easier to do that, that only would be "OK, no one wants this. *Dommage*, you've done that". But there would be things some people will use it as a tool to make easier tools, other people would say "Yes, that's a good idea to incorporate in this". So it can be incorporated, and if it does, then now it is incorporated in something larger...

The sociology of science is very useful here calls it a "package". All these things come together: good ideas, scientific systems, measure, tools, devices that you can use to make a language to express it. Every time I go down to Boulevard Vaugirard [in Paris], I see the bar, the standard, the entire work. Except in the United States of course. Which is an interesting case because there is differences because the anglophone countries still use the antiquate, the ancient system of measurement that doesn't match very well to the metric system. It involves terrible problems. I think of the screws because I always pick the wrong size if I move from one system to the other. But that's something integrated and every body accepts the innovation because the meter, the metric system was a good invention, a good idea. People could have said "No" but people never did that and we are not going to start.

Exchanges with Christophe BANAON (doctorant LIRSA/Cnam)

Christophe Banaon : Do you think that everything we cannot make sure of the results ?

Howard Becker : Oui. Absolument. C'est ce que je pense en tant que scientifique. Par exemple, je ne connaissais pas la réponse à ta question avant que tu la poses !

Christophe Banaon : Est-ce donc à dire que l'incertitude soit inhérente à toute action collective?

Howard Becker : Absolument. C'est le modèle de toute action. Ce qui fonde le projet d'une organisation, c'est l'incertitude qui est un élément fondamental. Les acteurs ne peuvent pas disposer de toutes les informations sur l'environnement. À travers nos actions, nous donnons un sens aux choses. Nous les créons. En clair, on ne peut pas avant de poser une action savoir d'avance qu'on a fait le bon choix . On ne peut donc pas avoir une certitude sur la conséquence d'une action avant de la poser.

Exchanges with Thomas LEPERS (doctoral student LIRSA/Cnam)

Thomas Lepers : I have a question regarding data collection in case studies. You said you need to collect all variables and write everything down. How do you manage not to get lost in all these data, and where do you stop?

Howard S. Becker: I wrote a paper called « where do you stop? » Where do you stop is of course a matter of convention, acceptance. When I wrote this paper, my wife and I where here in 2003. There was a great « canicule ». It was being discussed everywhere that the city of Paris had not done enough to save the older people particularly etc. Why weren't we prepared? The same thing happened a few years later in Chicago. Many older people died and social scientists investigated they discovered racial, ethnic differences, in mortality. Every body said, ici à Paris et aussi à Chicago, we could have done more, to be sure. In Norway, I think, when there is something like that, all the social workers, were given 4 older people and they visit them 2 or 3 times each day during the event.

Well, Paris didn't have anything like that; Chicago certainly didn't have anything like that. And these assistances certainly saved many lives. And people ask why didn't we have something like that, why didn't we do more. It became very clear to me, very quickly, that yes you could do more, but doing more costs a certain amount, and you take the money from something else. And I remember, the great snow storms in Chicago. Je suis originaire de Chicago. So I know what it means to have snow this high (1 m): nothing moves, people die, all kinds of terrible things happen and there was a big one , shortly after the canicule, and the streets where blocked for 6 weeks. Most streets you couldn't get anywhere, a cauchemar. Why didn't we do more? Well we could have done more, we could have more machines, we could have more people. We didn't do that. But I also remember when I was in Kansas City. Some years ago I lived in Kansas City. Kansas City is a more temperate climate it snows very seldom. If it snows this one snow (10 cm) it is a disaster. In Chicago this one snow (10 cm) no one

cares, but in Kansas City everything stops, no one dares to drive. And then shortly after that event I went to Montreal. I was there and it began to snow, a real snow, even for a person from Chicago, it was an impressive amount. And I thought Oh Oh, I will have to stay here in Montreal for a week till they clean this up. No. As soon as the snow begin to fall, the machines were out, a million machines. And the snow disappears as quickly as it appeared, and I left when I was supposed to. They spent the money that Chicago is not willing to spend in the same way that in Norway they spent the money that Paris was not willing to spend.

So there is a process of judging, evaluating, assessing and the same problem receives a different answer, depending on ... The research problem is : « depending on what ? » So that's the problem when you collect data, you know. How much is enough? Bill Whyte in Boston, spent 4 years, and when you read his book you see the level of detail in his field notes what he wrote down I don't know where his archive is, but it must be enormous just from that one study. When we did our studies on medical students the two of us mainly who were doing research with medical students for 3 years and we had several thousands pages of field notes. And that's the problem you are talking about. And that is a real technical nightmare. You have to invent a method for doing it and when doing this, we were lucky that there was something such as a Xerox machine, so that you could at least duplicate the type written pages. And imagine before that. Good, every body have thousands of pages, it didn't help. So we invented a method of summarizing, collecting sorting, we invented for ourselves a system that other people invented for other purposes we used for a while, I don't know if any of you have ever seen this, cards that were punched along the edges of the card, you know it ?

That was invented by the way for large stores like the Bon Marché, to keep track, to control their inventory, to know how much they have, And we found out … and we made short summary field note, very short and we punched at the edge of the cards and we were able to assemble together the themes that went to the same topic. And it is very funny because then we made tables, we were able to say, you know this happened say 800 times etc. Because when Psychologists had criticized our work about students, because they were accustomed to experimental models, they were able to count, and we said oh ok we can count, and Jean-Michel Chapoulie, the great expert of École de Chicago said to me when he read that book , he said, it's very good that you did that , because now no one will ever have to do that again. It is obvious how people who do field work know these things. But it is a problem that every body has to solve. And I can't tell you the proper way for your problem. It is one of the things you discover when you do your research. How can I do then? It is an interesting question when you use other than verbal papers, if you use photographs, which I have been involved in doing, that a different kind of problematic, that is not so easy.

Exchanges with Tra NGUYEN (doctoral student, LIRSA/Cnam) about the creative process and the research protocol

T. Nguyen: You have mentioned previously[3] that every time we try to do something different, it shows an act of creation and it could start the creative process. I would like to draw attention to another side of differentiation as I am doing my research focusing on the strategic balance theory[4] between differentiation and conformity. This theory is demonstrated as a fundamental for a specific field in the framework of my research, but I dare say that it could be finally adapted to any domain. According to you, when we are in a quite new domain, if we start doing something different, we suppose it is creation. However, let's imagine that we are to do something in a very well established domain or field; we encounter the part called "evident things" which everybody should know about. That part you have described before[5] that either everybody should know, either they are considered as nonsense or stupid. If they enter a well-established domain and try to do something different, whether they are considered as a stupid person or as a creative person? I personally assume, from my observations; that people do not do differently right from the beginning. Before finding out how to be creative, people try to find out how to enter a domain to be accepted first. They will find a way to follow norms already established in that domain, adapt to the standards in order to be considered first as a "non-stupid" person, (what I call here conformity or legitimacy) before trying to do something different and start their creative process.

H Becker: I do not want to argue on anything you observed and I could not help on it either. A good place to say about creation is arts, or music, especially classical music. Because of different wonderful tastes of people, if you write the same thing, over and over, I or you or he writes the same thing, it would be boring for people to listen to. On the other hand if you'd write something very different, then it might be interesting for the people to enjoy.

[3] Previous answer of Howard Becker to a PhD student's question - Celine Fevres in the same meeting.
[4] Deephouse, D.L. (1999), To be Different, or to be the same? It's a question (and theory) of strategic balance, Strategic Management Journal Vol 20, pp. 147-166.
[5] Previous answer of Howard Becker to a PhD student's question – Sophie Agulhon in the same meeting.

Another example in the visual arts, there are people trying to build a strange construction, huge and completely crazy at the beginning, and few people accepted it. Then some professionals recognize it is difficult to build. It is a piece of arts without being collected; neither being sold nor being donated to the museum, but it lasts on the public area for people to admire. Besides, in painting or in sculpture visual arts, a fact to be considered first is whether the masterpiece lasts long, or it will be deteriorated with time. Some models in museum are supposed to last long, but accessories are decayed and it is impossible to replace the accessories so the models do not work any more. That is to remind to artists wishing to be recognized that they need to consider a lot of other points rather than just his masterpiece.

Briefly, you could say that the process of recognition is something that you have to concern in relation to who is accepting, who is judging, who is acting while judging. For example when I look at a picture I love it because I have in my mind the size of my wall of my apartment that the picture could perfectly fit in, I have in my mind the size of my door as well. If the picture fits my wall but could not pass my door then it does not work at all. It is the process for me to recognize, accept and admire the picture. People who would like to make such innovative things take advantages of what exists or find their own way to be recognized in one aspect as far as they create new ones in other aspects. Some examples of people taking advantages or managing constraints but keeping the innovative points are given as Rock n' Roll music in the US, graffiti in Brazil or nude paintings in China. The success innovative things are those whose authors could manage to overcome difficulties to be recognized and exist, though there are still other unknown innovative or creative things.

T Nguyen: It is a pleasant for me to read the preface of your book "Thinking together"[6] by Franck Leibovici; that being scientific when we do research follows by a strict research protocol of scientific writing. It means that when we do research and do science, we need to do a practical work: to write scientifically and our research articles need to be accepted by journals, by specific academic magazines. It is like we are trying to be recognized and it is a big obstacle for young researchers, with well established and complicated protocol. Do you have any advice for us to overcome this strict research protocol?

H Becker: I know it very well and it is indeed terrible. It is because the existing kinds of judgements in the reviews are really difficult to comply with. Sorry for you, young researchers but I could not give any advice for that, because if I really do give you advice, I know that your paper will be rejected. I myself had that experience. I wrote a paper many years ago in French about the government issues. A friend of mine, an editor, came across the paper and invited me to write it for his review in the US. I said to him that I would send him an article which I think it is really good, I like very much and I am very proud of, but I just bet with him 10 dollars that the article would be rejected. He would not bet, but finally the article was indeed rejected because of a simple reason: my paper did not include the literature review on governments. I know the reviews on governments but none of them are relevant to my article, why I need to add them in my paper then? Another reason that my articles are rejected is that I did not use the academic vocabulary or my words did not reach the research standard. Research writing protocol is to use an inappropriate way to express an idea to a certain public of academy; which is different from writing for the popular public and can be easily understood. I do not know what is going to happen with the reviews but I supposed they are going to die because it is not a way to value the scientists and their works. I abandon all reviews and journals, I devoted my time to write and publish on my websites because that is the only way I know that my articles are read properly.

Exchanges with Maty NDIAYE SY, pre-doctorant student, LIRSA/Cnam

---

Maty Ndiaye Sy : In a 2013 interview, why did you answer a question concerning one of the many roles you play by saying "A little of a private intellectual, not public not ever" ?

H. S. Becker: Well, I don't like the idea of public intellectual, because the examples I know *ici en France et aussi chez nous aux Etats-Unis*, I am not happy with their performances, because I know what happens. Because I am not very well known but I receive messages from you know people from TV, people from the news papers: "- What do you have to say about this?" "- Nothing!" ...

First of all, my wife was a photo journalist, she worked for a journal for many years, so she always said me "When they call you they know what you are suppose to say, they have your answers written, they just want you to say the right thing". This is really true; I had experience with this kind of thing. And you can understand how it happens. This is *sociologie du travail*. They have an editor and the editor say "get some experts", get some experts, *n'importe qui*, experts! ...

---

[6] Howard S Becker & Robert R Faulkner, *Thinking Together*, Les Laboratoires d'Aubervilliers/ questions théoriques, Paris, 2013.

And for years, I used to receive phone calls, from journalists who wanted to interview me about marijuana... Some of them, many of them actually were quite serious people, who often agreed with the way I viewed that so called problem. And they would talk to me for hours, and then the story that appeared ...was something I didn't say. Then they called you and apologised saying "Well the editor did that, I don't have any control".

So I learned a trick. After a while, they would call and say "We understand that you are an expert on marijuana" and I would say very enthusiastically "Yes, I was too really good ... in 1953". And they would say "Did you do anything since", I would say "No", they would say "Thank you very much". And after a while they stopped bothering me because if you feed them they come back, it is like stray cat.

So, this is what apparently a public intellectual is. Someone who is willing to give an answer to *n'importe quelle question*, and I really do not want to do that. I think is *desastre*! Many people have no fear of doing that, no shame ... I just do not like to do that.

Echanges avec Souchinda SANGKHAVONGS PRAVONG (doctorante LIRSA/Cnam)

Souchinda Sangkhavongs Pravong : Trois questions ont été préparées avant ces échanges, elles concernent principalement le livre *Thingking Together*.
1°) Quels sont les ingrédients pour que l'échange fonctionne ? Est-ce dû à l'amitié profonde, à une connaissance commune ou autre ?
2°) Par ricochet, l'inamitié peut-elle fonctionner pour arriver à "penser ensemble" ? L'incompréhension des mots, des sens, des méthodes, des barrières de langue, de langage commun est d'autant d'obstacle pour arriver à ce stade de pensée commune.
3°) Comment nomme-t-on cette méthodologie de recherche ? Peut-on qualifier de transfert de connaissance comme en finance ou l'on parle de T/T lorsque l'on transfère de l'argent d'une banque vers l'autre.
La première question a été répondue largement. En résumé et ce que je peux retenir de ces échanges H. Becker avec les collègues : « what question to get it ?(...) what people know or should know change (…), If we do something together (…) people know or should know exchange together (…) How (…), this group could be form for the moment (..) to create activity. This creation is doing something different.

Je ne vais pas jouer le jeu (acte de déviance voulu) en retranscrivant totalement les réponses d'Howard Becker puisque nous avons un enregistrement de notre collègue Tra qui nous fait revivre ce moment mais j'essaye de garder l'esprit de ces échanges pour arriver à créer quelque chose de nouveau comme le font remarquablement Howard S. Becker et Robert R. Faulner avec leurs mails. Nous avons pu poursuivre l'échange en déjeunant au « Café des techniques », j'ai pu ainsi poser des questions subsidiaires sur les anecdotes échangées dans ce livre pour lesquelles on essaie de comprendre le sens. Le conseil qu'il m'a donné, à cet instant pour ma thèse sur « la diaspora, un réseau d'influence pour la création de valeurs dans le pays d'origine » c'est d'approcher les artistes. (sic !).

Je partage ici la photo prise avec Howard S. Becker au Musée des Arts et métiers (envoyée par Terry Rocves).

Séminaire organisé par le LIRSA (EA 4603)
Sous la direction de Sonny Perseil et Yvon Pesqueux