

COMM 3000-002
Spring 2006
Exam 2 Review

Format of Exam:

40% Core Concepts and Connections—Choose 4 of 6 questions worth 10 points ea.
30% Applications—Read two short pieces describing a controversy—apply core concepts to ask questions and explore how the controversy can be shifted. Worth 15 points ea.
30% Essay—Choose two of three. Worth 15 points ea.

Reading Covered:

ABC—Foreword & Chs. 1, 2, 3, 5
Flick—All
Isaacs—Foreword→Ch. 7
All on-line readings assigned

Key “Characters”

Martin Buber (1878-1965) Austria/Germany/Israel
Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002) Germany (East→West)
Jürgen Habermas (1929-) Germany Hitler Youth→”awakening”
Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) Russia Exile→Kazakhstan
Paulo Freire (1921-1997) Brazil Exile→S.Am, U.S., Switzerland
David Bohm (1917-1992) U.S. Exile→Brazil, Israel, UK
Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995) France→WWII Prison

Recurring Concepts

Speaking to the Center
Mind models/worldview
Listening to understand
Respecting
Suspending
Voicing
Productive vs. Reproductive Communication
Finding the right problem
Explore nature of choice
Curious and Open
Attitude of curiosity
Strategies to enhance

New(er) Concepts

I-Thou → dialogic meeting
Hermeneutics→ author intent vs. historical context/dialogue
Communicative Action→replaces revolution as mode of change
Ideal speech situation→requires communicative competence
□ Symmetrical distribution of the chances to choose and apply speech acts;
□ Understandings and preconceptions of the world are not privileged and are open to

contestation—participants are motivated by a search for understanding and negotiation of norms

- Authority is not absolute and must be negotiated in interaction
- Interactants must be able to express their own authentic interests, needs, and feelings.

Multivocality

Dialogue as communication between simultaneous differences

Critical consciousness, mutuality, respect

Holism

Tensionality

Descriptive and Prescriptive Approaches

Making *in common*, not *making common*

Coordinated Management of Meaning

- Communication perspective
- Coherence
- Coordination
- Mystery

Radically foregrounding communication

Responsive ethical /

Appreciative Inquiry—Moving from problem-focus to asset/aspiration focus—creating more of what is good in a system.

Core principles:

- Constructionist principle—what we know affects what we do.
- Principle of simultaneity—*inquiry IS intervention*—change begins with the first questions we ask and shapes what we will find. Seeks “essential goodness” in a system.
- Poetic Principle—moves from metaphor of org/system as machine to org as text—subject to interpretation
- Positive principle—language matters—more positive the inquiry the more it endures
- Anticipatory principle—collective imagination and discourse about the future is our greatest asset for generating constructive organizational change.

4D model:

- Discover—appreciating the best of what is—questions engage participants in the telling of stories to one another about what gives energy and vitality to a system.
- Dream—Imagine what might be—from the most compelling images and stories explore “what the world is calling us to become.”
- Design—Co-constructing what should be—develop design principles called “provocative propositions”—that stretch the system from where it is to where it wants to be.
- Destiny—what will be—people begin to read, understand, and envision the organization or system in a new way that invites possibility and creates new direction.

Strategic Questioning

Key Features:

- ❑ Is “productive” –synthesizing new knowledge
- ❑ Awakens suppressed possibilities for change
- ❑ Is empowering
- ❑ Releases blocks to change and to new ideas
- ❑ Facilitates people’s own responses to change
- ❑ Generates energy to make changes happen
- ❑ Creates answers that emerge over time

Shaping Strategic Questions:

- ❑ Creates motion—moves beyond “stuckness”
- ❑ Creates options—opens up new possibilities
- ❑ Digs Deeper—asks “long lever” questions that create synthesis, motion, and energy
- ❑ Avoids “Why”
- ❑ Avoids “Yes”/“No”
- ❑ Is Empowering
- ❑ Asks the unaskable questions

Level 1: Describing the issue or problem

- ❑ Focus Questions
- ❑ Observation Questions
- ❑ Analysis Questions
- ❑ Feeling Questions

Level 2: Strategic Questions to Dig Deeper

- ❑ Visioning Questions
- ❑ Change Questions
- ❑ Consider the Alternatives
- ❑ Consider the Consequences
- ❑ Consider the Obstacles
- ❑ Personal Inventory and Support Questions
- ❑ Personal Action Questions

Compelling Questions:

1. Choose one of the “key characters” we have studied in class and explore how their life experience informed or influenced their particular contribution to dialogue. (May choose this question up to two times using different characters).
2. Explain the concept of the ideal speech situation. What does it contribute to our understanding of dialogue? What flaws do you see in this model? How would you address these flaws?
3. How do notions of Holism and Tensionality inform your understanding of dialogue? What is meant by each term? How do these concepts operate in relationship to one another?
4. What distinguishes an I-Thou orientation from an I-It orientation? Why did Buber believe this shift was important to the possibility of dialogue? List two other core dialogue concepts this idea seems related to and explain why.
5. What distinguishes descriptive from prescriptive approaches to dialogue? How do these differing orientations inform and support one another? In what ways are they at odds with one another? Explain and support your answer.

6. Of all of the authors we have read, or read about, whose theory or perspective on dialogue is most exciting to you? Explain why. Whose theory or perspective is most difficult for you to believe or accept? Explain why. How can you reconcile these differing perspectives?
7. What are the two stages of Suspension advocated by both Isaacs and Bohm? Provide an example of a time when you practiced suspension that clearly illustrates the application of these principles OR provide an example of a time when you failed to use suspension and explore how the practice could have altered or transformed the interaction.
8. How can one balance tendencies toward analysis, separation and categorization with the attempt to be aware of and understand a totality? How and why is this important to dialogue? Provide an example of what this would look like in practice.
9. What would it look like to “radically foreground communication” in our interactions with one another? How would such an orientation shape our understanding of and orientation to dialogue? Give an example of what this would look like in practice.
10. List and explain the core principles of Appreciative Inquiry. How do each of these principles relate to other core dialogue concepts? In what situations does this model seem especially helpful? Explain why.
11. What are the key features of strategic questioning? How do each of these principles relate to other core dialogue concepts? In what situations does this model seem especially helpful? Explain why.
12. What do you see as key similarities and differences between Appreciative Inquiry and Strategic Questioning? How are both practices related to dialogue? Do you see one as more or less effective than the other (in general, or in specific contexts...)? Why? Give concrete examples to illustrate your answers.
13. Identify a contemporary issue (NOT your group issue) around which there is significant controversy. Explain how the issue is polarized. Develop a model for dialogue that applies either Appreciative Inquiry OR Strategic Questioning principles in a way that would move the issue from debate to dialogue. Explain how your approach could transform the interaction. Anticipate potential challenges and explain what you could do to overcome them.
14. What have you learned about dialogue? Be as specific as you can. What core concepts have you found especially compelling? Why? What concepts do you continue to struggle with? Why? What have you learned about yourself through dialogue?