CMM and Public Dialogue:
Practical theory in a community-wide communication project

Carey Adams, Charlene Berquist, Randy Dillon, and Gloria Galanes
Southwest Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

This article discusses "public dialogue" as an implementation of coordinated management of meaning (CMM) theory in a community-wide communication project. CMM provides a framework for interpreting and critiquing public communication and serves as a practical theory informing action research and community empowerment. In this essay we examine the Every Kid Counts public dialogue project, which focused on the needs of youth in Springfield, Missouri. In that project, several "moments" of discovery produced insights, informed by CMM theory, about three aspects of public dialogue practice: coordination and coherence, situating dialogue, and facilitation. These insights suggest implications for future research and theory development.

Introduction

"Public dialogue" exemplifies how coordinated management of meaning (CMM) theory can be implemented in facilitating community-wide communication. As the underpinning for public dialogue practices, CMM provides a framework for interpreting and critiquing public communication and serves as a practical theory informing action research and community empowerment. This essay examines a case study of a particular public dialogue project that highlights CMM's role and suggests implications for theory development and future research.

CMM informs our work in public dialogue in two encompassing ways. First, in facilitating public dialogue, we co-create meanings with participants in many ways and at several levels. Second, public dialogues are <u>particular</u> communication systems that we attempt to foster and in which we ourselves become enmeshed. While not having predetermined forms, these communication systems establish certain preconditions, based on the tenets of CMM theory, to promote dialogic communication in a public context.

Public Dialogue Practice

Grounded in coordinated management of meaning theory (CMM) and social constructionism, public dialogue is a "practical theory" (Pearce & Pearce, 2000) approach assisting communities to bring about positive social change. Developed by the Public Dialogue Consortium (see Pearce & Pearce, 2000, 2001 and Spano, 2001 for thorough reviews of the PDC's work), public dialogue encompasses both a set of micro-level facilitation skills and a strategic design approach to making possible community-wide discussion. Training for facilitators focuses on four essential skills, including openness, active listening, questioning/probing, and recording (Pearce, 2001). Participants are asked to agree to certain ground rules, such as listening respectfully, sharing the

floor, and confidentiality. They also are informed that reaching consensus is <u>not</u> the dialogue's purpose. These group discussions occur in the context of a strategic process that includes advance preparation, multiple events, and feedback to the community.

It is worthwhile to note that PDC's flagship project in Cupertino, CA, is credited by that city's manager for preventing racial tensions from exploding (Krey, 1999). That project, a complex one involving interviews, public dialogue discussions and several town meetings, lasted many months and provided Cupertino citizens a productive, positive way to discuss important and controversial issues.

Pearce and Pearce (2000) contrast public dialogue with other strategic process models that do not allow for true dialogue, such as when public forums are used only to educate community members about decisions that have already been made, or when input is sought regarding issues that have already been framed and limited by decision makers.

Moments of Discovery in Every Kid Counts

Our project, called Every Kid Counts (EKC), began in 2000 when indicators such as dropout rates and teen pregnancies raised alarms about the well-being of youth in Springfield, MO. The Good Community Committee, a grass-roots group of involved, influential citizens, sought to focus the community's attention on the status of its youth. The public dialogue process provided a way to engage in widespread community discussion of this issue. The first major event was an October, 2001 open community public dialogue for people to discuss the needs of youth. This successful event, facilitated by the Pearces with faculty from the Department of Communication and trained community discussion leaders, attracted over 100 individuals. However, participants were not representative of the entire community, and only three youth attended. Further, participants overwhelmingly agreed that the conversation needed to continue. Consequently, the Good Community Committee next scheduled a series of public dialogues in a variety of settings, targeting primarily young people. These dialogues, conducted by Communication faculty and students, culminated in May, 2002, with a report on the status of youth and a growing recognition that the community needed to attend more to its youth. The report supported creation of a new nonprofit organization, Every Kid Counts, whose mission is to focus community awareness of the needs of youth. This organization hired its first full-time executive director in November, 2003.

From the EKC project, we experienced a number of insights about public dialogue, CMM, and how we should approach future projects.   Our experiences also raised questions that serve as heuristics for further inquiry. Many of these insights and questions came as the result of unexpected and challenging "moments" (Pearce & Pearce, 2001), which confronted us with the choice of staying the course and pursuing our immediate goals or experiencing the situation as an opportunity to enact a different "grammar of practice" (Spano, 2001). This essay provides specific examples of those moments that produced insights or raised questions about public dialogue and CMM. Our insights represent three areas: coordination and coherence, situating dialogue, and facilitation.

Before proceeding, we offer two points of clarification. Although coordination and coherence have not always been defined consistently by CMM writers, we assume that coordination, the ability of two or more individuals adequately to predict one another's behaviors and thereby make communicative choices in pursuit of their individual goals, is possible without what Pearce, Cronen, Johnson, Jones and Raymond (1980) call symmetrical or mutual coherence, which occurs when all parties are able to interpret their sequence of messages and rules-in-use in similar ways. We also acknowledge that incidents of coordination or coherence are possible even when we would not characterize the larger interaction as having accomplished either. Second, although we discuss coordination and coherence, situating dialogue and facilitation separately, these are not discrete categories. Many of the moments we observed overlap and have implications for more than one category.

Coordination and Coherence

Coordination and coherence are central concepts in CMM for interpreting interactions and relationships. Pearce et al. (1980) defined coordination as "the absence of unpredictability" of the other and as the intersection of "stories lived," in which interactants are able to act and respond in ways that accomplish their goals (Pearce & Pearce, 1998). Minimally, communication partners are able to communicate in ways that make sense to one another (Rose, 1988). Coherence refers to participants making sense of sequences of messages, or "stories told" (Pearce & Pearce, 1998). Put another way, coordination is accomplished in people's talk, or action, while coherence is accomplished in talk *about* that action.

One plausible explanation for the infrequency of true community dialogue is community leaders and citizens anticipate conflict, misunderstanding, or even apathy. Even in the best of circumstances, dialogue may seem a relatively inefficient means of decision making, and in the worst cases it may devolve into conflict, politicking, or unproductive, circular discussions. By imposing ground rules and structures (albeit flexible ones) and equipping facilitators to apply them skillfully, public dialogue employs principles of CMM in attempts at creating and sustaining systems of meaning that make community dialogue possible.

Public dialogue practices draw on the theoretical concepts of rules and the forces those rules exert in interaction. These practices impose certain regulative and constitutive rules that facilitate coordination in two ways. First, the rules give participants a common set of conventions for conversing and constructing meanings. Second, the rules themselves foster certain types of communication systems that encourage coordination. Logical force describes the range of legitimate possible interpretations participants may choose, while practical force represents the constraints on participants' actions based on the likely consequences of those actions (Pearce et al., 1980). When logical force is high and interactions are highly ritualized and patterned, people hold intractable positions and utilize repetitive patterns that impede new interpretations and actions, making genuine dialogue difficult. Conversely, when discussants have little experience or motivation to participate, there may be too little logical force to organize the conversation.

Two examples from the EKC project illustrate how communication rules served to change forces at play in community discussions. The initial community-wide dialogue included representatives from a segment of the faith community that in previous public forums had been at odds with those whom they perceived as advancing a secular humanist agenda. Based on those past experiences, those individuals expected conflict, i.e., they expected others to argue with them and they were prepared themselves to argue. However, ground rules for the event – not seeking consensus or decision making, respectful listening, sharing the floor – created a different context than those in which previous discussions had occurred. Further, trained facilitators both enforced the ground rules and coached participants in productive dialogic behaviors. In short, the event succeeded because the recursive patterns of the past were not repeated in this setting.

In the dialogues we conducted with youth we faced a very different challenge. Rather than having to help participants rewrite scripts for routinized behaviors, we realized early on that middle- and high-school youth generally lacked any expectations for what we were asking them to do. Whereas in the initial event unstructured discussion could have produced debate and conflict, with the students the same open format would have led in many cases to blank stares and boredom. In these dialogues, ground rules and structure helped create a context in which youth were motivated to participate.

Creating a successful public dialogue takes considerable preparation, time and energy. Coordination and coherence require strategic planning. As Griffin (2002) notes "Events of the social world are *made*, rather than *found*" (p. 64). To succeed, public dialogue planning involves scripting questions, attending to the words and phrases used in the public dialogue, and listening to the diversity of voices participants bring to the discussions. Pearce and Pearce (2000) refer to this process as "manag[ing] the architecture of conversations about the issue, focusing on their inclusivity and quality" (p. 408).

Prior to the initial EKC public dialogue, we participated in small workgroups and gradually introduced the idea of dialogue as a way to encourage diverse community voices to weigh in on youth issues. The public dialogue method was attractive because it frames issues to focus on appreciative inquiry and promotes thoughtful listening to all voices (Dillon and Galanes, 2002). We planned the initial public dialogue together with the Good Community Committee's existing workgroups that were already examining youth needs. We also included interested community members in the facilitation training for that dialogue.

The process of developing questions was critical and took about eight months. We phrased questions carefully to pique participants' interest and further the project goals. For example, we started with questions developed by an existing Good Community Committee workgroup that had been meeting for several months. Telephone and email exchanges permitted our initial dialogue facilitators, the Pearces, to play an active role in developing questions.

An important "moment" for us during EKC planning involved our recognition that we needed to frame issues as challenges, not problems. In the initial event involving adults, we asked participants to discuss what were the community's responsibilities with respect to youth, as well as the responsibilities youth had toward the community. In the youth dialogues, in addition to

asking what they thought their needs were, we asked youth to discuss areas in their lives that they thought were going very well. David Cooperrider and colleagues (e.g., Cooperrider & Srivastava, 1987; Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999) refer to this reframing of difficult issues in a constructive way as "appreciative inquiry." Similarly, Barge (2003) has described the use of "asset mapping" as an alternative to focusing on deficits and needs in the Imagine Chicago community-building project. This moment clarified for us how our interactions create our social worlds and how events are created, not discovered (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Pearce and Cronen, 1980; Cronen and Lang, 1994), with language playing a significant role in influencing action and shaping meanings (Stewart, 1995).

In designing questions, we used language strategically to frame participants' perceptions. Pearce (1994) argues that language is "the single most powerful tool that humans have ever invented for the creation of a social world" (p. 71). For example, middle school students were confused when we asked them to suggest strategies for addressing youth needs. Strategy was a very abstract concept to them, although they had plenty of ideas when asked, "In what ways could your needs be better served?" Similarly, teenagers especially were turned off or assumed that a discussion about *kids* had nothing to do with them. Although we called our project "Every Kid Counts," we phrased questions to ask about *youth* and *youth needs*.

These illustrations of labeling are not trivial. CMM theory treats language as "fateful" (Pearce, 2001), including the labels we give and use with one another. Ong (1982) underscores the importance of labels by explaining that they   " . . . give people power over what they name" (p. 53).

Throughout the EKC project our primary objective was to facilitate contexts in which coordination -- the intersection of "stories lived" – was possible. In many specific instances this coordination made moments of coherence possible for participants: conversations in which individuals were able to understand and value the lived experiences of others holding different viewpoints. In undoubtedly many more instances this level of coherence was not achieved, but coordination opened the door to further dialogue.

The value of the EKC public dialogue project did not occur in isolation but developed from a series of ongoing conversations that continue. We wanted members to feel that good conversation could lead to productive action, but that the conversation itself—always incomplete—had to continue. We encouraged participants to continue to talk.   Coherence, an integration of diverse elements, relationships and values, focuses on what we as a community hold in common. During Every Kid Counts project, this coherence consisted of a diverse community intensely interested in its young people, with a wide range of ideas, but united in the commitment of meeting the needs of youth, both today and tomorrow.

Situating Public Dialogue

Public dialogues occur in particular settings of time and space that influence significantly the levels of meaning described in CMM (content, speech act, episode, relationship contracts, life scripts, and cultural patterns). At the levels of cultural patterns and life scripts, public dialogue

asks participants to suspend their prejudices (e.g., "decisions are always going to favor the wealthy"; "I'm just a migrant worker") and co-create a different kind of communication system. They are asked to accept a specific framework regarding what kind of communication (episode) they are engaging in and how they stand in relation to other participants (relationship contracts). What occurs in the actual moments of public dialogue (content interpreted as speech acts), then, is interpreted within the larger context of dialogue. This reframing of the context—no simple task—begins with planning where and when dialogue events will take place, who will participate, and must guide every decision dialogue facilitators make. Sometimes coordination and coherence are made possible by the planners' and facilitators' deliberate choices, but often they occur in the absence of or in spite of our planning.

Situating the Every Kid Counts project to be inclusive and to sustain the participation of diverse individuals was challenging. CMM promotes listening to multiple voices, particularly muted voices. Typically, solutions to community problems are discussed and decided by those in power; one goal of public dialogue is to equalize power through structured discourse (Pearce & Pearce, 2000; Spano, 2001). However, those without power are often reluctant to come to the table or to speak authentically, even in structured environments like public dialogue, which encourages people of varied backgrounds to share their stories and perhaps create a transcendent story or vision. We experienced such moments in the EKC project that magnified, for us, the difficulty in achieving this ideal and caused us to modify the dialogue structure and process.

Early attempts to involve youth in the workgroups had been unsuccessful, and only three youth attended the initial EKC dialogue event. One reason that youth, particularly at-risk and homeless youth, may have been reluctant to participate in dialogues was that, despite public dialogue's intention to privilege all voices, the communication of dialogue emerges out of the dominant culture. As Orbe (1998) explains, "those experiences unique to subordinate group members often cannot be effectively expressed within the confinements of the dominant communication system…" (p. 21). Phillipsen (1995) concurs, arguing that the "celebration of liberation" in CMM may be a "culture-bound ideological notion…" (p. 41). This recognition caused us to modify the public dialogue structure so as to incorporate the voices of marginalized groups.

First, we structured homogenous rather than heterogenous dialogue groups, to lessen the threat marginalized individuals sometimes perceive when interacting in the dominant culture and to empower individuals in these groups to create a communication system more conducive to sharing their stories. We were also more flexible in facilitating these groups (discussed later).

In heterogeneous groups, participants from marginalized groups may be reticent to talk. Despite facilitators' best efforts, their voices may continue to be muted, but without their voices, we cannot create that pluriverse of meaning sought. We chose to establish homogeneous dialogues of similar participants who were comfortable with each other. This strategy succeeded, especially for the at-risk youth. We recognize that this represents a trade-off—we sacrifice the potential for someone to hear and understand an alternative point of view for the benefit of ensuring that the alternative point of view is at least expressed. Ideally, everyone—regardless of age, race, social status, ability to speak in public, and so forth—speaks his truth and hears the other truths.

In practice, some voices will continue to be muted. Constructing homogeneous dialogues can broaden the voices included.

Stewart and Zediker (2000) discuss the centrality of flexibility in structuring ethical dialogue. In order actually to hear the voices of marginalized and sometimes silent groups, we had to modify both the context and form of typical dialogue structure.

A second strategy for including marginalized voices was to consider the location where dialogues were conducted. Whether dialogues take place in an unfamiliar setting, neutral location, or safe and familiar surroundings can profoundly influence the level and quality of participation, particularly of marginalized individuals and groups. In the EKC dialogues, it did make a difference to facilitate dialogues with marginalized groups on their home turf. Martin and Nakayama (2004) refer to these familiar places as cultural space that are the "the social and cultural contexts in which our identity forms (not necessarily the physical homes and neighborhoods), but the cultural meanings created in these places" (p. 236).

In settings unfamiliar to them, like the EKC workgroups to which they were invited, the at-risk youth were skeptical, reticent to speak, and at times hostile. However, when we held a public dialogue at Rare Breed, a safe, familiar place where the youth perceived support from others, they opened up and shared amazing stories and insights. We concluded that we would not have elicited the same stories and insights had we conducted the dialogue in a neutral setting with a diverse group including other youth populations.

The moments we experienced in situating the various EKC dialogues raised several important questions that invite further investigation. First, a by-product of restructuring public dialogue locations to encourage participation of and provide safety for marginalized individuals is the potential of such changes to influence their life scripts and perceptions of their place in the community. An important area for further study is the long term impact of dialogue as it relates to marginalized groups and their "place" in the community.

Another consequence of conducting homogenous dialogue groups was that the stories of marginalized individuals were shared with those in power in the form of recorded texts, not as persons-in-conversation. Do participants in heterogeneous groups interact differently from those in homogenous dialogue groups? What is the potential of homogenous public dialogue groups to influence relationship contracts between individuals and groups and to further the goals of a given dialogue?

Finally, because of the challenges in bringing non-dominant co-cultural and ethnic groups into these projects, we began to question the effectiveness of dialogue with different ethnic groups and in non-Western societies. Golden, Berquist, and Coleman (1996) pinpoint our concerns when they write about cultural differences in valuing talk:

 "The spirit of Western civilization is the spirit of inquiry…Everyone speaks their minds eloquently and persuasively. The exchange of ideas is held to be the path to the realization of the potentialities of each society.…In a high context culture such as Japan's, however, cultural homogeneity encourages suspicion of verbal skills, confidence in the unspoken,

and eagerness to avoid confrontation. The Japanese have even developed haragei, or the "art of the belly" for the meeting of minds or at least the viscera, without clear verbal interaction" (p. 401).

Facilitation

In addition to fostering coordination and coherence in the immediate setting, public dialogue can build individual and community capacity for productive public communication. In discussing CMM as a theory of culture, Hall (1992) argued the ultimate good of communication "is to allow for the freedom of creatively extending seminal ideas and for the freedom of going beyond old ideas to new ones" (p. 57). Public dialogue aims to equip participants to engage in communication that realizes this potential. This capacity-building occurs on at least three levels. First, public dialogue events should create cultural spaces in which all interactants can be competent, which means they can understand others and make themselves understood. Participants should have the tools necessary to accomplish maximum coordination, including being able to make sense of the interaction, having a feeling of control, and perceiving the interaction as positive (Rose, 1988).

Second, we hope that participants, having experienced successful public dialogue, become more competent in other meaning systems and settings. The communication skills promoted in public dialogue events are transferable to other contexts. Finally, we hope that productive public dialogue experiences lead to broader systemic changes in the community's approach to public communication.

Facilitators of public dialogue are part of the communities and meaning systems in which they act. As we have trained novice facilitators and observed them in the field, we have come to appreciate the distinctive role of the facilitator as both third party and participant in the public dialogue process. In CMM terms, facilitators must be at least satisfactorily competent at managing meanings in public dialogues (a particular system of meaning), but ideally they are optimally competent, in that they can shift between the meaning system prescribed by public dialogue technique and the natural meaning systems of the participants.

Pearce and Pearce (2000), discussing the challenges of facilitating Public Dialogue, note that facilitators must continually move between the first-, second-, and third person positions as well as often assume a stance of "indirect influence." They argue that, "The theoretical implications of this stance are enormous for social constructionists and others who believe that "ordinary language" comprises the limits of our social world…" (p. 418).

The EKC project elicited moments leading us to concur with Pearce and colleagues that facilitation is a multifaceted role wherein the facilitator's stance and relationship to the topic and participants has significance that is largely unexplored in dialogue research.

For example, context and facilitation are highly intertwined, demanding flexibility on the part of facilitators. Facilitators of public dialogue should not be so locked into a particular method or a particular goal that they refuse to modify or even abandon either the goal or the method, depending on the context. During a dialogue with youth from the Rare Breed, a drop-in center for homeless or troubled youth, facilitators faced an atypical dialogue situation. Youth wandered

in and out of the discussion. Some kids, although seated at a distance from the circle, occasionally interjected comments. Deciding that these adults were probably safe to talk to, non-participants sometimes joined the discussion in progress. Newcomers to the group often wanted to rehash questions covered earlier, or were more interested in relaying their own situations and issues than conforming to the adults' plan. Facilitators could have chosen to insist on the required format; instead, they elected to participate within the discussion structures that were more comfortable for these youth. Their choice ultimately paid off in terms of the overarching project goals when several of the Rare Breed kids, deciding the adults were to be trusted, later strongly encouraged their friends who attended a local alternative school to participate in subsequent dialogues. The choice to compromise immediate dialogue goals in order to build bridges of trust *within the existing framework of meaning of the Rare Breed youth* is consistent with the intentions of CMM.

Pearce and Pearce (2000) observe that …"the meaning of any act is not under the full control of the actor and is not finished when it is performed…". Although the Pearces were describing the sequencing of acts in a dialogue, their words apply to the transcendent nature of facilitation. When people facilitate, they influence the dialogue process but are also influenced by it. Our understanding of this process and how the experiences of facilitating may transcend the immediate context to influence the lives and experiences of facilitators and participants remains incomplete—it is a story that is still unfolding.

Conclusion

The needs of youth were not suddenly satisfied as a result of public dialogue, nor were we the first to acknowledge that our communities needed to discuss this issue. However, the outcomes of this project have been much more than "just talk." Most visibly, EKC has led to further community action. Every Kid Counts now is the name of a new nonprofit organization advocating for youth. More fundamentally, the public dialogue process has helped develop constructive communication systems that become community resources for "creatively extending seminal ideas and for the freedom of going beyond old ideas to new ones" (Hall, 1992, p. 57). Since the EKC project began, we have been asked to coordinate two other public dialogue series. One of these requests came from a community foundation, to engage the community in discussions about how best to serve the needs of elders. The other project has been to assist the city's long-range planning with respect to public education by conducting dialogues throughout the city.

We have been able to use CMM theory to interpret and critique patterns of communication, then employed public dialogue practices to foster new systems of communication that make possible coordination, even coherence, where previous attempts have failed. We have seen also how public dialogue projects can enhance the competence and capacity of facilitators, participants, and, potentially, entire communities. We also have identified several avenues for further exploration.

First, the potential for public dialogue to draw marginalized persons and muted voices into community conversation needs further attention. We were more prepared to reframe

confrontational meetings than we were to coax people into participating. It is naive to assume that people will speak eagerly when the broader communication system has taught them to remain silent. While at times we were frustrated at not bringing diverse groups together for dialogue, we realized that the foundation necessary for such conversation had not been established. In the future we hope to use both homogenous and heterogeneous groups and to examine how outcomes may differ in the two different types of groups.

Second, our varied experiences have led us to speculate about antecedents and consequences of public dialogues. For example, what social cognitive abilities of individuals contribute to or detract from the competence of facilitators and participants? What are the cumulative effects of prior experiences with public dialogue events on future events? How do participants experience and explain what occurs in public dialogue? Do positive experiences with public dialogue produce long-term effects for individuals and/or communities? We should use the interpretive framework of CMM theory to inform the application of other frameworks in analyzing public dialogue events.

Finally, with the Public Dialogue Consortium, we are interested in the potential of public dialogue to transform how communities approach situations where public communication is necessary or desired. Every Kid Counts came at our initiative, but we have subsequently undertaken several projects at the request of various groups in the community. Others appreciate the intention and utility of public dialogue. However, we see at least two reasons to temper our optimism.

First, although we are now engaged in our fourth project with a community action group, a relatively small circle of influential community leaders links these groups. Word of public dialogue is spreading among a number of important individuals and groups, but we hope it spreads throughout the community as a whole. If we believe public dialogue to be truly transformative in our community, we will need to persuade grassroots groups and marginalized persons, as well as civic leaders, of its potential.

Second, while the language of "public dialogue" resonates with a growing number of people in our community, we find we must continually educate the community about what public dialogue is and what it is not. At one level, public dialogue may be seen as similar to focus groups, i.e., a means of gathering rich opinion data. Although a valuable function, this stops short of the more ambitious goals of public dialogue. As CMM suggests, we must continually monitor what we are co-constructing with participants and question whether we are truly creating something new or simply renaming familiar patterns.

Our experiences with public dialogue have been rich and challenging. We have presented these "moments" because they offer questions/points of consideration further to develop Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) theory and public dialogue. We theorize to gain practical knowledge about how to act, and we continue to be "curious participants in a pluralistic world" (Griffin, 2002).

Please address correspondence about this article to: Carey Adams, Department of Communication, Southwest Missouri State University, 901 South National Avenue, Springfield, MO 65804, USA. E-mail: careyadams@smsu.edu

References

Barge, J.K. (2003). Hope, communication, and community building. *Southern Communication Journal,* 69(1), 63-81.

Berger, P. L. & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* New York: Doubleday.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative Inquiry in organizational life. In W. A. Pasmore & R. W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (1999). *Appreciative Inquiry.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cronen, V. & Lang, P. (1994). Language and action: Wittgenstein and Dewey in the practice of therapy and consultation. *Human Systems: The Journal of Systemic Consultation and Management, 5,* 5-43.

Dillon, R. K. & Galanes, G. J. (2002). Public dialogue: Communication theory as public affairs praxis. *The Journal of Public Affairs, VI(1),* 79-90.

Goldman, J. L., Berquist, G. F., & Coleman, W. E. (1996). *The rhetoric of Western thought* (6th ed.). Kendall Hunt: Chicago.

Griffin, E. (2002). *A first look at communication theory* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, B. J. (1992). Theories of culture and communication. *Communication Theory,* 2(1, February), 50-70.

Krey, D. (1999). Cupertino asks, "Can we talk about diversity"? *Western City, 75,* 4-8.

Martin, J. M. & Nakayama, T.K. (2004). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy.* New York: Muethen.

Orbe, M. P. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, K. (2001). Facilitating dialogic communication: Basic facilitation training manual. Public Dialogue Consortium.

Pearce, K. A., & Pearce, W. B. (2001). The Public Dialogue Consortium's school-wide dialogue process: A communication approach to develop citizenship skills and enhance school climate. *Communication Theory,* 11(1), 105-123.

Pearce, W. B. (1994). *Interpersonal communication: Making social worlds.* HarperCollins: New York.

Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, action, and meaning: The creation of social realities.* Praeger: New York.

Pearce, W. B., Cronen, V. E., Johnson, K., Jones, G., & Raymond, R. (1980). The structure of

communication rules and the form of conversation: An experimental simulation. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44*(1, Winter), 20-34.

Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000). Extending the theory of coordinated management of meaning (CMM) through a community dialogue process. *Communication Theory, 10,* 405-423.

Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (1998). Transcendent storytelling: Abilities for systemic practitioners and their clients. *Human Systems: The Journal of Systemic Consultation & Management, 9*(3-4), 167-184.

Philipsen, G. (1995). The coordinated management of meaning theory of Pearce, Cronen, and Associates. In D. Cushman & B. Kovacic (Eds.), *Watershed research traditions in human communication theory* (pp. 13-43). Buffalo, NY: SUNY Press.

Rose, R. A. (1988). Organizations as multiple cultures: A rules theory analysis. *Human Relations, 41*(2, February), 139-170.

Spano, S. (2001). *Public dialogue and participatory democracy: The Cupertino community project.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Stewart, J. (1995). *Language as articulate contact: Toward a post-semiotic philosophy of communication.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, ethical practice. *Southern Communication Journal, 65,* 224-242.