**UNIT III: ROGERIAN ACTIVITY**

**DAY ONE (MONDAY):**

* Pair up.
* Find an issue you disagree on.
  + *Do not argue about it.*
* Get out a phone with a timer.
* One person speaks, one listens for 2 minutes.
  + Speaker should talk about *why* they hold this position.
  + Listener must be focused on them, but must not speak.
* After that, listener should take some notes and ask any clarifying questions.
  + Perhaps ask *how* the other person came to that position.
* Then, shake hands.

**HOMEWORK:**

Using the notes you took during your “opponent conversation” on Monday, write three paragraphs addressing the following: 1) Explain your opponent’s position, summarizing it fairly and informing us why he/she takes that position. 2) Discuss what is right, good, or excellent about your opponent’s argument. 3) Respond to your opponent’s argument by highlighting your common ground. **Do not propose a solution (yet).**

**DAY TWO (WEDNESDAY):**

* Come back together with your opponent.
* Shake hands.
* Read to your opponents your summary of their argument. They must agree that it is accurate. Then, listen to their summary of your argument.
* Discuss the common ground you both identified.
* Try to find a possible solution together.
* Present to the class.
  + Each person describes the other's perspective and why he/she holds it (you must represent that person and their position well). Be sure to praise the other person.
  + Then, talk about your common ground together and any solutions you found.
  + *(This presentation should be no more than 3 minutes in length.)*
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**Initial Context**

* Baylor University – ENG 1304 (second semester freshman year)
* Textbook: *Perspectives on Argument*, Wood/Miller (Pearson, Baylor edition)
* Argument: summary/response, Toulmin, Rogerian, final research project (same topic)

**Rationale**

* Teaches students how to mediate between opposite viewpoints
* Common ground helps them identify what’s at stake (for various stakeholders)
* Shows them how difficult it is to find solutions/compromises that please everyone
* Gets them to know a classmate and talk through ideas, as well as present those ideas

**Goals**

* To help students practice talking and listening to other perspectives
* To have students practice putting an opposing argument into their own words
* To make students identify the common ground between opposing arguments
* To ask students to look for compromises and solutions with someone on the “other side”

**Behind the scenes**

* Mix-up Mondays
* Most common issue? “We don’t disagree on anything!”
* Shaking hands – demonstrating presence and civility

**Follow-up discussion**

* Is there any such thing as “neutral language”?
* What kinds of arguments does this process work best for?
* Can this work on paper, without conversation?
* What happens when there cannot be agreement? (Dissensus)
* What is the value of common ground?
* What different goals does this kind of argument have?
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