

UNITED WISDOM

Thinking between people: what makes a task joint

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-09-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Thinking between people: what makes a task joint

Epigraph

> *Communication is a process of sharing experience till it becomes a common possession.*

John Dewey, Democracy and Education, Chapter I, Summary, complete sentence beginning ‘Communication is a process…’.

What this article is about

Two people can hold different information without producing a joint decision. One knows where an exhibition box is stored; the other knows when its carrier will arrive. A joint task emerges when their information relates to one outcome: returning the box in the required condition at an available time. This thinking can be examined through connections among participants, speech, and records. We turn to Dewey’s historical argument about communicating experience, Clark and Brennan’s framework for establishing understanding, and Hutchins’s analysis taking an aircraft cockpit with its people and devices as a unit. These sources serve different roles; they prove no superiority of every group over an individual. An original example of returning an exhibition lets us explore what needs connecting, how an accepted message differs from correct information, and why joint work retains room for personal responsibility and disagreement.

I. Two participants do not yet define a joint task

Imagine an original situation: a small library returns a temporary exhibition to its owner. Irina knows the box’s location and packaging condition; Pavel has received the carrier’s arrival window. Each holds a needed part, yet the sum of information does not establish whether the exhibition can be handed over. Does arrival fit access to the room? Is the box ready? Who can release it? Relationships among these conditions determine the shared outcome’s feasibility. The information need not become identical in both participants’ memories. The required connection needs to be available for deciding, with each understanding the grounds for proceeding to the next action. The case is invented, rather than an observation from the sources.

Similar wishes differ from one agreed outcome. Irina wants to free library space; Pavel wants to complete the arrangement with the owner. Both can say ‘return the exhibition’ while

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

imagining different completion boundaries. For one, moving the box out is sufficient; the other needs confirmation of receipt. In our scene, identifying what counts as the result makes the task joint. The necessary information and actions then become clearer. Agreeing on an outcome does not require identical personal motives. It connects different motives with a specified undertaking while preserving questions about responsibility for each part and when that part can count as completed, checked, or still awaiting another person’s response.

If there is no agreed outcome yet, identify that state. Information can be exchanged and discussion can pause without becoming a joint decision. Irina may not have agreed to release the box before checking an inventory; Pavel may only be clarifying arrival conditions. Each already has substantive work, but proceeding to shared action requires another agreement. This distinguishes the conversation’s status without evaluating their relationship or demanding immediate unity. A joint task’s content emerges through a named connection among purpose, conditions, and actions. Mere proximity, identical words, or equally confident statements about completion do not establish that connection or tell an observer what the participants have actually undertaken together.

II. A new relation emerges between pieces of information

Suppose room access in our example runs from ten to twelve, while the carrier offers eleven to thirteen. Their overlap is eleven to twelve. That elementary conclusion concerns two specified intervals, rather than observed operations at an actual library. If one participant retains only the first record and another only the second, each may repeat their information correctly without identifying the overlap. Comparing records produces a relationship relevant to action. It is no additional detail sent by the carrier, nor a completed message concealed in one person’s head. It is obtained by combining the stated conditions and asking about one handover time. Its usefulness depends on those conditions remaining applicable.

Overlap is not yet an appointment. Pavel may have received a proposal rather than confirmed arrival. Irina may have stated ordinary access hours without checking an exception for the selected day. Retain status and date beside each condition, or a logically valid comparison can rest on misunderstood grounds. Our case might record: ‘Access confirmed; carrier window proposed; a time within the overlap still needs agreement.’ Participants then see which relationship is established and which decision awaits a response. Neither arithmetic clarity nor agreement between both participants turns the other party’s proposal into an actual commitment. The conclusion can remain correct as a conditional relationship while its practical use remains unresolved.

Jointness here means connecting information to the outcome through accessible transitions. Irina need not perform all Pavel’s work, nor must Pavel inspect every box. Yet if the outcome depends on packaging readiness, its status must enter the shared question. The participant

responsible for checking can report what was checked and what remains open. Another gains sufficient grounds for their part without obtaining complete knowledge of someone else's experience. This differs from merely distributing lists and from requiring everyone to know everything. The task needs information at a relevant scale: that without which the next step would otherwise rest on a guess about what someone else established or agreed to do.

III. Understanding is established for a current purpose

Clark and Brennan open their grounding chapter by distinguishing the content and process of joint activity. Their duet example requires playing the same composition and coordinating entrances, tempo, and other features of performance. This is a theoretical coordination account, rather than a measured outcome for our example. The selected concluding fragment treats understanding as sufficient for current purposes. Sufficiency has a domain: participants need not certify every possible interpretation before continuing. They seek grounds to believe the part required for their activity has been understood. We use bounded primary passages of the chapter, rather than claiming a complete survey of the conversation studies its authors discuss or importing their experimental results without examining them.

Returning an exhibition can require different confirmations at different stages. While discussing feasibility, understanding that the carrier's window is still proposed may suffice. Before release, the specific box and recipient need identifying. A brief 'understood' does not automatically establish which question is closed. Someone may confirm hearing a time while leaving the contents question open. A useful response can name content: 'I understand the time has not been appointed yet.' The other participant can then clarify status. This is our original application of the distinction. The selected chapter yields no obligatory speech template, and repeating a sentence promises no prevention of every error or complete grasp of the other person's work.

Understanding words also differs from accepting a proposal. Irina may understand a request to release the box today and decline to do so without an inventory. Pavel may accept discussing another time without yet understanding which document confirms the exhibition's contents. Clarifying these transitions permits continued work without assuming someone either agrees to everything or understands nothing. Content, understanding, and decision have their own indicators. Ask about the one on which action depends: 'Are the contents confirmed or awaiting checking?' Disagreement can remain an available part of conversation, while an intelligible message acquires no force of consent to every subsequent demand. This leaves room to revise a proposal without treating revision as failed understanding.

IV. What is distributed in Hutchins’s account

Edwin Hutchins examines how speed information passes between people and external representations in an aircraft cockpit. In the selected account, a value on one display supports selecting a card; the posted card is available to participants; a spoken value corresponds to an instrument setting and a later action. The useful question concerns transitions: what is retained, in which form it becomes available, and who can check the next correspondence. This describes a particular working system, without making its participants one consciousness. ‘Remembers’ in the paper’s title concerns organised retention and use of information. It establishes no additional experiencing subject composed of a cockpit, instruments, and crew.

The author explicitly calls this a stylised account of work in a particular aircraft model, informed by professional and field experience. He reports over a hundred flights as an observer over six years. That is no random sample of all crews, controlled group-versus-individual trial, or measurement of prevented incidents. We read selected introductory, procedural, external-representation, and final discussion passages, without completing the interior section on individual memory. Our summary therefore stays within those bounds. It concerns relations between representations; no actual aviation values or procedures become operating instructions here. A detailed field-informed argument does not acquire the design or evidential reach of a controlled performance experiment.

For our box, we borrow an analytical question rather than an approved aviation procedure. Where are contents retained? What connects the exhibition name to this particular box? How does packaging confirmation become a basis Pavel can use for release? Tracing that chain can expose a missing transition: the inventory describes last year’s exhibition, while the box retains its former label. Each participant may remember correct information about different versions. The problem then concerns representations that fail to identify one object, rather than someone insufficiently trying to think. Repair requires aligning versions. Calling collective memory poor identifies neither the conflicting records nor the correspondence the task actually needs.

V. Shared experience needs formulation

Dewey connects community with communicating experience and participating in the significance of a common activity. In the chapter read, he distinguishes physical proximity, an externally common result, and relations in which people know one another's purposes and progress. Coordinated-looking actions alone do not establish the last. He also considers command and obedience: complying with a demand need not mean participating in a common purpose. This is a historical philosophical argument about education and communication. We retain its question about participation without importing outdated civilisational comparisons from adjacent pages or declaring every conversation a measured educational benefit. Attribution matters because a philosophical proposal and an experimental result support different conclusions.

When Irina says 'the box is ready', she may mean her inspection is complete. Pavel needs to know whether that includes packaging and the handover document. Formulating experience here means identifying what happened so another person can connect the statement with their part of the task. 'Items checked against the inventory; packaging still open' supplies relevant distinctions. It is no lower form of thought than a brief professional expression. Irina also need not narrate her entire working history or personal circumstances. Sufficient content about the object's state can be communicated without making joint work a demand for unrestricted access to the person or treating every omitted detail as concealment.

The listener also participates in formulation: a question can reveal an unexpressed distinction. Pavel asks whether the box may now be closed; Irina notices that the final item awaits confirmation. The common description of readiness changes although no items have been added. Retaining that transition prevents the earlier 'ready' from circulating beside the correction as an equally current status. The conversational result in this scene is a more definite statement. We need assign it no brain change, special harmony, or shared view of the entire enterprise. It is enough to identify how the message becomes more usable for a particular next decision, while other questions remain open.

VI. Division of work and its joining point

A task can be divided so everyone completes their portion while the overall result remains unfinished. Irina checks the items; Pavel agrees an available hour. Nobody establishes who prepares the handover document. Two completed assignments do not automatically produce a third action. Identify the joining point: which results must meet, and what indicator permits the next step? In our case, it might be a document carrying the inventory and box identifier. This requires no paperwork for every act of assistance. It concerns this invented handover, where a missing specified document leaves contents and recipient unidentified. The problem belongs to the relation between completed parts rather than to their individual correctness.

The phrase ‘I have done everything’ can conceal this absence. It may be true of an assignment and insufficient for the whole. A boundary can be clarified without accusation: ‘Your part is complete; the next transition has no agreed owner yet.’ This identifies a matter for discussion, without deciding who must accept additional work. If Irina and Pavel agreed only two parts, the new part needs a separate decision rather than silently expanding either commitment. Examining connections can therefore protect responsibility boundaries: it makes an additional step visible before a missing result is attributed to someone’s supposedly obvious obligation. Naming a gap is distinct from assigning it.

The reverse problem arises when both independently prepare the same transition. Irina lists checked items; Pavel uses an old email. Two records may resemble useful redundancy without confirming each other, because their grounds differ. Establish which document is current and what the second one checks. Independent checking of contents and copying an exhibition name perform different roles. Relations between representations matter in Hutchins’s account; our original example likewise needs an identified relation rather than treating any repetition as accuracy evidence. Once resolved, the earlier record can remain historical provided its status prevents using it as current. Retaining history and authorising current use are separate decisions about the same document.

VII. Mutual understanding does not establish truth

Suppose both participants correctly understand and confirm that the carrier arrives at eleven. They later discover that the email concerns next week. Mutual understanding was achieved about the old message’s content, without establishing its applicability to today’s handover. This is a practical distinction: another kind of check is needed, involving email date, order day, and current carrier confirmation. Repeating the agreed time more loudly establishes no date. Clark and Brennan’s selected reasoning concerns sufficient understanding for a conversational purpose. We do not extend it to a guarantee that all information accepted by participants is true about the world. Agreement can identify a proposition for checking without performing that check.

A circulated answer also gains no independent grounds simply by being repeated. Irina hears the hour from Pavel; Pavel sees it in her record and treats it as confirmation. Her record came from his own statement. Tracing provenance reveals one ground where they imagined two. This is our logical analysis of an invented case, rather than an estimate of organisational error frequency. It explains why the shared record can usefully identify an originating confirmation. A reference to an earlier summary preserves conversational history but does not replace information from the party whose action is described. The number of readable copies and the number of independent supports answer different questions.

Correcting the date need not invalidate the whole conversation. Contents, address, and required handover form can remain established if the new time leaves them unaffected. Identify dependency: what relied on the former hour? A particular employee’s availability to open the premises may need renewed agreement. Correction then follows connected conditions instead of arbitrarily cancelling everything. That possibility follows from our explicit account of conditions, without promising error-free management of any project. If a dependency is unknown, mark the question rather than declaring remaining parts automatically checked because they occupy the same record. Preserving an established result calls for recognising its actual grounds and practical scope.

VIII. What remains after conversation

A spoken clarification ceases to exist as sound while a written mark can remain accessible. Hutchins examines differing media and the persistence of representations in a particular working system. Our record preserves agreed content after the meeting, but duration guarantees no currency. A perfectly legible inventory of last year’s exhibition can sit on the table. The medium retains the former record; the task requires establishing whether it fits the present object. Date, version, and identifier therefore answer practical questions of use. They are no decorations of documentary seriousness, and do not make every stored message operative indefinitely. Persistence supplies an opportunity to consult information rather than a verdict on its validity.

Accessibility also concerns particular people. If the inventory resides in Irina’s personal folder while Pavel sees only its filename, contents remain unavailable for his part. Opening the entire folder is unnecessary: an appropriate extract or separate document can preserve access limits elsewhere. Joint work needs the relevant informational transition, without common ownership of every personal note. Check that an extract belongs to the current version and identifies the box sufficiently. Otherwise access reaches only an assurance that a useful inventory exists somewhere, while the needed content remains unavailable for action. Selecting a sufficient representation can protect both the task’s requirements and information unrelated to it.

Even accessible text needs an intelligible status. ‘Transferred’ can mean an email sent, a box physically released, or receipt confirmed. If those events matter, clarify the record. Separate message and object-release dates can suffice without building an elaborate system for a simple handover. The relevant distinction matters more than the number of fields. A subsequent participant can see which result is established and which action remains. This concerns a relationship’s content rather than paper’s capacity to think. A shared record participates because people use it in particular ways; it neither decides nor frees its user from interpreting symbols. Material retention and responsible use remain connected but distinguishable parts of the work.

IX. Responsibility within a joint task

Distributed execution does not remove individual judgment. Pavel may see the shared inventory and notice that its recipient differs from the carrier’s confirmation. He can identify the discrepancy even when everyone is ready to finish. The question in our scene concerns the object and grounds of transfer, without judging participants’ character. Two conflicting records suffice for discussion. ‘We agreed’ reports a conversational state rather than answering the newly found mismatch. Retaining the objection in the common description makes that issue available for resolution. Participation need not require silence to maintain an appearance of completion, and an objection can concern one transition without rejecting the entire collaboration.

Responsibility for checked content differs from responsibility for a later action. Irina may confirm an inventory without agreeing to release the box to anyone named. Pavel may agree an hour without guaranteeing each item’s condition. Such boundaries need actual agreement; we establish no legal liability or museum policy here. Our conditional analysis can identify who checked which question and leave an unconfirmed question open. This transfers no obligations to a ‘system’ supposedly responsible instead of people. It makes visible which particular decisions have grounds and which participant can explain their portion’s result. Using a distributed description does not supply missing consent or enlarge a promise beyond its stated scope.

A discrepancy need not end in an immediate common opinion. If the recipient needs external confirmation, participants can agree to await an answer. That is a joint result: a next question and a continuation condition are identified. Call it waiting rather than completed handover. The distinction protects stopping at what has actually been achieved. Our account does not measure reasonable joint work by an absence of pauses or objections. It examines accessible connections, retained grounds, and intelligible transitions. Sometimes incompletion accurately describes a situation where required information is absent and participants cannot replace it with an agreed assumption. A clear open question can preserve more usable content than an unsupported declaration of closure.

X. When a task has become joint

Returning to the opening scene, Irina and Pavel need neither identical experience nor identical wording. Their selected result requires connecting contents, permitted time, recipient, and transfer status. Jointness becomes concrete where one part’s information is available to the next and participants understand what a confirmation concerns. This is our conclusion about a conditional example rather than a definition of every human association. Friendship, community, and a brief object handover have different purposes; they are not reduced to one table of conditions. The task makes a particular relation between actions and representations visible while leaving other kinds of community as questions in their own right, requiring their own contexts.

The three sources support different questions. Dewey examines communicable experience and participation. Clark and Brennan distinguish content, conversational coordination, and sufficient understanding for a current purpose. Hutchins analyses representations within a particular distributed system. These are no three independent trials of one technique, agreed proof of group consciousness, or single standard for managing people. Our original comparison connects their questions while retaining source genres. Claims about a group method’s effectiveness would need research on that method, participants, and outcome. No such efficacy is asserted here, so philosophical or field authority does not substitute for it. The comparison supports interpretation of this case within the scopes actually read.

Completion can be described as precisely as the beginning. Inventory checked, hour confirmed, box released to the named recipient; arrival elsewhere not yet confirmed. This preserves what happened without claiming the next result. If the purpose was release, the task may be complete; if it was receipt, a specified part remains. The agreed object of the result matters rather than a feeling of having talked well. Thinking between people appears in accessible relations: one part’s question changes another’s description, a record retains a transition, a confirmation gives grounds for action. Each participant remains a separate person able to understand, choose, object, and clarify their own participation throughout that connected activity.

What this means in practice

Choose a small voluntary task involving two people, or examine an invented case alone. State a concrete result in one sentence: what should happen and how it will become known. If ‘ready’ or ‘transferred’ can denote different events, select the intended meaning. No personal reasons or information irrelevant to the task need disclosure. An object and two conditions held by different participants provide enough material to begin. Keep the case limited enough that you can identify the result rather than attempting to describe every relation in an organisation.

Record each condition with its status: checked, proposed, awaiting a response. Identify the originating confirmation, without turning a summary of it into a second ground. Examine how one part’s information becomes available to the next. If an additional document or decision is needed, mark a separate transition and agree participation before treating it as someone’s duty. A question may remain open while the necessary answer is missing; that state should not be called a completed action. The record can show a dependency without deciding who must accept extra work.

Describe the current result so completed and remaining portions are visible. Another participant may voluntarily identify what content they understood and which action they agreed to; these are different answers. If a correction arises, establish which condition depends on it. Working alone, describe possible different understandings of one status without assigning them to real people. This original exercise examines a bounded situation. It has not been validated as a method of raising team performance, and requires no agreement about everything, shared ownership of personal notes, or continuation of an unwanted conversation. Use its distinctions only insofar as they help you describe the chosen task.

Key quotation

> *The experience has to be formulated in order to be communicated.*

John Dewey, Democracy and Education, Chapter I, §2, paragraph beginning ‘Try the experiment…’, complete closing sentence.

Connections between traditions

1. **Dewey / Clark and Brennan:** formulating experience and sufficient understanding concern participation and purpose, within distinct philosophical and theoretical arguments.

2. **Clark and Brennan / Hutchins:** conversational coordination and representational transitions distinguish message content from a system’s work; they prove no group consciousness.

3. **Dewey / Hutchins:** an externally common result does not describe participation; external media in a particular analysis do not replace separate people.

4. **Hutchins / original example:** transitions between inventory, label, and confirmation pose a version question; aviation procedures are not transferred to a box.

5. **Three sources / practice:** original analysis of status, grounds, and next transition preserves different source genres without making the exercise a tested team technique.

Primary sources

1. John Dewey, Democracy and Education, Chapter I §2 and Summary: historical philosophy, two exact complete sentences.

2. Edwin Hutchins, How a Cockpit Remembers Its Speeds (1995): selected introduction, procedure, external representations, and discussion; stylised field-informed analysis.

3. Herbert Clark and Susan Brennan, Grounding in communication (1991): opening paragraph and bounded concluding fragment actually read in primary search display after direct retrieval failed.

Tags

joint task, thinking, communication, understanding, participation, Dewey, Hutchins, Clark, Brennan, distributed cognition, representations, common result, content, process, purpose, version, status, confirmation, responsibility, consent, objection, record, medium, source, condition, transition, division of work, boundaries, practice, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.