

Re: Preaching To The Converted

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/1172.html>

From: Ryan Tanaka (yidijm_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 10/26/04

Date: 26 Oct 2004 10:37:29 -0700

"Immortalist" <Reanimater_2000@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<urqdnZuW44Fz1uDcRVn-oQ@comcast.com>...

You know what they say...new ideas gain recognition only when the
opposition dies off.

Ryan

--

<http://www.ryantanaka.com>

> The more well informed the members of the audience are, the less likely they are
> to be persuaded by a one-sided argument and the more likely they are to be
> persuaded by an argument that brings out the important opposing arguments and
> then proceeds to refute them.

>

> On the other hand, an uninformed person is less apt to know of the existence of
> opposing arguments. If the counterargument is ignored, the less-informed members
> of the audience are persuaded; if the counterargument is presented, they may get
> confused.

>

> (3) One-Sided vs Two-Sided Arguments:

>

> Suppose you are about to make a speech attempting to persuade your audience
> that capital punishment is necessary. Would you persuade more people if you
> simply stated your view and ignored the arguments against capital
> punishment, or would you be more persuasive if you discussed the opposing
> arguments and attempted to refute them? Before trying to answer this
> question, let us try to understand what is involved. If a communicator
> mentions the opposition's arguments, it might indicate that he or she is an
> objective, fair-minded person; this could enhance the speaker's
> trustworthiness and thus increase his or her effectiveness. On the other
> hand, if a communicator so much as mentions the arguments on the other side
> of the issue, it might suggest to the audience that the issue is
> controversial; this could confuse members of the audience, make them
> vacillate, and ultimately reduce the persuasiveness of the communication.
> With these possibilities in mind, it should not come as a surprise to the
> reader that there is no simple relation between one-sided arguments and the
> effectiveness of the communication. It depends to some extent upon how well
> informed the audience is: The more well informed the members of the audience
> are, the less likely they are to be persuaded by a one-sided argument and
> the more likely they are to be persuaded by an argument that brings out the
> important opposing arguments and then proceeds to refute them. This makes
> sense: A well-informed person is more likely to know some of the
> counterarguments. When the communicator avoids mentioning these, the

sci.logic: Re: Preaching To The Converted

- > knowledgeable members of the audience are likely to conclude that the
- > communicator is either unfair or unable to refute such arguments. On the
- > other hand, an uninformed person is less apt to know of the existence of
- > opposing arguments. If the counterargument is ignored, the less-informed
- > members of the audience are persuaded; if the counterargument is presented,
- > they may get confused.
- >
- > Another factor playing a vital role is the initial position of the audience.
- > As we might expect, if a member of the audience is already predisposed to
- > believe the communicator's argument, a onesided presentation has a greater
- > impact on his or her opinion than a two-sided presentation. If, however, a
- > member of the audience is leaning in the opposite direction, then a
- > two-sided refutational argument is more persuasive. Most politicians seem to
- > be well aware of this phenomenon; they tend to present vastly different
- > kinds of speeches, depending upon who constitutes the audience. When talking
- > to the party faithful, they almost invariably deliver a hell-raising set of
- > arguments favoring their own party platform and candidacy. If they do
- > mention the opposition, it is in a derisive, mocking tone. On the other
- > hand, when appearing on network television or when speaking to any audience
- > of mixed loyalties, they tend to take a more diplomatic position, giving the
- > opposing view a reasonably accurate airing before proceeding to demolish it.
- >
- > <http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=vt49oq3usfsbda%40corp.supernews.com>
- >
- > The Social Animal - Elliot Aronson - 8th Edition 1999
- > <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0716733129/>