ARTICLE

RDBCI: Revista Digital Biblioteconomia e Ciência da Informação
RDBCI : Digital Journal of Library and Information Science

DOI 10.20396/rdbci.v16i3.8651364

MEANINGS AND CONTEXTS: READING AND INTERPRETATION IN INFORMATION SCIENCE

SIGNIFICADOS E CONTEXTOS:
LEITURA E INTERPRETAÇÃO NA CIÊNCIA DA INFORMAÇÃO

Lourival Pinto[1]
[1]Universidade Federal de Pernambuco

Correspondência
[1]Lourival Pinto
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Recife, PE
E-mail: joaolori@yahoo.com.br

JITA: CF. Reading and story telling.

Submitted on: 14/05/2018
Accepted on: 02/07/2018
Published on: 27/08/2018

RESUMO: Este artigo tem como objetivo refletir sobre a relação entre as leituras, os significados, as interpretações e seus contextos, na ótica da Ciência da Informação. A pesquisa quanto aos objetivos, é exploratória, quanto aos procedimentos é bibliográfica, e traz como hipótese que as interpretações dependem diretamente do contexto espaço-tempo do leitor. O artigo traz uma revisão bibliográfica elegendo como temas principais de investigação os significados e seus contextos de significação. As considerações finais confirmam, mesmo que *a priori*, que as leituras são resultados de vivências dos leitores, sejam elas, resultantes de leituras textuais ou leituras de mundo. Além disso, o artigo defende que essas questões são fundamentais nos trabalhos de organização da informação e do conhecimento, e que as vivências podem acontecer nos processos de formação de leitores, facilitando a leitura das pessoas em estruturantes significantes mais complexas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Leitor. Semiótica. Conhecimento e informação.

ABSTRACT: This article aims to reflect on the relationship between readings, meanings, interpretations and their contexts, from the point of view of Information Science. The research on the objectives is exploratory, as far as the procedures are bibliographical, and hypothesizes that the interpretations depend directly on the space-time context of the reader. The article brings a bibliographical review choosing as main themes of investigation the meanings and their contexts of signification. The final considerations confirm, even if a priori, that the readings are the results of the readers' experiences, whether they result from textual readings or world readings. In addition, the article argues that these issues are fundamental in the work of organizing information and knowledge, and that the experiences can happen in the processes of formation of readers, facilitating the reading of people in more complex structures.

KEYWORDS: Reader. Semiotics. Knowledge and information.

RESUMEN: Este artículo tiene como objetivo reflexionar sobre la relación entre las lecturas, los significados, las interpretaciones y sus contextos, en la óptica de la Ciencia de la Información. La investigación en cuanto a los objetivos, es exploratoria, en cuanto a los procedimientos es bibliográfica, y trae como hipótesis que las interpretaciones dependen directamente del contexto espacio-tiempo del lector. El artículo trae una revisión bibliográfica eligiendo como temas principales de investigación los significados y sus contextos de significación. Las consideraciones finales confirman, aunque a priori, que las lecturas son resultados de vivencias de los lectores, sean ellas, resultantes de lecturas textuales o lecturas de mundo. Además, el artículo defiende que esas cuestiones son fundamentales en los trabajos de organización de la información y del conocimiento, y que las vivencias pueden ocurrir en los procesos de formación de lectores, facilitando la lectura de las personas en estructuras significantes más complejas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Lectura. Semiología. Información y comunicación.

1 INTRODUCTION

This article presents as main theme the relation between the readings, the meanings, the interpretations and their contexts, in the perspective of Information Science. The question of research originates from our concern about the multiple meanings that the readings can provoke in the subjects receiving the reading, and the resumption of a textual construction based on the deep readings undertaken by the most different readers. In addition, we seek to argue that reading is the basis of information, and as such, reading issues directly involve the technical intricacies of knowledge and information organization.

Based on these concerns, we come to a question of research, namely: why do readers, in the production of meanings, create or recreate different meanings for the same signifying structure? This structure can be a text, a video, an audio, all configured in a broad spectrum, of what we call reading. The hypothesis is that these interpretations depend directly on the reader's space-time context. Thus, in order to answer this question, our main research objective is to reflect on the relationship between meanings and their contexts, specifically in the acts of reading and interpretation in Information Science.

The research, regarding the approach is qualitative, regarding the nature is applied, regarding the objectives, is exploratory, and as far as the procedures is bibliographical.

The article is divided into sections, and in the second section, we reflect on the meanings of meaning, in the third section we present the context of meaning, and finally, in the fourth section, we present the final considerations. That said, in the next section, we will discuss the meaning of meaning.

2 THE MEANINGS

In the semiotic concept, signification occurs in the relation between signifier and meaning, and the sign is "the correlation in a significant way with a (or with a hierarchy of) unity that we define as meaning" (Eco, 1997, p. 150).

In the relation between signifier and meaning, what is observed and named as a sign constitutes only the signifying form. Meaning is the content of the signical expression (signifier).

Ogden & Richards (1976) argue that words mean nothing by themselves, but when used they represent something or, in a certain sense, have a meaning. In order to communicate, the subject uses signical resources, which are references to objects that are not present, are abstract, or are present, but have different meanings.

By postulating a sign and its meaning, the subject communicates through speech or writing or even gestures, in what Blumer (1969) called symbolic interaction. In order to

clarify, the use of a sign of a cultural unity brings with it common elements of interaction between communicating individuals. When using these signs, the individual seeks and attains a representation, insofar as he represents a referent by means of a sign. Thus expression-content go together at the level of distinct cultural units, and separate, alternate, and reconnect in the act of a new representation, or in the signifiers of 'new' cultural units.

Eco (1984), quoting the conceptual triangle established by Ogden & Richards (1976, p. 32), says that in this relation, the expression of a sign connects with the intension and the extension of an expression. For Ogden & Richards, the three points of the triangle are: symbol, reference and referent. Eco, in criticizing this model, argues that it gives margins to ambiguities, because when referring to the referent, it does not clarify whether it is an object or a class of objects. When someone quotes a horse (symbol), is a specific horse of a race, or the totalizing class of horses? Still according to Eco, the solution would be to postulate a triangle as follows: expression-intension-extension.

Lara (2001) clarifies that intension is the set of constituent characteristics of a concept and that extension is the totality of the objects to which a concept corresponds. The process of communication that is based on the relation of signs is codified and decoded by common codes, generating the transmission of information circulating in a group and / or in various social groups. Codes are coined, and sometimes in reading and interpreting a text, the reader may make a mistake in the attempt to discover the author's intention, even though the author lived and produced the text in another space-time universe, where and when the common codes were others.

In this regard, Thornley & Gibb (2009), trying to define conceptual differences between the meaning of meaning in philosophy and in information retrieval, argue that the context gap in documents, when they are far from the time and space in which they were generated, may cause a weakness in terms of communication, but often, it is a force in terms of information, by allowing this information to have resisted through the ages and in different places.

But even this resistance cannot avoid, or even end up favoring, the multiplicity of meanings that are produced during the reading of an original text in other contexts. And, theoretically, it would not even be necessary for such an elastic space-time distancing to happen. Sometimes a small contextual deviation is enough to bring about diversity in the production of meanings, because according to Croatto (1985), the greater the distance between writing and reading, the greater the perspective of reading a text.

Therefore, these variables (intentions, distances, experiences) influence the production of the senses by the individual at the moment of apprehension of referents. And it is at that moment that the cultural units articulate to generate a signifier. To understand the meaning of sense and meaning in a reading context, we must identify the phenomena as they manifest. It

is not the case to discover which comes first, the sense or the meaning, but perhaps to understand that in reading, the reader produces a sense meaning, or the sign means on the basis of a sense. Husserl (1996, p.33) states that:

> the meanings of the respective propositions reside in the judgments on the experiences, and not in the own experiences, desires, questions, etc. In the same way, the meanings of statements about external things also do not reside in the last ones (houses, horses, etc.), but in the judgments we make inwardly on them or in the representations that help to construct these judgments.

In this statement, the author brings to the fore the function of judgment and representation in the process of signification, which is corroborated by Thalamus (2004), when he says that "to assign a concept to a term depends on the formulation of judgments." (p.8). Judgment is, in reality, a judgment that will give quality to a term, since it is it that will determine the objects denoted, clarifying their individual and general characteristics (statements of intension and extension).

Another observation to be made regarding Husserl's statement is the notion of the representation of things, that is, the use of a sign to signify something that is hidden. The covered object is represented by a sign to make its own representation viable. Significance thus produces a process of unfolding symbols, intensions and extensions, according to the relations of the interpretants.

In Heidegger's words (2004), meaning is the remission of the remission of something that was hidden, but comes to the presence, through a reference within his world, and is pronounced through a sign of relationship.

The unfolding is articulated in the same way when someone reads a text and appropriates the meanings of the text to produce the meanings according to what the meanings present themselves. And, phenomenologically, it reads the concepts as they are apprehended during the process of reading, meaning production, meaning and knowledge. During this process the reader is able to simultaneously represent and interpret the text and convey the information according to prior knowledge prior to signification and may be contained in the senses of the soul or in the sense of his own being. A covert object is not necessarily concealed from the senses, but rather it can be shown in a way different from that intended by the author (in the case of reading), and its reading is established according to the reader's previous experiences and knowledge, factors that can determine culturally the representation of a sign.

In establishing an act of reading, the reader uses schemes that create the meanings for a text. Part of this scheme is the legacy of the pre-knowledge that is established with their experiences and their memories that emerge from it. This is very clear in the associations that the reader formulates based on this knowledge. We can mention the concept of collateral

knowledge, established by Welb (Peirce, 1977), which is called familiar knowledge by Widdowson (2007), and background knowledge by Eco (1984).

Such knowledge is necessary for Pragmatics, which takes the reader's social world into account, and takes it beyond purely linguistic knowledge. It is the Pragmatics that assumes that the reader already has enough knowledge to understand what is written. They are, in reality, the schemes produced in the mind of the reader that will subsidize it at the time of reading. And when he comes across a new sign, he constructs his hypotheses in an attempt to confirm them. It is true that they can happen to confirm themselves differently from the hypotheses previously established, depending on the world in which the reader is, or how their conscience, by relying on their experiences, will rely on judgments to construct meanings.

This process of producing the senses for the reader sediments the interpretation of the signs and concepts presented in the text and gives him the conditions to produce his own discourse. It is at this moment that rhetoric emerges, a phenomenon of knowledge construction based on the information received in the text (s), because it is clear that the function of the process of signification is to facilitate the communication process.

In receiving the information and processing the knowledge, the individual establishes a relation of the information received from the external environment with the subjective knowledge. It is noticed that there will always be a subjective knowledge, and that throughout his informational life, the individual constantly changes his state of knowledge. We say this in a socio-cognitive way of seeing the information process, because the search for information will always happen in an external environment through social interactions. It is very probable that from the first information received, already in its first times of life, the individual begins to process information and to sediment the knowledge.

In reading a text, in producing meanings, the reader establishes relations of world states with symbols (or signs). When faced with a given expression, he resorts to his schemes in the search for meaning. In doing so, it searches for the immediate resource of a symbol (or sign) that accounts for representing that expression. It is true to say that what the reader does is to establish comparative judgments, and to continue to mean according to his senses. He then resorts to the signs, which have the function of representing the meaning and providing the senses in a conceptual map.

In the field of Information Science there are several literature reviews that seek to draw a panel of its intersection with other areas of knowledge. Mendonça (2000) studies the connections with linguistics. According to her, the Science of Information shows dependence on linguistics, because in its field of study, it is essential to use language, which is the very object of knowledge.

For Mendonça, "it is in the act of knowing (content) and representing (language) that the Information Science will define its object of study - information - and this information cannot be formulated without a dependent but proper language" (p. 65). To represent the content of documents, Information Science uses resources borrowed from Linguistics, Terminology and Semiotics. In a system of conceptual representation, content is represented by terms based on choices (paradigms), and the combinations (syntagma) of these terms are made in order to formulate a search for information.

In ordinary language, as we formulate a phrase, we make certain choices of expressions in omission of others. So, as we said the traffic light turned green and the automobiles passed, we could have said the signal went green and the cars passed. In this case, we choose traffic light and not signal, and we prefer cars, not automobiles. It is a process of choice, at the same time that we combine the + traffic light + became + green + and + the + cars + passed.

In Information Science, the process is similar, that is, in the conceptual analysis of a document or a domain, the terms that best represent the concepts are chosen. We can determine that the term car will best represent the concept of a *motor-driven, four-wheeled vehicle that can be driven by a driver,* rather than the term *automobile*. And such language must be constructed to facilitate that the user when appealing to the system can combine some terms to allow its search. This combination is based on Boolean algebra, in a process of choice, inclusion, or exclusion (or, and, not).

In Semiology, in establishing paradigms and syntagma, the information system works with signifiers and meanings, seeking a correspondence with the user. This 'semiotic integration' should bring to light the phenomena of conceptual fluctuation cited by Pinto in a master's thesis (2005). Signifiers can have different meanings depending on the time and space in which they are, for example, the author and the reader at the time of writing and reading. The concept of conceptual fluctuation was, in turn, borrowed from Physics to be applied in the system of signification.

In one of the theories of Prigogine[1] (Massoni, 2008) the canonical coordinates define the position (q) and the moment (p) of the specific points of the phases. A fact, or event, can occur in certain coordinates, reducing the entropy and the idea of irreversibility. In a sense of chaos, the facts occur at different points, and can be reversed, depending on the phenomena that determine the coordinates, which, in other words, are the space-time fluctuations. This, according to Prigogine, is one of the principles of the uncertainties that constitute the systems of worlds. It is even pertinent to emphasize that such a principle is based on Einstein's theory of relativity, in a sense that phenomena occur and are seen depending on where they are and depending on where and when they are observed.

In the links of Information Science with some other domains, Saracevic (1995) shows connections with four areas: Librarianship, Computing, Cognitive Science and Communication. With Librarianship, the relationships are mainly in the processes of Information Retrieval in online catalogs. With Computing, the connection is made to computers and networks. The concern of the two areas is similar in relation to the storage of data, systems and techniques to recover them. The difference is that computing is concerned with the most efficient technology that will allow the viability of this process, especially in large physical collections and digital collections, while Information Science focuses more on information content and efficient languages for Information Retrieval.

With Cognitive Science, the connection is presented in the theories and experiments of Artificial Intelligence and Human-Machine Interaction[2], not linking the correspondences to the technologies, but to the simulations of human thought to enable the possibilities to adapt the processes of the machines to the way the man thinks, conceptualizes, analyzes and synthesizes the information. Systems of signification aim at a process of communication, in which there is the sender, the codification, the message, the decoding and the receiver. Information permeates the whole process and aims to achieve its goal, which is to communicate.

[1] Ilya Prigogine was a Russian physicist (1917-2003), winner of the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1977, for his studies in thermodynamics of irreversible processes with the formulation of the theory of dissipative structures. Dissipative structures are systems that draw energy from their environment and produce order. Prigogine was able to reconcile the theory of evolution with the second law of thermodynamics. (N. of A.)

[2] This relationship can be noticed in the projects of collaborative information sites, and in some semantic web projects, such as the use of technologies in descriptive representation in digital information environments. (Castro & Santos, 2009

Some observations are necessary here: every process of interdisciplinarity presupposes exchanges. Collaboration between domains goes hand in hand. Just verify that if there is no information, there is no sense in building communication technologies. And if there is no appropriate technology, information services run the risk of becoming difficult for users to access. And, also, without the use of the technologies, the services themselves will be done in a precarious way. And when one says communication technologies, an interdisciplinary practice is foreshadowed, because it connects communication and computing.

Another point to note is that new connections always emerge between domains. One example is with regard to language studies, which points out collaborations between terminology and documentary analysis.

Still talking about the relationship of Information Science with Cognitive Science, Lima (2003) presents a review of the contributions between these two sciences and emphasizes that this linkage occurs mainly during the processes of categorization, indexation, information retrieval, and human-computer interaction, machine. With regard to these four elements, we observe that categorization involves classification for organization of knowledge. To classify is to know and classification is done by means of cognitive processes of knowledge of domains, classes and by the ability to categorize, hierarchize and relate things, facts and phenomena.

Indexing is the understanding of the text for the analysis, identification of the main elements, construction of concepts and representation through terms. In fact, indexing is clearly a cognitive process. This is also the case with Information Retrieval, which is a mental process of the user that articulates with the system to recover the desired subject. This process involves the user's mental schemes, which can facilitate the search for information. These schemes are the user's pre-knowledge and intuition when using the technological and conceptual resources of the system that depend, in large part, on how the languages that will give access to the concepts that are represented by the terms sought by the user in natural language.

For Thalamus (2001), terminology and documentation are a connection in the sense that the documentation appropriates the terminology to operate the units of signification within the documentary languages and, in the context where the communication is transmitted, based in systems of signification. It is convenient to explain that, although it is not a documentation discipline, Information Science studies the phenomenon of information itself and its various contexts, including communication. Thus, when she worries about documentation studies, she abstracts the information from the context and tries to grasp the various meanders she goes through.

Documentation is one of these intricacies, and the use of terminology in documentation brings to the fore the specialized languages in their different domains, and in clipping in a
particular domain, processes the conceptual signs according to the resources of induction and deduction, using theoretical and practical terminology. In fact, when analyzing a domain to make a representation, the documentarist uses the terminology of the area to cut out the concepts and adapt them to the possible terms that respond to those concepts.

Thus, by analyzing a text from that area, by reading it documentarily, he knows that the keywords can give a clue to the concepts present there, but he must also know that he has to use the conceptual map that represents the area, with its relations and associations, in order to situate the concepts according to the possible descriptors, which have already been pre-

established for their respective concepts. And you must also be aware that these relationships and meanings on the conceptual map are subject to fluctuations.

Besides the sense of interdisciplinarity, the Information Science, according to Wersig (1993) can be considered an inter conceptual discipline. Constituted as a postmodern science, it escapes the rules of a formal notion of classical discipline, with its own concepts, methods, and languages. As far as the object of study is concerned, Wersig believes that the difficulty of this new science is to establish information as an object of study that can be rejected as such, because it is not an exclusive term for Information Science and it runs through all scientific domains.

Wersig cites other terms that may be in the same situation as knowledge, culture, reality, art, and technology. By their generic characteristics, such concepts cannot be considered objects of study of any discipline or science. What the author proposes is the interweaving[3] of concepts, in a sort of network where concepts mean something according to their characteristics around them, and per pass around other disciplines. We realize that interdisciplinarity can have several meanings in the systems of signification that involve Information Science. First, in the contributions between various domains with the purpose of communicating information, and secondly, in common concepts that are intertwined in a network of relations and gain meaning.

We could also propose that there are interdisciplinary texts and meanings. A text can generate concepts that intertwine and reach meaning in various domains. Such interlacing can take place in the unfolding of the representations that are made during the reading of the text.

[3] Wersig (1993) proposes the idea of an interlacing of concepts similar to the work of the bird-weaver.
This inter-conceptuality would be the aggregation and relation of concepts that underpin the Information Science. These concepts are, in some way, the contribution of several domains to inform the Science of Information. Such a technique, then, could be applied to the inter-conceptualities of domains considered interdisciplinary.

The concepts analyzed and represented gain 'new life' and establish a new dialectic with other domains. In another way of thinking, concepts, after reading, representing and producing meanings 'carry' information to other fields.

3 THE CONTEXT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The term 'first of all' means that the context in which such a concept is applied refers to the subject's moment before any knowledge. Which means that, basing itself on phenomena such as *Kaspar Hauser's Enigma*[4], it would be a prehistory of the subject before the apprehension and affirmation of its language and thought. From the moment the interaction period begins, the subject begins to articulate and produce his concepts based on the interactions with himself and his environment.

The biblical text that narrates the 'Tower of Babel' refers to this prehistoric moment of language, metaphorically speaking. It is a time when one first language was undone, for others to be built. The phenomenon may present itself as a kind of myth that explains the genealogy of languages, and that such genealogy has been built over the centuries. Then, as the subject begins to articulate with his world, his process of world representation begins. Because if the objects[5] of the world[6] do not present themselves in a relational, direct, or at least in theory, it is not possible for this to happen, the subject resorts to representations of objects.

In the Heideggerian logic of phenomenology, the subject (entity) interacts with his world before obtaining his knowledge. Because it is through these interactions and experiences that the objects of the world present themselves to him, but not only in a way of being as they present themselves in a definite way. No. The subject seeks a meaning for things by investigating objects in their sense of being.

[4] German film directed by Werner Herzog, released in 1974, and that brings reflections about the relationship between experiences and language.

[5] Objects here have the meaning of all things within the world. Everything that exists, whether this is a tangible object or not. In a narrow sense, it could be an entity (person, thing), some referent, or a given phenomenon (N. of A.).

[6] Worlds in the sense of common things within a given universe. This world surrounds the conceptual world of the subject. A concept of difficult apprehension, even more so than, relatively, a world can be an object, because it is itself an intangible thing. It can also be understood as a domain of knowledge, or a community of people. Their common meanings are not restricted and can be shared by other 'worlds' through the transmission of information. (N. of A.).

In other words, one wonders: Why are these objects? What is the meaning of these entities that show up to him? It is at the moment of apprehension of concepts that they are represented by signs (or terms) that facilitate communication between the subjects of their world.

In this article, we call the *act of reading* as that of the *moment of apprehension*, that of the moment when the subject/reader grasps the concepts and articulates them with his

cognitive perspective. It is not here to raise questions such as the cognitive state of the subject in the *'first-of-all'*, but only to propose a line of common reasoning between that moment and the explanation of the subject's interaction through meanings common to a world. In the prehistory of the subject, as Locke[7] has shown, there are the senses, but senses in a sense (meaning) of sensations. From the sensations, the experiences of the subject are established in the interior of their world.

The act of reading, then, is a determining factor for the production of senses and meanings and consequently for the flows of information. In reading, the reader evokes their experiences, and brings to consciousness the statements that give life to the concepts, which in turn, will give meaning to the signifiers present in the text, based on judgments, or judgments of comparison. In producing the senses, meanings are created or recreated, which will support a possible dialogue with an information system.

To mean is to interpret, just as to classify is to know. This means that by apprehending the meaning of the concept and establishing meanings, the reader interprets the text according to its judgments and interactions. Here too the question is: what is the purpose of interpreting? We can create hypotheses here, but for now, the answer, which has not yet been validated, is that the interpretation depends in part on the proposed text and/or cultural influence that this text has on the community. We define culture, in the present context, as all phenomena seen as social, historical, and temporal.

We must now focus on the sense as sense and the sense as meaning. For Farradane (1979), meaning is the result of the reaction to interpreted information associated with the experiences of the subject, and for Ogden & Richards (1976), meaning has no specific meaning but multiple meanings depending on how they are contextualized. Although very close in character, these concepts of sense and meaning are treated here as far as possible in the following way: sense is produced by the reader, who, in reading, relates the text to his universe.

Within your universe of understanding, the reader can create and recreate senses, dialoguing with the text and proposing or not new outings. Meanings permeate this dialogue from beginning to end, normalizing meaningful structures, and naming the concepts that arise

[7] John Locke, English philosopher (1632-1704).

as a result of the new meanings attributed by the reader. If, in reading a text, the reader recreates a new universe based on an interpretation, the meanings will account for establishing a connection of the terms of this universe with the assigned concepts, creating or recreating a conceptual map of expressions and contents.

The explanation of Ferreira and Dias (2004) corroborates this statement when they say that meaning is taken as belonging to the personal universe of the individual, but shared

within the context of interaction, and meaning is something that is culturally shared. In this statement, the concept of meaning is closely connected to the concept of information, since information is seen as a phenomenon that circulates socially.

Times can define spaces, and vice versa, and both affect the experiences and the consciences. It is necessary to speak about truths, to clarify understandings about true meanings or not, because ultimately, absolute truths do not exist, and the statements of Eco (1995) and Ogden & Richards (1976) corroborate this, when they say:

> So, when you really talk about a possible world, I think you are not speaking in terms of True 2, but in terms of True 1. True in a possible world means 'recorded in an encyclopedia'. This has nothing to do with reality. (Eco, 1995, 272, in the dialogue of Dr. Smith, Dpt. Of Cognitive Sciences, and Charles Sanders Personal, Antipodean Computer).

> Our interpretation of any sign is our psychological reaction to it, as determined by our past experience in similar situations and by our present experience. If this is stated with due care in terms of causal contexts or related groups, we will get an explanation of judgment, belief, and interpretation that puts the psychology of thought on the same level as the other inductive sciences and, incidentally, settles the 'Truth Problem' (Ogden & Richards, 1976, pp. 246-247).

We must think of the distinction of a possible truth in the reception of information exclusively as the responsibility and selections of the subjects. It would then be the phenomenon seized and given as a relative truth on the part of the informants and possibly as truth in their corresponding worlds. Searle (2002), relating meaning and truth contests arguments for the defense of literal meaning, that is, that sentences are given and are apprehended in a zero context or null context. According to Searle, the dominant view is that sentences have literal meaning. "The literal meaning of a sentence is wholly determined by the meanings of its component words and by the syntactic rules according to which those elements are composed" (p. 184). Corroborating Widdowson (2007) on the linguistic question, and Lévy (1996) in relation to rhetoric, Searle opposes literal meaning and zero context.

Expressions or acts of speech occur in a context that defines possible truths. In addition to syntax and grammar, semantics (meaning) and pragmatics (the use of language, as in Wittgenstein), determine meanings in certain contexts. In a simple expression like *'snow is white'*, which apparently has a literal meaning, there are underlying issues that determine or can determine their meanings. First, the zero or null context in this case does not exist. Perhaps the understanding of this expression is different between the Eskimo peoples and the Bedouin of the Sahara, who have never seen snow.

For those who have never seen snow, nor even know their characteristics, the expression can become meaningless, hence the effect of non-understanding. Secondly, in any sentence the phenomenon of background knowledge or collateral effect occurs. This last observation is related to the Bedouin of the Sahara, as the collateral effect or background knowledge requires them to know the concept of snow beforehand and to distinguish in a color table the white color, or more specifically the similar white color to the tonality of the white color of the snow.

Certainly, the absence of a null context or a literal meaning in speech expressions or acts (Searle, 2002) may reject the concept of absolute truth, since the individual who cannot produce senses for snow or white, can invalidate as truth the statement expressed in the sentence 'the snow is white'. On the other hand, it can propose other 'sets of meanings' that make interpretations in relative or possible truths.

4 FINALS

After the reflections made here, we conclude, at least for the time being, that readings are the results of experiences, whether they result from textual readings or world readings. The bibliographic review, which was the method adopted here, showed that the interpretation of the reading results from the experiences of the readers. For the interpretation, it is necessary the understanding, that occurs in dependence of previous knowledge of the readers. Such knowledge may be of a social and/or cognitive order, and clearly influence the significance of the possible worlds open to readers. In addition, these reflections may favor a better understanding of the processes of knowledge and information organization, since their practices involve readings, both in the entry and exit of information systems, because we understand that readings of worlds, texts, or specialized readings, such as documentaries, are subject to these experiential factors.

The readings are social practices and bring with them complexities that can be understood by those who understand that the process of production and use of information is directly affected by the relations between experiences, meanings and productions of meaning. Therefore, we consider that the results of these reflections eliminate with the fallacy of the *technicality* in the Information Science, since the processes of organization involve readings and knowledge, and for that reason they are human activities.

In these final considerations, we find it pertinent to point out, still as a result of these reflections, that the research brought us future perspectives of research in the area of reader training, so thought today in Information Science, and more specifically in Librarianship. Reading is an activity that must be developed, and like every development process, it requires

an increase in the complexity of reading. Reading mediation can elaborate your projects in order to relate people's experiences to their possible readings, and then embark on a journey to understand more complex readings. Thus, we understand that the process of mediation itself is included in the memories and experiences of the readers, propitiating their literary deepening, and developing in these readers the sensitive and critical spirit.

The readings and their possible meanings directly influence the information, which is the set of activities of information and formation in the universe that *includes* the human and social variables of the people who produce and use information.

REFERENCES

BLUMER, Herbert. **Symbolic Interactionism**: perspective and method. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

CASTRO, Fabiano Ferreira de; SANTOS, Plácida Leopoldina Ventura Amorim da Costa. Uso das tecnologias na representação descritiva: o padrão de descrição bibliográfica semântica MarcOnt Initiative nos ambientes informacionais digitais. **Ciência da Informação**, v. 38, n. 1, p. 74-85, jan./abr. 2009.

CROATTO, Joaquim Severino. **Hermenêutica Bíblica**: para uma teoria da leitura como produção de significado. São Leopoldo, RS: Sinodal; São Paulo: Paulinas, 1985.

ECO, Umberto. O conceito de texto. São Paulo: Queiroz, EDUSP, 1984.

ECO, Umberto. O signo. 5. ed. Lisboa: Editorial Presença, 1997.

ECO, Umberto. **Os limites da interpretação**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1995.

FARRADANE, Jason. **The nature of information:** definitions and concepts of information. Journal of Information Science, v. 1, n.1, p. 13-17, abr. 1979.

FERREIRA, Sandra Patrícia Ataíde; DIAS, Maria da Graça Bompastor Borges. **A leitura, a produção de sentidos e o processo inferencial.** Psicologia em Estudo, v. 9, n. 3, p. 439-448, set./dez. 2004.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ser e Tempo**, parte 1. 13. ed. Petrópolis, 2004.

HUSSERL, Edmund. **Investigações lógicas, sexta investigação**: elementos de uma elucidação fenomenológica do conhecimento. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1996 (Os Pensadores).

LARA, Marilda Lopez Ginez de. O unicórnio (o rinoceronte, o ornitorrinco...), a Análise Documentária e a Linguagem Documentária. **DataGramaZero – Revista de Ciência da Informação**, v. 2, n. 6, dez. 2001.

LÉVY, Pierre. **O que é o virtual?** São Paulo: ed. 34, 1996.

LIMA, Gercina Ângela Borém. Interfaces entre a ciência da informação e a ciência cognitiva. **Ciência da Informação**, v. 32, n. 1, p. 77-87, jan./abr. 2003.

MASSONI, Neusa Teresinha. **Ilya Prigogine:** uma contribuição à filosofia da ciência. Revista Brasileira de Ensino de Física, v. 30, n. 2, São Paulo, 2008.

MENDONÇA, Ercília Severina. A linguística e a ciência da informação: estudos de uma intersecção. **Ciência da Informação**, v. 29, n. 3, p. 50-70, set./dez. 2000.

O ENIGMA de Kaspar Hauser. Direção: Werner Herzog. Produção: Werner Herzog. Intérpretes: Helmut Doring; Bruno S.; Walter Ladengast; Brigitte Mira e outros. Roteiro: Werner Herzog, 1974. (110 min.), son., color.

OGDEN, Charles Kay; RICHARDS, Ivor Armstrong. **O significado de significado:** um estudo da influência da linguagem sobre o pensamento e sobre a ciência do simbolismo. São Paulo: Zahar, 1976.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders. O que é significado?, de Lady Welb. In: PEIRCE, Charles Sanders. **Semiótica**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1977. p. 157-164.

PINTO, Lourival Pereira. **A representação documentária e o paradigma social.** 2005. 108 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciência da Informação) – Escola de Comunicações e Artes, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2005.

SARACEVIC, Tefko. Interdisciplinary nature of information science. **Ciência da Informação**. Brasília, v. 24, n. 1, p. 36-41, 1995.

SEARLE, John. **Expressão e Significado**: estudos da teoria dos atos da fala. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002.

TÁLAMO, Maria de Fátima Gonçalves Moreira. A pesquisa: recepção da informação e produção do conhecimento. **DataGramaZero – Revista de Ciência da Informação**, v. 5, n. 2, abr. 2004.

TÁLAMO, Maria de Fátima Gonçalves Moreira. Terminologia e Documentação. **TradTerm**, n. 7, p. 141-151, 2001.

THORNLEY, Clare; GIBB, Forbes. Meaning in philosophy and meaning in information retrieval (IR). **Journal of Documentation**, v. 65, n. 1, p. 133-150, 2009.

WERSIG, Gernot. Information Science: the study of postmodern knowledge usage. **Information Processing & Management**, v. 29, n. 2, p. 229-239, 1993.

WIDDOWSON, Henry George. **Discourse Analysis**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007.

WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig. **Investigações filosóficas**. 5. ed. Bragança Paulista, SP: Ed. Universitária São Francisco; Petrópolis: Vozes 2008.