

Artifact 4: Discussion Protocols and Dialogic Practices Activity

Emma Stine

Summary of class made for Job Interview

The class focuses on "Values in Practice: Navigating Ethical Challenges in Construction Management" where students will explore how to maintain professional values when facing industry pressures. The main activity revolves around a case study about construction site safety briefings for workers with limited English proficiency, where students will analyze the ethical dilemma of a near-accident caused by language barriers.

Using the Organizational Transformation Framework, students will examine different approaches to ethical challenges, from accepting current practices to taking strategic action. The class will involve facilitated small group discussions, reflective activities, and collaborative problem-solving to help future construction managers develop strategies for implementing their values effectively in real-world scenarios where safety, budget, and timeline considerations often compete for priority.

Artifact

Facilitator Move 1 (Name and Briefly Describe in Your Own Words): Balancing - This technique creates space for different perspectives when students seem reluctant to disagree with dominant viewpoints or when only one type of opinion has been expressed. It involves explicitly inviting alternative viewpoints to ensure a more comprehensive discussion.

Implementation (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose balancing because I want to create a safe space for students to honestly express why ethical considerations might feel burdensome or impractical in real construction scenarios. When discussing the language barrier case, I'll validate their practical concerns by saying "I understand meeting deadlines and staying under budget are critical in construction. What makes it difficult to prioritize worker safety communication in these situations?" This approach acknowledges their real-world pressures instead of making them feel judged for not immediately prioritizing ethics. The highlight is that students can openly explore tensions between professional demands and ethical responsibilities without feeling defensive. Potential pitfall: Students might think I'm endorsing putting profits over safety. I'll address this by clarifying that understanding barriers to ethical practice is the first step to finding workable solutions that respect both business realities and human welfare.

Facilitator Move 2 (Name and Briefly Describe in Your Own Words): Tolerating Silences - This technique recognizes that periods of silence are valuable for processing complex frameworks and aren't dysfunctional but rather essential for deeper thinking.

Implementation (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose this because the Organizational Transformation Framework requires thoughtful processing before meaningful discussion can occur. When introducing this framework, I'll create intentional silences by saying, "Let's take 15 seconds to consider which quadrant best represents situations you've experienced." The highlight is that it gives students time to connect abstract concepts to personal experiences. Potential pitfall: Some students might find silence uncomfortable and fill it with hasty comments.

Facilitator Move 3 (Name and Briefly Describe in Your Own Words): Paraphrasing and Mirroring - This reflective listening technique involves restating what a student has said to ensure understanding, particularly when they're struggling to articulate complex ethical tensions or when students seem to be talking past each other about priorities.

Implementation (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose this because students often struggle to articulate the tension between construction priorities and ethical considerations. When a student discusses this conflict, I'll mirror their statement: "So you're concerned that addressing language barriers might delay the project timeline, and you're wondering what supports would make it easier to honor both responsibilities." The highlight is that students feel understood and validated, creating trust. Potential pitfall: Poor paraphrasing could misrepresent students' views. I'll mitigate this by always checking, "Did I understand your point correctly?" and inviting clarification.

Discussion Protocol 1: Three "A"s Analysis (Agree, Argue, Aspire) - This structured protocol guides students through analyzing ethical case studies by identifying which decisions seem reasonable, which they disagree with, and what they would aspire to do in similar situations.

Implementation (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose this protocol for analyzing the case study about safety briefings and language barriers because it provides a balanced framework for ethical analysis. Students will read the case independently for 3 minutes, then discuss with neighbors using the three prompts. The highlight is that it encourages nuanced thinking beyond simple right/wrong judgments. Potential pitfall: Students might rush to the "Aspire" stage without fully engaging with realistic constraints. I'll address this by emphasizing that "Agree" isn't about endorsing but understanding legitimate constraints in construction management.

Discussion Protocol 2: World Café - This protocol involves small group discussions at tables where students write or draw their ideas on paper "tablecloths" and then rotate to new tables for each discussion round, building on previous conversations.

Implementation (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose World Café for my construction ethics lesson because it encourages collaborative exploration of multiple ethical perspectives. I'll set up four tables with large paper "tablecloths," each focused on a different aspect of the language barrier safety scenario: practical solutions, systemic changes, personal responsibilities, and industry regulations. Students will spend 10 minutes at each table, building on the notes left by previous groups. The highlight is that it creates a visual record of evolving discussions and allows students to engage with multiple facets of complex ethical issues. Potential pitfall: Some students might dominate table discussions while others contribute minimally. I'll address this by assigning a "table host" who stays at each table to welcome new groups and asking that everyone contribute at least one written idea at each rotation.

Discussion Protocol 3: Polling Battle - This interactive protocol uses real-time polling to identify which ethical approaches students initially favor, followed by structured debate between different positions within the Organizational Transformation Framework.

Implementation: (Why You Chose It, Highlights, and Potential Pitfall): I chose this because it helps students test their understanding of the framework by applying it to real construction scenarios. For the safety briefing case, I'll have students individually vote on which quadrant they think it belongs in (using Mentimeter), then show the class results to reveal differences in perception. The highlight is seeing that the same situation can be interpreted multiple ways depending on your perspective - is ignoring language barriers "accepting current practices" or is it "recognizing issues but not changing them"? Students will debate why they categorized it as they did, which tests their grasp of the theory and shows them how the framework works in practice. Pitfall: Students might argue about terminology rather than substance.