Version 6, June 5, 2007

CMM in "other hands"
Critics, reviewers, and folks using it interesting ways…

Barnett Pearce

This paper began as an attempt to respond to the (quite reasonable) questions about what "other people" say about CMM. To put it more specifically, many students and participants in my trainings have asked "what are the criticisms of CMM?"

As I began to assemble "criticisms," my purpose expanded. In 2004, Jeremy Kearney and I published a special issue of the journal *Human Systems* (volume 15, numbers 1 – 3) that brought together "Extensions and Applications" of CMM. The papers in this special issue can be found at http://www.pearceassociates.com/essays/documents/ContentsCMMExtensionsandApplications.htm. The present paper may be seen as a supplement, in 2007, of that special issue. In the pages below, you will find:

- Critical assessments of CMM;
- Comparisons/Integrations of CMM and other theories;
- CMM as a theory in the tradition of American Pragmatism;
- Some interesting applications of CMM; and,
- Other interesting things.

I do not see this document as "finished" and would welcome suggestions for useful additions.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENTS

1. Brenders, D. A. (1987). Fallacies in the coordinated management of meaning: A philosophy of language critique of the hierarchical organization of coherent conversation and related theory. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 73*, 329-349.

> The National Communication Association selected this paper for its "article of the year" award. That makes it the ONLY CMM-related article to win an award from the national disciplinary association. I'd have preferred the recognition to go to a paper whose title started with some word other than "fallacies." Anyway, Brenders studied the "philosophy of language" (primarily John Searle's work) and noted that CMM uses some of the same vocabulary (specifically, "speech acts" and constitutive and regulative rules). But CMM doesn't use them the same way that Searle does, so he accused us of "fallacies." Here is the abstract published at http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ355400&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=eric_accno&accno=EJ355400:
>
> > Analyzes W. Barnett Pearce's "Coordinated Management of Meaning" theory--finding philosophical flaws and equivocations inherent in the model proposed within the theory. Argues that by making all the terms of their hierarchy conform

> to the notion of "episodic" communication, Pearce reintroduces basic errors about the nature of meaning. Offers tentative revisions in thinking about conversational dynamics.

The journal in which this article was published declined to publish our response, so we published it elsewhere, pointing out that we took the Wittgensteinian "meaning is use" position about language, which is quite different from the approach Brenders presumed in his critique:

> Vernon E. Cronen, W. Barnett Pearce, and Changsheng Xi (1989/1990), "The Meaning of 'Meaning' in CMM Analyses of Communication: a Comparison of Two Traditions," *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 23*: 1-40.

For more on the intellectual tradition in which we, but not Brenders, were working, see Williams, M. (2006). *Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations: Critical Essays*. Rowman & Littlefield; and Harré, R. & Tissaw, M. A. (2005). *Wittgenstein and Psychology: A Practical Guide*. Ashgate Publishing. A question for the curious: within this tradition, what contributions, if any, does CMM make?

2. Chenail, Ronald J. (1990/1991) Bradford Keeney's Cybernetic Project and the Creation of Recursive Frame Analysis. ***The Qualitative Report, 1*** **(2 and 3).** (http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR1-23/keeney.html)

> In the Milan-CMM project, Karl Tomm put together a conference in 1982 at the University of Calgary which allowed for an interesting exchange between a group of Milan-style therapists (e.g., Gianfranco Cecchin, Luigi Boscolo, and Tomm himself) and a number of communication theorists and researchers from the Coordinated Management of Meaning project (e.g., Vernon Cronen, W. Barnett Pearce, John Lannamann, and Sheila McNamee) (McNamee, Lannamann, & Tomm, 1983). This meeting lead to a number of projects and papers created from a juxtaposition of the circular notions of Milan therapy (e.g., Selvini-Palazzoli, Boscolo, Cecchin, & Prata, 1980) with the circularity of communication approach of CMM (Cronen, Johnson, & Lannamann, 1982; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). As a result, Milan-style circularity in therapy took a reflexive turn evident in Tomm's subsequent work (1987a, 1987b, 1988) and a turn towards curiosity exemplified in Cecchin's therapy (1987). As for a change in research, the notion of questions as interventions in therapy (Tomm & Lannamann, 1988) helped lead to the suggestion that research questions may also be seen as interventions and, possibly, as therapy (McNamee, 1988).

3. Deetz, Stanley, Kirsten Broadfoot and Donald Anderson (2004). Multi-levelled, Multi-method Approaches in Organizational Discourse. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:HYIuz_i2qNEJ:https://portfolio.du.edu/portfolio/getportfoliofile%3Fuid%3D21347+cronen+CMM&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=130&gl=us&client=firefox-a.

> The final research approach we discuss, CMM, attempts to meet this challenge of balancing discursive moments.

Coordinated management of meaning

> The 'coordinated management of meaning' (CMM) was developed as a theoretical and methodological perspective by Barnett Pearce and Vernon Cronen primarily to describe and explain complex family systems (Pearce, 1989; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). While not applied to the study of organization and discourse in any continued and systematic way, clearly useful ways of understanding the discursive forces and tensions that hold organizing fabrics together can be developed from it.
>
> …
>
> The driving force of CMM is to show the reciprocal relationship between individual actions and forms of social order. The nested nature of CMM allows us to consider resources gleaned from diverse sites and experiences as well as how organizing life is in constant creation and definition. At the minimum, Pearce and Cronen would hope that coordination might be improved by understanding a wider range of logics and developing the ability to talk about logics rather than simply acting out of them. This requires a particular sensitivity to the unintended consequences of practices. Moreover, CMM and its emphasis on cosmopolitan communication' does not deny the existence and inherent humanity of other resources and action (Pearce, 1989). By treating all resources as equal, or symmetrical, meaning and action can be coordinated without the reconciliation between incommensurate social realities, just as diverse discourses can be articulated together to form a coherent sense of reality. However, our dependence on some discursive resources over others, and our accessibility and our awareness of these resources all impact on what we accomplish in interaction. CMM begins to illuminate the ways in which certain discursive practices and resources close others off, effectively reducing alternative courses of action or interpretation. When these closures are effected, by institutions or individuals, wider purposes are served and the social distribution and ability to use certain logics clearly advantages some people at the expense of others.

4. Griffin, E. (2003). *A first look at communication theory*. McGraw-Hill. 6th edition.

> (p 66) "Barnett Pearce (The Fielding Graduate Institute) and Vernon Cronen (University of Massachusetts) believe that communication is the process by which we collectively make the events and objects of our social world. Their theory, the coordinated management of meaning (CMM), starts with the assertion that *persons-in-conversation co-construct their own social realities and are simultaneously shaped by the worlds they create*. That's why Pearce and Cronen focus on the things that we *do* to each other and the things that we *make* with each other when we interact. When engaged in a conversation with others, these theorists find it useful to ask: *What are we doing? What are we making together? How can we make better social worlds?*

Pearce and Cronen present CMM as a practical theory crafted to help make life better for real people in a real world. Unlike some objective theorists, they don't claim to have discovered ironclad principles of communication that hold true for everyone in every situation. Instead, CMM consists of a set of concepts and models to help parents, therapists, social workers, mediators, teachers, managers, and others enhance their understanding and act more effectively in a wide range of communication situations. For its creators, the ultimate test of their theory is not one of "truth" in the sense of representing something accurately, but rather in the sense of beneficial consequences. They deem their theory successful when it helps create a higher quality of life."

(pp. 78, 80) " Critique: What does the language of CMM create for you?

There's a professor at the college where I teach who gives one-question essay exams. Students are fond of characterizing their breadth: "Describe how the universe works. Use examples." Pearce and Cronen's coordinated management of meaning reads like an answer to that question. They've crafted an impressive macrotheory of face-to-face communication, yet the very scope of the theory makes its core ideas difficult to pin down.

Perhaps Pearce and Cronen make comprehension more difficult by not being consistent in how they define their terms or in the way they state their claims. For example, they sometimes use the word *coherence* to label the process of people making sense of their own stories lived. Yet in other cses, the theorists use the term to refer to persons-in-conversation sharing a common interpretation of their social universe – a meeting of the minds. As Pearce wryly admits, "social constructionism scarcely suffers from overly-precise definitions."

When Pearce asked long-time CMM practitioners what changes or additions they thought should be made to the theory, the most frequent plea was for user-friendly explanations expressed in easy-to-understand terms. The following story from the field underscores why this call for clarity is so crucial:

> My counseling trainees often find CMM ideas exciting, but its language daunting or too full of jargon. Some trainees connect with the ideas but most feel intimidated by the language and the concepts – diminished in some way or excluded! One trainee sat in a posture of physically cringing because she did not understand. This was a competent woman who had successfully completed counselor training three years ago and was doing a "refresher" with us. I don't think she found it too refreshing at that moment. CMM ideas would be more useful if they were available in everyday language – perhaps via examples and storytelling (Gabrielle Parker, Dance Movement Therapist)

Pearce responds that he can train people to use CMM concepts, but not by asking them to read. He first asks them to describe something going on in their lives and

then *shows* them rather than tells them how to use the ideas and models that the theory offers. Because that interactive option isn't available to us, I've tried to heed Parker's advice while writing this chapter. Hopefully, you haven't cringed. But in order to reduce the wince factor, I've had to leave out many of the valued terms, tools, and models that are the working vocabulary of this complex theory. You haven't read about constitutive rules, regulative rules, reconstructed contexts, gamemastery, grammars, the daisy mode, or the LUUUTT model – just to name a few.

What I have stressed in Pearce and Cronen's rock solid belief that persons-in-conversation co-construct their social realities. While many theorists today hold that the joint use of language creates, shapes, and limits the diverse social worlds in which we live, the coordinated management of meaning is the most comprehensive statement of social construction crafted by communication scholars. Your evaluation of CMM's worth will ultimately hinge on whether or not you share their worldview…

5. Philipsen, G. (1995). "The Coordinated Management of Meaning Theory of Pearce, Cronen, and Associates,"pp. 13-43 in *Watershed Research Traditions in Human Communication Theory*, ed. Donald Cushman and Branislav Kovocic, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen gives CMM a positive review, but by standards that make CMM-ers uncomfortable. (Is that the cruelest cut of all?) He notes that one of our studies (the "URPs" study) accounts for over 50% of the variance in the dependent variable and thus CMM meets (actually, with flying colors!) the standards of a social theory in the dominant tradition.

6. Reed, Jan. (2006). *Appreciative Inquiry: Research for Change*. Sage (excerpt from chapter 9, retrieved on May 26, 2007 from http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/uploads/AI-Research%20for%20Change%20Ch9.pdf

In order to explore these issues in more depth, the different contributions that AI can make to both organisational development (OD) and research are first revisited. This revisiting follows on from the first chapters of this book which described the use of AI in organizational development and its emergent use in research in some detail, so only brief summaries will be given here, focussing on central ideas and messages. From this we can explore some of the debates on 'practice theory ' that have been discussed in the literature, and some of the research frameworks, that is Action Research and the Co-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) frameworks which have been developed and which move the worlds of theory and practice together.

In looking at these frameworks, AI is placed alongside them as a similar development, but some fundamental issues are also outlined. These fundamental issues involve an exploration of the philosophical basis of Action Research, CMM

and AI, that is the pragmatist philosophy which underpins them, gives them direction and places the bringing together of theory and practice at the centre of thinking. In pragmatist philosophy, theory is not something which is developed separately from action and then applied to it, but is integral to it – there is no theory without action, and no action without theory. Current pragmatist concerns have focused around ideas of 're-description' that is that by inviting people to think about and describe their world differently, behaviour and activity are also shaped. This pragmatist concern with language is then viewed in relation to some of the concerns which have led to the development of AI as an OD approach, that is that the process of appreciation involves thinking and talking about the world differently, and this can generate different ideas about the future.

7. Tomm, Karl. (1987). Interventive Interviewing: Part 11. Reflexive Questioning as a Means to Enable Self-Healing. *Family Process, 26*: 167-183. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from http://www.familytherapy.org/documents/Interventive2.PDF

I noticed that therapeutic interventions were being introduced in the form of reflexive questions in most of my sessions. The necessity of the formal end of-session intervention began to pale. Sometimes it seemed quite irrelevant, occasionally even contraindicated. What transpired moment to moment during the interview became more important. Although I often still use a carefully prepared final intervention, I now regard it as only one component of the treatment process and not as the essential therapeutic agent, as I once did.

1 It was partly because of this incident that I first came to the conclusion, as indicated in Part I (9) of these papers on Interventive Interviewing, that one could answer "yes" to the question posed by the Milan team: "Can family therapy produce change so1ely through the negentropic effect of our present method of conducting the interview without the necessity of making a final intervention?" (8, p. 12).

A THEORETICAL RATIONALE

The term "reflexive" was borrowed from the "Coordinated Management of Meaning" (CMM), a theory of communication proposed by Pearce and Cronen (6). In CMM theory, reflexivity is regarded as an inherent feature of the relationships among meanings within the belief systems that guide communicative actions. A brief description of Cronen and Pearce's theory will help explain what they mean by reflexivity and why I chose this term to characterize these questions.

CMM theory regards human communication as a complex interactive process in which meanings are generated, maintained, and/or changed through the recursive interaction among human beings. That is, communication is not taken to be a simple lineal process of transmitting messages from an active sender to a passive receiver; rather, it is a circular, interactive process of co-creation by the participants involved. Pearce and Cronen originally set out to differentiate and describe the rules that organize this generative process. Two major categories of rules were delineated: regulative (or action) rules and constitutive (or meaning)

rules. *Regulative rules* determine the degree to which specific behaviors ought to be enacted or avoided in certain situations. For instance, a regulative rule in a particular communication system might specify that "when one's integrity is challenged, it is *obligatory* to defend oneself." *Constitutive rules* have to do with the process of attributing meaning to a particular behavior, statement, event, interpersonal relationship, and so on. For instance, a constitutive rule might specify that "in the context of an argumentative episode, a compliment *constitutes* sarcasm or hostility rather than friendliness or respect." CMM theory proposes that a network of these regulative and constitutive rules guide the moment-to-moment action of persons in communication.

Of particular relevance to the notion of reflexive questioning is the organization of constitutive rules. Building on Bateson's (l) application of Russell's theory of logical types, Cronen and Pearce suggest that the communication systems in which human beings are immersed entail a hierarchy. They outline an idealized hierarchy of six levels of meaning rather than just two (report and command levels), as popularized by Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (10) and the Mental Research Institute (MRI) group. These six levels include: content (of a statement), speech act (the utterance as a whole), episode (that is, the whole social encounter), interpersonal relationship, life script (of an individual), and cultural pattern. Following Bateson further, they postulate a *circular* relationship between the levels in the hierarchy (not a lineal one as originally implied by Russell and the early MRI group). For example, not only does the relationship (command level) exert an influence in determining the meaning of the content (report level), but the content of what is said also influences the meaning of the interpersonal relationship. The organizational relationships between any two levels of meaning—content and speech act, content and episode, relationship and life script, cultural pattern and episode, and so on—are circular or reflexive. The meaning at each level turns back reflexively to influence the other. Thus, the Cronen and Pearce hierarchy is not just a simple vertical organization, but a self-referential network.

Cronen and Pearce went on to describe the nature of this reflexive relationship among constitutive rules. At any one moment, the influence of one level of meaning on another, for instance, of item A at one level on item B at a lower level, may appear stronger than, vice versa, the influence of B on A. In this case, Pearce and Cronen would say that A exerts a downward "contextual force" within the hierarchy, with A determining the meaning of B. However, they point out that while the relationship between these levels may appear lineal and stable, with B responding passively to the dominance of A (as if in a vertical hierarchy), the relationship actually remains circular and active. That is, B always continues to exert an upward "implicative force" on A. The circular nature of the relationship becomes more apparent as the implications of B for A become more noticeable. For instance, the implicative force of B may be potentiated when connections are made between aspects of B and certain meanings at levels higher than A. Furthermore, if the implicative force of B increases in significance, its influence

will eventually *exceed* the contextual force of A. When this happens, the levels in the hierarchy suddenly become reversed. B then becomes the context, and what previously was B's upward "implicative force" now becomes B's downward "contextual force," which then redefines the meaning of A. Depending on the nature of B, such a reversal may result in a dramatic change in the meaning of A. This could produce a sudden change in communicative behaviors because a different constitutive rule now applies.

8. West, R., & Turner, L. H. (2000). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield. 87-102.

"Coordinated Management of Meaning is one of the few theories to explicitly place communication as a cornerstone in its foundation. Because communication is central to the theory, many scholars have employed the theory in their writings. To this end, CMM is a heuristic effort. Researchers have incorporated the theory and its tenets to understand conflict (Pearce & Littlejohn, 1997), cultural communities (Narula & Pearce, 1986), conversations (Pearce & Conklin, 1979), groups (Pearce & Pearce, 2000), families (Cronen, Johnson, & Lannamann, 1982; Harris, 1980; Harris, Cronen, & McNamee, 1979), organizations (Cronen, Pearce, & Snavely, 1979), and public address (Branham & Pearce, 1985). In addition, the theory is broad in scope, in that it covers both the intrapersonal and interpersonal processes. Pearce and Cronen attempt to understand what takes place in the minds of communicators and how they manage meaning. Although some writers have criticized the theory because communication does not explicitly frame the CMM studies (Philipsen, 1995), the theory nonetheless consistently incorporates communication action. In terms of CMM's usefulness, the theorists claim that the theory is practical (Cronen, 1995). Considering that it tries to understand everyday conversations, we believe that the theory passes the test of utility.

Despite these strengths, CMM has been criticized by communication scholars. David Brenders (1987), for example, takes issue with Pearce and Cronen's belief that individuals introduce unique language systems into their conversations with others; for CMM theorists, meaning is an intrapersonal experience. Brenders disagrees. He argues that "we do share a language which is not our idiosyncratic production, but a medium of shared symbolic meanings" (1987, p. 342). For Brenders and others, the examples that Pearce and his associates use consistently underscore the fact that the rules inherent in a conversation may differ from one person to another. This is too broad a claim, says Brenders, and in fact "leaves unexplained the social nature of meaning" (1987, p. 342). The theory's validity, therefore, is suspect if one believes this claim.

Pearce and Cronen have attempted to respond to their critics over the years. First, they believe that many critics forget that they were trained within the empiricist tradition, something we explained in detail in Chapter 4. Therefore, their earlier discussions of the theory were rooted in this heritage. Pearce (1995) candidly admits that during "'the first phase of the CMM project,' [our writings] were

confused because we used the language of interpretive social science. . . . Only as we continued to refine our thinking did we discover . . . that we *could not* say what we were doing in the language of . . . social science" (pp. 109, 110). Therefore, critics should interpret the theory within the spirit of change; even theorists change as they clarify the goals of their theory. Further, Cronen (1995) admits some early problems with the conceptualization of their theory by indicating that the way that he and Pearce discussed the creation of meaning was originally confusing and "wrong-headed." The theorists believe, however, that what they have produced is an ethical undertaking and do not believe that their theory should be discarded because of some past misjudgments. Pearce and Cronen, then, believe that those who levy indictments against their theory should understand the time period in which the theory was developed.

CMM proponents have responded to additional criticisms. For instance, some (Cronen, Pearce, & Changshen, 1989/1990) argue that critics such as Brenders fail to recognize that their interpretation of meaning is based on a view of communication not shared by their theoretical ancestors. Therefore, to suggest that meaning cannot be co-constructed and to claim that a "deficient notion of meaning" (Brenders, 1987, p. 341) exists within CMM is limiting and uninformed. Pearce and Karen Foss (1990) further believe that messages derive their meanings from a co-construction of the social interaction, not simply the meaning one brings into an interaction. Therefore, although Brenders's critique is aimed at the way Pearce and others interpret meaning, Pearce believes that CMM should not be reduced to a simplified view of what meaning is and is not.

The struggle to understand the dynamic interplay of intrapersonal and interpersonal communication will continue. Thanks in large part to CMM, we have a deeper understanding of how individuals co-create their meaning. Further, the theory has aided us in understanding the importance of rules in social situations. Critics may continue their critique of the theory, but few can deny that CMM positioned communication at the core of human experience. That makes Coordinated Management of Meaning one of the few communication theories that is "firmly in the world it describes" (Anderson, 1996, p. 209).”

> My comments: Like Griffin, West and Turner (quoted above) describe CMM’s language as imprecise and fluid, and take this to be a problem with the theory. If CMM were intended to represent some state of the world, and if that state of the world were understood as fixed/unchanging/immutable, this would be a grievous fault indeed. However, CMM understands the world to be polysemic, in a state of continuous creation, unfinished and reflexively mutable. If this is the state of the world, then we should not expect a good theory to be either precise or static. Instead of trying to represent such a world, CMM is a practical theory, designed to help us engage and participate wisely in such a world. As Vern Cronen suggested, CMM evolves, and does so my becoming richer through involvement in use, not by the addition of additional

theorems and findings. For a discussion, see Cronen, V. E. (2001) Practical theory, practical art, and the pragmatic-systemic account of inquiry. *Communication Theory, 11*: 14-35

9. Wood, Julia. T. (1997). *Communication Theories in Action: An Introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

(pp. 172-174): "Criticism of CMM has tended to focus on three issues.

Unclear Meaning of Rule. One problem is that not all rules theorists agree on the meaning of the key basic concept of rules. Susan Shimanoff (1980, 1985) asserts that rules deal exclusively with observable behaviors. On the other hand, Pearce and his colleagues (Cronen, Chen & Pearce, 1988; Cronen & Pearce, 1981; Pearce, 1989; Pearce & Cronen, 1980) claim that rules pertain to internal, subjective interpretation, as well as to overt activities. Because the term *rule* is used to mean different things, it's difficult to coordinate findings from rules theorists' research. Of course, the deeper issue underlying terminological confusion concerns epistemological assumptions. If we assume that only observable behaviors can be known, then we would agree with Shimanoff's definition of *rule*. If, however, we think that behaviors that aren't overt also matter and deserve scholarly attention, we're likely to find ourselves more comfortable with Pearce and his colleagues.

Too Ambiguous. Rules theories have also been criticized for their ambiguity. Not only is there no agreed-on definition of rule, but theorists have not advanced a precise definition of how to identify whatever it is they count as rules. In other words, what are the constitutive rules for defining rules? This ambiguity leads to the related question of whether rules theory deals well with unexpected forms of communication. If rules are based on the hierarchy of meanings and are influenced by logical force, then what accounts for creativity, innovation, and violations of convention? Ambiguous responses – such as the assertion that violations follow different rules – are not convincing. Rules theorists have not developed or identified precise rules of violations, so creative behaviors remain difficult to analyze within the framework of this theory.

Too Broad in Scope. The most common and most serious criticism of CMM theory is that it is too broad in scope. Critics have asserted that CMM tries to explain the whole universe from problems between cultures to difficulties in intimate relationships (Brenders, 1987). In attempting to explain such diverse phenomena, critics charge, the theory fails to achieve sufficient precision to permit insight into specific communication activities.

CMM theorists do not deny the charge that the theory is extremely broad. They do, however, reject the idea that this is a problem or a weakness of the theory. One of the primary theorists, Vernon Cronen (1991), replies to the criticism by asserting that a good humanistic theory should shed light on the overall human

condition, not just on isolated facets of human activity. CMM theorists argue that the theory is meant to offer an expansive view of human action and should be assessed in terms of whether it achieves that goal. If that is the criterion of evaluation, then CMM fares rather well. Unquestionably, it gives us new insights into how we create meanings and how our patterns of making meaning guide our communication."

COMPARISONS/INTEGRATIONS WITH OTHER THEORIES

1. Baraldi, C. (1993). Structural coupling: Simultaneity and difference between communication thought. *Communication Theory, 3,* 112-30.

Abstract: Starting from the theory of the Germen sociologist Niklas Luhmann, it is possible to describe the relationship between communication and individual thought in a new perspective. Thought is the autonomous production of a psychic system. Communication is the autonomous production of a social system. The relationship between psychic systems and social systems can be defined as "structural coupling." Such a coupling is realized in two steps. First, a single communication and a single thought happen simultaneously, and this allows the individual to think what he or she is understanding in communication. In this way, communication forms (social structures) may perturb a psychic system. Second, meaningful information about the perturbing social structures is produced in the psychic system, depending on psychic structures. Thanks to this autonomous production of meaning, a psychic system can be unique. It is necessary to describe both the structural coupling and the two different kinds of coupled structures; the social structures shaping the perturbing communication and the psychic structures shaping the meaning of this perturbation. The communication theory called coordinated management of meaning (CMM) provides an interesting description of the effects of structural coupling for individuals. The theory of structural coupling seems a promising way to explain how individual autonomy can be based on communication, avoiding harsh debates between individualism and collectivism

2. Hall, B. J. (1992). Theories of culture and communication. *Communication Theory, 2*, 50-71.

Abstract: This article examines and compares three perspectives on culture, communication, and the relationship between culture and communication: traditional (neo positivist), coordinated management of meaning, and ethnography of communication. The concepts of culture and communication are discussed for each perspective in regards to their form, function, and locus. The three perspectives view the relationship between culture and communication as synecdoche, irony, and metaphor, respectively. Implications for research and theory on acculturation are discussed for each perspective.

3. Rose, R. A. (2006). A proposal for integrating structuration theory with coordinated management of meaning theory. *Communication Theory, 57*: 173-196.

> Abstract: In this essay ways in which structuration theory (ST) can be fruitfully integrated with coordinated management of meaning theory (CMM) are articulated. After initially summarizing and providing a constructive critique of both theories, the essay proposes that the narrative meaning frameworks of CMM be linked with the modality level of ST. It is argued that this move opens up valuable linkages in terms of the construct of positioning, at the level of interaction, and in terms of institutional analysis. Insights developed in the essay are then applied to Willis's (1977) fertile ethnography *Learning to Labor*. The essay is written in a heuristic spirit with an eye toward theoretically meaningful insights.

4. Salmon, Gill, and Faris, Jeff (2006). Multi-agency collaboration, multiple levels of meaning: social constructionism and the CMM model as tools to further our understanding, *Journal of Family Therapy 28* (3), 272–292.

> This study explores the discourse emerging when professionals from a child and adolescent mental health service meet with professionals from other agencies to discuss cases. The study is timely, given the current political contextual forces pushing agencies to work together which run alongside an expanding literature acknowledging the obstacles to achieving this.
>
> A thematic analysis identified nine themes, defined according to their discourse type, including single agency discourse, case complexity discourse and multi-agency discourse. In this paper, the usefulness of the coordinated management of meaning model (CMM) is examined as an additional tool which may be used in data analysis to help understand the discourse within multi-agency meetings. The two approaches to data analysis are complementary to each other, with both allowing for different layers of context and complexity to emerge from the data.

CMM AS A THEORY IN THE TRADITION OF AMERICAN PRAGMATISM

CMM explicitly builds on the work of the American Pragmatists (William James, John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, Richard Rorty, Richard Bernstein, etc.). Recently, other communication theorists have begun grappling with pragmatism. I hope that this will provide the grounds for a constructive evaluation of CMM from other scholars, but that has not happened yet.

In one way of telling this story, it began when Bob Craig set himself the task of systemizing communication theories:

> Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9*, 119-161.

This paper stimulated quite a bit of push-back from various folks and some good academic talk followed. (To my knowledge, no one challenged his positioning of CMM, although I thought it didn't quite fit any of his categories.)

At about the same time, there was a renewed interest in pragmatism and its potential contribution to communication theory. This was heralded by the publication, in 2001, of D. K. Perry (Ed.), *American pragmatism and communication research* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. One of the chapters dealt specifically with CMM:

> Cronen, V. E., & Chetro-Szivos, J. (2001). Pragmatism as a way of inquiring with special reference to a theory of communication and the general form of pragmatic social theory. (pp. 27-65) in D. K. Perry (Ed.), *American pragmatism and communication research* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bob Craig continued to defend his model against challenges until confronted by a young scholar whose dissertation and subsequent article vigorously argued for "pragmatism" as an additional category in his model. These papers included:

> Russill, C. (2004). *Toward a pragmatist theory of communication.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.
>
> Russill, C. (2005). The Road Not Taken: William James's Radical Empiricism and Communication Theory. *The Communication Review, 8*(3), 277-305.

Bob conceded the point (although not taking on the argument as a whole) and proposed a revision of his model to include pragmatism. He first presented this as

> Craig, Robert T. (2006) "Pragmatism in the Field of Communication Theory," International Communication Association annual convention, Dresden, Germany. The paper is now available on his website: http://spot.colorado.edu/~craigr/ica06_proceeding_92914.pdf.

In a footnote to this paper, he said:

> Russill, of course, is not the first communication theorist to write on pragmatism, only the first to define pragmatism as a distinct tradition of communication theory in Craig's scheme. Having encountered his interpretation, one revisits the existing literature on pragmatism in communication studies with new eyes. Themes of incommensurability and pluralistic community are present but not strongly emphasized in key collections of essays by Langsdorf (1995), in which epistemological and phenomenological commentaries on pragmatism are prominent, and Perry (2001), in which pragmatism is treated primarily as an approach to inquiry. Pragmatist ideas of communication are mentioned but not deeply examined in either set of essays. *CMM theory (Cronen, 2001; Pearce, 1989; Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Pearce & Littlejohn, 1997) stands out as a key exemplar of pragmatist communication theory in Russill's sense.* Richard McKeon (a student of Dewey) earlier articulated a philosophy of communication that is also squarely in Russill's tradition and deserves to be reexamined in this

> light (see Hauser & Cushman, 1973; McKeon, 1957). St. John & Shepherd (2004) exemplify another, more recent line of work in the pragmatist tradition as Russill defines it. Peters (1999) formulates Dewey's view of communication in a somewhat different way from Russill and argues for an alternative pragmatist communication theory inspired in part by Emerson. Russill's interpretation of pragmatism now enters this conversation. (italics added)

(Works cited in this footnote include:

> Hauser, G. A., & Cushman, D. P. (1973). McKeon's philosophy of communication: The architectonic and interdisciplinary arts. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 6*?
>
> Langsdorf, L., & Smith, A. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Recovering pragmatism's voice: The classical tradition, Rorty, and the philosophy of communication*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
>
> McKeon, R. (1957). Communication, truth, and society. *Ethics, 67*, 89-99.
>
> Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air: A history of the idea of communication*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
>
> St. John, J., & Shepherd, G. J. (2004). Transcending tolerance: Pragmatism, social capital, and community in communication. In P. J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 28* (pp. 167-187). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bob Craig's analysis compares each category of theory to the others. Figure 1 below is an adapted description of his "new" category of pragmatism

Table 1. Pragmatism in the Field of Communication Theory (a tentative reconstruction).

Essential Elements

- Communication theorized as: Pluralistic community; coordination of practical activities through discourse and reflexive inquiry
- Problems of communication theorized as: Incommensurability, triple contingency,
- nonparticipation, nonreflexivity or dogmatism, defective discourse practices
- Metadiscursive vocabulary such as: Practices, discourse, pluralism, responsibility, perspective, reflection, criticism, interest, purpose, consequences, cooperation, collaboration, community, participation, interaction, interdependence
- Plausible when appeals to metadiscursive commonplaces such as: We need to cooperate despite our differences; everyone has their own point of view and deserves an equal hearing; the real meaning of anything is the practical difference it makes
- Interesting when challenges metadiscursive commonplaces such as: There are certain truths that cannot be denied; some differences are so fundamental there is

no way to overcome them; there can be no cooperation with evil or falsehood ("a pox on all compromises")

Topoi for Argumentation *from* Pragmatism (pragmatism's "*column* ")

- Against Rhetoric: Rhetoric relies on traditional commonplaces, defeats reflexivity
- Against Semiotics: Intersubjective mediation occurs in coordinated practical activities, not through signs alone; meaning emerges through interaction and is triply contingent
- Against Phenomenology: Experience of the other means taking the perspective of the other in interaction; I –Thou depends on Us/Them (triple contingency); communication should be judged by its consequences, not its "authenticity"
- Against Cybernetics: "Contingency goes all the way down" (Russill, 2004, p. 173), so communication cannot be adequately rendered in formal models of information processes
- Against Sociopsychology: "Contingency goes all the way down," so consequences for practical action cannot be reduced to any particular set of predictable effects
- Against Sociocultural Theory: Stable cultural patterns and social structures as a basis for communication assume only double contingency
- Against Critical Theory: "Contingency goes all the way down," so there can be no universal validity claims; identity differences and social conflict do not preclude efforts to extend pluralistic community
- Against Pragmatism: *Dilemma of reflexivity*: inquiry, when instituted (routinized/ritualized) as social practices, becomes nonreflexive
- *Paradox of pluralism*: a standpoint that can take no particular standpoint

Topoi for Argumentation *Against* Pragmatism (pragmatism's "*row* ")

- From Rhetoric: Pragmatism lacks the specificity of an art; pluralistic community is merely an intellectual ideal
- From Semiotics: Coordination depends on a shared code; community is constituted symbolically
- From Phenomenology: Experience of the other with an eye to consequences is not a genuine experience of the other
- From Cybernetics: Pragmatism overestimates agency, underestimates the degree to which the determinism of complex systems can be captured by formal models
- From Sociopsychology: Pragmatic consequences are most usefully assessed through rigorous empirical procedures; "there is nothing so practical as a good theory"
- From Sociocultural Theory: Pragmatism overestimates agency, underestimates the profound influence and persistence of cultural patterns and social structures
- From Critical Theory: Pragmatism inadequately accounts for relations of power, systematic distortion; differences are negotiated in political struggle: not coordination but reclaiming conflict is the object of critical praxis
- From Pragmatism: Same as "Against Pragmatism" (see above)

The unpublished convention paper has now been revised and published:

Robert T. Craig (2007) Pragmatism in the Field of Communication Theory *Communication Theory 17* (2), 125–145.

Abstract: *This article reconsiders Craig's (1999) constitutive metamodel of communication theory as a field in light of Russill's (2004, 2005) critique and proposal of a pragmatist tradition of communication theory. After reviewing the constitutive metamodel, I examine Russill's argument and assess its implications for a reconstructed field of communication theory including pragmatism as a distinct tradition. I argue, in conclusion, that the problems of pluralistic community in the field of communication theory are not unconnected to the corresponding problems in society generally.*

And the conversation continues:

Russill, Chris (2007) Communication problems in a pragmatist perspective. *Communication Monographs*, 74 (1): 125-130.

SOME INTERESTING APPLICATIONS

(Note: I don't have any good selection criteria for things in this section other than 1) I found them interesting; and 2) they are not included in the Barge, K. J. and Pearce, W. B. (2004). A reconnaissance of CMM research. *Human Systems, 15*:13-32.)

1. 'Abd al-Hayy Michael Weinman (n.d.). A Journey of Heuristic Inquiry into Community-based Action Research – A Prelude to Intra-Muslim Community Dialogue: The Case of the American Mosque in which Collectivism Meets Individualism and in which Tradition Meets Conviction. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:CIFg8gZ96UwJ:www.salaminstitute.org/weinman.pdf+cronen+CMM&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=86&gl=us&client=firefox-a.

At the core of *community-based action research* is the understanding that social research is neither neutral nor subjective. The researcher acts as a facilitator to invite community members to participate as co-researchers motivated to create positive change in their community. The terminology, rationale, and methodology of participative action research and community-based action research are discussed.

After "9-11" my core research question was to understand how to increase unity and support positive growth in the complexity of American Muslim communities. When a community is in transition, higher levels of uncertainty and chaos are perceived as threats or conflicts by some and as new opportunities by others. My focus is to study how American Muslims organize and associate, and introducing dialogic methods that may improve the ways these Muslims communicate and relate to one another. The study is guided by two basic principles: 1) To cause no harm to the community, and 2) to adhere to Muslim principles which the whole community accepts.

This action research is a dynamic process in that not only does it affect the community but, also, the researchers are continually changed by the process. The "primary heuristic researcher" as well as the participating "co-researchers" are

exposed to new understandings as they progress together in cycles of learning. This paper discusses the elements, the rationale, and the methodology of heuristic research. Through a series of on-going in-depth cycles of interviews and analysis, deeper understandings emerge as more community members are invited to dialogue. Stakeholders enter the dialogue with their particular cultural perspectives and worldviews which represent particular political and social agendas either for change or for retaining the status quo.

Examples and insights from participative action research with the Muslim community in Albuquerque as it builds a new mosque are discussed. Topics for dialogue identified: How do cultural differences, power differences, and differences of opinion affect human relationships and modes of interaction in times of change? How can the atmosphere in the mosque be made more inclusive and more welcoming to groups and individuals who perceive themselves as marginalized and silenced by the dominant culture(s)? What are the relationships – their benefits and challenges – when immigrant Muslims meet American converts in the mosque; and how can they be improved? To summarize, this action research engages with the meeting of worldviews in the American mosque: when collectivism meets individualism and when tradition meets conviction.

2. Baraldi, Claudio (2006) New Forms of Intercultural Communication in a Globalized World. *International Communication Gazette, Vol. 68*, No. 1, 53-69.

Communication is the basic concept in explaining globalization. Globalization can be observed as the worldwide expansion of a functionally differentiated European society through intercultural communication. In this society, since the 17th century, intercultural communication has assumed the form of a modernist ethnocentrism based on values such as knowledge, pluralism and individualism. During the 20th century, historical changes created the necessity for new forms of intercultural communication. In the last decade of that century, a transcultural form of communication based on dialogue was proposed as a basis for cross-cultural adaptation, a creation of multicultural identities and a construction of a hybrid multicultural society. However, this transcultural form creates paradoxes and difficulties in intercultural communication, mixing the preservation of cultural difference with the search for synthesis. Consequently, a new form of intercultural dialogue, dealing with incommensurable differences and managing conflicts, is needed to create coordination among different cultural perspectives.

3. Bruss, M. B., Morris, J. R., Dannison, L. L., Orbe, M. P., Quitugua, J. A., & Palacios, R. T. (2005). Food, Culture, and Family: Exploring the Coordinated Management of Meaning Regarding Childhood Obesity. *Health Communication, 18*: 155-175.

Increased rates of childhood obesity combined with more accessible information about the relationship between diet, physical activity and inactivity, and chronic diseases suggest the need for analyzing the complex process of receiving and transmitting messages related to child feeding practices. This study examined the perceptions of childhood obesity within 1 multiethnic community, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. In particular, through the use of focus groups, individuals indicated that sociocultural, familial, and official

nutritional messages were most influential to their health care behaviors. The coordinated management of meaning (CMM) theory was used to gain insight into how individuals negotiate competing messages occurring at different levels of meaning. Given its focus on cultural influences (parallel to the concepts of archetypes), CMM proved especially relevant for understanding child feeding beliefs, values, attitudes, and practices in diverse ethnic populations. Implications for future health communication research that might draw from a CMM approach were identified, as well as pragmatic endeavors that focus on the development, implementation, and evaluation of culturally appropriate interventions in the prevention of childhood obesity.

4. Buttle, F. A. (1994). The Co-ordinated Management of Meaning: A Case Exemplar of a New Consumer Research Technology. *European Journal of Marketing, 28* (8/9): 76-99.

Abstract: The Co-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) is a social constructionist theory of human action which provides insight into the structure and process of multi-person decision making. In the CMM analysis presented here, the Hughes family's vacation decision making supplies an episode within which the family's socially constructed resources are expressed and recreated. CMM is a technology offering considerable promise to new paradigm consumer researchers.

5. Chetro-Szivos, J. (2006). The new challenges for intercultural encounters post 9-11. pp. 69-89 Sides, C. S. (2006). *Freedom of information in a post 9-11 world*. Amityville, N.Y.: Baywood Publishing.

6. Chong, Hyon-sook (2004) Intercultural Conflict in the Workplace: A Case Study of Communication in a Multicultural Organization. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:AEjnLObj6MoJ:www.speechcom.or.kr/file/3-9.pdf+cronen+CMM&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=102&gl=us&client=firefox-a.

This study is a systemic, qualitative, micro, and practical approach to intercultural conflict which believes that a conflict is a co-creation of all the people involved, and aims to explore the making or process of a particular conflict in a particular situation and propose a practical and effective way to better deal with the conflict.

Specifically, based on the theoretical orientation of the CMM theory, it investigates the nature or pattern of a major conflict found in a multicultural organization by attending to various dimensions of analysis including cultural difference. Precisely speaking, it looks at cultural, situational, relational, and individual factors that give birth to the conflict.

7. Crume, Alice L. and Rosanne L. Hartman (n.d.) Expressing Conflict Publicly: Using Public Forum Mediation with a Reflecting Team to Assist Public Issues Discussion. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from http://www.adrlawinfo.com/expressingconflict05.html

Public forum mediation is a promising strategy in public conflict. This type of mediation differs from other types by the expansion in the mediator's role and the inclusion of a reflecting team. This article offers an explanation and an illustration of the public forum mediation process with a discussion of the strategies of the mediator and the reflecting team members in the process. Participants in the pilot study explored the two questions: "How might mediators assist conflict parties with larger non-personal conflict issues using a reflecting team?" and "How does the inclusion of a larger group of people concerned about the same issue(s) in a public setting affect the mediation process especially due to the lack of confidentiality in place?" The discussion and conclusion give answers to these questions.

8. Forbat, Liz, and Kathryn Pekala Service (2005). Who cares? Contextual layers in end-of-life care for people with intellectual disability and dementia. *Dementia, 4* (3): 413-431.

The complexity of the relationship between intellectual disability (ID) and dementia is increasingly acknowledged. In order to operationalize a route towards person-centred care, we introduce the hierarchy model (Pearce, 1999) as a tool to focus the attention of policy and practice on all aspects of caregiving. This tool, which is taken from the family therapy literature, enables practitioners to examine the broad systems that impact on the delivery and receipt of care. In this article, we focus on its utility in scrutinizing end-of-life and later stages of dementia by illustrating its use with three key areas in dementia care. These three areas provide some of the most challenging situations at the end stages, because of the possible treatment options, they are: nutrition, medical interventions, and the location of care provision. This model enables a focused approach to understanding how meaning is created within social interaction. The article draws out implications for practice and policy and has applications for practice internationally.

9. Goodwin, Janna (2004). The Productive Postshow: Facilitating, Understanding and Optimizing Personal Narratives in Audience Talk Following A Personal Narrative Performance. *Theatre Topics. 14 (1)*: 317-338.

10. Harris, Linda M., Connie Dresser, and Gary L. Kreps (n.d.) E-Health as Dialogue: Communication and Quality of Cancer Care. Retrieved on June 5, 2007, from http://www.ccs.neu.edu/home/bickmore/dshc/kreps.pdf.

Abstract: The communication demands in cancer care are very high, involving gathering, interpreting, and sharing complex and often emotionally-charged information among a network of interdependent caregivers, health care professionals, and patients.
Communication technologies (such as interactive computer systems, advanced telecommunications programs, and multimedia educational programs) have been developed, adopted, and adapted to help individuals confronting cancer to meet the unique communication demands of cancer care, to access the most relevant and accurate health information, to coordinate complex interdependent caregiving activities, to gather and provide needed social support, and to facilitate informed

decision making. The purpose of this paper is to examine the uses of health communication technologies, often referred to as e-health, to promote needed information sharing, feedback, and dialogue in cancer care.

11. Montgomery, E. (2004), Tortured Families: A Coordinated Management of Meaning Analysis, *Family Process 43* (3), 349–371.

Abstract: Torture is known to affect both the individual and the family. The aim of the present study was to reach a better understanding of the significance of communication and information about parental exposure to violence in torture-surviving families. The theoretical background is Social Constructionism and Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). In-depth interviews were carried out with 14 members of 3 Middle Eastern refugee families living in Denmark in which the father had been exposed to torture. The 3 families experienced their life stories and situations as refugees in very different ways, ranging from meaninglessness, discontinuance, and alienation to a sense of community, solidarity, and openness. Communications about past events were related to such meaning-providing contexts. The way in which parents talk with their children about torture and organized violence can be understood in terms of "stories told" and "stories lived." When stories told (e.g., the experience of torture and organized violence) are in contradiction to stories lived, a situation of ambiguity and uncertainty is created. The meaning-providing contexts for making sense of the family history of violence and exile can be more or less coherent or contradictory, and might result in a strengthened relationship or confusion, powerlessness, and action paralysis. Clinicians can help traumatized families deal with their past histories of violence by paying attention to such ambiguities and contradictions.

12. Oliver, Christine (199x). Systemic eloquence. *Human Systems: the journal of systemic consultation and management, Vol. 7, No. 4*

Systemic Eloquence is offered as a form of systemic social constructionist practice. As work in progress it begins to speak to a way forward between the two apparently opposing grammars of post modern relativism and moral commitment. This paper suggests and develops an account of systemic eloquence by exploring the potential influence of Co-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) theory on the original Milan principles of hypothesising, circularity and neutrality. Use of these ideas is encouraged in all areas of systemic practice. The case example offered here is from an organisational consultancy context.

Christine has developed this idea into a formal model for consultation. See:

Oliver, Christine (2004). Reflexive inquiry and the strange loop tool. Human Systems, 15: 127-140.

ABSTRACT: Reflexive Inquiry (RI) is offered as a framework for consultancy and a tool for developing insights gained from Co-ordinated Management of Meaning Theory (CMM). RI extends CMM, through positioning the space within *interpretive acts* as offering reflexive potential in drawing attention to the ways that we notice, interpret and decide on our choices, responses and actions in a communicative process. In the same way, strange loop patterns can work as a reflexive tool in a context of uncritical consciousness. This paper suggests that the strange loop as a lived pattern represents an attempted, but self defeating, solution to the 'problem' of complexity. However, it is a 'solution' that fragments and polarises. When such looped patterns are identified, connections between poles and fragments are made possible, facilitating reflexive action. The consultancy case used to illustrate the workings of RI shows how it can inform consultant sense making and dialogue.

Oliver, Christine (2005). *Reflexive Inquiry: A Framework for Consultancy Practice.* London: Karnac.

13. Pawanteh, Latiffah (n.d.). Sojourn and the construction of bi-cultural identities: An analysis of the intercultural adaptation of Malay women. Retrieved on May 26, 2007, from www.aber.ac.uk/~jmcwww/Identact/Papers/paper96.doc.

Sojourn is a composition of the intercultural interactions of persons who are in another cultural context for a particular duration of time. This paper is a compilation of the stories of sojourn of Malay women and their adaptation process as interpreted within the theoretical framework of Coordinated Management of Meaning, hereafter referred to as CMM (Pearce and Cronen, 1980). It is an episodic analysis of their reported daily interactions with Americans and other Malays during their three years sojourn in the United States. As it is, sojourn is both an exciting and yet challenging situation fraught with uncertainties in many aspects of the everyday life of the individuals. As such, these Malay women enacted the social identity of international students who in their pursuit of academic fulfillment undergo a range of experiences in their process of intercultural adaptation. The analysis compiled the similarities and differences in daily interactions, the tensions and emotions that emerged, and the patterns of resistance, stability and transformations in their cultural identity that were intrinsic in their lived experiences. A review of the three cases revealed that initial episodes with Americans reflected Malay patterns of interaction. These patterns of cultural communication sustained their cultural identity but it created tensions and misunderstandings. Patterns of intercultural communication emerged after these women recognized that there are differences between their cultural ways. The ability to coordinate these interactions was a consequence of the implicative effects on their lived experiences. These lived experiences redefined their autobiographical stories and subsequently, transformed their cultural identity into one that has features and resemblances of the American. Nevertheless, interactions with other Malays reflected a Malay pattern that has features of

collectivistic tendencies and any attempt to do otherwise was met with resistance. As such, these women enacted an identity that is comprised of both the Malay and American features and the enactment of the features are determined by the "other". As a consequent of their sojourn, their cultural identities have experienced a transformation into one that is "bi-cultural or dual-featured identity". Such a pattern is inevitable in sojourn where one's everyday interaction is predominantly with others who (re) enact a different cultural context.

14. Pearce, P. P., Kim, E., & Lussa, S. (1998). Facilitating tourist-host social interaction: An overview and assessment of the cultural assimilator. Pp. 347-364 in B. Faulkner, E. Laws, & G. Moscardo, eds., *Embracing and Managing Change in Tourism: International Case Studies*. Routledge.

Includes case studies of four Korean-Australian tourist-host situations, analyzed using CMM concepts. These are the data for developing change management strategies.

15. Richert, A. J. (2003). Living stories, telling stories, changing stories: Experiential use of the relationship in narrative therapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration. 13*(2), 188-210.

In narrative therapy, the therapeutic relationship is seen as facilitative, although constructionist thinking emphasizes the relational nature of meaning, suggesting that the client-therapist relationship is central to developing the client's story. By contrast, humanistic/existential theories stress the mutative nature of the therapeutic relationship. This article integrates these perspectives by developing a rationale for using the story both as lived in relation to the therapist and as verbalized. The implications of this rationale for the therapist's use of his or her own experience in treatment, the active use of the relationship, and the use of reflexive procedures that draw upon the I (subject/author) versus me (object/protagonist) distinction in the client's narrative are discussed.

16. Salmon, G. & Faris, J. (2006). Multi-agency collaboration, multiple levels of meaning: Social constructionism and the CMM model as tools to further our understanding. *Journal of Family Therapy,* 28 (3): 272-292.

This study explores the discourse emerging when professionals from a child and adolescent mental health service meet with professionals from other agencies to discuss cases. The study is timely, given the current political contextual forces pushing agencies to work together which run alongside an expanding literature acknowledging the obstacles to achieving this. A thematic analysis identified nine themes, defined according to their discourse type, including single agency discourse, case complexity discourse and multi-agency discourse. In this paper, the usefulness of the coordinated management of meaning model (CMM) is examined as an additional tool which may be used in data analysis to help

understand the discourse within multi-agency meetings. The two approaches to data analysis are complementary to each other, with both allowing for different layers of context and complexity to emerge from the data.

17. Sluzki, C. E. (1992). Transformations: A Blueprint for Narrative Changes in Therapy Family Process 31 (3), 217–230.

When problematic-symptomatic behaviors are conceived as embedded, retained, and maintained in collective stories, therapy can be described as the transformative process by which patients, families, and therapists co-generate qualitative changes in those stories. An emphasis on narratives allows one to specify further how those transformations unfold at the more "micro" level of the exchanges that take place throughout the consultation. To that specification is devoted the core of this essay, which closes with a discussion of the clinical, training, and, especially, research potentials of this systematization.

18. Tomm, K. (1987). Interventive Interviewing: Part II. Reflexive Questioning as a Means to Enable Self-Healing, *Family Process 26* (2), 167–183.

Reflexive questioning is an aspect of interventive interviewing oriented toward enabling clients or families to generate new patterns of cognition and behavior on their own. The therapist adopts a facilitative posture and deliberately asks those kinds of questions that are liable to open up new possibilities for self-healing. The mechanism for the resultant therapeutic change in clients is postulated to be reflexivity between levels of meaning within their own belief systems. By adopting this mode of enquiry and taking advantage of opportunities to ask a variety of reflexive questions, a therapist may be able to augment the clinical effectiveness of his or her interviews.

19. Tomm, K. (1988) Interventive Interviewing: Part III. Intending to Ask Lineal, Circular, Strategic, or Reflexive Questions? *Family Process 27* (1), 1–15.

Every question asked by a therapist may be seen to embody some intent and to arise from certain assumptions. Many questions are intended to orient the therapist to the client's situation and experiences; others are asked primarily to provoke therapeutic change. Some questions are based on lineal assumptions about the phenomena being addressed; others are based on circular assumptions. The differences among these questions are not trivial. They tend to have dissimilar effects. This article explores these issues and offers a framework for distinguishing four major groups of questions. The framework may be used by therapists to guide their decision making about what kinds of questions to ask, and by researchers to study different interviewing styles.

20. Wilson, E. Vance (2004). A standards framework for academic e-advising services *International Journal of Services and Standards (IJSS), Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004*

E-advising services provide a mechanism for using the internet to provide many aspects of academic advising. Benefits include the ability to offer advising to off-campus students enrolled in distance learning programmes and increase advising opportunities for on-campus students. Currently, little standardisation exists among e-advising programmes, and there are indications that initial development of e-advising systems is unstructured and atheoretical. This paper presents a standards framework for e-advising services that is based on theories of communication needs. The framework provides a guide to developing e-advising standards that are flexible to needs of advisees, advisors, and administrators.

OTHER INTERESTING THINGS

A slide show presenting CMM based on Em Griffin's chapter on CMM in the 3rd edition of *A first look at communication theory*. The author of the slide show, Bob Craig, does a nice job bringing together several strands of work and presenting a "charmed loop" analysis of the "Dave and Jan" data reported first in Pearce and Cronen, *Communication, Action and Meaning* (1980) and more recently in Pearce, *Making Social Worlds*, chapter 4 (in press, expected September 2007).
http://www.colorado.edu/Communication/meta-discourses/Theory/cmm.htm

Adler, R. B. (1995). Teaching communication theories with 'Jungle Fever.' *Communication Education, 44*, 157-65.

Abstract: Describes the use of Spike Lee's film "Jungle Fever" in an introductory communication theory class. Demonstrates how the film can be used to help students understand four metatheoretical perspectives: laws, rules, systems, and critical approaches. Discusses when and how to use the film in class.