TRANSFORMING DEBATE:

The Best of
The International Journal of Forensics

JACK E. ROGERS, EDITOR

fo·ren·sic (fə-rĕn′sĭk, -zĭk) *adj.* **1.** Relati
propriate for courts of law or for public dis
tation. **2.** Of, relating to, or used in debate
ical. [From Latin *forēnsis*, public, of a forum
See **dhwer-** in Appendix.] —fo·ren′si·cal

forensic medicine *n.* The branch of med
or establishes the facts in civil or criminal la
medical jurisprudence.

fo·ren·sics (fə-rĕn′sĭks, -zĭks) *n. (used wi*
art or study of formal debate; argumentatio

fore·or·dain (fôr′ôr-dān′, fōr′-) *tr.v.*
-dains. To determine or appoint befor
—fore′or·dain′ment, fore·or′di·na′tion

fore·part (fôr′pärt′, fōr′-) *n.* **1.** The firs
period of time. **2.** The anterior part, as of an

TRANSFORMING DEBATE

TRANSFORMING DEBATE:

The Best of *The International Journal of Forensics*

JACK E. ROGERS, EDITOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

In order to move forward into the dawn of a new era in the publishing of scholarly manuscripts regarding the theory and practice of academic debate within the international community, it is necessary to dedicate some time to the past: the roots of *Controversia: An International Journal of Debate and Democratic Renewal*. In 1995, a group of scholars meet for the first time to discuss the need for publishing outlets for forensic professionals. Groundbreaking research in the application of argumentation and debate theory was being conducted, but with so few journals available, the rejection rates were astonishingly high. As a result, too many outstanding young forensics scholars found it impossible to publish. Something had to be done to save, publish and disseminate these monographs. From those early meetings, *The Southern Journal of Forensics* was launched.

The Southern Journal of Forensics, ISSN: 1085-9853, was published quarterly through two volumes (1996-1998). During its tenure, the journal was mailed out to over three-hundred individuals, libraries and forensic teams across the United States, Great Britain and Canada. Dozens of feature-length articles and forums on controversial forensics issues were published. During this same period, the Editor of the SJF hosted the British National Debate Team and led an exhibition / lecture tour to Great Britain. As President of the International Public Debate Association, contacts from across the globe were made. Several members of the international debate community suggested that the Journal should be expanded to include a more international focus. This was taken under advisement, and the *SJF* was published under its new mission and title, *The International Journal of Forensics*.

The International Journal of Forensics, ISSN: 1521-4826, was first published in the Winter of 1998. The Journal was published bi-annually and included many feature-length articles and forum pieces from across the globe. In the Fall of 2000, Dr. Kenneth Broda-Bahm of Towson University and Mr. Noel Selegzi, Executive Director of the International Debate Education Association approached the Journal with an offer. I.D.E.A. was interested in producing a journal for its membership that was both of the highest professional quality and useful in a pedagogical, practical sense for its

readership. A consultancy was established and complete control of *The International Journal of Forensics* was given over to I.D.E.A. and its membership. This book is a direct extension of that partnership.

Due to a very limited printing and subsequent high demand, back issues of both the SJF and the IJF are extremely difficult to procure. Anyone interested in subscribing to *Controversia* would find the articles published in those back issues both insightful and very helpful. Given the history of the evolution of *Controversia*, many of the articles, forums and back issues could be classified as seminal works; and therefore, of value in terms of completeness of the body of research. Therefore, Dr. Broda-Bahm and Mr. Selegzi commissioned this work.

This collection begins with two theoretical selections. Both are geared towards the understanding and application of social argument theory within the context of academic debate. The first, "Emancipatory Rhetoric", written by Dr. Brian McGee of Texas Tech University was published in Volume 2, Number 1, Spring 1997 of the *SJF*. The second, "Applying a Psycho-Social Perspective to Argument Spheres", written by Dr. Steven Combs of Loyola Marymount University, was published in Volume 1, Number 2, Summer 1999 of the *IJF*. Both articles are excellent examples of the application of theory to the practice of debate.

The next section is dedicated to three articles on the more practical application of debate. The first, "English-Language Debate as Business Education Training in Japan", written by Takeshi Suzuki of Tsuda University and Shigeru Matsumoto of Tokai University, was published in Vol 1, No 1, Winter 1998 of the *IJF*. It both reviews the history of academic debate in Japan and makes the application of debate seminars as a unique opportunity to learn reasoned decision-making and negotiation skills. The next two articles, "The Future of Forensics" and "A Sociological Approach to Improving Style in Academic Debate" are both written by Dr. Alan Cirlin, of St. Mary's University. Published in the *IJF*, 1,1, Winter 1998, "The Future of Forensics" examines international options for debate exchanges and includes numerous practical suggestions to plan, organize, complete and pay for international exchanges. The second, "A Sociological Approach . . ." published in the *SJF*, 2, 3, Fall 1997, provides pedagogical insights into teaching a socially responsible and effective methods of academic debate. This article would be of particular benefit to the new coach, mentor or administrator interested in developing a debate program.

The final section consists of three forums. The first, "Audience-Centered Debate", edited by Dr. Brian McGee, published in Vol 2, 4, Winter 1998 of the *SJF*, examines the notion of audience, or "public" centered debate. Exactly what is it? What are its benefits? And How can we alter debate formats to take advantage of this public centered, social exercise? The second and third forums, "The Future of

Debating", edited by Dr. David Berube, the University of South Carolina, published in Vol 1, No 2, Summer 1998 of the *IJF*, and "The Director of Forensics", edited by Dr. Jeffry Brand of South Dakota State University, published in Vol 2, No 3, Fall 1997 in the *SJF*, both discuss trends within intercollegiate, academic debate from a variety of perspectives and viewpoints: Where have we been? Where are we gong? Why are we going there? What are we likely to find when we get there?

Finally, this short introduction would be incomplete without a brief listing of some of the individuals who have made both this work and this book possible. Dr. David Thomas of the University of Richmond and Dr. Nina Jo Moore of Appalachian State University served as mentors and advisors from the very beginning. Dr. Brian McGee, of Texas Tech, was and is the best friend an editor could ever have. A brilliant theorist, a hard worker who never missed a single deadline, a visionary supporter, a pinch hitter as guest editor, what more can be said? Sixty-eight assistant and associate editors, Deano Pape, the Copy Editor, the most thankless task on earth, and a host of supporters without whom nothing would have survived. And finally, Dr. Broda-Bahm and Mr. Selegzi who had the vision and insight to not only make this project possible, but to insure that future generations will have *Controversia: An International Journal of Debate and Democratic Renewal* to inspire them to social responsibility.

We change our debaters one soul at a time. We can only hope that they will use what we have taught them to change the world. –

Jack E. Rogers, Ph.D.
Central Missouri State University
Founding Editor,
The Southern Journal of Forensics
The International Journal of Forensics

EMANCIPATORY RHETORIC IN AN INSTRUMENTAL MILIEU:
Habermas and Academic Debate

Brian R. McGee
Texas Tech University

Many academic debaters have adopted a rhetoric of emancipation. This rhetoric is understood as identifying oppressive features in the material conditions of contemporary society and as advocating radical social change. One should not evaluate the rhetoric of emancipation using methods suited to instrumental rationality. This analysis has implications for forensic pedagogy and rhetorical theory.

As Thomas Conley (1990) has commented, philosophers have turned to rhetoric in the twentieth century. Ordinary language philosophy, phenomenology, critical theory, feminism, and French poststructuralism have emphasized human communication in efforts to ground truth claims or to "unground" those same claims. In turn, contemporary rhetoricians have been heavily influenced by these philosophers of human communication. With this shift to a philosophical emphasis in rhetorical theory, the practice-driven scholarship of academic debate and the practice-driven environment of the academic debate tournament are often of little interest to the rhetorician. The once taken-for-granted connection between rhetorical theory and academic debate is openly questioned by some communication scholars (see Logue & Shea, 1989).

Of course, rhetorical theories affect research on academic debate. Even a casual review of recent forensic scholarship suggests that rhetorical theory and the philosophy of communication have influenced research and theory development in forensics. Balthrop (1983) turns to the hermeneutic tradition to inform his analysis of the judge in interpreting academic debates as texts. Ulrich (1984) argues that debate could be viewed as dialectic by debate judges. Bahm (1988, 1993) once contended that phenomenology provided useful guidelines for argument analysis in academic debate.

But academic debate also creates a space for the development and examination of rhetorical theory and, to the extent that rhetoric and argumentation studies are linked, to argumentation theory. Rowland (1984; Rowland & Fritch, 1989) notes that academic debate might provide a field laboratory for the evaluation and development of argumentation theory in some cases. Also, the products of theory-building in academic debate might be relevant in other communication contexts. For example, Palczewski and Madsen (1993) use traditional debate theory as a starting point in their analysis of a speech delivered by President Bush. As the work of these scholars suggests, academic debate provides students with an opportunity to develop and refine an array of argumentation competencies, but debate is not inherently limited to this educational function. Like Rowland, I assume that academic debate provides an example of argumentation about policy-making and the optimal organization of the polis, where student advocacy and argumentation practices might suggest revisions and innovations in rhetorical theory and confirm or disconfirm extant theories. In short, academic debate provides a space where one might build rhetorical theory.[1]

In this essay, I continue the work of establishing bi-directional linkages between debate theory and rhetorical theory. Using components of the critical apparatus of Jurgen Habermas and other critical theorists, I argue that many academic debaters have adopted a rhetoric of emancipation. Following Rorty (1984, p. 172), who sees the rhetoric of emancipation as "the notion of a kind of truth which is not one more production of power," emancipatory rhetoric is understood as identifying oppressive features in the material conditions of contemporary society, as well as calling attention to the discursive practices that reproduce and sustain this oppression. I maintain that one should not evaluate the rhetoric of emancipation using argument evaluation methods suited to instrumental rationality. The argument choices of undergraduate debaters (and their coaches) are of relevance as those choices pertain to this thesis, with its attendant implications for debate theory and rhetorical theory.

DEBATE AND THE RHETORIC OF EMANCIPATION

The debate judge of the 1950s would be shocked by many aspects of academic debating in the 1990s. The evolution of delivery practices in both NDT and CEDA between the early 1970s and the late 1980s — towards a rapid rate of delivery, heavy reliance on evidence, changes in format, and so on — has been so widely analyzed and criticized that there is no need to review this evolution here.[2] In the ongoing effort to attack or defend delivery practices and other points of contention in contemporary debate, insufficient attention has been paid to the substantive argument choices made by debaters over the last few decades (as opposed to the legitimacy of argument

types such as the counterwarrant or critique). Debaters most typically attempt to save capitalist democracy and avoid nuclear war within the conventional discursive framework of political change and U.S. party politics, but, in many cases, debates also revolve around proposals for sweeping social and economic change that imply the need for one or more new discursive frameworks or "language games."[3]

Such radical proposals for social change I label emancipatory rhetoric in academic debate. Rather than suggesting incremental reforms within the current U.S. political system in the traditional, instrumental fashion of policy debate, debaters sometimes advocate a wholesale rejection of that system without necessarily endorsing so-called critique arguments. Whether they focus on the political and economic liberation of African Americans, the emergence of a radical or socialist feminist consciousness, or the need for a deep ecological environmental ethic, these debaters propose alterations in U.S. politics that often are labeled radical. Encompassing all these varieties of argument is the implicit or explicit claim that Western culture must be transformed through a "consciousness change" or "paradigm shift" (see Capra, 1982). In Rorty's terms, this sort of advocacy is emancipatory because it does not seek to reproduce the power relations that characterize the dominant social order.

Much anecdotal evidence suggests that the rhetoric of emancipation maintains a continued presence in both NDT and CEDA, from the so-called utopian counterplan debates of a few years ago (see Katsulas, Herbeck, & Panetta, 1987) to more recent critique debates on such subjects as cultural imperialism and the racism of terms like "Islamic fundamentalism" (see, e.g., Broda-Bahm & Murphy, 1994), as well as in the conventional advantage and disadvantage argument forms. For example, Crenshaw (1993) suggests that feminism, including both liberal and radical feminisms, "is not dead. It is alive and well in academic debate" (p. 72), since one often hears arguments for radical social change that are grounded in some version of feminism.[4] More specifically, those who recall the 1996-1997 topic used by NDT and CEDA should remember the frequency with which negatives on that topic offered disadvantages suggesting that an environmental crisis of the sort prevented by affirmative plans would make radical social change possible. In short, emancipatory argumentation has become an established feature of two major organizations sponsoring intercollegiate team debate in the United States (see note 2).

Why would debaters choose to use such emancipatory arguments? Obviously, the selection of these arguments often has a strategic purpose. Given the enormity of the social and political changes proposed by some scholars working in the traditions of critical theory and academic feminism, as well as the magnitude of the problems identified by these same scholars, the importance of these critiques of contemporary society often seems to dwarf the significance of incremental policy changes that fun-

damentally do not challenge the prevailing social order. Also, debaters presumably make certain kinds of arguments because they enjoy making them and prefer those arguments to other sorts of advocacy that might be strategically sound.

The shift towards a rhetoric of emancipation in both NDT and CEDA debate provides an opportunity to utilize academic debate as an argument laboratory that illustrates broader sorts of emancipatory advocacy. Specifically, emancipatory rhetoric in academic debate illustrates some components of Habermas's critical apparatus. In turn, that same critical apparatus helps us to identify ways in which this emancipatory rhetoric is problematic. Further development of this thesis requires a brief review of Habermas's project.

INSTRUMENTAL RATIONALITY AND COMMUNICATIVE ACTION

This discussion of instrumental reason and emancipatory rhetoric in this section relies heavily on the work of Jurgen Habermas. Habermas is one of the most prominent social critics of the twentieth century, and his work has received much attention from rhetorical theorists (e.g., Doxtader, 1991). I concentrate on his efforts to distinguish between *purposive-rational action* (work), where Habermas places instrumental rationality, and *communicative action* (interaction), where we would expect an emancipatory rhetoric to reside. While reliance on secondary sources is not usually desirable, I make use of such sources in the following section with the hope of making this discussion more accessible.

Instrumental rationality has been cast in the role of "foe" or "adversary" in some analyses of epistemology. The relationship of truth claims to the maintenance of allegedly irrational modes of societal organization has received considerable attention. For those who seek to criticize this irrationality and to advance a political and intellectual agenda, a focus on the instrumental rationality that has influenced the German intellectual tradition from Weber to Habermas has a certain appeal. This focus sometimes tempts scholars to reduce "reason" solely to instrumental rationality. Hawkesworth (1989) explains that:

> Rather than acknowledging that reason, rationality, and knowledge are themselves essentially contested concepts that have been the subject of centuries of philosophical debate, there is a tendency to conflate all reasoning with one particular conception of rationality, with instrumental reason. Associated with Enlightenment optimism about the possibility of using reason to gain technical mastery over nature, . . . with processes of rationalization that threaten to imprison human life in increasingly dehumanized systems, and with the deployment of technology that

threatens the annihilation of all life on the planet, instrumental reason makes a ready villain. (pp. 542-543)

The wholesale indictment of instrumental reason summarized by Hawkesworthis probably unjustified. Instrumental rationality serves a useful purpose in an advanced industrial society, where the organization of several modes of everyday life may require such a rationality (e.g., sophisticated communication and transportation networks). As Hawkesworth might argue, a more subtle analysis must concentrate on identifying the modes of human existence in which a different rationality is most appropriate. After all, "the real problem, Habermas argues, is not technical reason as such but its universalization, the forfeiture of a more comprehensive concept of reason in favor of the exclusive validity of scientific and technological thought, the reduction of *praxis* to *techne*" (McCarthy, 1978, p. 22). The difficulty for Habermas comes in separating the practical problems of political choice from the technical problems of administration. Practical and technical questions are increasingly collapsed together in contemporary analyses, since "we now commonly think of the practical as being a matter of technical application or know-how" (Bernstein, 1976, p. 187).

The separation of the technical from the practical begins for Habermas in his discussion of purposive-rational versus communicative action. In his famous 1968 essay in honor of Herbert Marcuse, "Technology and Science as `Ideology'," Habermas (1970a) explains that by "purposive-rational action [work] I understand either instrumental action or rational choice or their conjunction" (p. 91). Further, instrumental action is identified by the application of "technical rules based on empirical knowledge. In every case they imply conditional predictions about observable events, physical or social. These predictions can prove correct or incorrect" (pp. 91-92). Another variety of purposive-rational action, strategic action, is marked by the use of "strategies based on analytic knowledge. They imply deductions from preference rules (value systems) and decision procedures" (p. 92).

In contrast, Habermas (1970a) sees communicative action, or interaction, as symbolic action, "governed by binding consensual norms, which define reciprocal expectations about behavior and which must be understood and recognized by at least two acting subjects" (p. 92). For Habermas, the public realm of communicative action increasingly is excluded from governmental decision making in favor of decisions made on the basis of purposive-rational action. Habermas's efforts to devise a satisfactory accounting of the conditions of communicative action range from the early Marcuse essay cited above to more recent work (*e.g.*, Habermas, 1987, 1992; see Calhoun, 1992).

What is the point of this work/interaction distinction? As implied above, it helps Habermas explain the problems created by the confusion of the practical and tech-

nical spheres of discourse. At the risk of oversimplification, the central goal of Habermas in his analysis of communication is the creation of an optimal discursive space free from the distortions of time and space constraints, where disputes are considered free from the influence of domination. For Habermas, the problem of emancipation must only be resolved via discourse, once communicative action becomes a possibility.

Central to the critical apparatus devised by Habermas is the need to ground truth-claims so that we may distinguish "between good arguments and those which are merely successful for a certain audience at a certain time" (Habermas, 1984, p. 194). He rejects *correspondence* theories of truth, in which truth is said to be grounded in objective experience, because "even the correspondence theory of truth . . . must be conceived in discursive terms" (Conley, 1990, p. 301). Habermas's concentration on devising a *consensus* theory of truth is premised on the notion that truth claims are supported via argumentation. All consensus is not created equal, however. Distortions in communication lead to failures in this truth-seeking discourse. When communication is distorted, whether by a lack of sufficient time to discuss a truth claim or by the domination of one participant over another, the consensus at which interlocutors might arrive is not necessarily a *justified* consensus. A leading cause of distortion in contemporary public discourse is the encroachment of instrumental and strategic rationalities on the discursive domain, which should be reserved for communicative action focused on practical questions.

What is Habermas's response to this "systematically distorted communication"? Habermas advances the notion of an "ideal speech situation," in which communication free from distortion would eventually result in a justified consensus. As Elshtain (1982) explains:

> For Habermas, the concept of an ideal speech situation serves as a *worthy* ideal (never perfectly attainable) which helps us to assess other alternatives with clarity and force. Within an ideal speech situation, no compulsion is present other than the force of discourse itself; domination is absent; and reciprocity pertains between and among participants. (p. 620)

The idea for Habermas (1970b) is that the outline of the ideal speech situation is implicit in any speech act, for "the *design* of an ideal speech situation is necessarily implied in the structure of potential speech, since all speech, even of intentional deception is oriented towards the idea of truth" (p. 372).

Below, the current practice of academic debate is examined on the basis of this

understanding of Habermas's critical apparatus. The attempt by debaters to criticize the current social order is impaired by the reliance of that attempt on a purposive-rational discourse that privileges the technical over the practical.

> One objective of radical social criticism is to question the dominance of technocratic, instrumental rationality, and debaters often believe that they are engaging in such criticism. But their discourse fails them, because they use a discursive framework, a language game, that reduces the evaluation of their advocacy to purposive-rational action. The confusion of practical discourse and technical discourse is ultimately counterproductive, because practical discourse is not attainable when the syntax of that discourse demands an instrumental evaluation of the truth claims that are advanced. And, as Bernstein (1976) summarizes, when practical discourse is eliminated or suppressed, the public realm loses — in the classical sense of politics — its political function. The problem has become urgent in our time not only because science and technology are the most important productive forces in advanced industrial societies, but because a technological consciousness increasingly affects all domains of human life, and *serves as a background ideology that has a legitimating power.* (p. 188; emphasis added)

Examples of this "background ideology" operating in academic debate are provided in the next section.

EMANCIPATING DEBATE?

Academic debate places purposive-rational action before communicative action in two ways, which are described below. I assume for the remainder of this essay that an emancipatory rhetoric will only be successful from the perspective of Habermas if that rhetoric falls within the domain of communicative action. The questions raised and the demands made by an emancipatory rhetoric are explicitly practical and should not be resolved within the technical sphere. To advance arguments about emancipation in a discursive context emphasizing technical appropriateness makes the success of emancipatory argumentation unlikely, since the discussion of the technical interferes with the practical considerations that are valorized by the idea of communicative action. (Even when such emancipatory arguments are successfully defended in instrumental terms by the winning debate team, they may well win for the wrong reasons.)

The admission of instrumental arguments allows the ideology of scientific and technological control to distort practical questions. Interlocutors cannot escape the limits of instrumental and strategic rationality unless they abandon the language game of those rationalities in favor of communicative action. For Habermas, "political emancipation cannot be identified with technical progress. While rationalization in the dimension of instrumental action signifies . . extension of technological control, rationalization in the dimension of social [communicative] interaction signifies the extension of communication free from domination" (McCarthy, 1978, p. 23).

I also assume that little about academic debate is consistent with Habermas's description of the ideal speech situation. The time limits of the traditional debate format and the requirement that debaters adapt to the preferences of a debate judge or judges function to distort the communication that occurs in debate rounds. While the ideal speech situation is unattainable even under the best of circumstances, the requirements of contemporary academic debate — with its emphasis on competition —make it very difficult even to approach Habermas's ideal. Even given these considerable limitations, however, academic debate fails in other ways to avoid the snare of instrumental rationality.

First, as suggested in a previous section, debaters use emancipatory rhetoric because they believe that such a rhetoric gives them a strategic advantage. Debaters wish to win debates. They undoubtedly choose arguments that qualify as emancipatory in part because they believe that they will be competitively successful if they utilize these arguments. The choice of an emancipatory argument by academic debaters is in many respects strategic in Habermas's sense. Debaters would not advance an emancipatory argument if they believed that it did not have some prospect for competitive success. The enormous expenditure of time and effort made in researching an uncompetitive argument would be deemed counterproductive. Debaters have a strategic interest in the invention of arguments that will be rewarded by the members of their own argument community. Arguments that should reside within a communicative framework are advanced instead with a strategic purpose and an instrumental rationale.

I suspect that this instrumental orientation to argument selection is responsible for the reductionism and analytic failings pointed out by Crenshaw (1993, 1994) in her discussion of arguments about feminism in academic debate. Against those who argue that any competitive debate format makes an instrumental orientation to argument selection unavoidable, I suggest that, at the very least, judges might reward those debaters who do not engage in questionable argument strategies with high speaker points (see Rowland, 1993). The instrumental purpose in initial argument selection need not predominate every facet of argumentation after an argument has

been chosen. To use Crenshaw's example, a debater who decides to advance arguments about "feminism" ought not be rewarded if she or he (knowingly or unknowingly) builds a position on the presupposition that feminism is a single, monolithic social movement.

Second, independent of win-loss concerns and the assignment of speaker points, the discourse of academic debate manifests the characteristics of instrumental rationality in other ways. One of the problems for both academic debate and other genres of debate at the close of the twentieth century is the problem of the "postmodern condition," as Lyotard (1979/1984) characterizes the current era. For Lyotard and others, our era is postmodern because we have grown suspicious of metanarratives; these metanarratives, or totalizing explanations for the world in which we live, no longer make sense of our experience. Instead, hundreds of disparate fragments of text assault us daily, and no single metanarrative explains this confused and confusing stream of messages.[5]

Specifically, this fragmentation of culture is reproduced and demonstrated in the discursive practices of debaters. Michael Calvin McGee (1990) argues that any rhetorical artifact is always an unfinished and incomplete fragment that is itself composed of other fragments of text. As he characterizes the research efforts of debaters, "Henry Kissinger may have chosen 8,000 words to express ... his opinion of U.S. policy in the Middle East. The debater ... will represent that discourse in 250 words, reducing and condensing Kissinger's apparently finished text into a fragment that seems more important than the whole from which it came" (M. C. McGee, 1990, p. 280). Out of these disparate fragments the debater constructs her or his own text, which acquires a local stability and coherence even when the presuppositions that underlie the analysis encapsulated in those different fragments are in tension.

I read Habermas as providing a procedural framework for argument evaluation.[6] This framework provides a space where interlocutors might evaluate the incommensurable fragments ("arguments") that confront them. The ideal speech situation re-centers the human subject as an agent capable of making informed decisions. Habermas's metanarrative suggests the procedural conditions for choosing to prefer some truth-claims to others as he seeks to reveal the criteria for believing that a consensus, once it is achieved, is justified. In this sense, his metanarrative can be distinguished from others that give one perspective on truth a preferred position or rely without critical reflection on instrumental rationality as the traditional guide to judgment. His analysis insists "only" that we must be able to separate a good argument from one that is successful. In distorted communication, some arguments prevail over others, but that success does not itself justify the conclusions implied by those arguments.

The opposition Habermas posits between purposive-rational action and communicative action might still be useful in speculating on the prospects an argument has for "justifiable" success in a particular discursive situation. From the perspective of Habermas, the rhetoric of emancipation adopted by many debaters has little chance of success on its own terms. To borrow from Fowler and Kress (1979, p. 185), the syntax pervading the discourse of academic debate "codes a world-view" that is instrumental in purpose and antithetical to communicative action. The evaluation of claims made by debaters and the language games that debaters play are characterized by an instrumental and/or strategic rationality that, as McCarthy (1978) explains, "is governed by technical rules that imply conditional predictions, as well as preference rules that imply conditional imperatives; it is directed to the attainment of goals through the evaluation of alternative choices and the organization of appropriate means" (p. 26). In short, the language of argument evaluation in academic debate is instrumental rather than practical. Arguments that belong in the practical, public sphere are not judged in accordance with the norms governing such discourse.

Many examples of instrumental rationality exist in the language of academic debate. Arguments about the "size" (qualitative and quantitative significance) of "links" (individual premises, usually in an interrelated series of arguments from cause to effect) allow judges to assess the probability of "impact" occurrence (a conditional prediction), where an impact is the ultimate outcome of a causal sequence of events (e.g., a nuclear war, the decline of democracy). Questions of impact "size" refer to the magnitude of an outcome when considering how much weight to give one argument as compared to another in making the final win-loss decision in a debate. Analysis of both link and impact probability concerns the likelihood that the outcomes predicted by an argument will ultimately come to pass. "Uniqueness" arguments emphasize the possibility that a purported cause might only be correlated with a particular event or explain that other causes also might trigger the same outcome. "Threshold" or "brink" arguments underscore the extent to which a cause might or might not be sufficient to produce the presumed effect. Finally, we have conditional imperatives, called "decision rules" or "criteria," that presumably tell judges what decision calculus to use in evaluating competing arguments.

All of these examples signal the presence of an instrumental rationality in academic debate, since anyone who has observed a significant number of CEDA or NDT debates in the last decade probably will acknowledge that this sort of instrumental language pervades the discussion of argument evaluation heard at debate tournaments. In academic debate we have a paradigmatic case of the application of technical rules grounded in empirical knowledge — Habermas's definition of instrumental rationality — and we can find examples of strategic action as well. For example, in the

current milieu of CEDA and NDT debate, the smallest risk of a nuclear war in the immediate future would provide sufficient reason for many (and probably most) judges to reject the transition to a deep ecological environmental ethic on the basis of "timeframe," assuming affirmative and negative debaters of roughly equal ability. Such a decision, while entirely consistent with current debate practice, demonstrates the argumentative burden placed on emancipatory rhetoric because emancipatory outcomes and/or new political-economic-social systems take more time to bring into being than incremental shifts in policy.

Debaters who adopt the rhetoric of emancipation typically fail to unravel the current confusion of practical with technical, primarily because debaters fail to abandon the language game of instrumental rationality, even as they construct arguments that rightfully belong to communicative action. Instead, whether debating the technical problems of designing computer software or the merits of a new feminist social order, they use the instrumental language game that props up the current political milieu, where the domain of communicative action has been colonized by the systemic imperatives of purposive-rational action (see Habermas, 1987, 1989). This language reduces fundamental practical discussions of the ways in which we ought to order our political system to mundane technical distinctions between fact and value, between the idealistic and the immediately realizable. Of course, those debaters who only make use of emancipatory rhetoric for strategic reasons undoubtedly do not care about this confusion of practical and technical questions. Those debaters who are interested in emancipatory advocacy for its own sake, however, should understand that their arguments are unlikely to receive a fair hearing within the constraints of instrumental discourse. Whether rewarded or rejected by debate judges, these arguments are evaluated using criteria unsuited to their assessment.

Emancipatory rhetoric cannot be given a fair hearing, on its own terms, within the dominant language game of debate, which reproduces the dominant instrumental language game of U.S. political culture. Debaters who wish to advance emancipatory truth-claims must question the language game that is assumed by most debaters and judges. They also must advocate a language game better suited to communicative action, or they risk the discursive reproduction of the very practices they wish to challenge. This approach could amount to a refusal to evaluate feminist arguments or other emancipatory genres of argument using standards unsuited to advocacy not falling within the realm of instrumental discourse.

While outlining the parameters of that alternative language game is beyond the scope of this essay, the *de facto* rules for performative competence in technical argumentation that are learned by academic debaters over time *can* be challenged; they are not an inevitable or unalterable feature of intercollegiate debate.

Debaters and judges might agree to allow or even encourage disputes on the language games appropriate to the evaluation of specific resolutions or certain genres of argumentation, even as they currently tolerate the evaluation of theoretical arguments about the desired relationship between the resolution and the arguments advanced by the participants in a debate (*e.g.*, topicality). In other words, I advocate making the language game used by debaters open to discussion during the debate. This is not an entirely new idea, as a review of the debates over judging paradigms suggests (Rowland, 1984).

But what would such debates look like? As an example, a debater might argue that instrumental standards for argument assessment or comparison are incommensurable with her or his advocacy; many of us have heard critique debates in which such a position is adumbrated. A more modest alternative would be a position suggesting that conventional threshold analysis is counterproductive when evaluating emancipatory argumentation, since the improbability that a single sequence of events could guarantee the emergence of a fully formed deep ecological popular consciousness, for example, should not result in a total devaluing of that consciousness.

If a shift from instrumental and strategic rationalities to communicative action makes the argumentation that is advanced in some academic debates "utopian," then so much the better. We do a disservice to our students if the training we provide them only prepares them to be effective managers, social scientists, and technicians, whatever the benefits attached to such training presently (e.g., Dauber, 1989; McGee & Romanelli, 1996; Panetta, 1990). As Richard Rorty (1989) reminds us, an important element of a liberal education at the university level is the preparation of students who are able to envision (and enact) a more peaceful and just society than the one that confronts them upon graduation. Envisioning such a society will surely require students who are not themselves preoccupied with the language game of purposive-rational action. They must uncover alternative language games within the sphere of communicative action, or the reification of the current order is likely.

Beyond forensic pedagogy, this analysis also has implications for rhetorical theory. Much of our rhetorical theory historically has emphasized *techne*, despite our occasional flirtation with and commitment to *praxis*. While some recent scholarship in rhetoric has concentrated on the celebration of subaltern voices and the expansion of traditional notions of rhetoric and politics, that work has not led yet to explicit theorizing regarding the discursive space in which those subaltern voices might encourage policy change, let alone widespread social change. Critique surely precedes any movement towards social change, but critique does not guarantee change. Those critics who wish to foster such change should seek to invent alternative political vocabularies that enable public consideration of counterfactual social possibilities.

Otherwise, like academic debaters who appropriate emancipatory rhetoric, those who resist the "technologization of the lifeworld" may find that their own reliance on instrumental discourse makes their desire for policy change unlikely, as promises of "compromise," feasibility studies, and issue and leadership cooption by political elites deprive change advocates of the inartistic proofs their audiences would find most compelling.

Academic debate might function as a space where rhetoricians could experiment with alternative language games in their attempt to enact the Habermasian idea of argumentation on matters of public policy, without dependence on the language of instrumental rationality. The invention of new procedural norms for argument assessment should be the task of rhetoricians, given the difficulty in achieving any concrete practice resembling the ideal speech situation. Such procedural norms would require modes of assessment for communicative action that are different from those used in evaluating purposive-rational action. The task of constructing a social theory of argumentation that is sensitive to different patterns of argument and does not valorize some trans-contextual normative ideal of argument requires such theory building (see Goodnight, 1989; McGee & Simerly, 1995).

CONCLUSION

Academic debate provides scholars with an argumentation laboratory that might help us evaluate and revise rhetorical theories. Many debaters are adopting a rhetoric of emancipation, but, unless that emancipatory rhetoric is adapted to the framework of purposive-rational action, this discourse does not fare well within the instrumental language game that currently dominates academic debate. Moving the language game of debate from the technical to the practical is a prerequisite for the appropriate evaluation of emancipatory rhetoric. In academic debate, we must move from an unyielding focus on learning one sort of syntax to a more flexible competence in many different sorts of discourse. In rhetorical theory, standards for argument evaluation must be separately devised for different discursive domains. While frequently criticized for his universalizing excesses, Habermas's efforts to construct a space for communicative action free from systemic distortion provide one prescriptive example of such an effort.

To remain unalterably attached to purposive-rational action in evaluating the arguments made by debaters is to reproduce the conditions for the continued distortion of communication and the continued expansion of instrumental and strategic rationalities at the expense of communicative action. Debate theory and rhetorical theory would be better served by a commitment to seeking out alternative perspectives on argument assessment.

NOTES

[1] As Doxtader (1991) notes, "the view . . . that rhetoric and argumentation are exclusive forms of communicative action is outmoded. . . . [T]he fragmentation of social and cultural decision making requires that critical theorists attempt to fully account for the means by which individuals and public communicate" (p. 63). For example, despite Habermas's suspicion of rhetoric, rhetorical theorists can contribute to his project by tracing the differences in the discourse of communicative action in comparison with purposive-rational action. On rhetoric and the public and technical spheres of argument, see Goodnight (1982, 1989) and Willard (1989).

[2] See Simerly (1990) for a partial bibliography of delivery criticisms pertaining to academic debate in CEDA and NDT. Other varieties of intercollegiate debate, including parliamentary debate and NFA-sponsored Lincoln-Douglas policy debating, so far have been largely exempt from such delivery criticisms. The National Educational Debate Association (NEDA) adheres to rules explicitly designed to restrict rapid delivery and some controversial argumentation options.

[3] At most, critics of contemporary debate condemn all argumentation that focuses on catastrophic events (i.e., deforestation, overpopulation, technological disaster, nuclear war, etc.). These critics do not recognize a distinction between advocacy challenging the current political system and advocacy seeking the abandonment of that system. Whatever the context, catastrophic advocacy is condemned by these critics as frequently unrealistic, fallacious, or tangential to the resolution under consideration (e.g., Gill, 1988).

[4] In a later essay, Crenshaw (1994) explains some of the limitations of "argument borrowing," where debaters might elide arguments about liberal and radical feminisms in their eagerness to create a coherent and compelling narrative. The liberal/radical dichotomy in feminist illustrates the distinction I draw here between instrumental advocacy of incremental change in a fundamentally unaltered status quo and the rhetoric of emancipation.

[5] Habermas calls Lyotard (and Richard Rorty) "contextualists," given their alleged antipathy to metaphysics and universal notions of reason. By his own account, Habermas has little affection for contextualism (see Habermas, 1992, Ch. 6). Years earlier, Lyotard criticized Habermas's project as another failed metanarrative, which erroneously assumed "that humanity as a collective (universal) subject seeks its common emancipation through the regularization of the `moves' permitted in all language games and that the legitimacy of any statement resides in its contributing to that emancipation" (1979/1984, p. 66).

[6] For a discussion of argument as procedure, see Habermas (1993), pp. 58-60.

WORKS CITED

Bahm, K. (1988). Intrinsic justification: Meaning and method. *CEDA Yearbook,* 10, 23-29.

Bahm, K. T. (1993). The impractical characterization of intrinsic justification: A rebuttal. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 30, 43-49.

Balthrop, V. W. (1983). The debate judge as "critic of argument": Toward a transcendent perspective. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 20, 1-15.

Bernstein, R. J. (1976). *The restructuring of social and political theory.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Broda-Bahm, K., & Murphy, T. L. (1994). A defense of critique arguments: Beyond the resolutional question. *CEDA Yearbook,* 15, 20-32.

Calhoun, C. (Ed.) (1992). *Habermas and the public sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Capra, F. (1982). *The turning point: Science, society, and the rising culture.* Toronto: Bantam.

Conley, T. M. (1990). *Rhetoric in the European tradition.* New York: Longman.

Crenshaw, C. (1993). Dominant form and marginalized voices: Argumentation about feminism(s). *CEDA Yearbook,* 14, 72-79.

Crenshaw, C. (1994). Argument borrowing and its obligations. *CEDA Yearbook,* 15, 76-85.

Dauber, C. (1989). Debate as empowerment. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 25, 205-207.

Doxtader, E. W. (1991). The entwinement of argument and rhetoric: A dialectical reading of Habermas' theory of communicative action. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 28, 51-63.

Elshtain, J. B. (1982). Feminist discourse and its discontents: Language, power, and meaning. Signs: *Journal of women in culture and society,* 7, 603-621.

Fowler, R., & Kress, G. (1979). *Critical linguistics.* In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew, Language and control. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Gill, A. M. (1988). Catastrophe and criterion: A case for justification. *CEDA Yearbook,* 9, 38-44.

Goodnight, G. T. (1982). The personal, technical, and public spheres of argument: A speculative inquiry into the art of public deliberation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 18, 214-227.

Goodnight, G. T. (1989). Toward a social theory of argumentation. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 26,* 60-70.

Habermas, J. (1970a). *Towards a rational society: Student protest, science, and politics* (J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon. (original essays published 1968 and 1969)

Habermas, J. (1970b). Towards a theory of communicative competence. *Inquiry,* 13, 360-375.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Questions and counterquestions.* In R. J. Bernstein (Ed.), Habermas and modernity (pp. 192-216). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action.* Volume two. *Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon. (original work published 1981)

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (original work published 1962)

Habermas, J. (1992). *Postmetaphysical thinking: Philosophical essays* (W. M. Hohengarten, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1993). *Justification and application: Remarks on discourse ethics* (C. Cronin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hawkesworth, M. E. (1989). Knowers, knowing, known: Feminist theory and claims of truth. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society,* 14, 533-557.

Katsulas, J. P., Herbeck, D. A., & Panetta, E. M. (1987). Fiating utopia: A negative view of the

emergence of world order counterplans and futures gaming in policy debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 24, 95-111.

Logue, B. J., & Shea, B. C. (1989). An examination and criticism of forensic research: The last five years, 1984-1988. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA* Conference on Argumentation (pp. 449-456). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (original work published 1979)

McCarthy, T. (1978). *The critical theory of Jurgen Habermas.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McGee, B. R., & Romanelli, D. (1996, November). Policy debate as fiction: In defense of utopian fiat. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego.

McGee, B. R, & Simerly, G. (1995). *The aporia of proceduralism.* In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Argumentation and Values: Proceedings of the Ninth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 308-313. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

McGee, M. C. (1990). Text, context, and the fragmentation of contemporary culture. *Western Journal of Speech Communication,* 54, 274-289.

Palczewski, C. H., & Madsen, A. (1993). The divisiveness of diversity. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 30, 16-27.

Panetta, E. M. (1990). A rationale for developing a nationally competitive National Debate Tournament program. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 27, 68-77.

Rorty, R. (1984). *Habermas and Lyotard on postmodernity.* In R. J. Bernstein (Ed.), *Habermas and modernity* (pp. 161-175). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Rorty, R. (1989, Spring). Education without dogma: Truth, freedom, & our universities. *Dissent,* pp. 198-203.

Rowland, R. C. (1984). Tabula rasa: The relevance of debate to argumentation theory. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 21, 76-88.

Rowland, R. C. (1993). Feminism, strategy, and pedagogy in intercollegiate debate. *CEDA Yearbook,* 14, 80-83.

Rowland, R. C., & Fritch, J. E. (1989). *The relationship between debate and argumentation theory.* In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument: Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 457-463). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Simerly, G. (1990, November). General Semantics and the "spirit" of the resolution. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago.

Ulrich, W. (1984). Debate as dialectic: A defense of the tabula rasa approach to judging. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 21, 89-93.

Willard, C. A. (1989). The creation of publics: Notes on Goodnight's historical relativity. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 26, 45-59.

APPLYING A PSYCHO-SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE TO ARGUMENT SPHERES:
Implications For Academic Debate

Steven C. Combs
University of Southern California

Criticisms of academic debate are legion, largely because debate organizations, for the most part, lack clear identities, denying a standpoint for meaningful reform. This essay provides a framework for defining the identities of debate organizations by revising and applying the notion of argument spheres, moving from a social perspective to a psycho-social perspective. The psycho-social perspective on argument spheres clarifies why CEDA and NDT are technical sphere activities and demonstrates the centrality of the judge or audience in dictating the nature of academic debate activities. Implications of the debate sphere approach include that the perspective provides a basis for creating organizational identities and pedagogic grounding of debate activities. The psycho-social perspective on debate spheres can also be used to formulate touchstones for critiquing the internal consistency of organizational goals and activities.

The extent of self scrutiny of academic debate is mind boggling. Ziegelmueller (1996) notes that the NDT, for example, "has been a lightning rod for controversy among forensic educators and communication professionals" (p. 143). The evolution of NDT debate from a public audience-centered activity to one focused on information processing (Cirlin, 1997) is lamented by some (Polk, 1995) while others argue that many criticisms of academic debate stem from "old-timers" who have failed to keep pace with a changing activity (Ziegelmueller, 1995).

Similarly, CEDA has been criticized because it has evolved in such a way that it fails to meet its original educational purposes. In its inception, the CEDA community was united by their dissatisfaction with NDT debate (Hollihan, Riley, & Austin, 1983; Howe, 1981; McGee, 1998). In a short time, however, "CEDA began to display the very factors—overuse of evidence, rapid-fire speaking, talking in forensic symbols that a lay audience could not understand, resorting to 'squirrel' analysis of topics—that CEDA was created to counter" (Howe, 1992, p. 15). A number of other critics con-

cluded that CEDA exhibited many of the same characteristics as NDT even before the activities were essentially merged (Cox & Jensen, 1989; Hollihan, Baaske, & Riley, 1987; Ulrich, 1985; Ziegelmueller, 1990).

The birth and development of CEDA, and its profound consequences on NDT, led to dire predictions. Rowland and Deatherage (1988) concluded that "NDT debate is very sick, perhaps dying" (p. 246). Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley (1987) add that "academic debate is in a crisis state" (p. 192).

Despite these dire predictions and the abundance of criticism, academic debate seems secure, albeit fractured. NDT and CEDA appear to command loyal followings. Dissatisfied forensicators abound, but they may choose from several debate styles found in a number of organizations. The field has shifted toward these new organizations, and they appear, unlike NDT and CEDA, to be poised for growth.

This analysis is not meant to suggest that all is well in academic debate. Horn and Underberg (1993) conducted a review of "significant publications in the field" in order to determine criticisms "that frequently appear in the literature about academic debate" (p. 37).

They note that "in reviewing the criticisms made of tournament debating, one is struck by the fact that we have been hearing the same complaints for the past 70 years" (p. 54). This suggests that the traditional cleavages in the CEDA and NDT communities remain unresolved. Furthermore, rather than resolve the differences between those who want academic debate to be a public activity and those who enjoy its technical merits, academic debate thus far responds, when criticism coalesces and frustration heightens, by creating new debate organizations (McGee, 1998). In the case of CEDA, the "new" activity was immensely popular. Eventually, CEDA evolved to the point where it essentially became the entity that it was designed to displace. What should trouble forensic educators today is whether new debate organizations will indeed be meaningful alternatives or whether they will become, for the next generation of educators, "the problem."

McDonald (1996) maintains that "the challenge for intercollegiate debate and forensics organizations in the twenty first century is to remain dynamic and responsive to the needs of the communities they serve" (p. 82). In order to remain dynamic and responsive, however, debate educators must first underscore the assumptions and objectives of debate activities. Yet, as Hicks (1998) notes, the underlying rationale for debate is "often left unexplicated" (p. 353). Others maintain that debate educators lack consensus on their educational objectives (Harrison, 1995; Nobles, 1993). And while "we don't have to create a completely homogenous culture to maintain a viable subcultural identity" (Cirlin, 1997, p. 177), forensic educators should have basic touchstones or identity markers.

An example of the lack of consensus regarding fundamental aspects of debate activities is how forensic educators perceive CEDA and NDT. Despite the impression of lay observers that NDT and CEDA are technical, and not public, debate activities, Rowland, Voth, and Bossman (1991) assert that "academic debate, by its very nature, is focused within the public sphere." Furthermore, "academic debaters, by the nature of the game, are situated firmly within the public sphere" (p. 446). Simerly (1996) says that CEDA aims to prepare students for the public sphere. These claims indicate why critics of NDT and CEDA may have significant unmet expectations for these organizations.

Academic debate has the potential to be a much more meaningful activity if its organizations have clear identities. While it is true that all debate activities have identities, the abundance of critical responses to academic debate indicates that these identities are not clear-cut. Furthermore, debate organizations differ greatly in the comprehensivity of their self-definitions and the extent to which their practices foster their stated objectives. In contrast, the identities of academic debate organizations should indicate the nature of their activities, pedagogic assumptions, and objectives; there should also be improved methods for evaluating the consistency of organizational objectives and practices. Such identities are particularly crucial as debate organizations continue to emerge and evolve. Finally, the identities of academic debate organizations should be guided by the notion of argument spheres (Goodnight, 1982) in order to ground activities in either the public or technical sphere.

This essay offers a rationale for "debate spheres," the identification of debate activities as belonging to either the public or technical spheres of argument, by applying a psycho-social perspective (Erikson, 1950/1963) to the concept of argument spheres and then using that perspective to analyze debate practices. Such analysis will delineate public and technical debate, thereby situating CEDA and NDT within the technical sphere. This delineation will also offer a fresh perspective on the cleavages within the debate community and provide an analytical device for clarifying the identities of academic debate organizations. Clarifying identities allows for a critique of the consistency between debate objectives and practices. This analysis will first, provide a psycho-social perspective on argument spheres; second, apply the psycho-social perspective on spheres to academic debate; and third, consider the implications of debate spheres.

DELINEATING ARGUMENT SPHERES

Goodnight's (1982) notion that there are three distinct spheres of argument activity—

personal, technical, and public—is fairly well understood, as is his use of these distinctions to argue that the public sphere is being usurped by the technical sphere to the detriment of democratic governance (Goodnight 1982, 1987). The spheres delineation may also be useful in other ways. Goodnight (1982) points out that "studying the current practices of the personal, technical, and public spheres" may allow us to "discover avenues for criticism" (p. 218). The central claim here is that the spheres concept, especially if informed by a psycho-social perspective, may profitably be extended to academic debate, particularly the linkage between academic debate pedagogy and praxis. I shall begin by examining past attempts to define the three spheres from a social perspective, then articulate a rationale for a definition predicated on a psycho-social perspective.

SPHERES AS SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONS

One of the most important prior issues in the use of spheres to critique social practices is the definitions used to delineate the three spheres. Such definitions are neither trivial (Rowland, Voth & Bossman, 1991) nor obvious. A significant distinction in defining spheres is the relative weight given to the inhabitants or individuals who interact in spheres versus the social forces at play that confine individuals and condition their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. When one's assumptions regarding the nature of spheres place greater emphasis on social forces than on individuals then s/he is employing a social perspective. That is, spheres are thought of as social entities and the inhabitants of spheres are members of bodies or social organizations. Hence, spheres are containers of some of the "processes through which one becomes integrated into society" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 5).

Note that the social perspective does not ignore the individual; rather it places less emphasis on the person than do psychological or psycho-social perspectives. Accordingly, "when we focus on societal processes, we examine the way our membership in one kind of group rather than another affects our thoughts, feelings, and actions" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 6). One might consider a number of factors, including "social roles, rituals, cultural myths, social expectations, leadership styles, communication patterns, family organization, ethnic subcultural influence, political and religious ideologies, and patterns of economic prosperity or poverty and war or peace" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 5).

A representative view of the social focus of most spheres research is provided by Aufderheide (1991) when she proclaims that "the public is a social concept and as such needs social spaces in which to exist, to learn about the public interest, to debate it and to act" (p. 168). Notice Hauser's (1987) emphasis on the social when he main-

tains that "the rhetorical study" of the public sphere, for example, "may make an essential contribution to social theory" (p. 440).

The social grounding of spheres research may be accounted for in a variety of ways. The most plausible assumptions are, first, that scholars attracted to the study of argument spheres are interested in delineating a unit larger than Toulmin's "field" and, presumably, smaller than Perelman's "universal audience." Such an approach lends itself to seeing spheres as social entities. Second, most spheres research has focused on the public sphere and its state of existence. The temptation to think of "publics" as groups rather than collections of individuals is obvious. Note, for example how the forthcoming review of the tripartite delineation of spheres is marked by words like "public," "society," and "social," while there are few references to "individuals" or "persons." One takes what I term a social perspective when the public sphere is seen to be inhabited by the body politic.

Those who take a social view of spheres tend to think of them as discursive spaces, or places, that create frameworks for certain types of communication interactions. A sphere can be thought of as a bubble containing a set of customs, habits, and norms waiting to envelop all who venture inside. Its most important characteristics are its spatial dimension, topics, and decision making criteria. The spheres are distinguished from one another by the variance in their topics, desired outcomes, and employment of decision making criteria.

The public sphere has been characterized as a discursive space, a physical place where the public gathers (Goodnight, 1982, 1987, 1990). The public sphere is the place where "society creates its interests" (Hauser, 1987, p. 438), and where "the public's business is defined, considered, discussed, influenced and decided" (Bitzer, 1987, p. 425), making it "an arena where interests conduct controversy and openly struggle for power" (Goodnight, 1987, p. 429).

Because the public sphere facilitates communication on issues of social concern, it promotes certain rhetorical practices, giving the sphere its discursive quality. Hauser (1987) notes that the public sphere is not so much a geographical place as a "social-psychological space . . . where society deliberates about normative standards and even develops new frameworks for expressing and evaluating social reality" (p. 439). Hence, the public sphere is a discursive space for conducting the business of the public (Hauser, 1987).

Hauser (1987) contends that the public discursive space "provides the framework of ideas and deeds encountered, participated in, discussed, and shared by those segments of society we are inspecting" (p. 440). Within the public framework, certain issues tend to be discussed and adjudication standards emerge with various levels of authority.

The subjects or topics of the public sphere are those that transcend individual and special interests, extending "the stakes of argument beyond private needs and the needs of special communities to the interests of the entire community" (Goodnight, 1982, pp. 219-220). These topics refer to "common problems" affecting the body politic (Goodnight, 1987), that is, "matters of shared concern" (Goodnight, 1992, p. 1), the consequences of which "extend beyond the personal and technical spheres" (Goodnight, 1982, p. 220). In contrast, the topics of the private sphere most directly pertain to the people in the conversation, while the topics of the technical sphere are amenable to objective determinations (Goodnight, 1987).

The rhetorical framework provided by the spheres also may determine the standards and authorities used to resolve disputes within these spheres. Goodnight (1982) says that spheres denote "branches of activity—the grounds upon which arguments are built and the authorities to which arguers appeal" (p. 216). These epistemic practices "prescribe what counts as fitting, true, or proper communicative reasoning in the social world where interlocutors argue and audiences assemble" (Goodnight, 1989, p. 62). The criteria for decisions may also include rules and procedures governing who may speak, how they speak, when they speak, and what they speak about (Goodnight, 1982; 1987; 1989).

The technical sphere, for example, focuses on issues to which there are determinate answers. Hence, interactants attempt to make "practice standard and reliable," stipulating "the kinds of evidence introduced" and restricting "the processes of deriving conclusions" so as to produce "state of the art decisions authenticated by the labor of expertise" (Goodnight, 1987, p. 429). Rowland et al. (1991) maintain that "for a particular argument to be accepted in the technical sphere, that argument must be pragmatically testable and must produce relatively consistent results" (pp. 449-450). By contrast, public sphere issues are not amenable to "objective" answers because "the questions at issue in the public sphere . . . are so strongly value-laden" (Rowland et al. 1991, p. 450).

Social definitions of spheres, especially the public sphere, while useful, have limitations. One consequence of a social view of the public, especially in its conception as a domain for transcending private concerns, is that it devalues the importance of alternative perspectives promulgated by individuals and marginalized groups. Griffin (1996) argues that the public sphere has an ideological dimension that dictates boundaries for appropriate communication. Phillips (1996) contends that notions of the public sphere proposed by Habermas, Goodnight, and Hauser undermine important practices of dissent:

> Because the public sphere is an arena of action, the requirements for consensus in the pursuit of judgment demands that interactants move

beyond a familiarity with the positions of spheres and achieve a level of compliance to a mutual position of action. (p. 243)

This "dominance of consensus" (p. 231) creates norms that undermine dissent. Individuals who do not share prevailing notions of the "public interest" are marginalized because their thinking does not allow us to "put aside our differences" and work for the "common good." This process causes us "to neglect the subtleties and potentials of contemporary resistance" (Phillips, 1996, p. 244). Similarly, distinguishing spheres by topic or subject matter has been criticized because it privileges the norms of prevailing power structures (Foss & Foss, 1991; Fraser, 1993; Griffin, 1996).

A final consequence of the social perspective on argument spheres is that it can mask or downplay the significance of the behaviors of individual people. When one considers academic debate from a social perspective one can say that CEDA and NDT are public sphere activities because tournaments take place in public settings and debaters consider topics of importance to the body politic. This view ignores the fact that debaters do not behave as though they are engaging the public. NDT and CEDA participants, for example, routinely use jargon, esoteric analysis, and rapid delivery, thereby making it virtually impossible for even well-educated nondebaters to understand a debate round.

SPHERES AS PSYCHO-SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONS

In contrast to the social perspective, the psycho-social approach (Erikson, 1950/1963) looks at the interaction of the social system with the additional components of the individual's biological systems, including "the effects of physical attributes and physical changes on our personal sense of self and our relationships" and thinking systems, "our internal representation of information and relationships, on the way we categorize and interpret experience" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 6). Thus, "psychosocial theory represents human development as a product of the interaction between individual (*psycho*) needs and abilities and societal *social*) expectations and demands" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 40). In fact, the theory is unique in the extent to which it addresses "the dynamic interplay between individual development and society" (Newman & Newman, 1991, p. 60).

A psycho-social view of argument spheres is appropriate when one considers the significance of individuals in argumentation. After all, "a public 'mind,' of course, does not exist except insofar as it is comprised of individuals who think and act in similar ways" (Balthrop, 1984, p. 339). When Willard (1989) declares that an argument is defined as a type of situation in which the interac-

tants believe they hold incompatible views, he reminds us that argumentation exists because of the perceptions of individuals.

This does not mean that one should ignore the social consequences of rhetorical interactions. In fact, a psycho-social perspective is preferable to a psychological perspective because it looks at the interaction between social and individual factors. Balthrop (1984) aptly notes that "the mass consciousness has meaning and existence only through individual choice and action. At the same time, however, the individual acquires meaning and the ability to act only through participation in a consciousness that transcends his or her own individuality" (pp. 339-340). Perhaps that is why Klumpp (1997) calls on theorists to stress "the creative powers of conversation" in analyzing "the interactional process of the public" (p. 155).

An example from Rowland et al. (1991) helps illustrate the difference between social and psycho-social interpretations of argumentation. They say that "when experts speak to the public in settings such as hearings they are forced to explain the meaning of their jargon. At that point of translation the technical jargon no longer becomes a barrier to public consideration of technical issues" (p. 450).

When experts speak in public settings they are speaking to different people than the ones who might gather to hear untranslated expert rhetoric. The technical expert might use the same standards, authorities, and topics in both situations. She or he may even ask both audiences to make the same judgment or type of decision. Certainly, the expert in a public setting will need to unpack the taken-for-granteds used by the technicians. But the message could otherwise be the same. What is most different in these situations is the people who interact with the technician's rhetoric. It is the audience that is most notably changed, and that change creates an entirely different argument-interaction. Hence, the example illustrates how audiences, people with perceptions in social settings, create a different sphere for the argument.

The (compound) question that remains is, what exactly is a psycho-social definition of argument spheres and how might the three spheres be delineated from one another? If argument "is a form of interaction in which two or more people maintain what they construe to be incompatible positions" (Willard, 1989, p. 1), then a psycho-social perspective would define an argument sphere as a metaphor describing the interaction of arguers' personal perceptions with social norms and customs concerning argumentation. A sphere does not preexist, but is formed dynamically when two or more people engage in argument and construe their argumentation to be bounded by factors other than their individual personal cognitions. Because of the influence of culture, individuals are likely to be aware of differences between private, technical, and public argumentation situations (Rowland et al. 1991). Yet, individuals may differ in their cognitions regarding what is appropriate in these situations.

The function of argument spheres is to reduce perceived uncertainty between arguers. When arguers believe that they share social norms about their argumentation then they operate with more certainty when they interact with one another. Hence, spheres are not only the topics or groundings of arguments but also represent a belief among interactants that they share assumptions with one another and society. These assumptions may include notions of the propriety of certain topics, the credibility of particular sources, and the criteria for decision making; but such assumptions are not always shared completely, and may include additional aspects perceived by arguers to be salient.

The answer to the second part of the question, how the three spheres are delineated from one another, follows accordingly. The spheres are delineated from one another by the nature of the psycho-social argument interaction. When the interaction between individual needs and abilities and societal expectations and demands is such that discourse is relevant almost exclusively to the arguers, then the private or personal sphere is manifest. When the psycho-social interaction extends beyond the arguers to the interests of a number of individuals, then the public sphere is operative. And when argumentation requires a high level of expertise in order to be processed, then one is arguing technically.

ARGUMENT SPHERES AND ACADEMIC DEBATE

The distinction between social and psycho-social perspectives on argument spheres is not merely a matter of definitional contention; it also impacts how one would situate academic debate. Depending on the perspective one uses, one may reach different conclusions about the nature of CEDA and NDT. Social perspectives on academic debate would view debate activities as a product of societal demands and expectations. For example, Rowland et al. (1991) look at debate as a public sphere activity because "debaters are concerned with what public actors should do in relation to a particular social problem" (p. 446). Since debaters consider issues decided upon by public officials, they are public sphere actors.

Of course, this view assumes that a social perspective defines a sphere. It focuses on social roles and issues. What is missing from a social perspective on academic debate is the individual and her/his interaction with the social. Psycho-social views consider societal demands and expectations, but examine them as they interact with individual needs and abilities. Hence, a psycho-social perspective of debate would look beyond the roles prescribed by the debate community, in its choice of topic and burdens of proof, and also consider what individuals do as debate interactants.

SITUATING NDT AND CEDA DEBATE

A psycho-social perspective on academic debate reveals that NDT and CEDA are technical sphere activities because the vast majority of debate interactants act as though they perceive themselves to be participating in the technical, not public, sphere. In addition, the social aspects of the activity are insular and elite. Debaters expect to be rewarded for their expertise with the subject matter, rapid rate of speech, and esoteric analytical approaches. Furthermore, the activity has a number of barriers that restrict student participation. Finally, the audiences for these debates are composed of "insiders" who do not behave like public actors. These factors exemplify why CEDA and NDT not only are not public sphere activities, but also are antithetical to public standards of argumentation.

While CEDA and NDT debaters may initially lack expertise on a debate topic, they soon become experts through their research activities. Ingalls (1985) points out that "by the time the season starts, it is not unusual for an N.D.T. team to have accumulated some 15,000 pieces of supporting evidence. . . ." In fact, students frequently carry "reams of photocopied sheets" (p. 13). Zarefsky says that the intensity of preparation for debate is "analogous to working on a master's thesis" (Ingalls, 1985, p. 14). While the amount of evidence cut and carried today has probably changed since 1985, debaters still spend considerable time preparing. Gass (1988) notes that academic debate provides opportunities for students to acquire expert knowledge on an incredibly wide range of issues. The expertise of individuals is soon reflected in participants' expectations regarding the familiarity that judges will have with technical terms, acronyms, and sophisticated analytical positions.

CEDA and NDT participants also behave as though they are in a specialized arena when one considers their speaking rates. Colbert (1991) found that the average CEDA debater motors along at approximately 237 words per minute (wpm). Furthermore, "the average for all NDT finalists in this study was 284 wpm, although 9 of 42 speeches sampled exceeded 300 wpm" (p. 91). He notes that "even though CEDA finalists speaking rates are slower than NDT finalists, both greatly exceed what is considered optimal for normal speaking rates" (p. 91). Dempsey & Hartman (1986) point out that "the oral skills which generate the most victories have the least relevance to the needs of real world communicators" (p. 171).

Herbeck and Katsulas (1988) argue that "debate speeches are a specialized mode

of communication that is not supposed to sound like a normal conversation, nor read like a Ronald Reagan speech" (p. 240). The rates of speed are so high that "what passes now for oral persuasion in the typical debate has virtually no application at all in any other oral setting demanding persuasive skill" (Southworth, 1984, p. 56). Boaz (1984), who transcribed a number of the NDT final rounds, notes that, in general, "the rate of speaking is fastest when debaters are reading evidence and their reading of that evidence is frequently garbled to the point that only words or phrases of content are intelligible to anyone not familiar with the evidence" (p. 120). While most people would assume that public actors need to be able to communicate effectively with many people, Colbert (1991) concludes that academic debating is "the wrong forum for the development of speaking eloquence" (p. 92).

Many debate resolutions, particularly in NDT, invite students to argue the superiority of one policy over another. Naturally, debaters began to borrow the techniques of policy analysis used in technical arenas of governmental decision making in order to argue the superiority of their position over their opponent's (Corsi, 1986; Hollihan, Riley, & Baaske, 1985; Klumpp, 1987; Lichtman, 1986; Lichtman, Rohrer, & Hart, 1992; Prentice, 1992). Various models and methodologies used in policies analysis are also applied by debaters to predict future or hypothetical outcomes and create standards for deciding the impacts of various arguments. Corsi (1986) observes that "to the extent that debate mirrors the world of governmental analysis methods, we should not be surprised to find the methods which have taken precedence in that domain are adapted to the debate arena as well" (pp. 159-160). Goodnight (1981) illustrates how policy analysis reinforces the technical aspects of debate:

> The systems analysis or policy-making model is oriented toward improving the decisions of an educated elite who must govern a complex world. Consequently, debate as method is refocused from a common activity to an elite responsibility, from a broad attempt to define consensus to a specialized requirement for social actors operating within constraints from the discourse most appropriate to a public forum to specialized languages insulated within technical forms of decision-making. (pp. 417-418)

Hence, the popularity of the use of systems analysis in CEDA and NDT argumentation is further evidence that academic debate participants believe that their activity is a technical, not public, activity.

Academic debate also has numerous entry barriers that inhibit the participation of large numbers of students (Olson, 1985; Stepp, 1997). Rowland and Deatherage (1988) argue that practices such as incomprehensible speaking and lack of evidence

analysis create entry barriers for students and institutions that "discourage all but the most committed coaches and debaters from participation" (p. 247). Riley and Hollihan (1982) argue that communicating at high rates of speed requires students to undergo approximately three years of debate experience in order to compete on the national debate circuit. Those students without high school experience in debate "are often intimidated by peers who have had extensive forensics training at the high school level" (Ziegelmueller & Parson, 1984, p. 39). The consensus seems to be that the unusual conventions of academic debate often are overwhelming for beginning students and that without extensive high school preparation, students will be unsuccessful in on-topic, intercollegiate debate (Dempsey & Hartman, 1986; Griffin & Rader, 1992; Hollihan et al., 1987; Panetta, 1990). Hence, academic debate participants are not members of the public but rather a select few individuals who are able to make a significant commitment to an esoteric activity.

The result is "a model of debate which encourages policy debaters to emulate the behaviors of highly trained technically skilled public policy advocates" (Hollihan et al., 1987, p. 184). Polk (1995) argues that information processing is now "the primary thrust of the debate activity" (p. 122). Panetta (1990) notes that NDT "immerses participants in a highly technical language game which reflects the trend toward specialization in contemporary society" (p. 68). He concludes that "NDT debate benefits society by training people as experts . . ." (p. 73). Gass (1988) recommends that "academic debate serve as the training ground for students who will one day enter the professional ranks of society. . . " because "debaters should learn to argue before expert or professional audiences" (p. 84). Gass further observes that "even with all its limitations, academic debate succeeds admirably in training students to become expert advocates and decision-makers in professional fields" (p. 85). It trains them to analyze those issues in more detail and depth than any other educationally related activity. And it induces students to seek and use "objective" methods of decision making.

Trapp & Schuetz (1990) claim that technical communities are typified by arguers who "are insiders with specialized knowledge who have their own criteria for evaluating the strengths or weaknesses of the arguments they present" (p. 175). These arguers have a vocabulary, research procedures, and inferential standards that differ from other communities. These criteria certainly apply to CEDA and NDT participants. NDT and CEDA debaters are "insiders" who possess expert level topic knowledge, speak faster than most people are capable of critical listening, employ sophisticated analytical models, rely on extensive note taking to process information, and do all of this in front of specially trained judges. And of course, that debate is laden with technical jargon is truistic. Clearly, CEDA and NDT are designed to prepare students, who may initially be analogous to "the public," for a transformation into technocrats.

DEBATE AUDIENCES AND ARGUMENT SPHERES

Of course the technical practices that typify NDT and CEDA exist only because judges reward them. Judges facilitate the "need for speed" with a number of behaviors, most notably, flowing the debate. I suspect that the average person would expect public sphere interactants to maintain eye contact and make careful assessments of both verbal and nonverbal elements connoting credibility. Academic debaters frequently view eye contact as problematic. If debaters are watching judges, then they are probably not reading evidence as quickly as they would otherwise, and if judges are watching debaters, then they are not flowing. Cox and Jensen (1989) observe that a judge's ability to maintain a written, contemporaneous record of the multitude of arguments presented in a debate (flowing) is now "the benchmark" for determining the expertise of a judge. Herbeck and Katsulas (1988) contend that decisions reached by judges with poor flowing skills are incompetent.

It is also clear that CEDA and NDT are technical because participants insist on employing specially trained judges. Critics trained in argumentation and debate are the only judges perceived to be competent judges of debates (Biggers & Gotcher, 1984; Cox & Jensen, 1989; Friedman, 1972; Gass, 1988; Goodnight, 1981; Herbeck & Katsulas, 1988; Hollihan, 1991; Hollihan et al. 1987; Hollihan & Riley, 1987; Hollihan et al. 1985; Panetta, 1990; Polk, 1995; Riley & Hollihan, 1982). Biggers and Gotcher (1984) complain that judges who lack experience in debate, particularly CEDA debate, weaken the judging pool. Hollihan (1991) unhappily reports that the prevailing view held by CEDA and NDT participants is that "public audiences are too unsophisticated, uninterested, and biased to make good decisions, and that consequently only trained judges are capable of evaluating these contests" (p. 1237). The use of expert judges in debates has reached the point where individuals outside of the activity are essentially excluded from judging academic debates (Combs, 1993; Hollihan, 1991; Hollihan et al. 1987; Polk, 1995). Hence, academic debate participants perceive that they communicate in a technical activity. They, in fact, believe that members of the public are not capable of judging their activity.

As a final note, it must be pointed out that, of all interactants in academic debate, the judge is the crucial person determining in which sphere debaters will perceive themselves to be arguing in a debate round. Spheres are defined in large part by the perceptions of argument interactants, and one must give particularly strong consideration to the judge as an individual shaping the nature of a given debate. After all,

the judge, or audience, renders a decision about the speakers' performances and ultimately determines who wins the game. More importantly, the judge is the only academic debate participant who is capable of being an "outsider" to the activity, thus opening up the closed systems under which CEDA and NDT operate.

Rather than act like outsiders, judges are constrained by the social nature of NDT and CEDA. Miller (1988) argues that the "forensics community has become a 'closed system.' That is, the judging pool is not very diverse" (p. 77). An open system interacts with its environment, while in a closed system "the behavioral unit is isolated from its environment and consequently does not receive or exchange energy or information from outside its boundaries" (Harris & Smith, 1973, p. 356). Academic debate, considered from this perspective, is a closed system: "As an activity it appears to be divorced from interaction of information or energy from other aspects of its environment. In other words, as a closed system, the activity does not respond to feedback from its environment" (p. 356).

Since the tournament itself is a closed subsystem, guided only by the standards of the closed supersystem of academic debate, an insulated system is the result. Harris and Smith (1973) argue that tournaments are in the "unique situation" of being "a closed system within a closed system" (pp. 356-357). The result is an organizational orthodoxy, a "behavior pattern developed and reinforced by hundreds of supporting coaches and debaters" (p. 359).

Due to the prevalence of strike sheet, and the fact that the judging pool is composed primarily (if not exclusively) of judges who operate within the system, judges will conform to the conventions of the system or lose status in the activity and not be allowed to judge very often (Dempsey & Hartman, 1986; Hollihan et al., 1985; Miller, 1988; Rowland & Deatherage, 1988). Rowland & Deatherage (1988) note that judges who do not conform "are effectively excluded from the system" (p. 248). Harris & Smith (1973) argue that "those who object to the system are rejected from the system much like the human system rejects certain bacteria" (p. 359). Thus, NDT and CEDA are technical activities because their audiences are technical.

A psycho-social perspective demonstrates that NDT and CEDA are technical sphere activities that, if anything, are decidedly anti public. Willard (1997) says that academic debate "is an elite language game, aside from piano competitions and chess tournaments, the most unpopulist activity imaginable" (p. 130). Furthermore, the spherical location of debate activities is highly dependent on the debate judge. Given the closed nature of academic debate, and the current composition of judging pools, if one wishes to alter academic debate practices one should "concentrate on changing the nature of the audience instead of trying to change the way in which the existing audience processes information" (Herbeck & Katsulas, 1988, p. 240). Perelman and

Olbrechts-Tyteca's (1969) idea that "it is in terms of an audience that an argumentation develops," (p. 5) becomes particularly germane in academic debate.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEBATE

Applying a psycho-social perspective on argument spheres to academic debate activities makes it clear that NDT and CEDA debate participants are involved in technical sphere argumentation. Furthermore, judges possess an inordinate amount of influence in dictating the spherical nature of debate activities. The "power" of judges to render wins and losses in tournament competition cannot be overestimated. When early CEDA debates were adjudicated well-educated lay persons wise debaters adapted to the situation by employing argumentation techniques better suited for public sphere argumentation. As CEDA judging practices have evolved so has the nature of its argumentation practices. Hence, I conclude that the most significant factor in delineating public sphere debating is the use of judges who employ public sphere argumentation standards.

A psycho-social perspective on argument spheres therefore provides a foundation for clarifying the identities of academic debate organizations. Once these identities have been articulated clearly, one may then use this perspective to determine the extent to which an organization's practices are consistent with its principles.

ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY

A recent "Forum Section" in *Argumentation and Advocacy* offers an interesting profile of how the various intercollegiate debate organizations define themselves in terms of their organizational goals and purposes (McDonald, 1996). In discussing the National Debate Tournament, Madsen (1996) refers to three goals: opportunities for participation, a quality debate experience, and sound educational objectives. Entry barriers aside, what is missing from this statement is a sense of what is entailed by a quality debate experience and what constitutes sound educational objectives. In particular, there is no reference to judging practices in the essay. Consequently, the ambiguity with which NDT is described makes it vulnerable to the criticisms of members whose expectations are violated by their experiences in the activity. Those who believe that NDT is a public sphere activity lament; those who believe it is a technical sphere activity rejoice. Those who lament long enough, leave.

If NDT took seriously Goodnight's admonitions about the encroachment of the technical sphere into the public sphere, and wished to affirm a commitment to

invigorating public sphere argumentation, then the NDT community could utilize the debate spheres concept to clarify and enact an organizational identity consistent with that goal. Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley's (1987) idea of incorporating the narrative paradigm in academic debate, for example, attempts to retain public sphere qualities in NDT.

On the other hand, if NDT were to announce what many already believe, that it is a technical sphere activity, then it could use its spherical identity to develop a more thoughtful approach to technical argumentation. At the same time, potential participants who are interested in a public sphere activity would understand that NDT may not be for them before they invest time and money in an activity that will frustrate them. In other words, academic debate organizations can use their spherical identities to provide "labels" for consumers who wish to make good choices.

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY

I believe that NDT and CEDA are perceived as problematic, yet remain relatively indifferent to said criticism, because there is disagreement regarding their educational objectives. Until such a consensus is in place there can be no reasonable standpoint for critique of these activities and no standard by which to make dynamic and responsive changes.

A psycho-social perspective on debate provides a vantage point by which one can critique the internal consistency of debate activities. Specifically, it can help answer the question of whether actual debate practices foster the stated goals of the organization. One way to test this claim is to note how a psycho-social perspective would have interpreted the evolution of CEDA debate.

Simerly (1996), writing in the aforementioned "Forum" profile of debate organizations, provides an account of CEDA, the largest intercollegiate debate organization in this country. He casts CEDA as an organization that "represents our increasingly multicultural population and strives to prepare students for participation in the public sphere" (p. 84). He then notes fourteen goals that guide the activity. Interestingly, none of these goals mention the word "audience," make reference to judging, or indicate a relationship to or support for the notion of "participation in the public sphere." These omissions are telling, because they are indicative of the variance of CEDA's founding principles and current practices.

The failure of CEDA to achieve the objectives of Howe and other founders could have been predicted because the CEDA judging pool was composed of debate insiders. As one would expect from the previous analysis, attempting to reform debate from within the closed system of the judging pool is problematic (Ulrich, 1983; 1985).

Ulrich (1983) notes that "the growth of CEDA is partly in response to a perceived fail-ure of NDT judges to punish teams that debate using undesirable strategies" (p. 939). Nonetheless, just a few years later, CEDA judges routinely reward technical practices that violate public argumentation standards. Weiss (1998) notes that every recent CEDA organizational procedure and community norm rejects the "audience-oriented philosophy" (p. 333). Thus, CEDA is presently a technical sphere activity. If CEDA members decide that they wish to have a public sphere activity, or to be inclusive of the public sphere, then they must formulate and enact judging practices that are con-sistent with that goal. This could be accomplished, in large part, by requiring a mix-ture of technical and public judges.

A psycho-social perspective would also predict that the evolution of CEDA is a precursor to what could happen in parliamentary debate. Trapp (1996), while focus-ing on goals rather than mission, recognizes the relationship between what an activi-ty espouses and audience standards when he describes his view of the National Parliamentary Debate Association. He describes the goal of the NPDA as creating "parliamentary debating as a form of good public debating" (p. 85). Trapp then notes that the public nature of NPDA is its "most definitive" characteristic, saying that "argu-ment is aimed at a 'universal audience.' Rather than being accessible only to a tech-nical audience, parliamentary debate ought to be accessible to an informed and intel-ligent public" (p. 86). Trapp notes, however, that these ideas are his; the organization "has not formalized a statement of goals" (p. 85). Furthermore, Trapp relies on judges from within the NPDA system to "act" like the public. A more appropriate stance would be to insist on public sphere judges. The danger to public activities of closed judging pools, even if well-intended persons currently populate those pools, should be clear.

Expert parliamentary debate judges would be a natural consequence of an unreg-ulated, ongoing activity. As NPDA matures, it will develop a following. The tempta-tion for tournament directors would be to use the trained and available bodies who fol-low the activity as judges. Unless tournaments were required to use non debate-cir-cuit judges, there would be a natural tendency to use the judges "who show up" rather than recruit and train new and inexperienced judges. For these reasons, parliamen-tary debate easily could evolve into an activity that uses public "experts" as judges. The organizational system would be closed because these experts, who would consist of former debaters and current students who migrate from tournament to tourna-ment, would comprise the audience for the activity. They would not necessarily appre-ciate the communication practices of CEDA and NDT debaters, but they surely would have expectations of "what debate should be" that could galvanize the assumptions of the activity without considering the need to gain proficiency in debating to the broad-

er public.

This phenomenon is already evident in American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA) competitions. Tournament invitations proclaim that they offer "trained" judges as inducements to participation. Trained judges are usually defined as judges who have participated in the activity as debaters or who have some experience judging at tournaments. They are gaining importance in parliamentary tournaments because trained judges offer debaters a more consistent and homogeneous pool of audiences. While trained judges might be perceived by some as more "fair" or "consistent" they do so at the expense of the diversity that typifies the public sphere.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Defining the nature of academic debate organizations provides a clearer rationale for institutional program support. Some CEDA and NDT programs disingenuously ask for university funding, because they are training debaters for the public sphere, while their coaches cringe at the idea of a dean or university president attending a debate tournament. By employing the debate spheres concept, debate program administrators should be able to develop clearer and more consistent rationales for institutional support of their programs. Debate spheres also enable a strong rationale for locating debate programs in communication departments. If, for example, the NDT community endorsed the technical sphere concept it could be an outstanding laboratory for the study of technical sphere argumentation. Acknowledging the technical nature of NDT might also pave the way for further innovation. Several critics have suggested that NDT make greater use of computers (Corsi, 1986; Steinfatt; 1990). Corsi (1986) argues that computer-mediated debates would allow debaters to focus on high quality argumentation and process large amounts of information without the requirement of making the information comprehensible to listeners via the spoken word. In fact, the activity could link various on-campus departments with a social scientific slant on information processing. If NDT were conducted by computer, universities might be able to develop their own software programs designed to process information quickly and effectively. Such a program at the university level could have tremendous benefits for students and society-at-large. Finally, if debate were conducted by computers, it would provide an interesting laboratory for the study of mediated communication.

CONCLUSION

This analysis demonstrates that the psycho-social perspective can profitably be

extended to academic debate. A psycho-social analysis of argument spheres could also generate significant insights for other argumentation studies. The idea that spheres are defined in part by the perceptions and behaviors of individuals accommodates the idea that spheres may change, not only as social groundings move, but also as dynamically as when perceptions shift. When one thinks of spheres as inhabited by individuals interacting with one another, then the public sphere can be entered by anyone who perceives her/himself to be engaged in a public sphere activity. No topics or perspectives enjoy prior status, except as the sphere's inhabitants confer it. By acknowledging that people confer argumentative authority one empowers audiences.

Thus, if Goodnight is correct, and decision groundings once public are becoming technical, then part of the responsibility for this rests on the shoulders of people who accept this state of affairs (Brashers & Jackson, 1991; Peters, 1989; Taylor, 1991). Elite rule, media manipulation, and the veneration of technical expertise require complicity. Our fragile democracy still rests in part with the people because of sheer numbers. If politics is numbing and dumbing it is because the people who constitute "the public" accept their plight. The public sphere can only be usurped when people stop demanding a voice, not when groundings shift. The public can demand different groundings. Defining spheres psycho-socially may, in fact, strengthen Goodnight's position by suggesting a pragmatic agenda for invigorating the public sphere.

Finally, this analysis does not presuppose that academic debate "should" be a particular thing. Debate educators must decide for themselves their organizational structures, educational objectives, and tournament practices. What this analysis does show is that debate organizations will be of greater service to others if they develop clear and well-known identities. Furthermore, these identities should be grounded in debate spheres. Identifying debate activities in relation to these spheres provides touchstones for developing sound debate organizations, promoting consistency between principles and practices, and connecting debate activities to academic curricula.

REFERENCES

Aufderheide, P. (1991). Public television and the public sphere. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *8*, 168-183.

Balthrop, V. W. (1984). Culture, myth, and ideology as public argument: An interpretation of the ascent and demise of "southern culture." *Communication Monographs*, *51*, 339-352.

Biggers, T., & Gotcher, M. (1984). On consideration of judging in CEDA debate tournaments—A modest proposal. *CEDA Yearbook*, *5*, 80-83.

Bitzer, L. (1987). Rhetorical public communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *4*, 425-428.

Boaz, J. K. (1984). A footnote to William Southworth's critique of the final round of the 1984 National Debate Tournament. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *21*, 119-122.

Brashers, D. E., & Jackson, S. (1991). In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *Argument in controversy* (pp. 284-288). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Cirlin, A. (1997). A sociological approach to improving style in academic debate. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, *2*, 170-201.

Colbert, K. R. (1991). A study of CEDA and NDT finalists speaking rates. *CEDA Yearbook, 12*, 88-94.

Combs, S. C. (1993). The parallel crises in democracy and debate. In R. E. McKerrow (Ed.) *Argument and the postmodern challenge* (pp. 43-49). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Corsi, J. R. (1986). The continuing evolution of policy systems debate: An assessment and a look ahead. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *22*, 158-163.

Cox, E. S., & Jensen, S. L. (1989). Redeeming part of debate's education mission via public formats. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument* (pp. 440-445). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Dempsey, R. H., & Hartmann, D. J. (1986). Emergent voting criteria and judicial impotence of critics. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *22*, 167-175.

Erikson, E. H. (1950/1963). *Childhood and society.* New York: Norton.

Foss, K. A., & Foss, S. K. (1991). *Women speak: The eloquence of women's lives.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Fraser, N. (1993). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.). *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 56-80). Cambridge: MIT.

Friedman, R. P. (1972). Reflections of an incompetent judge. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *8*, 123-126.

Gass, R. H., Jr. (1988). The narrative perspective in academic debate: A critique. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *25*, 78-92.

Goodnight, G. T. (1981). The re-union of argumentation and debate theory. In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Dimensions of argument* (pp. 415-432). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Goodnight, G. T. (1982). The personal, technical, and public spheres of argument: A speculative inquiry into the art of public deliberation. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *18*, 214-227.

Goodnight, G. T. (1987). Public discourse. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *4*, 428-432.

Goodnight, G. T. (1989). Toward a social theory of argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *26*, 60-70.

Goodnight, G. T. (1990). The rhetorical tradition, modern communication, and the grounds of justified assent. In D. C. Williams & M. D. Hazen (Eds.), *Argumentation theory and the rhetoric of assent* (pp. 173-195). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Goodnight, G. T. (1992). *Populist and progressive movements: The dialectics of identity and the modes of social invention for a democratic public sphere.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Griffin, C. L. (1996). The essentialist roots of the public sphere: A feminist critique. *Western Journal of Communication*, *60*, 21-39.

Griffin, J. C., & Raider, H. J. (1992). Women in high school debate. In D. A. Thomas & J. P Hart (Eds.), *Advanced debate: Readings in theory, practice and teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 8-14). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Harris, T. E., & Smith, R. M. (1973). A systems analysis of the current debate controversy. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *9*, 355-360.

Harrison, F. (1995). The NDT at fifty: An intergenerational perspective. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Argumentation and values* (pp. 114-118). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Hauser, G. A. (1987). Features of the public sphere. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *4*, 437-441.

Herbeck, D. A., & Katsulas, J. P. (1988). Rules on the substance of debate: A critique of the charter of the National Debate Tournament. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *24*, 233-245.

Hicks, D. (1998). Public debate and the ideal of public reason. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, *2*, 350-363.

Hollihan, T. A. (1991). Academic debate and American political democracy. In F. H. Van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation* (pp. 1233-1239). Amsterdam, Netherlands: International Centre for the Study of Argumentation.

Hollihan, T. A., Baaske, K. T., & Riley, P. (1987). Debaters as storytellers: The narrative perspective in academic debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *23*, 184-193.

Hollihan, T. A., & Riley, P. (1987). Academic debate and democracy: A clash of ideology. In J. W. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices* (pp. 399-404). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Hollihan, T. A., Riley, P., & Austin, C. C. (1983). A content analysis of selected CEDA and NDT judges' ballots. In D. Zarefsky, M. Sillars & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Argument in transition* (pp. 871-882). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Hollihan, T. A., Riley, P., & Baaske, K. T. (1985). The art of storytelling: An argument for a narrative perspective in academic debate. In J. R. Cox, M. O. Sillars, & G. B. Walker (Eds.), *Argument and social practice* (pp. 807-826). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication

Association.

Horn, G., & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: An unfilled promise? In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings* (pp. 37-74). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Howe, J. (1981). CEDA's objectives: Lest we forget. *CEDA Yearbook, 2*, 1-3.

Howe, J. (1992). Coaches corner. *The Forensic, 78*, 15.

Ingalls, Z. (1985, May 8). Resolved, that competition in college debate is as fierce as in a basketball playoff. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 13-14.

Klumpp, J. F. (1987). Beyond the social engineering paradigm: Public policy decision-making fifteen years later. In J. W. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices* (pp. 395-398). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Klumpp, J. F. (1997). On behalf of his time: Moving beyond the Willardian project on the public sphere. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33*, 147-159.

Lichtman, A. J. (1986). Competing models of the debate process. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 147-151.

Lichtman, A. J., Rohrer, D. M., & Hart, J. P. (1992). Policy systems revisited. In D. A. Thomas & J. P Hart (Eds.), *Advanced debate: Readings in theory, practice and teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 278-288). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Madsen, A. (1996). The National Debate Tournament. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33*, 88-90.

McDonald, K. M. (1996). Introduction. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33,* 81-83.

McGee, B. R. (1998). Which audience? Problems and prospects for public debate. *The Southern Journal of Forensics, 2*, 315-325.

Miller, G. R. (1988). The forensic critic as an "ideologue- critic": An argument for ideology as a new paradigm for academic debate. *CEDA Yearbook, 9,* 71-80.

Newman, B. M., & Newman, P. R. (1991). *Development through life: A psychosocial approach* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Nobles, W. S. (1993). Assessing CEDA: Achievements and challenges. In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings* (pp. 5-9). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Olson, C. D. (1985). Teaching the argumentation course from a multifaceted perspective. In J. R. Cox, M. O. Sillars, & G. B. Walker (Eds.), *Argument and social practice* (pp. 874-882). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Panetta, E. M. (1990). A rationale for developing a nationally competitive national debate tournament oriented program. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 27*, 68-77.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argument*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Peters, T. N. (1989). On the natural development of public activity: a critique of Goodnight's

theory of argument. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Phillips, K. R. (1996). The spaces of public dissension: Reconsidering the public sphere. *Communication Monographs*, *63*, 231-248.

Polk, L. R. (1995). The NDT and information processing: The decay of dialogue. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Argumentation and values* (pp. 122-124). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Prentice, D. (1992). Value analysis in Lincoln-Douglas debate. In D. A. Thomas & J. P Hart (Eds.), *Advanced debate: Readings in theory, practice and teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 87-93). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Riley, P., & Hollihan, T. A. (1982). *Paradigms as eristic: A changed element in intercollegiate debate*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Rowland, R. C., & Deatherage, S. (1988). The crisis in policy debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *24*, 246-250.

Rowland, R. C., Voth, B., & Bossman, J. (1991). Technical argument in the public sphere: What academic debate tells us about the interaction of spheres of argument. In D. W. Parson (Ed..), *Argument in controversy* (pp. 446-451). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Simerly, G. (1996). Speak a new world! The Cross Examination Debate Association. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *33*, 83-85.

Southworth, W. (1984). Fourth judge critique. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *21*, 53-56.

Steinfatt, T. M. (1990). College debate a quarter century later. *CEDA Yearbook*, *11*, 66-71.

Stepp, P. (1997). Can we make intercollegiate debate more diverse? *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *33*, 176-191.

Taylor, C. A. (1991). On the public closure of technical controversy. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *Argument in controversy* (pp. 263-269). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Trapp, R. (1996). Parliamentary debate as public debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *33*, 85-87.

Trapp, R., & Schuetz, J. (Eds.) (1990). *Perspectives on argumentation: Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Ulrich, W. (1983). The influence of the judge on the debate round. In D. Zarefsky, M. Sillars & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Argument in transition* (pp. 938-950). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Ulrich, W. (1985). Eliminating the abuses of CEDA debate: The debate judge as referee. *CEDA Yearbook*, 6, 39-42.(1989).

Underberg, L. (1996). The National Education Debate Association. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *33*, 96-98.

Weiss, R. O. (1998). "The audience standard": Twelve years later. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, *2*, 331-338.

Willard, C. A. (1989). *A theory of argumentation*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Willard, C. A. (1997). McWorld and the tweed jihad. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *33*, 122-134.

Ziegelmueller, G. W. (1990). Policy debate: A retrospective and prospective view. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *27*, 26-31.

Ziegelmueller, G. (1995). Mirrors: NDT and the communication discipline. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Argumentation and values* (pp. 125-127). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Ziegelmueller, G. (1996). The NDT through a half century of argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *32*, 143-151.

Ziegelmueller, G., & Parson, D. W. (1984). Forensic directors as professional educators. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *American forensics in perspective* (pp. 37-40). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE DEBATE
as Business Communication
Training in Japan

Takeshi Suzuki and Shigeru Matsumoto

This essay reviews the history of debate education in Japan and presents a new course design for English-debate training programs for Japanese businesspeople. English-language debate seminars provide Japanese seminar participants with unique opportunities to learn reasoned decision-making and international negotiation skills.

Much has been argued and published about the transferability of academic debate skills to real-life situations.[1] No one doubts that forensic experiences have helped prepare thousands of American students to become businesspeople, politicians, lawyers, and college professors. On the other hand, very little has been written on the application of debate theories to business contexts, not to mention their application to communication training for Japanese businesspeople. The authors' experience as instructors in business communication training has convinced them that debate theories, if taught properly, are useful tools to help Japanese businesspeople improve their business communication and management competence.[2]

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is threefold: (1) to review the history of English debate education in Japan from the 1950's to the 1990's; (2) to discuss the relationship between academic debate and real-world decision making; and (3) to present a course design for debate training programs for Japanese businesspeople. In the end, the authors hope to illustrate that a unique foreign-language debate format has provided and will continue to provide an effective communication training experience for the Japanese people in the age of information explosion and internationalization.

A HISTORY OF DEBATE EDUCATION IN JAPAN[3]
The Dawn of English Debate Activities in Japan

Very few Japanese scholars of speech communication had written about Japan's forensic activities prior to the 1980's. To analyze the early development of Japan's English

debate education, the authors will primarily refer to and cite comments made by coaches and debaters who participated in the Japan-U.S. Exchange Tour. There are two reasons for this approach. First, the Tour Reports have consistently provided observations about the state of debate in Japan, American teams have been visiting Japan almost every two years since 1976. The Tour Reports have been published to provide observations and generalizations concerning Japanese debate and the Exchange Program between the Committee on International Discussion and Debate (CIDD); the Japan English Forensic Association (JEFA)[4]; and, most recently, the Japan Debate Association (JDA). In addition, the Reports have been written by American experts in forensics. Most Reports presented a general overview of debate in Japan, descriptions of thedebates in which the U.S. teams participated, and recommendations to CIDD and JEFA (or JDA). Since all the American coaches participating in the tour have been prestigious debate coaches as well as professors of speech communication in the United States, an insightful analysis may be generated by considering their reviews and suggestions.

To begin with, it is well known that debate was introduced into Japan by Yukichi Fukuzawa, the founder of Keio University in Tokyo.[5] In the Meiji era (1868-1912) Japan began to modernize itself by transplanting various Western institutions, such as the formal education system, the judicial system, and, above all, the parliamentary system. In order to run this new political system effectively, there was a pressing need to train politicians who would be good at public speaking and discussion in Japan. In 1873 Fukuzawa, therefore, organized Mita Enzetsukai (Mita Oratory Association) where the first training programs in Japanese language debate and speech were provided based upon Western rhetorical principles and rules of parliamentary procedure.[6]

Unfortunately, Japanese-language speech survived, but Japanese-language debate failed until the 1990's debate boom in Japan. (There had been the exception of the Japanese debate tournament sponsored by Mizuno Foundation in the 1980's.) Nobody is certain why Japanese-language debate once died out. Some people suspect that Japanese people are harmony-loving; and hence, do not relate to verbal confrontation. For instance, Edwin O. Reischauer, the U.S. ambassador to Japan of the Kennedy administration, comments that the key Japanese value is harmony, which many Japanese seek to achieve by a subtle process of mutual understanding rather than by sharp analysis of conflicting views or clear-cut decisions by one-person dictates or majority-vote. Others say that a debate in Japanese would be virtually impossible because of the very polite nature of the Japanese language.[7]

Although Japanese-language debate once died out, English-language debating began to grow in the early 1950's. The first United States debate team (from the University of Hawaii) visited Japan in 1928. Following the Second World War the

first Intercollegiate English-language Debating Contest was held in Tokyo in 1950.[8]   Since then the number of English-language debating tournaments has been steadily increasing in Japan. As Takehide Kawashima and Wayne H. Oxford note, these debating tournaments as well as other types of forensic contests have been playing an important role in terms of providing oral English communication training for Japanese undergraduates.[9]

Owing to the fact that traditional English education has been centered upon literature and linguistics at the expense of oral communication, Japanese college students who desired to learn communicative English participated in the activities of extracurricular organizations known as English Speaking Societies (ESS's).[10] These organizations are almost entirely run by students, and a large number of students in Japan today engage in the study of forensics through the activities of ESS's.

The majority of ESS's have four "sections" in which the students choose to study one of their areas of interests: namely, Debate, Discussion, Drama, and Speech. The Debate Section carries out debating activities, such as participating in the intercollegiate tournaments. The Discussion Section holds formal discussions in small groups on topics of current interest. The Drama Section often puts on several plays each year. The members of the Speech Section participate in intercollegiate contests held by other ESS's throughout the year. Some clubs also have other sections: Newspaper, Pronunciation, Oral Interpretation, Guide Service, etc. There is no doubt that the Debate Section was one of the most active sections in most ESS's. As Donald W. Klopf notes, "Almost 10,000 Japanese university students study debate each year and most of them actually participate in debate matches. Next to the United States of America, Japan has the largest amount of debating in the world—and almost all of it is in the English language."[11]

In the past, many American scholars continued to wonder why Japanese students wanted to debate in a foreign language instead of their native language. However, the authors can see the growth of Japanese debate programs in the 1990's. There has been much discussion on the particular significance of learning how to debate in English for the Japanese students. Many experts seem to agree that there are three major benefits unique to the participation in English debate. First, debate is an effective means of improving the students' English speaking capabilities, as opposed to the traditional methods of teaching English. Satoshi Ishii and Donald W. Klopf attribute the popularity of the extracurricular forensic programs in Japan to inadequate English education provided in classroom when they state:

"The expansion [of the extracurricular forensic programs] appears to be caused by the increasing interest in learning English as a second language and by a failure of the Japanese education system to provide ade-

quate oral English training in the normal English-language classroom.
Training in the classroom is concentrated on grammar and literature at
the expense of speech." [12]

Thus, this is the major reason why extracurricular debate has become popular among
Japanese undergraduates. Inadequate English instruction at Japanese schools strongly
motivated these students to participate in communication-oriented English programs.

Carl Becker further explains why debate is especially suited to the study of a for-
eign language when he is quoted by Ronald J. Matlon:

> "First and foremost, because [debate] is a living language, not planned
> repetition. It is more like real conversation than a memorized speech or
> drama. The debater must listen, think, respond, present new ideas.
> ...Better than most English conversation classes, debate has deep subject
> matter as well. But debate is not only speaking. Debate combines all the
> important language skills: reading, writing, thinking, hearing, speaking.
> ...Thirdly, debate is good language study because it is coached and
> judged. The judging is not on pronunciation and intonation, but on the
> ideas and the effectiveness of communication ...Fourth, debate teaches
> confidence, assertiveness, much needed by Japanese. ...Debate forces
> one to speak. In the beginning this may be scary. In the end, it is fun.
> Debate gives us the courage to speak whatever we wish. Debate gives us
> practice in making our words respected and persuasive." [13]

In addition to this aspect of language learning, debate offers an opportunity for
Japanese students to discover Western ways of communication. It is often said that
whereas Japanese are taught the art of sasshi, or intuitive guessing,[14] Westerners are
taught the art of dichotomy, or logic. In the West this art is known as debate, and until
recently the Japanese have not studied this form of communication. Mitsugu Iwashita
and Yo Konno maintain that learning debate is one of the shortest ways to acquire the
logical methods of decision making: "The paramount goal of academic debate is to
train the student in the tools of argumentation, to train him[/her] how to construct
logical arguments, and to detect weakness of lapses from logical standards in the
argumentation of others.[15] Therefore, debate can be viewed as an attractive tool for
Japanese students to learn Western ways of communication. As Ronald J. Matlon
summarizes their incentive, "Japanese college students participate in debate as a way
of learning Western thought, language, and behavior so that they can advance both
themselves and their country in the years ahead."[16]

Finally, debate offers Japanese students an opportunity to argue about social, polit-

ical, and economic problems in English. As mentioned already, since English education in Japan's universities has been focused upon literature or linguistics, the Japanese students can scarcely find a better means to learn and improve their command of English than through an academic competition on contemporary issues. Iwashita and Konno explain: "[Debate] motivates the students to learn much about current social, political, and economic problems, which in turn leads to better reading habits. It provides healthy competition and helps cultivate a sense of fair play. It affords the students an opportunity to travel and meet interesting people.[17] Thus, Japanese undergraduates are attracted by this academic intellectual competition, which otherwise cannot be experienced through their normal academic curricula. The goal of Japanese debaters, in short, is to gain an all-around ability in English to communicate freely with the rest of the world, as well as to acquire knowledge on current issues in the present internationalized society. As Robert Meadow observes, "The value of debate in Japan simply cannot be calculated, but I feel that debate in Japan may be more educational than in the United States."[18] Obviously, academic debate in Japan has played and will continue to play a variety of invaluable pedagogical roles.

However, the debaters in ESS's usually have had little faculty supervision, although debate has the above-mentioned unique advantages. As John P. Davidson notes, "Debate coaches, in the sense that we know in the United States as faculty advisors, are the exception rather than the rule in Japan."19 As a consequence, the ESS members virtually learn how to debate, how to conduct research and how to construct arguments in English without any faculty guidance. Daniel Bassesen extends Davidson's comment and argues:

> "Unfortunately [for the progress of individual students and Japanese debate in general] there seems to be a chronic lack of interest on the part of many faculty members in ESS club activities. The students in these groups work very hard, often leading themselves from year to year. It is unfortunate that the faculty members do not take a more active role advising this exciting group of students. I hope the next few years will see more 'coaching' by these educators or even foreigners in Japan." [20]

Quite often, the students in ESS's were instructed and judged by older-class students or alumni members with limited experience in English-language debate. The students also had to sponsor tournaments and manage the budget of Debate Sections. Despite their extraordinary efforts, the students received neither debate scholarships nor academic credits from their colleges.[21] Clearly, the lack of debate practicum placed constraints upon the development of debate in Japan.

In the final analysis, there was a consensus among American communication

scholars that Japanese college students in ESS's needed to be coached by faculty members with professional knowledge and experience in this academic discipline. Since forensics was proven to be an effective and essential training for those students, it was natural to assume that the curriculum should be the place where forensic training was provided. Matlon supports:

> "What is needed is to have speech communication recognized as an important and much-needed academic discipline in Japanese education. What is also needed is to have the Japanese not become so oriented in traditions concerning their approach to education, for preserving a custom just because it is a custom serves as an unfortunate barrier to educational progress. When all these things begin to happen, the study of argument and debate can be an even more beneficial experience for college students in Japan." [22]

JAPANESE ENGLISH DEBATE IN THE MID-1980'S AND AFTERWARD

However, actual procedures and techniques in academic debate should be adapted to suit each social and educational context of the participants. Actually, the highly sophisticated American strategies that were introduced into debate practices in Japan caused some serious drawbacks. American debate coaches warned that Japanese students might be emulating American practices to the detriment of English-language debate in Japan. Larry S. Richardson argues:

> " ...speakers speak rapidly in the U.S. because; a) time is strictly limited and, thus becomes a factor in strategy, b) audiences are seldom present in tournament debate, c) effective delivery is not a priority variable in many judges' hierarchy of criteria, d) debaters are loading up the round with many arguments in an effort to see opponents fail to answer everything put forward, and e) debaters are using their own native language (emphasis added). My concern is that Japanese debaters are using U.S. form in their own debating, and thus, applying certain techniques out of their context. I would point out that audiences are much more important in Japanese debate. I would also point out that Japanese debaters who use debate as a method for learning English are at disadvantage when the speech speed is at a rate which is difficult to comprehend. And, speed is only one area of "U.S. form" which needs to be considered in terms of context and appropriate application to Japanese debate." [23]

Not only do the authors strongly agree with Richardson, but they feel that the Japanese debate community needs much more discussion on such questions as what the students debate for, or why they debate in English. Therefore, Catherine H. Palczewski concludes that "it would be wise for Japanese debaters to forego the use of 'the spread' and rely more on normal rates of delivery. In fact, calling for a slowing of presentation speed would further develop language skills because it would call for economical word choice."[24]

At the same time, as happened in the United States in the 1970's, the change in the function which resolutions served in debate contributed to the shift, in Japan as well, from the use of evidence cards to that of brief sheets in the 1980's. The function of resolutions is no longer to state the policy to be considered, but merely to set the boundaries for dispute.[25] Consequently, the affirmative no longer defends the entire resolution, but instead defends one particular plan as an example supporting it. The change in the nature of debate resolutions seems to be based on the recognition that "broad" topics are more beneficial than "narrow" topics for the participants. Dale Herbeck and John P. Katsulas explain:

> "Broad topics allow the affirmative flexibility in selecting a case. Such topics encourage the affirmative to investigate the entire problem area. Further, broad topics prevent stagnation. If debate was held on the same few cases round after round, all participants would lose interest. Debaters would degenerate into mindless and repetitive brief reading contests." [26]

Thus, the people concerned reached a conclusion that broad interpretation of resolutions—as providing only an area from which topic cases are chosen—offers a pragmatic benefit to the debate community as an escape from the boredom that debating a few cases over and over can lead to.

Unfortunately, although the Japanese debate community decided to use broad topics (or broad interpretation of resolutions), its debaters have not necessarily made the best use of them.[27] While broad topics have encouraged American debaters to engage in flexible interpretation of the topics, they have led Japanese debaters in the opposite direction. Broad topics with limited debating experience discouraged the Japanese debaters from carrying out in-depth research of resolutions. In fact, limited student experience has placed constraints upon the development of debate in Japan. Michael D. Hazen comments:

> "Japanese debate is hindered in developing a large pool of experienced debaters by several structural factors. On the whole, it is a collegiate

activity in Japan (even though there [are] a few high school programs). In addition there is a long standing tradition that Japanese debaters do not debate their senior year because they "need to prepare for finding a job," and freshmen usually do not get to debate much because of their inexperience. So the effective debate of most Japanese debaters is limited to two years which hinders the overall quality of Japanese debate." [28]

As a result of both "Americanization" and the adoption of broad topics, English debate programs in Japan underwent a very difficult period in the late 1980's. While the debaters' understanding and handling of issues such as topicality, counterplans, and generic disadvantages did improve significantly, they struggled to cope with the spread strategy, rapid delivery, and theoretical arguments.

In fact, the change in debating style produced pluses and minuses whose balances are quite difficult to calculate. Whereas more and more Japanese students were motivated to go to American graduate schools majoring in speech communication, most junior colleges decided to withdraw from the debating activities. Also, while Japanese debaters tried to study and contemplate theoretical issues in academic debate, the spread delivery encouraged them to read more briefs and present more arguments at the expense of explanation and the development of public-speaking skills. Although the student debaters have learned to understand standard theoretical arguments, the Japanese debate community still needs to solve the problem of a lack of faculty supervision and to promote high-school debate programs.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC DEBATE AND REAL WORLD DECISION-MAKING

From the early 1980's to the early 1990's, the practice of academic debate was the subject of a number of harsh criticisms in both the United States and Japan. As explained previously, some argued that debate propositions were interpreted so broadly that they must have been responsible for decreasing participation, and for the frustrating proliferation of "squirrel" cases. In Japan, so-called "spread" cases were rampant; such strategies as "hypothetical counterplans," "counter-warrants" and ill-considered "topicality" arguments were often employed.

This kind of practice in debate tournaments is not all bad. As V. William Balthrop argues, debate is a pedagogical laboratory or game simulation designed to teach students an understanding of argument and to provide an opportunity for developing skills in argument use.[29] The goal of this activity is, therefore, not merely to focus upon real-world decision-making, but to learn and develop theories of argumentation.[30]

Unfortunately, many of the students competing in the tournaments were not carrying out in-depth analyses of the topic and were increasingly employing prepared generic arguments. Others pointed out that judges were required to adapt to debaters, instead of requiring debaters to adapt to judges, at the cost of promoting clear public presentation skills.[31] While real-world argumentative skills require comprehensibility, explanation, analysis of evidence quality, and comparison of the relative merits of the positions in a debate, too often zeal for winning debates encourages incomprehensibility, poor evidence analysis and comparison, as well as a lack of argument explanation.[32]

In this regard, the authors have taken extra care not to let such ineffective practices in academic debate interfere with debate training for businesspeople. They also believe that, when we introduce debate to in-company training programs of Japanese companies, the authors have to make it clear what kind of skills can be fostered and what kind of skills cannot be acquired easily through debate training.

However, most members of the Japanese business community do not have the luxury of attending many different seminars in speech communication skills due to a lack of time and financial support. Therefore, it is often the case that the personnel in charge of the program ask instructors to make the debate training as realistic as possible so that the participants take the skills acquired back home and use them for tomorrow's business meetings and negotiations, thereby enabling them to reach better decisions.

APPLICATION OF DEBATE TO BUSINESS CONTEXTS

In order to conduct successful debate seminars for Japanese businesspeople, the authors believe that a number of debate concepts should be formulated for presentation in this context. The concepts would help seminar participants understand how debate as a means of decision making can function in real-world situations and demonstrate the broader relevance of debate theory and practice outside the ESS's.

First, the concept of "affirmative and negative" should be replaced by that of "initiator and examiner," since the purpose of debate, in business contexts, does not appear to be whether to adopt or negate a specific resolution but to choose the best possible option/plan in a given situation. By initiator, the authors mean a person who advocates a proposal to attain future desired outcomes. If the initiator is a manager or executive, he/she may offer a plan for each autonomous division, branch office, or the overall company. If an initiator is a salesperson, he/she may present a strategy to do business with new dealers, compete with other franchise-chain shops, or increase the company's market share in an area. Similarly, by examiner, it means a person who examines a given proposal by presenting counter-analyses, plan-meet-advantage argu-

ments, disadvantages, and counterplans.

This "examiner concept" requires particular attention, since, in real-world business contexts, the boss of the initiator is supposed to play this role. It should be noted that more and more Japanese businesspeople are beginning to complain about their bosses who "supervise" their subordinates, not by providing constructive criticism, but merely by finding fault. In this sense, the examiner concept in debate will help the Japanese get used to the practice of examining others' ideas and evidence without paying too much attention to age or rank of the speaker, which are believed to be important factors in interpersonal communication. To the extent that good ideas may come from junior employees with relatively little experience, debate training may encourage a favorable reception for any good idea, independent of its source.

Second, a debate can take place in either non-resolutional situations or particular-resolutional situations. In other words, when one side initiated a debate, its proposal becomes a proposition to be considered in a later debate. Initiators can propose a more effective plan to achieve a goal that has already been agreed to within the organization. The point is that there must be a proposal, or policy system, to be compared with alternatives so that it can provide the participants with an opportunity to research a certain topic, construct a case, and compare two competing policy systems. By "two competing policy systems," the authors mean that, although the negative/examiner can take theoretically inconsistent positions and present conditional arguments, he/she cannot take substantially inconsistent positions by presenting conflicting analyses. This consideration is essential to make a comparison of competing policy systems closer to real-world decision making.

Finally, there should be no distinction between non-topical and topical counterplans, since the goal of the debate is to compare competing policies and find the best possible alternative to the present system. Specifically, as Rowland summarized, resolutional advocacy is of limited utility in such an activity that strives for realism and debatability.[33] In fact, once an initiator has selected a particular policy system to advocate there is no further need for an assessment of the proposition's general validity. When an examiner advocates a topical counterplan, the quality of policy comparison can in many instances be enhanced by analyzing alternative causalities.

A SAMPLE TWO-DAY INTRODUCTORY DEBATE SEMINAR

In order to assure the effectiveness of the Introductory English Debate Seminar for Japanese businesspeople, instructors should take the following teaching guidelines into consideration:

    1. Instructors of the seminar, if possible, should also use Japanese when

the level of the participants' English does not appear to be high enough to understand the English explanation of debate theories. In this way, all Japanese participants will be able to grasp the important concepts of debate more easily, regardless of their facility with English.

2. Instructors should offer many oral exercises in English. After receiving the debate training, trainees will engage in a series of business communication activities in English, including negotiations with people from different cultures. Since many Japanese businesspeople have few opportunities to use English in their daily routine at work, trainees should undertake sufficient oral practice in debating to prepare effectively for these future encounters.

3. Instructors should also assign written exercises. Since some of the debate theories are not easy for the Japanese participants to understand at first, instructors should provide them with a wide variety of written exercises. Instructors should organize these exercises in such a way that trainees can learn important concepts step by step.

The following are examples that could be used when teaching the concept of the Toulmin Model and Systems Analysis:

[Q] Fill in the statements for parts of argument:

CLAIM	DATA
1. The price of fruit will increase soon	Fruit pickers recently received a substantial wage increase.
WARRANT:	
2. We do not want to breath polluted air.	Gasoline powered automobiles pollute the air, electrically powered automobiles do not.
WARRANT:	

[Q] Write a label for each part:

Japanese auto plants are harmful to the Big 3.

A. Observation: [   ]
U.S. capacity next year will exceed demand by 2.7 million vehicles—and
the surplus could rise above 3 million

B. Uniqueness: [   ]
Ignoring the current sales slump, the Japanese plan to boost U.S. pro-
duction 41% in the fourth quarter, even as General Motors, Ford, and
Chrysler cut their output by 18%.

C. Impact: [   ]
Indeed, in the first half of this year, Japanese-transplants built 14.7% of
the passenger cars produced in the U.S., up from 8.9% only two years
ago.

The following is a sample two-day introductory debate seminar for a class of 4 to 16
people. This two-day course is the most common way a debate seminar is conducted.

FIRST DAY

Orientation:
-Explanation of the seminar
-Goal setting: The participants set goals they want to achieve in this seminar.

-Self-introduction:
    The participants introduce themselves. They explain, among other things, the
reasons why they have decided to attend this seminar, their overseas experience, and
their present jobs. (This enables the instructor to become aware of the trainees' level
of motivation and English.)

Brainstorming on "What is Debate?":
-The participants exchange their images of and knowledge about debate.

Lecture on "What is Debate?":
-The instructor defines "debate."
-The instructor explains the values and "limits" of debate training.

Demonstration Debate:

-The participants watch a video of a demonstration debate. (Since most participants have not seen a debate, it is important to have them watch a demonstration at an early stage of training.)

Lecture and Exercises on Formal and Informal Logic:

-The instructor explains "deduction" and "induction" as important elements of logic.

-The instructor explains the Toulmin Model.

-The participants work on various written exercises on logic.

Lecture and Exercise on Propositions:

-The instructor explains the types of propositions.

-The instructor explains the important elements of propositions.

-The participants write propositions and compare them with other participants'.

Lecture on Formats and Rules:

-The instructor explains basic rules, formats, roles of speeches, and note-taking.

Mini-Debate:

-One or two-member debates will be conducted.

-The debate format is 3-1-2: 3-minute constructives, 1-minute cross-examinations, and 2-minute rebuttals. An easy proposition is chosen. An example is, "Resolved: That our company should adopt a four-day workweek." An oral critique follows the debates.

SECOND DAY

Lecture on Cross-Examination and Refutation and Rebuttal:

-The instructor will explain some tips for cross-examination, useful expressions, and methods of refutation and rebuttal.

Formal Debates:

-Formal debates will be conducted. The number of debaters on one team varies from one to four depending on the number of the participants in the seminar.

-The debate format is 6-4-3: 6-minute constructive speeches followed by 4-minute cross-examinations, and two 3-minute rebuttal speeches.

Wrap-up:

-The participants self-evaluate their debate presentations.

-The instructor summarizes main points of the seminar.

-The instructor makes some suggestions on how the participants can continue to study.

It is not easy for any instructor to evaluate participants' performances during the short two-day period. The following are suggestions for written evaluation:

1. The main purpose of the evaluation is not to compare one trainee's ability with that of others, so the instructors should encourage participants to continue studying debate and its related areas by giving them positive comments.

2. When the instructor points out the participants' weaknesses, he/she should give them specific suggestions on how to work on such shortcomings.

3. This written evaluation should be supplementary because many oral critiques, as the primary feedback to the participants, should be given during the seminar.

4. Although linguistic aspects of English, such as vocabulary and fluency, are not focal points of the seminar, these should also be evaluated because the participants will apply debate theories to business contexts in which English is also used. These linguistic aspects are as important as organization, problem analysis, etc. in arguing a proposition.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS:

Communication, including debate and argumentation, is the process by which shared meaning is created. Communication patterns between people are influenced by the nature of their culture, and their culture is influenced by their communication. Since there is such a reciprocal and causal relationship between communication and culture, it is necessary to consider the advantages accrued from English debate, as a training program for the Japanese people, within the context of intercultural communication. There are three implications to be outlined.

First, the debate training program provides Japanese businesspeople with an opportunity to learn an adversarial communication style of decision-making. Debate encourages them to take issue, saying "no" even to their business partners. To put things bluntly is not the characteristic of Japanese tradition since it might hurt the feelings of the other party. For instance, Keiko Ueda describes sixteen ways to avoid saying "no" in Japanese society.[34] The first and perhaps most typical way is to say "yes" first, followed immediately by an explanation that employs words implying "no."

The second way to avoid saying "no" is to be vague and ambiguous in one's reactions so that the other party becomes confused and lost to the extent that he/she cannot even remember what the issue was. The third way is not to answer the question directly and simply leave the matter unattended. Other ways include changing the subject abruptly, criticizing the other party, or assuming a highly apologetic tone.

On the other hand, the above mentioned strategies could bring about the risk of unnecessary misunderstanding and mistrust, since to say "no" clearly is often the best way to tell what is acceptable and what is not. On the other hand, debate provides Japanese businesspeople with the effective training to say "no" and explain why with sound reasoning and evidence in business situations. For instance, the debate case format such as systems analysis teaches Japanese businesspeople how to compare competing policy options and how to weigh advantages accrued from each policy system. They would be able to make on-balance judgments regarding the issue in question and show the grounds for accepting or rejecting a given proposal.

The second advantage of studying English debate for Japanese businesspeople is that the program helps them engage successfully in international negotiation. As Japanese society is often described as being homogeneous in terms of race, language and basic value orientation,[35] it is imperative for Japanese businesspeople to learn the importance of "agreeing to disagree" with other people. Japanese people find it easy and comfortable to make decisions based upon consensus or old customs, instead of making decisions based upon evidence and arguments since they share much more in common compared with Americans living in a so-called "melting pot" or "mosaic society." Whereas learning how to express one's opinion, how to advance arguments, and how to reach a mutual understanding through the exchanges of ideas is the very skill necessary for survival in American society, the Japanese are not always well trained in persuasion, rather emphasizing harmony or compromise between the people concerned.[36]

An important point about Japanese culture is that they use *sasshi*, or intuitive guessing, when they are in communication with others.[37] In most cases, adaptability to a situation is especially important, and being far more specific or elaborate than the situation demands is likely to be interpreted as a sign of communicative incompetence, or *yabo* (i.e., insensitivity). In the Japanese cultural context, persons who disclose in a manner consistent with social norms or expectations are perceived as appropriate, while those who deviate from normative patterns are considered inappropriate. It is, hence, of the utmost importance for Japanese people to establish a harmonious and trustful atmosphere even within business negotiation. Michael Isherwood observes: "The Japanese will not do business with people they dislike, no matter how attractive the deal appears. High profits are not their chief priority; stability, sustained growth and good personal relations come first."[38] Thus, the Japanese way of business negotiation aims at a long-term

friendly relationship with business partners, rather than short-term commercial profits.

Although such a business strategy might work in domestic negotiation, it is often considered a set of "local rules" by other nations. This is particularly true today, since the Japanese government has decided to open the Japanese financial market to foreign companies, which is the Japanese version of Britain's "Big Bang" in the 1980's. The traditional type of business strategy might no longer be effective. When communicating with people from different cultures, it is quite difficult for anyone to make a right guess regarding their best hopes, complaints and expectations. Japanese businesspeople are almost forced to expose their position, policy and proposals in contrast to their business partners'. It is urgent that Japanese businesspeople be able to function according to "global rules." In this sense, English debate offers an invaluable context for Japanese people to set themselves free from their cultural constraints and participate in argumentation as a cooperative decision-making activity.

Finally, the training program provides scholars of communication the chance to see how and why a foreign-language debate format can play a role in terms of cross-cultural and international business communication education. As argued previously, English debate has been a unique pedagogical experience for Japanese people as training to improve both linguistic and communicative competence. For instance, Susan L. Stern states that a foreign language performance could function like role-playing, removing the psychological barrier from the participants that prevented them from expressing their opinions in public.[39]

Further research should be undertaken to analyze the communication needs of Japanese employees, especially the needs and problems of Japanese businesspeople assigned to work overseas for a long time. The findings of such an investigation would provide a sound basis for improving the curriculum for teaching Japanese businesspeople communication skills.

When the contents, perspectives and methods of debating suggested in this essay are implemented their effectiveness should be assessed. Pre- and post-assessment evaluations should be undertaken to measure trainees' relevant skills so as to justify, modify, or jettison the method.

In summary, English debate training adapted for business needs is likely to provide Japanese people with a unique opportunity to learn critical decision-making skills applicable to real-world situations. Ideally, seminar participants will participate in similar seminars several times during their careers in order to improve their skills and provide feedback to the instructors so that the contents of the seminars will continue to improve.

NOTES:

[1] For example, see Kent Colbert and Thompson Biggers. "Why Should We Support Debate?" *Journal of the American*

Forensic Association. 21 (1985): 237-40.

[2] As for the relationship between culture and argumentation, see, for instance, "The Effects of Code Usage in Intercultural Communication," in Lustig, Myron W., and Jolene Koester. *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures.* 2nd ed. (New York: HarperCollins College Publisher, 1996): 216-237.

[3] This part of the essay is derived from Takeshi Suzuki's MA thesis, "Japanese Debating Activities," University of Kansas, 1989, completed under the direction of Donn W. Parson.

[4] This organization is no longer active.

[5] Okabe, Roichi. "Yukichi Fukuzawa: A Promulgator of Western Rhetoric in Japan." *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* 59 (1973): 186-195.

[6] Oxford, Wayne. *The Speeches of Fukuzawa.* (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1973).

[7] See, for instance, Dean S. Ellis. "Debate in Japan." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 5 (1968): 95-98, and Michael D. Hazen. "Report on the 1980 United States Debate Tour of Japan." *JEFA Forensic Journal.* 5 (1982): 9-26. Hazen relates: "The desire to learn English and its linkage with Western forms of logical thinking is coupled with a belief that the Japanese language is 'emotional' and does not express classical forms of Western logic well. As Masao Kunihiro puts it, 'English is a language intended strictly for communication. Japanese is primarily interested in feeling out the other person's mood, in order to work out one's own course of action based on one's impression.' This dichotomy of functions serves many people as a rationale for debating in English not Japanese. Thus, debate (even more than other ESS activities) seems to be linked to the desire to learn Western logic so as to be able to understand the West and to be able to communicate with it" (emphasis added, 11).

[8] Ibid. 95.

[9] Kawashima and Oxford. "Speech Education in Japan." in *International Studies of National Speech Education Systems.* Fred Casmir and L.S. Harms, eds.. (Edina, MN: Burgess Publishing Company, 1970): 115-132.

[10] There are a number of coordinating organizations of ESS's. For instance, the Kanto Universities E.S.S. League (KUEL) is the largest regional student-run organization, and the Japan Universities E.S.S. League (JUEL) is a national organization. The Tokyo Intercollegiate Debate League (TIDL) and the Kansai Intercollegiate Debate League (KIDL) are the two major student-run organizations that specialize in debate activities.

[11] Klopf. "Preface." in Mitsugu Iwashita. *The Principles of Debate.* (Tokyo: Gakushobo, 1973): 1.

[12] Ishii and Klopf. "Differences between American and Japanese Forensics." *Speaker and Gavel.* 13 (1975): 12-13.

[13] Becker, as quoted by Matlon. "Report on the Japanese Debate Tour, May and June 1978." *JEFA Forensic Journal.* 2 (1978): 26-27.

[14] See Nakanishi, Masayuki. "Perception of Self-Disclosure in Initial Interaction." *Human Communication Research.* 2 (1986): 167-190.

[15] Quoted by Matlon 26.

[16] Ibid. 25.

[17] Quoted by Matlon 26.

[18] Meadow. "Report on the Japanese Debate Tour, May and June 1978." *JEFA Forensic Journal.* 3 (1979): 61.

[19] Davidson. "Debaters as Pedagogue: The First United States-CIDD Debate Tour of Japan." *Speaker and Gavel.* (1976): 3.

[20] Bassesen. "The 1978 SCA Tour of Japan." *JEFA Forensic Journal.* 3 (1979): 53.

[21] Unfortunately, the situation remains almost the same even in the 1990's although the number of English debate classes at the college level is increasing in recent years.

[22] Matlon: 39.

[23] Richardson. "Report on the 1985 United States Tour of Japan." Report to the Japan English Forensic Association (JEFA), October 1985.

[24] Palczewski. "Parallels between Japanese and American Debate." Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Annual Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, April 14, 1989: 25.

[25] The propositions debated at the 1986-1988 EAST-WEST Intercollegiate Debating Contest illustrate the tendency: in 1986, "Resolved: That the Japanese National Government should further restrict the Freedom of the Press where that freedom infringes on the civil rights of individuals"; in 1987, "Resolved: That the Japanese Government should significantly decrease its control over agricultural products"; and in 1988, "Resolved: That the Japanese Government should geographically diversify functions located in Tokyo."

[26] Herbeck and Katsulas. "The Affirmative Topicality Burden: Any Reasonable Example of the Resolution." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 21 (1985): 135. On the dispute over the appropriateness of debating the "whole resolution," see issues of the *CEDA Yearbook* and the Alta Argumentation Conference Proceedings from the late 1980's and early 1990's.

27 The Japanese debate community has adopted two "narrower" topics for one academic year, instead of one "broader" one, in recent years. The narrower topics have been welcomed by both debaters and judges in terms of case analysis, refutation and rebuttal of arguments, and speech delivery. For example, the resolution for the Fall 1998 season is "Resolved: That the Japanese government should significantly reduce the progressiveness in the rates of direct taxes imposed on individuals."

28 Hazen 12.

29 Balthrop. "Debate Judge as 'Critic of Argument': Toward A Transcendental Perspective." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 20 (1983): 1-15.

30 See, for instance, Goodnight, G. Thomas. "The Re-union of Argumentation and Debate Theory." in Ziegelmueller and Rhodes, eds. *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Argumentation*. (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1981); Kay, Jack. "Rapprochement of World I and World II: Discovering the Ties Between Practical Discourse and Rhetoric." in Zarefsky, et. al., eds. *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation*. (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1983): 927-937; Fritch, John. "The Relationship between Debate Theory, Practice and Pedagogy." Central States Speech Communication Convention, Kansas City, April 13, 1989; Rowland, Robert C. "The Debate Judge as Debate Judge: A Functional Paradigm for Evaluating Debates." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 20 (1984): 183-193; Rowland, Robert C. "Tabula Rasa: The Relevance of Debate to Argumentation Theory." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 21 (1984): 76-88.

31 Rowland, Robert C., and Scott Deatherage. "The Crisis in Policy Debate." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 24 (1988): 246-250.

32 Ibid.

33 Rowland. "The Relationship Between Realism and Debatability in Policy Advocacy." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 22 (1986): 125-134. In the United States, the validity of topical counterplans is no longer disputed by the majority of NDT and CEDA debaters in the 1990's. By 1996, Brian R. McGee could describe a "slowly emerging consensus in favor of topical counterplans." McGee. "Defending Tradition." *Southern Journal of Forensics*. 1 (1996): 116.

34 Ueda. "Sixteen Ways to Avoid Saying 'No' in Japan." John C. Condon and Mitsuko Saito, eds. *Intercultural Encounter with Japan*. (Tokyo: Simul Press, 1974): 185-192. It has been emphasized that Japanese people learn to say "no" clearly. For instance, see Ishihara, Shintaro. *The Japan That Can Say No: Why Japan Will Be First Among Equals*. (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1991).

35 See Nakanishi.

36 Note that the authors are by no means suggesting that the Japanese style of communication is "illogical" or "vague," or that the Western style of communication is "logical" and "exact." They are simply pointing out discrepancies between the two in terms of relative social necessity, emphases of educational systems, or value hierarchies. Applying different criteria, the same country's communication style would be judged very differently.

37 See Nakanishi.

38 Isherwood. "Business Japanese-Style." in P. Norbury and B. Bownes, eds. *Business in Japan: A Guide to Japanese Business Practice and Procedure*. (London: Macmillan Press, 1974): 11.

39 Stern. "Dramas in Second Language Learning from a Psycholinguistic Perspective." *Language Learning*. 30 (1980): 77-100. 39 "Business Japanese-Style." in P. Norbury and B. Bownes, eds.

WORKS CITED

Balthrop. "Debate Judge as 'Critic of Argument': Toward A Transcendental Perspective." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 20 (1983): 1-15.

Bassesen. "The 1978 SCA Tour of Japan." *JEFA Forensic Journal*. 3 (1979): 53.

Colbert, Kent and Thompson Biggers. "Why Should We Support Debate?" *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 21 (1985): 237-40.

Davidson. "Debaters as Pedagogue: The First United States-CIDD Debate Tour of Japan." *Speaker and Gavel*. (1976): 3.

Ellis, Dean S. "Debate in Japan." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 5 (1968): 95-98.

Fritch, John. "The Relationship between Debate Theory, Practice and Pedagogy." Central

States Speech Communication Convention, Kansas City, April 13, 1989

Goodnight, G. Thomas. "The Re-union of Argumentation and Debate Theory." in Ziegelmueller and Rhodes, eds. *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Argumentation*. (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1981

Hazen, Michael D. "Report on the 1980 United States Debate Tour of Japan." *JEFA Forensic Journal*. 5 (1982): 9-26.

Herbeck and Katsulas. "The Affirmative Topicality Burden: Any Reasonable Example of the Resolution." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 21 (1985): 135.

Isherwood. "Business Japanese-Style." in P. Norbury and B. Bownes, eds. *Business in Japan: A Guide to Japanese Business Practice and Procedure*. (London: Macmillan Press, 1974): 11.

Ishihara, Shintaro. *The Japan That Can Say No: Why Japan Will Be First Among Equals*. (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1991).

Ishii & Klopf. "Differences between American and Japanese Forensics." *Speaker and Gavel*. 13 (1975): 12-13.

Kawashima & Oxford. "Speech Education in Japan." in *International Studies of National Speech Education Systems*. Fred Casmir and L.S. Harms, eds.. (Edina, MN: Burgess Publishing Company, 1970): 115-132.

Kay, Jack. "Rapprochement of World I and World II: Discovering the Ties Between Practical Discourse and Rhetoric." in Zarefsky, et. al., eds. *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation*. (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1983): 927-937.

Klopf. "Preface." in Mitsugu Iwashita. *The Principles of Debate*. (Tokyo: Gakushobo, 1973): 1.

Lustig, Myron W., and Jolene Koester. "The Effects of Code Usage in Intercultural Communication," *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures*. 2nd ed. (New York: HarperCollins College Publisher, 1996): 216-237.

Matlon. "Report on the Japanese Debate Tour, May and June 1978." *JEFA Forensic Journal*. 2 (1978): 26-27.

Meadow. "Report on the Japanese Debate Tour, May and June 1978." *JEFA Forensic Journal*. 3 (1979): 61.

McGee, Brian R. "Defending Tradition." *Southern Journal of Forensics*. 1 (1996): 116.

Nakanishi, Masayuki. "Perception of Self-Disclosure in Initial Interaction." *Human Communication Research*. 2 (1986): 167-190.

Okabe, Roichi. "Yukichi Fukuzawa: A Promulgator of Western Rhetoric in Japan." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 59 (1973): 186-195.

Oxford, Wayne. *The Speeches of Fukuzawa*. (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1973).

Palczewski. "Parallels between Japanese and American Debate." Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Annual Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, April 14, 1989: 25.

Richardson. "Report on the 1985 United States Tour of Japan." Report to the Japan English

Forensic Association (JEFA), October 1985.

Rowland, Robert C. "The Debate Judge as Debate Judge: A Functional Paradigm for Evaluating Debates." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 20 (1984): 183-193

— "Tabula Rasa: The Relevance of Debate to Argumentation Theory." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 21 (1984): 76-88.

— and Scott Deatherage. "The Crisis in Policy Debate." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 24 (1988): 246-250.

— "The Relationship Between Realism and Debatability in Policy Advocacy." *Journal of the American Forensic Association.* 22 (1986): 125-134.

Stern. "Dramas in Second Language Learning from a Psycholinguistic Perspective." *Language Learning.* 30 (1980): 77-100. 39 "Business Japanese-Style." in P. Norbury and B. Bownes, eds.

Suzuki, Takeshi, "Japanese Debating Activities," Unpublished MA thesis, University of Kansas, 1989.

Ueda. "Sixteen Ways to Avoid Saying 'No' in Japan." John C. Condon and Mitsuko Saito, eds. *Intercultural Encounter with Japan.* (Tokyo: Simul Press, 1974): 185-192.

Takeshi Suzuki (Ph.D., Northwestern) is an Associate Professor in the Department of English Literature, Tsuda College, Japan. Shigeru Matsumoto (M.A., Univ of Massachusetts) is a Professor at the Research Institute of Education, Tokai University, Japan. An earlier version of this essay appeared in the Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation, *Argument in Controversy*, edited by Donn W. Parson. (Annandale, VA:SCA, 1991)

THE FUTURE OF FORENSICS:
Some International Options

Alan Cirlin
Director of Forensics, St. Mary's University

This essay is intended to give insight and practical advice to debate colleagues who are interested in pursuing international study tour and competition opportunities for their students. Topics include contacting international debate unions, networking, planning, execution, fund-raising and after tour considerations. Numerous leads are provided to get the novice started.

Why do Directors of Forensics stick to their jobs? Why don't we all go running off in terror and bail out at the first opportunity? It can't be for the immense salary. And I doubt it's because of the tremendous prestige which goes along with the profession. So, why do we stay? What is the real payoff? What, if anything, are we trying to achieve?

There may be as many different answers to these questions as there are individuals who head forensics programs. But I'd like to believe that one thing we all have in common is a compelling desire to help our students develop impressive communication skills. We want to provide them with solid foundations in public speaking and argumentation. And, as we head into the 21stCentury, that foundation will very probably need to include strong cross cultural communication skills.

Our world is becoming more global all the time. Yet most forensics educators seem oblivious to the need to incorporate international elements into their programs. In the U.S., debaters and individual events speakers generally consider international issues only within the context of their speaking events. Few programs bring international debaters to their campuses, and even fewer actually travel students to foreign countries to debate. Instead, they have their students read about foreign countries in *Time* magazine and *Newsweek* and then debate about them with an American partner, against American opponents, before American judges.

Yet it is getting progressively harder to play the part of an ostrich. Even if we try to stick to small parochial interests and ignore all things foreign, the world has a funny way of intruding. This is likely to be even more true for our students in their professional lives. As educators we have three choices. We can studiously ignore foreign options in

pursuing our educational goals. We can remain aware of these options, but only in a theoretical way. Or we can embrace them and make international forensics experience an important element in our programs.

Embracing international forensics options means creating opportunities for our students to interact with actual speakers from foreign cultures. These are the same individuals our students may have to coordinate with and argue against in their professional futures. The good news for English speakers is that English has become the lingua franca of modern global communication. Hence, it isn't strictly necessary for forensics educators to teach oral communication skills in a multitude of foreign tongues. This is especially true of the Internet, which is quickly becoming, if it hasn't already become, the major access point for global interconnectedness. The bad news is that the use of the English language for global communication masks a myriad of cultural differences. And effective audience analysis in modern international communication requires a real understanding of people from other cultures.

But how are our students supposed to achieve such an understanding in the absence of cross cultural interactions? How can we set up such real-world educational encounters to help them? On the typically limited budgets with which most of us work, this is a large order. It may even seem impossible. This is probably why so many Directors of Forensics don't even make the attempt.

Well, I am here to tell you it is possible. And this essay is written for anyone who would like to make it happen. We will begin with a discussion of basic opportunities for involvement in international forensics. Next, we will discuss some of the practical problems that go along with this kind of involvement. And, finally, we will explore a few of the benefits that might make participation worth your while and how best to take advantage of them.

DISCLAIMERS

Let me first admit to a certain, unavoidable bias. This essay is written primarily from a U.S. perspective since that is the perspective with which I am most familiar.[note 1] More importantly, this essay can in no way be considered a definitive or comprehensive treatment of the subject. When I was asked to contribute an article on international forensics, I felt tremendously inadequate to the task. What made me the great expert? That I had hosted a dozen touring international debate teams? That I've attended a couple of the IFA tournaments in Greece and London? That I had arranged and taken my students one exhibition debate tours to a few foreign countries? That I had written one, single textbook on international debate? That I had maintained professional contact with a number of debaters and debate educators in a variety of foreign countries? To my way of thinking, that is not an overly impressive

resume or de facto evidence of a high level of expertise in the area.

And yet, when I thought about it more objectively, I realized that as ignorant as I am with respect to international forensics, I didn't know of anyone who was any more knowledgeable. And I had in fact done all of those things mentioned above, where my typical colleague on the forensics circuit hadn't done any of them. This led me to think that perhaps I did have something to offer after all. [note 2] So let's leave it at this: while I cannot claim to be a huge expert in how to run a forensics program with major international components, I don't know of anyone who is. I know of a good many individuals who are remarkably knowledgeable in limited aspects of international forensics, but of no one who has a comprehensive understanding and experience with the total range of possibilities. So please consider the following essay a starting point. It may not tell you everything you'd like to know, but it ought to be enough to give you a toe-hold on the possibilities. This essay is intended to offer practical suggestions to anyone interested in creating or developing a strong international component in their forensics program. If it achieves that end, I will be satisfied.

REALITY CHECK — AN EXPERIMENT

Before we get into the main discussion, let's stop for a little reality check. I like to think that I'm getting my money's worth when I take the time and effort to read something. I'm sure you do too. So let's assume that you either have come to this page convinced that greater involvement in international forensics is a good idea, or that reading my introductory section has convinced you. Grab paper and pen and start making a list. Off the top of your head, what can you do to add international forensics options to your program? Jot your ideas down before reading any further. You might want to include an estimate of how much time, money, energy, and cooperation each idea would take. Once you've completed this list, or at least exhausted your obvious first thoughts, read on. If you end up with a whole bunch of new ideas, or ways to achieve your current objectives more efficiently, then you can depart knowing that this was your pay-off. If you come away with only one new idea, and it is valuable enough, you might still find your time was profitably spent.

OPPORTUNITIES

The first thing we will discuss is a partial list of opportunities available for international forensics participation. One general principle up front: start small and grow. Begin with simple and relatively cheap projects and become more ambitious as your appetite, resources, and experience allow. For this reason, the following list has been

organized according to degree of difficulty and resources required. The first item on the list is in my opinion the easiest and the one that requires the fewest resources. The final item is the most difficult and most expensive (and I include the amount of time, energy, and effort involved as an expense).

One more thing before we begin. It behooves you to educate yourself with a basic understanding of another culture before establishing your first contact there. Failure to do so is typical of the "ugly American" syndrome. Fortunately, there are a number of excellent field guides that you can read to start you on this process. [note 3] And once you get more involved and actually set up some international communication events, you can use these same texts as orientation manuals for your students.

INTERNET CONTACTS - NETWORKING

Perhaps the most valuable resource you can develop in creating an internationally oriented component to your forensics program is personal contacts in other countries. Imagine that someone from a foreign country had an interest in bringing some debaters to visit your city. They were going to pay their own way, so money wasn't an issue, but they were interested in finding a local contact who could arrange an exhibition debate for them. They hoped to locate someone who could set up a venue, provide an opposing team, do the advance publicity, and scare up an audience. They might also be grateful to an individual who knew the area and could make local lodging arrangements based on their particular financial limits and requirements. Someone who might meet them at the airport, provide local transportation or at least provide a map and useful directions. Someone who could recommend places to eat and might even host a meal or two. Someone who could write a post exhibition letter of thanks on official university letterhead to their department chair or dean or president.

If someone like that were interested in visiting your city, imagine how you might be able to perform all or part of these functions. What else could you provide by way of advanced information, resources, or help? Perhaps you could contact some other local schools on their behalf and turn their single exhibition debate against students from your school into a mini-tour by setting up a couple of other debates at other institutions. Think about what you might be able to gain from such an arrangement, including publicity, an international debate experience for your team members, recruitment possibilities, experience for some of your students in setting up and publicizing a special event, etc. Every foreign contact you develop is another individual who might possibly visit you someday on these exact terms. Every foreign contact is another who might be able and enthusiastic about providing the same services for you and your squad if you ever decide to tour their little corner of the world.

St. Mary's has gone on four major foreign exhibition debate tours over the past five years and in each case, we had a primary local contact who set up most or all of our tour. Each one also provided a tremendous amount of advance information, including such mundane things as suggestions about how to dress and telling us the local customs of which we should be most aware. Without such a local contact, I doubt that any of these tours could have happened. Certainly, they would have been nowhere near as comfortable or successful.

So making foreign contacts is a wonderfully important first goal. And, fortunately, it's one of the easiest and cheapest goals to achieve. I was going to recommend that, if you had not already done so, you get hooked up to the Internet and become familiar with Email communication. I changed my mind. I'm going to make this a requirement. Email is fast, efficient, highly reliable, and extremely cheap. If you try to establish and maintain a foreign correspondence using the postal system, not only are you likely to find that your contacts tend to fade as time goes on, but you are putting a large energy (and minor but important financial) burden on them as well. Snail-mail can be a useful method of establishing a foreign contact, but you should always include your Email address in all correspondence and hope that your contacts will reply by way of the Internet.

It's getting to the point were I can assume that many, if not most, of the readers who come to these pages are already hooked up to the Internet. But a great deal of personal experience tells me that there are still a goodly percentage of coaches out there who are either unfamiliar with the Internet or are extreme neophytes. For the sake of these readers, let me just say that the physical requirements, expense, and expertise necessary to set up and operate Email are not excessive. The first thing to do is check with your university computer center and see if they can arrange for the equipment, connections, and training you require. You may well find that all you need do is ask, and all will be provided free of charge. If this is not available and money is an issue, you can usually buy a decent used computer system through your University's computer vendor or by keeping an eye on the want ads. [note 4] You can also spread the word that you are in the market. It's amazing how quickly computer equipment becomes "obsolete" because of the introduction of newer and more powerful systems. Yet for the purpose of Email, many systems three or four generations out of date are perfectly serviceable. You only need a basic system equipped with a modest modem.

As far as getting hooked up is concerned, your university can probably provide an Email address along with full Internet access at no cost to you. If not, you can buy these services for just under $20 per month from a service provider. Full access is a very good thing to have for reasons that will be discussed below. Failing that, you can get free Email without full access from a number of sources. The three main free Email systems of which I am most aware (because they cover the majority of messages I receive) are

Hotmail, Juno, and Yahoo. [note 5]

Once you get your equipment and an Email address and become reasonably familiar with its use, [note 6] you can begin establishing Email contacts just by sending out messages of inquiry. Send an Email message to everyone in the field you know and tell them of your interest in international forensics. Ask them for advice and for an introduction to anyone they might know who can further your education in this area. Keep a lookout for forensics mailings and announcements in your professional newsletters. Look for references to international forensics and more specifically for the mention of Email addresses. Compose polite and respectful letters of inquiry about issues that are of potential interest. Start "surfing the net" if you've got full access (or get one of your team members with access to do some surfing for you). I'll provide a set of web sites below. Once you get into a few of them, they will provide all kinds of links to other sites. You can also plug various forensics-related word combinations into search engines and see where they take you. In a very short time you will find yourself with more contact information than you can possibly use. Then you can start being selective.

At this point it is wise to remember three things. First, it is not necessary to go from zero to 100 kph instantly. If you were to budget only half an hour a day to networking, you would find within a very reasonable period of time you had established as many contacts as you could maintain. Second, try not to make a pest of yourself. Not everyone you contact will be deliriously happy to hear from you or want to maintain a correspondence. Unless you receive some encouragement, be satisfied with any initial reply you get and move on. You are certain to find enough enthusiastic partners that you don't need to try to turn every contact into a long term relationship. And third, keep in mind that your long-term networking goal is to establish not just a set of foreign contacts, but a set of positive relationships. If you haven't already done so, read the Dale Carnegie text on winning friends and influencing people and keep his principles in mind when composing messages. [note 7] Try to begin every message with the word "you" or "your." It is much more effective than beginning a message with the word "I." [note 8]

JOIN ASSOCIATIONS

Another potentially valuable resource for educators interested in international travel is to join professional associations with foreign interests. Aside from the networking possibilities, it is probable that membership in such associations will improve your knowledge of forensics-related events and schedules in other countries. This is especially true if you can become a member of foreign debate associations and get yourself added to their Email distribution lists.

If you do become involved in a foreign debate association, you will greatly increase

your networking potential. Look for opportunities to establish individual relationships. You might find someone working on a research project who is seeking information you can provide. Volunteer to do so. Someone else might be expressing an opinion with which you agree. It wouldn't hurt to send an Email message supporting their opinion. Out of this might come a correspondence and eventually a partner.

CIDD TOURS - PLAYING HOST

The Committee for International Discussion and Debate (CIDD) is an organ of the National Communication Association (NCA). It has been in business for decades and sets up tours of foreign national debaters through the U.S. Keep your eyes open, and you will come across CIDD announcements, inviting schools to apply to host one of the international debate teams. [note 9] To my knowledge, this program began with exchange debates in 1922 with Great Britain. [note 10] Since then, tours have been added to the schedule with debaters from Japan, Russia (originally the Soviet Union) and, most recently, Israel. Anyone can apply to be a stop on a CIDD tour. If you are scheduled, there will be a promotional fee that now ranges between $600 and $1,500 and is used to offset the travel and administrative costs of the tour. In addition, host schools are expected to cover the lodging, in-town transportation, and meals for the touring debaters. Once scheduled, you will receive material containing suggestions about how best to organize your exhibition debate and how to get the biggest public relations bang from the event. You will also receive information about the topic alternatives and full biographical information about the touring debaters.

Most CIDD tour stops are quite brief. On average they last between 24 and 48 hours. On a typical one-day stop, the visiting team will fly in late one evening, be set up in their lodging, and taken to dinner. The next morning there is breakfast, a tour of campus, lunch, and an afternoon exhibition debate between the visiting debaters and a couple of your own debate team members. There follows an open reception. And then you're headed back to the airport to put them on a plane to their next appearance. A two day stop follows the same basic pattern, but on a more relaxed schedule. At St. Mary's we always volunteer to host the visiting teams somewhere near the middle of their tours and over a long weekend. We've had teams stay with us for as long as 4 days. This increases our lodging and meal expenses, but it allows the visiting debaters to kick-back and relax a bit.[note 11]

HOST PRIVATE EXHIBITION DEBATER TOURS

Coach Don Black at Kansas City Kansas Community College (KCKCC) took this route

when he invited a couple of debaters from Cambridge University to visit the U.S. [note 12] Don was working on a very short schedule and did some quick fund-raising. He came up with a kitty of about $3,000. This, along with some private donations of lodging and meals, was enough to cover all their expenses, including airfare. Their tour lasted 12 days. They flew into Salt Lake City, Utah, where they debated a couple of Philosophy Club members at Brigham Young University. Another exhibition debate was arranged by one of Don's relatives against an Orem High School team. Then, after considerable touring and wining and dining, they all returned to Kansas City, where four more exhibition debates were staged, two at local high schools and two on the KCKCC campus. The Cambridge debaters then flew back to England from Kansas City. [note 13]

This was a major Win-Win-Win-Win-Win situation. From the visiting debaters' perspective they got a wonderful, all-expenses-paid Exhibition Debate Tour experience. All it required was the good fortune of being part of the program at Cambridge that had hosted Don's group the year before. For Cambridge University it was yet another feather in their program cap. It helped to enhance the school's reputation, which was what their debaters had capitalized upon in getting this invitation from Don. [note 14] From the perspective of the five U.S. institutions that hosted the Cambridge exhibition debates, the tour provided a great learning experience, an interesting diversion, and something for administration to brag about. For Don Black's debate program at KCKCC, this was a major coup that provided visibility, generated public support, helped in recruitment, and generally looked great on the front page of the school newspaper. And for Coach Black personally, it was both a fun and interesting experience and a career-enhancing project. It became a notable vita item. And I'm sure it also looked good when salary, tenure, and promotion time came around. Beyond this, it represented a major contribution to Don's networking contacts and his reputation on the international circuit. The moral of this story is that for a very low cost, and with the cooperation of relatively few others, you can set up a similar tour once you've established the right contacts. And if you don't feel like conducting a two-state tour and covering all of the expenses yourself, consider these possibilities.

First, an exhibition debate tour can be limited to a single city. When the St. Mary's forensics team went on an exhibition tour to Russia in 1993, it included three venues that were all in Moscow. The three debates set up by Russian Coach Tamara Nazarova were held at Moscow State University, the Moscow Pedagogical Institute, and the Russian Institute of International Relations, all within a relatively small geographical area of Moscow. And yet, don't those stops sound grand? And don't you think they looked just as impressive in our school newspaper as if we had stopped in three different cities?

Second, try to think creatively when setting up a tour. I think Don's contacting the philosophy club of Brigham Young University was a wonderful touch. Since no debate

team was available, he found another organization on campus that provided the same name recognition when the foreign debaters returned home. How about contacting an international relations club, a pre-law society, or the Business school? Suggest a debate on "the ethics of cloning," and you might possibly set up an exhibition against a school's biology club. Check out a potential host school's Internet web page, if they have one, and see what student organizations exist and how to contact them. I would recommend being diplomatic and going through the debate team first, but, having paid that proper courtesy, it's open hunting season.

Third, the world is full of debaters. In any given year, a whole slew of them will decide to take private trips at their own expense to visit strange and exotic places. There are some who are likely to find your place, so common and familiar to you, strange and exotic. And if they knew that you would welcome them with open arms (and perhaps even toss in a few meals and perhaps some cheap or free lodging) they would be delighted to show up at their own expense and put on some exhibition debates. If you've identified such likely individuals, a 12-day tour with five exhibition debate stops within a small geographic area might be set up for well under $1,000.

Fourth, by canvassing your local support systems you can lower expenses even further by arranging free lodging and some free meals as well. Your school might be able to donate dorm rooms. Or a local hotel might be willing to chip in accommodations for the tax deduction and publicity—a very real possibility during heir non-peak season. Perhaps some prominent local personages would be willing to sponsor receptions or dinner parties. Contact the fund-raising people at your university and see if your efforts might dovetail. As far as you know, at this very moment they might have some rich and influential donor in mind who they have never been able to interest in the university because they have never had exactly the right hook. What if this individual has strong ties to Australia, and here you are trying to find the funds to help bring a couple of debaters in from the University of Sydney?

Fifth, you can coordinate with others to set up mini-tours and reduce expenses all around. So you've established your network contacts and you've found a couple of debaters in Israel who have the time and interest to visit. What's lacking is cash. Based on Don Black's experience you figure a two-week tour might cost upwards of $4,000 when you factor in airfare. And you don't have it. But you do have $1,000. So you get on the phone and start calling other schools in your area. If you find three other partners with $1,000 each, you can bring the team over, and the Israeli debaters have four schools on their tour instead of just one.

By the way, as a side note to end this discussion, Don mentioned that the Cambridge tour had been set up somewhat unexpectedly at the last minute. It only took a few weeks of telephoning and arranging to find the funding, get British Airways to play

along, and set up all of the debates on the tour. Sometimes, last minute opportunity is the mother of creativity.

TRAVEL ABROAD

All of the ideas mentioned so far have been designed to bring international forensics to you. In many ways, this is easier and cheaper than going in search of international forensics. Now we are going to discuss options for traveling abroad. If you like the idea of foreign travel and are willing to invest more in the way of resources, effort and commitment, this can be fun and very rewarding as well.

CIDD TOURS - TRAVEL OPPORTUNITIES

The NCA Committee on International Discussion and Debate not only arranges for foreign debaters to tour U.S. schools; it also sets up tours of U.S. debaters to foreign countries. These tours are regularly scheduled through Great Britain, Japan, and Russia. You will find calls for tour debaters published in the NCA newsletter, SPECTRA. Also, if you get on the CIDD mailing list, you should receive regular announcements about these tours as they are being planned. A call goes out for interested debaters. Applications are accepted. And a small set of finalists are invited to attend the annual NCA convention in early November to participate in an interview and tryouts where the final two participants are selected.

Now admittedly, the CIDD tours are not a bankable international forensics certainty. Many apply, and only a very few are chosen. But if you don't put in your application, you make yourself ineligible for miracles. Besides, your odds are much better than winning a big lottery, and you buy tickets for those from time to time, don't you? So the CIDD tours are at least an option worth considering. And there are networking possibilities in applying, even if your students are not selected

THE INTERNATIONAL FORENSICS ASSOCIATION TOURNAMENT

Harry Strine, Director of Forensics at Bloomsburg University in Pennsylvania and Chair of the International Forensics Association (IFA), has created an association that permits a combination of foreign travel and forensics competition. The IFA tournament is held once a year each spring around Easter. It is organized much more as a U.S. tour-group than as an international competition. [note 15] On the other hand, the IFA tournaments are extremely well organized and competently run. They are also associated with an IFA convention in which papers are presented. Thus, interested coaches can

contribute some of their scholarship and can often obtain additional school convention funding to attend.

The IFA tournament is organized like a travel tour in a number of ways. The time frame for the event is usually about a week arrival to departure. The tournament and convention itself occupies a day and a half of this. The rest of the time you are free to enjoy the host country, and several guided mini-tours are made available. You will also notice that lots of family members and friends of the coaches and competitors attend these tournaments. Some of these are used as judges. Others are just along for the ride.

One big advantage of the IFA tournament is that, unlike CIDD tours, it is open to all. If you haven't received an invitation to this tournament before, I'd encourage you to contact Harry or some other member of the IFA and request one. [note 16] Another big advantage of the IFA tournament is that it can give you a toe-hold on foreign forensics travel if you've never done this before. Go, bring some students, participate, and take notes on everything you see and do. Use the IFA tournament as a learning experience and then consider getting involved in some of the more ambitious international travel projects suggested below.

THE WORLDS COMPETITION

Another forensics competition which is, in fact, global in scope is the Worlds Competition. This is by far the most truly international debate competition in existence. I Emailed a few well-experienced parliamentary debaters to give me a list of nations that they could remember having sent teams to participate in the Worlds competition. [note 17] Here is a composite list of the countries they mentioned: Australia, Bangladesh, Bosnia, Botswana, Canada, several of the Caribbean nations, Croatia, England, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Russia, Scotland, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, The United States, and Wales. And this is, to be sure, merely a partial list.

The Worlds competition uses a relatively new 4-team, 8-person parliamentary debate format. [note 18] It is not my purpose here to go into detail about this format, but if you are interested in this kind of competition it is prerequisite that you become familiar with it. I'd suggest you surf the net and follow debate links to the various sites where this format is described and discussed. [note 19] Many, if not most, of the Parliamentary Debate associations around the world have followed the Worlds Competition and adopted this new format.

The Worlds competition is held every January in a different country. One can get on the mailing list to receive an invitation to this tournament by doing a little network-

ing. A number of U.S. forensics programs have sent representatives to participate. Generally, however, since this format is virtually unknown in the U.S., the U.S. schools haven't done very well. Recent host countries have included Greece, Ireland, and South Africa. In 1993 the competition was hosted by Princeton University in New Jersey. I've been told by a number of visiting debaters that there was a great deal of distress among the contestants that the U.S. drinking age was 21. Apparently social drinking (again, based on the British pub model) has become a large part of the ethos of this event. This may be something for the thoughtful coach to consider when making plans to attend. On the other hand, Wayne Kraemer at Southwest Texas State University took a contingent to the Worlds Competition last year, and from his report they all had a great time. And to the best of my knowledge they all came back alive as well.

I cannot speak with any authority about the World's competition since St. Mary's has never attended one. However, based upon the reverence with which it is discussed by just about everyone I know who has participated, it would have to qualify as the premier debating event in the world. At a guess, I would say the situation is analogous to world soccer. [note 20] For most countries soccer is the quintessential world sport. But in the United States, the World Cup is an event of secondary importance while we concentrate on such "major" sports as football, basketball, and baseball. I mention this in part because the whole theme of this essay is for U.S. forensics coaches to help their students get past a parochial U.S. view of the world and adopt a more international perspective on communication and argumentation. Familiarity with the preeminent style of international debate competition might be an excellent start. And regular participation at the Worlds Competition might lead to some great networking possibilities and future travel opportunities.

Certainly participation in this tournament ought to be worth a great deal in terms of visibility, public relations, recruiting, and status. And, if you're engaging in fundraising, you might find you can use the name recognition of having attended the worlds to help open doors and pocketbooks.

TRAVEL TO TOURNAMENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN

This is a possibility that ought to be of great interest for anyone thinking about attending the World's Competition. There are regular debate tournaments held at various schools throughout Great Britain. [note 21] I had a team entered at London School of Economics tournament in 1997, and they did quite well, coming in seventh. But I am sure they would have done much better if they had more experience in the expectations and conventions of the event. Given this and my experience in various U.S. competitions, I can only assume that attending some British tournaments first will put your students in a much

better position to be competitive at the Worlds competition.

From a practical, financial perspective, attending British tournaments will certainly be more expensive than attending local tournaments, but perhaps not that much more. In some ways domestic travel is getting more expensive at exactly the same time that foreign travel is becoming less so. By way of comparison, it generally costs me between $1,000 and $1,500 to take a squad of 8-12 team members to an "away" tournament. That includes transportation, lodging, a couple of meals, and entry & judging fees. By contrast, a round-trip airline ticket to England from New York can sometimes be had for under $500. So if everything breaks your way and you time it properly, you might be able to send a couple of students to a London area tournament at about the same price, or perhaps even a little less, than it would cost to take the squad to a regional tournament. Now, obviously, if you are based in Connecticut this will be much cheaper than if you are based in Arizona. And just as obviously, you cannot travel nearly as many competitors for anywhere near the same price. But if you attend a couple of English tournaments a year, sending different teams each time, you can build up a core of expertise that you bring back and can use when holding practices. And, if you are going to do this, I would definitely invest in a high quality portable tape player and see if you can't get RECORDINGS of some of the out-rounds from the tournaments. Between the experience of your students and the taped examples of the format, you ought to be able to get a real jump on the learning curve. Then, if your team members do attend the Worlds competition, or any other competition using this format for that matter, they will be much more competitive.

SET UP YOUR OWN INTERNATIONAL TOURS

St. Mary's has gone on four international exhibition debate tours in the past five years. The first was in Russia. This was almost an accident. The Russian Coach, Tamara Nazarova, had stopped at St. Mary's as part of her CIDD tour and was impressed enough with our students' audience-centered speaking style that she wanted us to come to Moscow the following year to do exhibition debates at their international teaching conference.[note 22] We were delighted but broke. But we gave it a shot, and, through some extreme good fortune in fund-raising, we were able to go. Flushed with this success, I remembered a second invitation I had received years before to visit some schools in the Netherlands. I got back in touch with Peter M. van der Geer, director of Holland Debate, who had made the invitation. The offer was still open. So we raised the funds, he made the arrangements, and we went. By now, we were beginning to feel like we almost knew what we were doing. The following year, with the help of Yoshiro Yano, we planned a tour through Japan. Mr. Yano was himself an ex-CIDD debater who had visited St. Mary's. He was now the Japan Debate Association officer in charge of setting up

tours for the visiting CIDD teams. [note 23] The next year we attended the IFA tournament in London. With the help of Mr. Trevor Sather, another former CIDD debater and current head of the English Speaking Union (ESU) Centre for International Debate and Communication Training, we were able to develop this into an Exhibition Debate Tour of Great Britain. By an accident of timing, the IFA tournament led us to overlap our tour with the Easter Holiday, so there were only limited opportunities for us to schedule stops. But Mr. Sather was still able to set up six events for us in addition to the IFA tournament.

In discussing the content of this paper with Dr. Nazarova, she offered an observation that I thought was particularly valuable for anyone thinking of setting up their own foreign exhibition debate tours. She suggested you consider the needs of the countries and programs you are thinking of visiting. I had been telling her about how important and valuable our local contacts had been in making arrangements for us. I had just finished thanking her again for all the help and hospitality she had afforded us on our tour to Russia when she surprised me by thanking me most sincerely in return. It seems our visit had important pedagogical value for a number of local teachers and programs who got their first close look at U.S.-style debate through our exhibition. And since securing our participation had been something of a professional coup for Dr. Nazarova, our visit had real personal value to her as well. So, during our conversation she encouraged me to "think in terms of the problems and needs of the other programs." She said it wasn't just what they could do to help us plan a visit, but what we could do for them and bring with us when we came.

This is another area where networking can be of considerable value. When planning a foreign tour and asking for help from your local contact, also ask what you might be able to do to help. Everyone has something that they can bring to the table. You will not know exactly what you have to offer until you discuss the matter with someone on the scene. But I can just about guarantee that no matter how mundane you think your situation might be, you will have a great deal more to offer than you suspect to someone in a far different country.

PRAGMATIC ISSUES

In this section, I'd like to consider some of the practical concerns, issues, problems, and opportunities involved in doing all of the things discussed above.

Operating over the Internet

You might get the impression that I have come to rely quite heavily on the Internet in my

international forensics activities. You would be right. I have found Email to be a quicker, cheaper, and much more reliable form of communication than snail mail or even the telephone. The telephone is more interpersonal, and you have the possibility of more immediate contact. But I've spent far too much of my life talking to answering machines. And the internet leaves you with a written copy of your correspondence (if you keep and file your messages) which you can reference at some point in the future. These advantages can be quite important when setting up international forensics connections. In addition to simply being able to send and receive messages, the Internet also affords tremendous possibilities with respect to researching international forensics. There are web sites galore scattered around the world, and my best guess is that at the current time there are well over 200 devoted to various forms of academic debate and forensics activities. There are materials and resources in abundance, notifications of upcoming activities and events, and news items; there are contacts to be made, perspectives to be exposed to, and a whole wealth of links to be explored. And in addition to the obvious forensics links, there are all kinds of web sites devoted to related topics of interest to international travelers: currency exchanges, travel options and rates, lodging and transportation in foreign countries, weather reports, etc.

However, surfing the net is not an entirely unmixed blessing. The Internet is a relatively liquid and unstable resource when compared to journal articles and publications. As a discipline we tend to leave a calcified trail of records, documents, and materials in our wake as we move through time. A book once written remains written forever, even if it goes out of print. Copies can generally be found. Most even marginally important texts remain available on interlibrary loan. But web sites come and go. The folks who maintain them are not all equally capable or conscientious. One cannot always rely on information downloaded off of an Internet site to be completely accurate, unbiased, or even coherent. And Internet addresses can change with such rapidity they make telephone numbers seem like great stone monoliths in comparison. So, taking the good with the bad, I would still highly recommend that internationally oriented directors of forensics become familiar with this tool and begin using it at the same time they start their networking activities.

In order to provide a concrete starting point for your cyberjourney thorough debate land, I will offer a short list of forensics web sites. These were operational on the day this page was written. They were selected in part because they personally struck me as having a certain significance and/or because of the large number of links they contained to other forensics websites. They should be enough to get you connected into the forensics web. But if you happen to come to this essay at some point in the future when none of these addresses are still valid, try typing various forensics terms into a search engine and/or do a little networking among your con-

temporaries to track down some starting points. Without preface, promise, or prejudice, here is the list:

Canadian University Society for Intercollegiate Debate-CUSID-Canada
     (http://www.cusid.anadas.com")
The Cross Examination Debate Association - CEDA – United States
     (http://debate.uvm.edu/ceda.html)
DebateCentral-UnitedStates   (http://debate.uvm.edu/lobby.html)
Debaters Association of Victoria - DAV - Australia
     (http://www.debating.netspace.net.au/home.htm)
Delftsche Studenten Debating Club – Netherlands
     (http://dsc.tudelft.nl/onderverenigingen/debating/andere.html)
Dundee University Debating Union - United Kingdom
     (http://www.dusa.dundee.ac.uk/debuweb)
Erasmus University Debating Society - Netherlands   (http://www.eur.nl/studeren/eds)
The International Public Debate Association - IPDA UnitedStates
     (*http://lonestar.texas.net/~pda*)
Japan Debate Association - JDA - Japan
     (http://www.kt.rim.or.jp/~jda)
Japan Parliamentary Debate Association - JPDA - Japan
     (http://www.asahi-net.or.jp/~cj3mlbky/parlidebate.html)
The Karl Popper Debate Society - Eastern Europe
     (http://www.soros.org/debate)
A Lincoln-Douglas Debate Link Web Site - United States
     (http://www.frii.com/~diverdi/debate/ld/index.html)
Monash University Debate Society - Australia
     (http://yoyo.cc.monash.edu.au/groups/mad)
National Association of Forensics and Argumentation - NAFA –Japan
     (*http://www.t3.rim.or.jp/~nafa/index-e.shtml*)
The National Debate Tournament - NDT - United States
     (http://www.wfu.edu/NDT/index.html)
National Parliamentary Debate Association - NPDA -
     (*http://www.geocities.com/collegepark/union/2928*)
Phi Rho Phi - (http://ole.blc.edu/prphome.html)
University of Leeds Union Debating Society - UK
     (http://www.mopoke.demon.co.uk/uds/index.html)

Don't be surprised if some of these sites have moved or died by the time this essay appears in print. And whatever you find, please don't blame me. [note 24]

Avoid Over-Networking

A word of advice and caution involving the contacts you set up while networking is

appropriate. It is a basic theoretical axiom that all communication costs—it carries a price tag. At a minimum there is some kind of time and energy output involved in the act of communicating. Communication also carries definite risks to go along with the opportunities it affords. Once you have initiated contact with someone, there is a certain obligation to maintain the relationship. You might find that it is possible to establish a quick relationship, exchange a few messages, and then not contact the other person again for years. But some people might get offended by such casual and negligent treatment. And the quality of relationships you might establish in this way is not likely to be very high. It is doubtful the person at the other end will feel much desire to go out of their way to help you unless there is a great deal in it for them. There is also a very high likelihood that your contact will have moved and/or have a new Email address by the time you want to get back in touch. So, when networking, think in terms of establishing and maintaining quality relationships, rather than simply seeing how many people you can contact. This in turn ought to make you think about just how many E-mail relationships you have the time and energy to keep up.

Fund-raising

It is not my purpose here to get heavily involved in the problems of fund-raising. This essay is involved enough without that. Besides, while there is lots of information and material available on fund-raising, I am familiar with almost none of it. But with the virtue that comes of necessity, I have gotten ankle deep into the practical aspects of finding money and have no doubt I'll be up to my knees before much longer. Fund-raising is not my favorite thing to do, but without a pocket full of money, many international forensics options simply vanish. It therefore behooves you as an internationally focused Director of Forensics to wade into the donor pool, put on your best smile, stretch out your palm, and start asking.

Expertise aside, what follows is the product of my own poor and limited experience in raising money for St. Mary's foreign trips.

Be Friendly but Assertive:

If you've never raised funds before, as I hadn't before our Russia trip, you are likely to have a strong internal feeling that no one out there really wants to give you any. As head of a forensics program, you are likely to be familiar with the experience of going to administration begging for extra funds to attend an end-of-the-season national tournament. Your success might have been great, limited, or non-existent. But whatever it was, you probably came away feeling that money was tight, lots of folks were asking,

and you were in a very weak position. Within the context of a university that is not an unfair analysis.

However, out there in the big beautiful world, there are lots of rich individuals and organizations who are literally looking for worthy projects to sponsor. Your administrators know about these people and court them regularly. You can too. Your weakness is that you are very probably a small and inexperienced voice with limited or no fund-raising contacts. Your strength is that you are on the very front line of education with a remarkably valuable product to sell. You are training some of the most articulate students at your university, who in all likelihood have the greatest potential to become future leaders. You want to give them a strong grounding in international communication by providing them with real-world opportunities and experiences. That's not a bad sales hook, so don't be shy.

Start Networking:

The sooner the better. Begin with your own team members. Hold a meeting. Describe the general outlines of the problem. "We need money. We want to use it for the following purposes. Does anyone know anyone who might be a valuable resource in tapping into some funds?" You might be surprised. Think about asking some of the other professors on your campus, especially those in international relations and multi-organizational studies. What about members of the foreign languages department? Here again, you're not asking them to give you money. Rather, you are asking them to put you in touch (perhaps with a favorable introduction) to those who have money. And if they don't actually know anyone like that, they may know someone who knows someone. That's what networking is all about. Move out in all directions, and sooner or later you will start bumping into exactly the folks for whom you are looking.

Try this experiment—it will serve two important functions: Pick a relatively distant and unfamiliar city and consider how you might find a really good Italian meal there. Get the city's area code and telephone exchange. That much is easy. You can pluck that association directory off your shelf and find this much in less than a minute. Now, no fair calling anyone in the directory. Just grab the phone and dial the area code an d exchange and then a number at random. Whoever picks up the phone, act like you were calling what you thought was a good Italian restaurant that had been recommended to you. Apologize for the mistake but don't hang up quickly. Be very friendly and try to engage the other person in conversation: "Excuse me, but, I've got an important business meeting in your city next week and have promised to take the client out for a really good Italian meal. You wouldn't happen to know of anyplace in your area where I could get one, would you?" They just might. And if not, and you ask, they might be able to refer you to

someone who would know. Or they might look up a number in their local phone book for you. I'd be willing to bet that within five friendly conversations, you'd have your restaurant. (Non-answers, answering machines, and quick hang ups don't count.) I said this experiment would serve two important functions. If you actually try it, you ought to become convinced that this networking stuff really works. And second, it will help you to get over that tremendous psychological hump that ruins the career of many a rookie salesperson—that fear of making an initial cold contact. Do it. Force yourself. No one can punch you in the nose over the phone. Just concentrate on keeping things friendly. And, with just a little of this kind of experience, you'll be not only ready but positively eager to get out and start networking for dollars. [note 25]

Avoid Asking for Money.

This is actually a very useful strategy. I'd recommend you generally avoid asking for money directly. Instead, ask for advice on how to get money. If you're talking to a wealthy individual who has specifically invited you over to discuss funding your program, that of course is different. But if not, then work on selling the value of your project and the legitimacy of your need without actually hitting up on your listener. If you make networking in search of a donor your ostensible goal, it will put you in a much better position. Your listeners aren't likely to get defensive. If they like your project and have the money, they will very possibly volunteer it without your having to ask. If not, they will be much more likely to direct you to a potential appropriate donor with a strong introduction and recommendation.

Get Everyone Involved.

I mentioned having an early team meeting. Don't limit the discussion to how the team members can help network to find folks for you to contact. Send them out to do their own talking and networking as well. If one of your debaters is in contact with some potential donor, it is at least possible that the donor will be more open to the familiar student than to the unfamiliar you. Go if you're called; go as a back-up; go as an expert. But when possible, let the student make the initial contact. Besides, what are you training them for anyway? To be persuasive? To be successful? To be movers and shakers? Then don't take away this opportunity for them to practice their moving and shaking.

Consider Grant Possibilities.

Your institution very likely has a grant department, a grant officer, or at least someone

who is the primary contact for grant applications. This person, if asked, will be in a position to help you identify appropriate sources for funding and help you through the grant application process. What have you got to lose? Not much. You'll get a certain amount of kudos from your administration just for having put in a grant request, even if it isn't successful. Administration likes that kind of activity. But if you don't talk with your grant department, nothing is likely to happen. These individuals are usually busy enough without dreaming up new projects. However, once they know you exist, they tend to keep you in the back of their minds. And if they happen to become aware of a grant opportunity that would fit your needs, you're likely to get an unexpected phone call asking if you'd like to go after it.

Ask for more than you think you will need.

When you approach folks for money, they will ask want you want it for and how you plan to spend it. Having a well thought-out plan of action and a realistic budget with carefully researched figures is important. From a purely financial perspective, I'd suggest you ask for about 30% more than your minimal needs. Plan your itinerary, check with travel agents, use your network connections to find out prices and price ranges. Then use some of the upper range price figures to calculate your total budget. Don't use First Class ticket prices in your budget, but if you've got three different coach airfares use the most expensive. When you plan on lodging, budget for reasonably priced business hotels. If you're planning meal prices, figure on three meals a day plus snacks at moderately priced restaurants. You can always fly, sleep, and eat cheaper, but if you work from a rock bottom budget, you have no where to go if things get more expensive. You will probably also find you have a strong internal tendency to be very conservative about asking for money no matter who you are talking to: private donors, administration, or grant funding committees. You're not used to asking for money and might feel uncomfortable asking for too much.

But what is too much? I asked for and received a $5,000 grant to take a couple of students on a Japanese debate tour a couple of years back. It was actually insufficient to cover our expenses, but from the perspective of The Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership, which awarded us the grant, it was insignificant. Their secretary told me it was the smallest size grant they ever made. In fact, after screening our initial request over the phone, the secretary said she would send us a grant application and virtually guaranteed us that it would be accepted—the goal of our project sounding so good to her and the amount we were asking for being so small. Had I asked for $8,000 it might have been granted just as readily, and I wouldn't have ended up in the hole when I got back home.

If you ask for more than you need and get less, you are in much better shape. It will leave you with more options. If you ask for more than you need and actually get it, I'm sure you can find legitimate ways to spend it. And if not, return the surplus and suddenly you're a fiscal genius.

Fund-raising Projects.

I'm not a big fan of car washes and bake sales as fund-raising activities. I suppose if you are comfortable with such things and they work for you, then go for it. However, to my way of thinking there is something about this kind of fund-raiser that runs counter to the public relations image you are trying to establish with your international forensics activities. Your goal is to raise money. You've got a team full of hopefully bright, enthusiastic, and capable individuals. There must be some ways they can think of to generate income that is, for lack of a better term, more dignified and likely to bring in greater sums of cash as well.

One thing I have noticed about my debate teams is that, like Heraclitus' river, they are never quite the same twice. Each team is a compilation of a unique set of individuals, each with different talents, strengths, weaknesses, and contacts. Furthermore, each unique individual is constantly evolving; they grow, develop, change, and sometimes drift away. At any given moment, your team is going to be some distinct combination of opportunities and limitations. You might give this serious consideration before planning any fund-raising projects. And this raises another important point.

Think Creatively.

Brainstorming should be a big element in your fund-raising strategy. George Armstrong in the 1970's and 80's pioneered a system of using the interpretative talent of the Bradley University Individual Events speakers in a highly appropriate fund-raising system. George had a large and well-connected group of community supporters who would regularly invite members of the Bradley Forensics Team to present their interpretive selections at community meetings. In exchange, these organizations, businesses, and clubs would make significant donations to the team's travel budget. I was there in the early 1980's as a finalist for a faculty position when George mentioned that he had just come back with a few students from doing a lunch presentation at a local service club. He showed me a check for $250 and told me that his team — which was one of the largest in the country — gave these presentations on a regular basis. He said, they once did five in a single week. The amount of money they received varied, but I was led to believe that the total was quite impressive.

A second, negative, example comes from my own lack of creative thinking. When I was at the University of Richmond, the program started out with a small enthusiastic team and an even smaller budget. So, I was casting around looking for ways of keeping my people involved. Since the University had an extremely strong and well-established theatre program, we hit upon the idea of putting on an evening of Reader's Theatre productions. I called around and identified some of the very few forensics programs in the area that had Reader's Theatre teams and invited them to Richmond. One of the coaches who answered the call was Gerald Ratliff, then at Montclair State College, and perhaps the best Reader's Theatre director on the forensics circuit in the country. The evening was a smashing success and was repeated the following year with equally good results. The added visibility was enough to help us get additional University funding, and the team got busy with other, more traditional things. I didn't learn of my missed opportunity until much later when I was ready to leave the University. In a conversation with the Department Chair who directed the theatre program, he mentioned the Reader's Theatre productions and wondered why we hadn't charged admission. He felt we might have actually increased the size of our audience by doing so. He also felt it might have attracted some potential sponsors for our debate team. Without charging admission they had no way of knowing we needed money!

The Value of Building on Success.

Something which I've noticed and which I can't explain is the value of building on success in fund-raising. When you don't have any money, it's hard to get some. But when folks have already contributed to your cause and/or when you have piled up a large stack of dollars, collecting more suddenly becomes much easier. [note26] So don't be shy about telling potential donors and network connections about how much you have already collected and your prospects for more. Don't forget to emphasize how much you still need, but don't neglect building on your success.

The Importance of Thank Yous.

It's easy and fun to talk about your successes. It's more difficult and painful to reflect upon your failures. But we tend to learn more from those failures. When St. Mary's got invited to the Moscow conference, we knew it was going to take a great deal of money we didn't have. The conference was less than a year away, and we weren't too optimistic about being able to raise the necessary funds. But we tried and, without knowing what we were doing, suddenly found ourselves in the fund-raising business. We were having zero success. Then the grandfather of one of our team members stepped in and donat-

ed $10,000 toward our trip. I was so overwhelmed, I hardly knew what to do with myself. What I should have done, immediately was to send our donor an acknowledgment and enthusiastic thank you letter. But having never received any kind of donation before, much less a really big one, I cashed the check and got busy making arrangements. A week went by and some additional funding came in. I was elated. Then I found out the grandfather was very annoyed that he hadn't received an acknowledgment that his check had arrived, much less a simple thank you. Here was a wealthy man who was used to the proper etiquette of philanthropy. And here was I without a clue. I immediately tried to make amends. I called and left a message. I sent a letter in which I apologized, explained, and thanked him profusely. I never received any feedback after that, and I never received any additional support either. We brought back a very nice gift for his company from the trip, but I rather suspect he had totally lost interest in us by them. So learn from my example and don't make this particular mistake. Make thank yous a high priority.

Return Favors.

Every time you return a favor, you are building for the future. And it takes a lot of favors to add a successful international component to your forensics program. Start a list and make every effort to keep your various sponsors happy they supported you. It isn't necessary to pay back in kind or in equal value. Generally speaking, donors do not expect to make a profit on their donations. But getting something in return puts your program in a very favorable light. Why do you suppose people who donate $50 to a television fund-raising drive are given a lovely $5 T-shirt (or a similar token of equal value) in return?

Look for Ways of Paying Back Supporters.

This is another area for creative thinking. Look at your list of supporters before you head out on your foreign trip and think about the special interests and needs of each. Then keep your eyes open during your travels. Something as simple as a collection of pictures taken of the various churches you pass might be a particularly impressive return on investment for someone who happens to be interested in the architecture of churches. I once knew a professor who absolutely doted on his wife, and she had an amazing collection of ceramic frogs. On a trip somewhere I happened to come across an unique and inexpensive little frog I thought she might enjoy. She was absolutely delighted, and the professor beamed at me for the rest of the time I was in his graduate program.

Share the Largess.

Often in the course of engaging in forensics activities there are certain surplus resources. You attend a tournament, and things aren't as expensive as you had anticipated. You host a reception, and there is a large table full of food items left over. You engage in a massive cleaning and reorganization of your debate meeting room and come across an assortment of interesting knickknacks that are no longer being used.

There is a strong tendency to hoard such goodies against a future need. And to be sure, if you can clearly anticipate the need, it makes sense to do so. But I would argue that it is also a good investment to share resources for which there is no clear immediate purpose. It is a way of returning favors to and paying back your students who are often your most important supporters.

I usually budget for only one big team meal during away competition. But if money allows, I will kick in a second. Following a CIDD-Debate we almost always have bowls of mixed nuts and trays of cookies left over. I tend to distribute these to whomever is hanging around helping with the physical arrangements. I once inherited a couple of large boxes of semi-obsolete graphics arts supplies from a defunct program on campus. I am still handing out an occasional T-square or x-acto knife set to worthy students who either express or demonstrate a need for such things.

"Share the largess." It's a little maxim I tend to repeat to myself whenever I see an interesting surplus lying around. There is no requirement that the surplus be divided into equal shares. It is very much a matter of your personal assessment and style. Just think of Pavlov and be as generous as resources and circumstances allow.

Travel Problems

One thing I have found in taking debaters on international travel is that I generally encounter exactly the same kinds of problems I do when going to domestic tournaments, only more so. The distances are greater, the stay is longer, expenses are proportionately higher, and many of the minor irritations become major. Aside from that, there only seem to be a few problems that I consider unique to international forensics.

Passports and Visas. This is an obvious international travel problem that is not a factor in domestic tournaments. It is also the first problem you are likely to have to deal with. I make it a rule that all Forensics Program members have valid passports. It's not that they are all likely to be going on foreign trips. But on more than one occasion I've had tickets bought, arrangements made, and then at the last minute had one of the scheduled travelers drop out on me. (We frequently experience the same problems in domestic forensics, after all.) At this point funding is not the problem. The problem is

finding a last-minute replacement who can schedule the trip and who has a valid passport. If you happen to live in Washington, DC, or Chicago, or Houston, you have a local U.S. passport office where the student can show up with application and ticket and have a passport issued that same day. If not, they've either got a long trip or a big problem. There are passport and visa companies that specialize in just such last minute finagling on your behalf. You can find them in a phone book or over the Internet, contact them by phone, put in your order, FedEx out the necessary materials, and get your passport Fed Ex'd back in time for your trip. Maybe. And all you will be out is a great deal of time, aggravation, and cash (substantial if not outrageous). I've been through this process three times now.

While this last minute arranging for passports is possible, it is so much better if everyone simply has one to begin with. That's theory. In practice, my team members have been resistant. There is, of course, a $65 fee involved in applying for a Passport and another $20 or so to get proper pictures made up a tour local Kinko's. To offset this, I try to keep the process as simple as possible. I stop by the post office and pick up multiple copies of the application form. We have an early team meeting where those who need one are helped in filling out the application. And, slowly, the percentage of my squad with valid passports is going up. I hope that eventually most of my team will have one, and this will be something freshman are simply expected to obtain.

Insurance/Liability. If you're going to travel with your squad on international trips, I'd strongly suggest you schedule a nice long meeting with your University's legal advisor. You want to make sure you are following all of the proper procedures and that you have all of the appropriate insurance and liability coverages in place. Based on personal experience, I'd say that you are well over 90% likely not to need any of this, but it's that other 10% that just might cost you a pile of money, a tremendous amount of grief, and possibly your job and reputation. (This is exactly the same kind of problem I have when going to domestic tournaments, only more so.) There is no reason you cannot engage successfully and very productively in overseas travel, but problems can arise, and you want to be sure your employer is aware of and prepared for the possibility.

I can just about guarantee that you will have some small problems of one type or another. A student gets sick in a mild way, or a prescription is lost, and you have trouble getting it refilled. There is some problem with a visa, or a student loses a passport. Hopefully nothing too serious will take place. But there is always the possibility that someone could get seriously ill, or in a major accident, or into serious legal trouble. The time to find out what you need to do in a case like this and who you need to contact is not during the actual crisis, but well before the trip is in its final planning stages. All of this brings me to a predictable problem area.

Antics and Alcohol. Anyone who has coached forensics for any length of time has

run into problems involving boisterous behavior, various forms of mischievousness, and alcohol. This can be even more pronounced when students go from a society and culture where the drinking of alcohol by 18-21 year olds is both illegal and frowned upon by the establishment to a society and culture where it is both legal and accepted. It can hit your group like a sudden plunge into cold water. Students who are already regular drinkers can go nuts. Other students who only drink occasionally are faced with the novelty of being able to walk into a bar and order a drink with no legal problem. One of the former is likely to lead a charge into the local pub with several of the latter in tow. And with them you might also get a few hangers-on who have never been drinkers before but who are tagging along to keep folks company and see what the big deal is. It's a recipe for excess. My advice is to plan for it and set team policies before you start your trip.

Beware the Second-Day Depression: A phenomenon I have noticed on extended foreign trips, something I have never encountered even on longer domestic trips, is something I call the second-day depression. Usually the first day will be filled with all kinds of frenetic activity and adrenalin. There will be a spirit of adventure, plus a whole series of minor problems and aggravations with which you must deal. Then there is usually a change of time zone and disrupted sleeping patterns. And even when your traveling companions finally do get some sleep, they don't sleep very well. Then day two hits, with a small group of people trying to adjust to a new time zone, a new culture, a whole set of deadlines and responsibilities, and all with a notable lack of sleep. The result is a marked tendency for people to be highly irritable and to bark at each other. Day three can sometimes be even worse.

The good news is that by day four the problem has generally resolved itself. And the even better news is that if you warn your traveling companions about the second-day depression well ahead of time, as I am warning you in this article, its effects tend to be tremendously minimized. In some cases, it has been damped out so completely that there was no noticeable effect. I remember in particular our 1993 trip to Moscow with a group of six student debaters and myself. I had so stressed this phenomenon that I think my students were expecting each other to transform into two-headed monsters. The reality turned out to be so minimal in comparison that they thought I was either pulling their legs or mistaken. That was fine with me. I've continued to warn my students when on international trips and have had no problem with second-day depression since.

BENEFITS

Aside from any enjoyment you might actually take in international forensics activities, there are some very tangible benefits that are to be had as well.

Enhanced Prestige and Reputation for Your Program.

Most forensics programs are seen as little debate or individual event steams in the much larger context of other university programs. It's almost a case of someone having a small pet. Even when the pet is dearly loved, the feeling seems to be, "how sweet." It doesn't qualify you for a seat at the main table or serious consideration when there are significant resources to be doled out. But get involved in international activities, and you may suddenly find you have come to the attention of a lot of major players. Various people, including some of your top administrators, begin asking your advice or coming to you with ideas and opportunities. You will find your program and its activities being featured prominently in university literature and public relations releases. You will also find you have developed bulging muscles and the admiring hordes move out of your path and observe you with reverence as you pass. [note 27]

Enhanced Recruiting Value for Your Program.

Along with the increased visibility and prestige, you are likely to have much greater success in recruiting. Your program's international reputation will spread throughout the local high school forensics community. Yours will be one of the schools top forensics prospects put on their "A" list. High quality forensics students who happen to be at your school, but who hadn't seriously considered getting involved, will read about your exploits in the campus newspaper and find themselves tempted. Some will seek you out.

Enhanced Opportunities to Present Papers/Lectures at International Venues.

Having some international items on your VITA is no bad thing when it comes time to face promotion and tenure committees. Before becoming seriously involved in international forensics, I had no publications on international forensics topics. With this essay, I will now have two. [note 28] Before my international activities, I had presented 23 papers at professional meetings, and only two of these were outside of the U.S. Since my involvement I've presented 10 additional papers, and four of these have been outside of the U.S. I have also had the opportunity to make 19 Business and Professional presentations in foreign countries since 1993. Most of these have involved debate lectures and educational seminars which wouldn't count as scholarly presentations. But, all in all, they look extremely impressive in my annual reports.

POST-TEST EXPERIMENT

Remember that list you jotted down before you started reading the body of this essay? If you haven't already done so, go back and reconsider your initial ideas in light of what you have read here. You might actually be able to assign a monetary figure to the ideas you have picked up (in which case you can mail me a check). Since this is much more of a pragmatic than a theoretical essay, such a payoff is important. At least, that was my goal in writing this piece. On the other hand, if you come away from this essay thinking, "HAH, I knew all that before and a whole lot more," then for goodness sake get in touch and let me know what you know that I don't (in which case, I may mail you a check). I don't have a monopoly on good ideas concerning international forensics and in fact am convinced that there is a tremendous amount that others know and I don't. I suspect there is even more that no one knows and is simply waiting to be learned.

Since I am becoming a sort of international debate information exchange, I really would be delighted to learn anything which anyone has to offer. If you had even one good idea on your list that wasn't included in this essay—a circumstance that is highly probable for even the least involved of readers, I strongly encourage you to write it down and send it to me at Acirlin@stmarytx.edu. If there are enough good ideas and sufficient interest on the part of the editors of this journal, one day I might bundle them together, giving proper credit to the first contributor who sends me each idea and publish them as a follow-up essay.

Also, please feel free to contact me directly about any questions, concerns, ideas, or opportunities that you may have concerning international forensics. If there is one axiom that should guide you in developing an international forensics program, it is to remain constantly receptive to new ideas and possibilities. Opportunity knocks at the oddest times and in the strangest garb. You don't want to be asleep in the back room when it does. Good luck and God Speed.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Here are just a few general principles to keep in mind when thinking about or planning out international forensics activities:

Start now. Even if you have no current plans in the works and see no immediate prospects for international forensics activities, you can start surfing the net, networking, and setting up possibilities. Everything you do right now is building towards a long-term future. Float ideas, even if they seem impractical. You just might find that an influential someone likes one of your ideas and provides the resources necessary to make

the idea suddenly workable.

Get creative. You need funds? You need other resources? You need permissions? You need helpers? You need cooperative efforts? If the usual sources seem to be mined out, try looking in less obvious places. If there seem to be roadblocks in your way, try looking for alternative routes to your goal.

Always think Win-Win-Win. Consider who is involved and how can you structure your international activities to spread the wealth around. Share the largess. Think constantly in these terms and don't be too hesitant to make last-minute adjustments to your plans if it will bring in additional players who can add resources or if it helps to make a greater number of people happy.

Make up and update checklists. For each international activity, from hosting a CIDD team to going on a private foreign exhibition debate tour, there is a whole set of arrangements to be made. Unless you are planning to engage in these activities strictly as a one-time deal—and there is no way you can ever be sure of that—it is almost certain that your past experiences and lessons will be valuable in your future plans. Don't lose that experience. Keep a journal and make lists. Use those lists when planning future events and update them. [note 29]

NOTES:

[1] I would be very interested in hearing from anyone involved with forensics programs in other countries concerning how all this applies to your situation—what makes sense and what doesn't; where it's missed the mark and where it's right on the button. Please feel free to contact me with your feedback: Acirlin@stmarytx.edu.

[2] Think of this essay as a kind of snapshot of my current understanding of international forensics. I was tempted to do a good deal of informal research in preparing this essay beyond what I was able to find on my shelves and pull through the Internet. But on the one hand, the production schedule I was given didn't allow for this. And on the other, it might be interesting for the reader to note how much and how little a reputed "expert" in this area really   knows at this point in history.

[3] There are a large number of excellent and very practical textbooks available on the pragmatics of cross cultural interaction. They are not a substitute for direct experience, but they are a good foundation for that experience. There are a series of books written by Nancy L. Braganti and Elizabeth Devine, Travelers Guides on the Customs and Manners of various Geographic regions including Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East & North Africa. They were all published between 1987 and 1995 by St. Martin's Press. Instead of giving you tedious and redundant reference data for each title, get on the Internet, look up http://www.amazon.com, do a keyword search on "Braganti" and see what comes up. Another set of cross cultural guides are the "Do's and Taboos" series of Roger E. Axtell. There are at least nine texts in the series published between 1990 and 1998 and they have the added virtue of being a little more entertaining to read than the Braganti and Devine books. Axtell is published by John Wiley & Sons. One final set of guides for the international traveler I will mention is a "Do's and Don'ts" series written by Gladson I. Nwanna. I cannot speak to the quality of these guides since I am completely unfamiliar with them. But I chanced across the books at the Amazon.com web site almost by accident. There are approximately 12 books in this series published by the World Travel Institute. They seem to be an annually updated collection (all most recently "published" in 1998) and are substantially more expensive than the other two sets of publications. Also, I would recommend you take out a team subscription to the World Press Review. This is a magazine which specializes in providing a sampling of essays and articles from the foreign press in a wide variety of countries. The magazines web site is: http://www.worldpress.org. You can order a subscription through your usual discount (educator) vendor or call (212) 889-5155 and pay full bore.

[4] If you have no idea what you are doing, get one of your students to help. If you've got four members in your program, I can almost guarantee one of them is a computer jock. They might be especially valuable in showing you how to use your

equipment after it is set up and plugged in.

[5] Here again, it is not my purpose to turn this essay into a comprehensive Internet symposium, however, you can learn more about these free Email providers and sign up for service at www.hotmail.com, www.juno.com, & www.yahoo.com.

[6] I promise you, this only takes a matter of a few minutes to perhaps half an hour to master.

[7] D. Carnegie, How to Win Friends and Influence People (Pocket Books: New York) 1994.

[8] Compare the following two opening sentences and consider how they might affect your interest in reading the rest of the message: "I am interested in developing an internationally based forensics program and thought you might be a good person to contact." "Your web site looked so interesting, I wanted to contact you to find out more about your program."

[9] I wanted to include a CIDD web page and tried to find one at the NCA web site (http://www.natcom.org). No luck. You can find current contact information for this committee listed in the NCA Directory in the section on Governance. The 1998-99 chair of the CIDD is Thomas N. Hollihan at the University of Southern California (Hollihan@rcf.usc.edu).

[10] Cf. The English Speaking Union Website where some comprehensive information about the history of British-U.S. tours is listed: http://www.esu.org

[11] Here is one critical bit of advice. If you do get a team for a longer stay, avoid the temptation of trying to cram their every waking minute with activities. The feedback we have received from touring debaters makes it clear that our rest stop is much appreciated. You might also try to remain flexible, rather than pre-setting the visiting team's entire itinerary. We like to ask if there is anything the visitors would enjoy doing. One group wanted to listen to President Clinton give a speech in front of the Alamo, and we managed to get them tickets. Another wanted to visit Mexico, and we were close enough and able to make it happen. Trevor Sather wanted to hit baseballs in an electric batting cage, and, while there's no accounting for taste, we were able to accommodate him as well.

[12] This was a residual benefit of having taken some students to debate in England the year before. Cambridge had hosted KCKCC and in doing so, Don established the network connection that enabled him to set up this return tour. The St. Mary's exhibition debate tour of the Netherlands came about through a very similar kind of networking.

[13] And in case you were wondering, a call by Don Black to British Airways enabled him to set this itinerary as a simple round-trip. In other words, even though the debaters flew into Utah and out of Kansas, the tickets were billed at a simple round-trip fare.

[14] It's possible that Don might have gone out of his way to help any English school which requested his assistance. But to host a team from a school with the name recognition of Cambridge made the project especially worthy.

[15] In 1996, I participated in the IFA tournament and convention in Athens, Greece. I noticed that there were only U.S. schools in attendance, but I attributed this mostly to the fact that the tournament was being held in a non-English speaking country. The following year the tournament was being held in London. I was excited about the possibilities of international competition, but the IFA board of directors voted to use the NFA debate topic for the tournament. Since L-D is the only format offered at this tournament, this was a very significant decision. It was even more significant considering the topic in 1997: that the U.S. Department of Education should require the implementation of more rigorous methods of teacher and/or student performance evaluation in secondary school systems. How was the IFA supposed to attract foreign competitors with a topic like that? It would be like a group of British debaters holding a tournament in New York while using a topic concerning some esoteric branch of the British government. This was a topic, by the way, that the NFA schools had been debating all season. I contacted Harry Strine about this as soon as the topic was announced and expressed my concerns. I also told him that I had a lot of contacts in Great Britain and the Netherlands and that I might be able to spread the word about the tournament and generate a good number of local entries. However, I said, the topic would be inappropriate for an international competition. I asked if there were some way it could be changed, given the nature of the problem and the fact that the topic had just come out. Harry was sympathetic to my arguments and promised to take the matter up quickly with his board of directors, which he did. And the board voted to leave the topic exactly as it was. At news of this, all of my English contacts lost interest in the tournament. Aside from the inherent unfairness of this topic to potential foreign competitors, it was also extremely unfair to any U.S. schools who weren't debating on the NFA circuit. St. Mary's was one of these. I brought two quite decent debaters to the tournament—one of these, Joe Hoelscher, went on to win the Public Debate Association national championship the following year—but neither could win a single round against the more experienced and heavily evidenced NFA circuit debaters. All of which I mention simply to support my contention that the "International Forensics Association" is much more a tour-group branch of the U.S. National Forensics Association than a true "International" debate association. It is also interesting to note that the IFA adopted this debate topic about the U.S. Department of Education along with their convention theme, "Making Global Connections," without the slightest obvious sense of irony or even awareness.

[16] The IFA is another organization affiliated with the NCA. You can find them in the NCA directory in the section listing "Communication Associations and Related Organizations." Harry seems to be the perpetual Chair of this Association and can be found at Bloomsburg University. He has no Email address that I am aware of. None of the officers do. His current

phone number is (717) 389-4576.

17 The three primary respondents were Ian Duncan, a former   CIDD debater from Scotland, Michael Lubetsky, a Canadian debater now heading up the Parliamentary Debate movement in Japan, and Trevor Sather, a transplanted American living in London and co-director of the English Speaking Union (ESU) debate program that coordinates a great deal of the parliamentary debate activity in Great Britain.

18 Trevor Sather tells me that this format was developed primarily as a way of making the Worlds Competition more manageable. The number of teams entered was becoming so large that it was becoming impossible to find sites large enough to accommodate the tournament. This format cut the number of rooms required in half. Where traditional team debate formats requires one room for every two teams, this format could put four teams in that same room and conduct the round in essentially the same time frame.

19 If you move quickly, there are a couple of good   descriptions of this format on the web. A very basic description can be found at the Dundee University Debating Union Home Page — www.dusa.dundee.ac.uk/debuweb. A more official and complete description has been posted on the University of Bristol Debating Society web site at — http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Union/Debatingsoc/rules.html. Another official and compete description is available from the University of Rhodes Debate Society in South Africa —   http://debating.ru.ac.za/british.htm. You might consider South Africa to be a rather strange place to find such an excellent description of British Style Parliamentary Debate. But since South Africa hosted the Worlds competition a couple of years back, perhaps it isn't so strange after all.

20 I imagine that virtually all of my readers will be familiar with the nomenclature of Soccer vs. U.S. style Football. However just in case anyone is not, I am writing from a U.S. perspective. What the rest of the world calls "Football" Americans call "Soccer." What Americans call "Football" the rest of the world calls, "American Football." If you think about it objectively, the language of the rest of the world is more justified. In soccer, the use of the hands is not allowed—hence, it is "foot"-ball in a very real sense. Why American football is called football is beyond my comprehension. In basketball they originally tossed the ball into a basket. In baseball they still run around bases. But why is American football called football?

21 There are, of course, debate tournaments in many different countries other than Great Britain. But I emphasize the possibility of attending British tournaments here for a number of reasons. First, many of the debate tournaments in foreign countries are conducted in foreign languages. In the Netherlands, for example, many of their competitions are in Dutch. Second, in some other countries, a U.S. entry might seem unfair. In Japan, by way of another example, the students often debate in English, but for this reason, competition against an American team doesn't always sit well with local judges. We ran into this problem first hand when a couple of my debaters were invited to participate in the International Christian University parliamentary debate tournament in Tokyo. The experience was 95% positive, but that other 5% included some rather heated objections to our participation. Had I anticipated this ahead of time, I would have suggested we put on an exhibition debate at the tournament, rather than being part of the competition. And third, if you are at all interested in participating in foreign tournaments as a tune up for the Worlds competition, it is Britain where you will get your best introduction and stiffest competition.

22 Dr. Nazarova came to St. Mary's in the fall of 1992. She invited us to attend the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL) Bi-Annual Conference which was being hosted by Moscow State University in the fall of 1993. Since the Soviet Union had just fallen, there was a tremendous interest in bringing academic debate into the Russian educational system, and Dr. Nazarova wanted to demonstrate a model of that kind of debate which was also highly audience centered and communicative. I was flattered she picked us.

23 As a tour organizer, Yoshiro Yano is nothing short of a genius. He organized the tour as a set of major stops at magnet locations, rather than as a series of individual program visits. We would arrive in a train station, and there would be a reception committee literally waiting outside of our train window smiling and bowing at us as the train pulled in. All the details had been carefully preplanned. At the debate itself and at the lectures I gave on debate subjects, instead of just having team members and students from the local school in the audience, we would sometimes have as many as 20 other schools and debate clubs represented. In this way, while we only had seven major stops on the tour and participated in one tournament, we spoke to members of well over 100 different debate organizations and somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 individuals. Thus, our tour was relaxed, enjoyable, and extremely productive.

24 The exception, of course, is the IPDA web site. As   Executive Secretary of that association I am responsible   for the content there.

25 It occurred to me when writing this section that I've   actually used this cold-calling technique on more than one   occasion. I remember once, by way of example, when PKD   nationals were held in Tacoma. I was bringing a very large group of students and would be way short on judges. It was going to be very expensive to fly judges out, and just as expensive to pay fees. What to do? I got on the phone and called every school in the area looking for some cheap hired judges, but the tournament hosts had been there way ahead of me. So I got really friendly with the secretaries I talked to, explained my problem and asked for their advice. Within five conversations I had lined up two judges who fit the bill precisely and saved me a

great deal of money. And they were both delighted to help.

[26] This might have something to do with bandwagons. And it might have something to do with the credibility of your project. One day, I'll have to take some fund-raising gurus out to lunch and ask them.

[27] I think this might be doubly true for female Directors of Forensics. Whatever the reasons, they sometimes start out with less prestige than their male counterparts and have to put up with more aggravation along the way.

[28] The other publication is, Academic Debate and Program Development for Students and Teachers Around the World, Pecan Grove Press: San Antonio, Texas 1994, [297 pp.]   ISBN: 1-877603-24-4. (Well, you were curious, weren't you?)

[29] And if you have or create some good checklists, please send me copies.

Alan Cirlin (Ph.D. Univ of Iowa) is a Full Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas and serves as the Director of Forensics and Executive Secretary of the International Public Debate Association.

A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH
to Improving Style
in Academic Debate

Alan Cirlin
Director of Forensics, St. Mary's University

This essay argues that the stylistic abuses of NDT-style debate are much more a product of the sociology of the academic debate community than of any rhetorical failings. This helps to explain why rhetorical remedies have failed to have a significant impact on the problem. An alternative (sociological) solution is suggested, one which is currently being attempted by the Pubic Debate Association. Walter Fisher's "Narrative Paradigm" is then suggested as a new rhetorical model for this sociologal approach to debate and 10 criteria are developed out of this model as an aid to debaters and coaches.

You say you don't care for the style of academic debate. Too much speed. Too much evidence. Too much jargon. O.K., what are you going to do about it? This was the problem facing educators in the early 1970's. Or rather, this was the problem facing a small sub-set of educators. Most of the coaches from the larger more successful NDT programs didn't see any problem. They were quite happy with things exactly as they were (as were many of the coaches of the smaller and more moderately successful programs).

Generally speaking, stylistic abuses in academic debate were considered a rhetorical problem and rhetorical solutions had always been applied. If you didn't like the students' speaking style, teach them a new one. You might try to provide corrective rhetorical feedback on ballots, in oral critiques, between rounds, and in the classroom; study the problem rhetorically, provide analyses, and suggest improvements; and report your findings at conventions and in journal articles.

But all that wasn't working. The problems of rhetorical style in academic debate seemed remarkably resistant to rhetorical remedies.

The small group educators in the 1970's who were concerned with this problem, lead by Dr. Jack Howe of the California State University at Long Beach, attempted a much more sociological approach to a cure. They cloned a fresh new debate associa-

tion out of what they perceived to be the diseased old debate association. They started small, included only like-thinking coaches and willing students.

But that was about as far as their sociological departure went. The basic rule changes of the new Cross Examination Debate Association were all essentially rhetorical. They shifted from policy to value debate. They went from allowing three months preparation time at the start of the season (from topic announcement to the first tournament) to just a couple of weeks. They changed topic in mid-season to reduce the advantage of long exposure and practice. But more than anything they used the rhetoric of education and administration to try to persuade the problem out of existence. There was official literature generated, there was a regular executive secretaries' newsletter which carried editorial admonitions, there was a revised debate ballot with a slightly greater emphasis on ethos and a coversheet of judging instructions with a heavy emphasis on ethos, there was the creation of a CEDA yearbook, there were training sessions and speeches and convention programs. Yet in spite of all this, the speaking style of the students in this new association kept backsliding toward the NDT model from which it had emerged.

The new association attempted a number of rhetorical cures. But the only real sociological point of departure was membership. And over the 20 years between its creation and the early 1990's, the basic differences in membership between NDT and CEDA became progressively less significant. Then in the 1996-97 season the two associations had become so stylistically similar that they adopted a joint debate resolution and have essentially reintegrated. Almost nothing differentiates them any longer. They debate the same topic at the same tournaments before the same judges using the same criteria. And the style of this new reintegrated association is the NDT style, not the CEDA style of its founders. If CEDA was an experiment designed to alleviate the stylistic abuses of NDT debate, it is certainly time to declare that experiment a failure.

The purpose of this essay is to suggest that a much more sociological approach to the problem of style in academic debate which might very well succeed where CEDA failed. I will start by considering the academic debate community as a social/cognitive system whose principle educational role is to provide a kind of socialization. Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm will then be used as a bridge between debate as a sociological and rhetorical activity. All of which will lead to some suggestions about how to make the necessary adjustments which could, in fact, lead to positive change in the speaking styles of our debaters.

A SOCIAL/COGNITIVE VIEW OF REALITY

Academic debate is a training ground where our students learn to perform very specif-

ic oral communication skills to succeed in a highly selective sub-culture. Ideally, the skills they thus acquire will be transferrable to the larger sub-cultures of business, law, and politics. But will they? This is exactly the criticism which has been continually levied at the NDT/CEDA style—that many of the "skills" which our students are learning (high-speed delivery, the use of debate jargon, disrespect for the context and meaning of evidence, etc.) will not transfer well and will, in fact, be somewhat anti-social within the larger, real-world contexts. I will argue that the forces which keep traditional debate styles spinning off into these stylistic abuses lie not in the activity per se, but in the culture which supports that activity.

Philosophers have for centuries debated the problem of how we know what we know, how much we know, and how much we can ever know. Bertrand Russell has called this "one of the great historic controversies in philosophy."[1] On the one side, empiricists, such as Bishop George Berkeley, John Locke, David Hume, and even Thomas Hobbes, have argued that all human knowledge has its foundation in experience;[2] and on the other side, rationalists, such as Ren Descartes, Baron Gottfried Leibnitz, and to a lesser degree Immanuel Kant and Georg Hegel, have argued that there are certain forms of understanding which are innate to human beings and independent of human experience.[3] But from a practical, educator's perspective this is hardly a controversy: contextual (experiential) factors seem to play the overwhelmingly important role in determining the content of individual minds.

This truth can be easily demonstrated when we consider the socialization process. A child raised in an "English" environment will learn the English language, English history, English standards of behavior, and a generally English outlook on life. This despite the influences of genetic factors and any a priori or innate knowledge he or she may possess at birth. Jean Piaget has described this socialization process as it applies to language acquisition: "Language is a group institution. Its rules are imposed on individuals. One generation coercively transmits it to the next, and this has been true for as long as there have been men."[4] This coercive process of intellectual socialization is the wellspring of almost all human understanding.

Because people are socialized in this way to understand their environment, they can be said not to respond to the real, existential world, but to a cognitive world of society's and their own creation. (And before I go any further, let me note that I will be begging the question and oversimplifying an extremely difficult and complex philosophical question by making the assumption, for the sake of this essay, that an objective "reality" exists.) Since the vast majority of what we know comes indirectly to us through our senses, it is, practically speaking, impossible for humans to ever gain a direct knowledge of reality. Alfred Korzybski, in studying the relationship between symbols and meaning, posited that every human carries a "map" around in his or her head—a map which rep-

resents the "territory" of the real world.5 But as S.I. Hayakawa warns us, "the symbol is not the thing symbolized; the word is not the thing; the map is not the territory it stands for."6

Cognitive reality is a mere approximation of actual reality. Yet, so powerful is the hold that this psychological reality has over us, that, as Benjamin Whorf has speculated, "the forms of a person's thoughts are controlled by inexorable laws of pattern of which he is unconscious. These patterns are the unperceived intricate systematizations of his own language. . . . by which the personality not only communicates, but also analyzes nature, notices or neglects types of relationship and phenomena, channels his reasoning, and builds the house of his consciousness."7 Of course, people seldom trouble themselves about this distinction between their mental world and the real world. And even more seldom do they consider their consciousness to be, as Whorf describes it, "a mere puppet whose linguistic maneuverings are held in unsensed and unbreakable bonds of pattern."8 All human behavior from the microscopic to the macroscopic, from the psychological to the sociological to the political is governed by this basic truth: that human behavior is a function of cognitive rather than objective reality. From a novice debater's perspective, the unwritten rules of they game they are socialized into become a kind of basic truth—a fundamental way of seeing the world.

Taking this position one step further, it is also obvious that cognitive reality is heavily influenced, if not fundamentally determined, by the communicated beliefs, attitudes, and values of other people. Robert Rosenthal has demonstrated the strength and effects of interpersonal expectations,9 Solomon Asch, the powerful effects of conformity pressure,10 and Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, how the cumulative effects of these and other psychological forces result in the formation of a socially constructed reality.11 It is exactly this socially constructed view of reality which serves as the structural basis for the coercive socialization process described by Piaget above, a process which begins operating on neophyte members of the academic debate community almost from the moment they first become aware of the activity.

On the other hand and in another sense, social reality does not really exist at all. Social reality can be thought of as the sum total of individual perceptions of reality as created and maintained through interpersonal and artifactual communication. By interpersonal communication I refer to the sharing and confirmation of perceptions as described by Richard Weaver when he argues that language is sermonic: "We are all of us preachers in private or public capacities. We have no sooner uttered words than we have given impulse to other people to look at the world, or some small part of it, in our way. Thus caught up in a great web of inter-communication and inter-influence, we speak as rhetoricians affecting one another for good or ill."12 By artifactual communication I refer to those symbolic cultural artifacts including books, movies, and art which

embody and perpetuate a common cultural mythos masquerading in the guise of reality.[13] And our world of academic debate certainly has plenty of artifacts.

As a way of demonstrating the interdependence of social and cognitive realities, consider any cultural group which is supposed to share a common social construction of reality. Will every member of that society share every aspect of the common world view? Of course not. Will there be any aspect of that world view which is shared by every member, including every madman and every philosopher? Even that is doubtful. This creates a serious objection to thinking of socially constructed reality as having any existence independent of the minds of the individuals who comprise the social group. We could of course circumvent these objections by defining a "cultural group" in terms of commonly held perceptions; but by so doing we will have defined the theoretical objection out of existence rather than demonstrated its nonexistence. This is not to make the reductionist argument that social reality does not exist in any sense. It can, in fact, be said to exist as a synergistic product of individual views of reality; but in this sense it is dependent upon rather than independent of individual minds. The conclusion? That social reality exists in the aggregate of individual cognitive agreements rather than as some independent holistic entity. Our academic debate community exists as the sum total of its individual members and the interactions among those members which serve to define their collective reality. It therefore makes more sense to speak of a social/cognitive reality than to separate these two concepts. This conclusion carries with it a number of important implications for our discussion of academic debate as a sub-cultural group.

IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL/COGNITIVE REALITY

First, social/cognitive reality is variegated: The social agreements which constitute our common views of the real world will vary with geography, time, and social factors such as ideology, religion, and philosophy. And within any defined group there will be variation along a number of dimensions. A group of NPDA debaters may share a common social reality concerning the rules of their debate game yet hold radically different views on economics. And some members of NPDA may share a common economic reality with a group of CEDA debaters but completely disagree with them on what constitutes appropriate speaking style. Jerald Combs has provided an outstanding set of examples of this phenomenon when he systematically juxtaposes three distinct schools of political thought on their interpretation of thirteen events or trends in United States history.[14] To put this another way: is it necessary for a defined social group to completely agree on all aspects of reality before it can be said that they share a common social reality? If so, then there may be no such thing as a common socially constructed reality. If not (a

far more reasonable position), then social/cognitive reality may be seen as consisting of a number of dimensions or aspects. By this view, socially constructed reality is more a mottled mosaic with indefinite edges woven throughout a culture than a homogeneous background for that culture with sharply defined borders. The obviously good news here for forensics educators is that we don't have to create a completely homogeneous culture to maintain a viable sub-cultural identity.

Second, social/cognitive reality is dynamic rather than static. There is certainly a momentum and inertia which tends to maintain socially constructed realities, but this process is being constantly challenged by the physical world, changing technologies, political events, and the inexorable vagaries and eccentricities of human communication. These forces create a relatively continuous assault on accepted beliefs, and interpersonal communication about these assaults serves as a fermentation process out of which new social/cognitive views of reality emerge. Alvin Toffler in his book, *Future Shock*, has not only chronicled some of the forces which lead to change but argued convincingly that the general rate of change in our modern world is accelerating.[15]It is also worth remembering that there is a certain premium placed, at least in liberal societies, on artistic efforts which challenge accepted views and offer new and tension creating perspectives. Is it any wonder then that regressive political systems tend to discourage artistic creativity except in narrowly proscribed, governmentally approved directions. Plato, in describing his ideal Republic, goes so far as to prescribe the strict limitation of artistic license, in an explicit attempt to preserve his ideal political system.[16] This also helps to explain, at least to a limited degree, the almost hostile resistance to attempts to reform the debate activity. But so long as the human animal remains human, evolution of social/cognitive reality will continue and the forces opposed to change can do nothing more than effect its retardation. We have seen the evolution of NDT from a rhetorical to an information processing activity over a period of almost a century. And we have also seen the formation of CEDA as a rhetorical alternative to NDT and it's eventual devolution back into the NDT style over a period of less than a quarter century. It will be interesting to see how NPDA holds up and whether the exodus of smaller CEDA programs from the newly integrated NDT/CEDA circuit produces a similar devolution in the parliamentary style of debate.[17]

Third, social/cognitive reality is fragile, at least insofar is the individual is concerned: Paul Watzlawick in his delightful book, *How Real is Real*, describes a number of psychological hobgoblins which tend to disrupt the delicate faith people have in their cognitive view of reality.[18] Among these are translation, paradoxes, confusion, rule emergence, punctuation, disinformation, deception, interdependence, and self fulfilling prophecy.[19] More pragmatically, Joost Meerloo documents a number of cases involving "thought control, menticide, and brainwashing" across a variety of contexts,[20] William

Sargant provides an excellent discussion of the "mechanistic and physiological aspects" of conversion and brainwashing,[21] and Solomon Asch is able to quantify how fragile an individual's social/cognitive view of reality can be.[22] Given this fragility, it is not surprising that both individuals and entire social systems can be persuaded or coerced to adopt new views of reality if sufficient pressure is applied (which again is both a source of encouragement and a caution to would-be reformers).

Fourth, social/cognitive reality is highly vulnerable: Vulnerability almost follows as a necessary corollary of the third implication concerning fragility. As suggested above, both an individual's and society's view of reality is subject to a variety of forces including physical, social, economic, political, and informational change. And it is certainly possible for an agent to intentionally introduce such change in a calculated effort to influence individuals and social systems. Such efforts can run the gamut from a simple sales pitch to a major propaganda campaign and can involve anything from a minor manipulation of an individual's social/cognitive reality to a full scale assault on society's construction of reality. Furthermore this vulnerability is commonly recognized, as witnessed by the existence of entire branches of knowledge and human endeavor devoted to taking advantage of it (eg., advertising, argumentation, debate, marketing, negotiation, persuasion, public relations, salesmanship, etc.). Robert Cialdini, after completing a remarkable analysis of the modern techniques of influence, argues that virtually all these techniques are based upon the exploitation of "automatic compliance responses," that these responses are vital mental shortcuts which allow us to function in a complex world, and that "we should want to retaliate whenever we see someone betraying one of our rules of thumb for profit."[23] At the macroscopic or societal level, Jacques Ellul provides an excellent analysis of vulnerability in *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*.[24] Another discussion of this subject, from a somewhat different angle, is Vance Packard's classic report on media manipulation, *The Hidden Persuaders*.[25] He writes, "when this book first appeared [in 1957], advertised persuasion was an eight billion dollar business. Now [in 1980] it is a forty-odd billion dollar industry."[26] One might surmise that the recognition and exploitation of social/cognitive vulnerability is a large and healthy industry.

A final implication of viewing reality from a social/cognitive perspective is that the problem of debate style is both understandable and correctable. Social/cognitive reality is variegated, it's dynamic; it's fragile and therefore highly vulnerable. From a debate educator's perspective, the bad news is that, left to their own debaters will evolve styles which will tend to spin away quite easily from any kind of rhetorical ideal. It tells us that rhetoric is the *product* of the system and not a *controlling* factor of that system. This helps to explain why rhetorical interventions have consistently failed to achieve lasting stylistic improvements. [As an illustrative if imperfect analogy consider a parent at a pic-

nic telling a child not to eat sweets before dinner. The child likes sweets and all the other kids are eating them. The parent's lecture certainly has an effect, but in the absence of workable constraints the kid will make a bee-line for the candy at the first opportunity.]

The good news is that if the right kinds of pressure can be applied, the stylistic excesses of academic debate should be relatively easy to correct. The trick is to find a way to structure rhetoric as a teleological goal rather than as a causal pressure—to create a sociological climate which will literally pull debate into the future rather than relying on rhetorical tricks which within the current sociological climate are attempting to push it out of the past. In other words, we need an environment in which our students will *want* to adopt a sound rhetorical style as the best way of winning. In such a sociological sub-culture, academic debate would indeed become a training ground where the specific oral communication skills students learn would, in fact, be transferrable to the larger business, legal, and political worlds.

As a practical matter, what might such a sociological learning environment look like? How might the academic debate sub-culture be structured to promote a superior rhetorical style?

STRUCTURE, FEEDBACK, AND CULTURE

Feedback has been demonstrated to be the most critical element in the creation and maintenance of the NDT speaking style.[27] And the most critical kinds of performance feedback are the observation of who and what are actually winning tournaments and rounds. All the lip-service in the world is as naught when compared to the easily discernable speaking style of the debaters who consistently emerge as winners within the academic debate sub-cultural community.

Debaters do what they have to do to win. And they take their cues from those who are most successful. By definition, these top debaters have two obvious areas of excellence. First, they possess superior critical thinking and public speaking abilities. And second, they are most successful at adjusting to the biases and expectations of their judges.

So in creating our superior sub-culture let's take a tip by paraphrasing Shakespeare and "shoot all the judges." I.e., let's get the highly experienced, highly trained, super analytical judges out of the back of the room. Obviously the NDT speaking style can only be successful when employed in front of a judge who both comprehends and prizes that style. The most common reaction from a lay observer to a top NDT debate round is incredulity. They find it incomprehensible and more than a little bizarre. So the first thing we've got to do is to put lay judges in the back of the room. We redesign the bal-

lot to make it easy for lay-judges to fill out. We provide a simple and standard set of instructions for judging rounds. And we let the lay-judges judge using whatever rhetorical standards lay audiences use when assessing public advocates.

The most common objection I get to this suggestion comes from seasoned debaters and coaches. They object that debate is far too technical for lay judges to understand. There is too much theory to be responsible for. They won't be able to understand the issues or make intelligent decisions without the proper background and training.

Nonsense! That is precisely what is wrong with the sub-culture as it commonly stands. A highly trained and intensely inbred audience. By opening up this important aspect of the activity to the "real world" (so to speak) we force debaters to adjust to real-world audiences. I thought that's what the activity was supposed to be about in the first place.

So the "best" debaters, with the fastest speaking style, and the greatest volumes of evidence, logic, and theory, won't always win. Let me clue you in. They don't always win anyway. And they are still likely to win the lion's share of their rounds once they get the hang of adjusting to their new audience.

Now what do we do with the expert judges who will no longer be judging? Let's make them debate. They will become the "best of the best." They will set the standard for rhetorical excellence.

But will they? I mean, these are exactly the folks who are most devoted to and forgiving of the rhetorical excesses of the NDT style. Of course they will. They, more than anyone else, have both the knowledge and the skill to adjust to the lay audience. And they will win and thus become the role models for the rest of the sub-culture.

Beyond this there is another reason to believe that coaches as debaters will adopt extremely audience centered approaches to debate. The coaches have a tremendous rhetorical disadvantage. I.e., they are generally older and present a more sophisticated appearance in the round. They are very likely to be commonly perceived as "picking" on their younger and less experienced opponents. That's bad. When David meets Goliath, who among the crowd is rooting for the giant? Certainly not the lay judge. So Goliath better bend over backwards to project an especially pleasant and high-ethos image. That is what will win and that is what will become the standard of the sub-culture.

And that is basically it. That is the essence of the shift necessary to take a truly sociological approach to reforming style in academic debate. Move the experienced judges from behind to in front of the camera. This discussion could easily feather off into the various pros and cons of this approach. There are certainly a number of economic and practical advantages to using lay judges. And, of course, there will be a considerable number of criticisms as well. But this basic approach is currently being tested by the

new Public Debate Association and the proof of the pudding will be in the eating if it is anywhere at all. Either the style of debate generated within this new association is rhetorically superior and stable or it isn't. Either the practical elements of this approach are workable or they aren't. Assuming that association lasts long enough for an answer to emerge, then time will tell. (And for the rest of this essay I will refer to the alternative sociological approach suggested above as Public Debate.)

Of more interest to this current discussion is the question: what kind of speaking style is likely to become the governing paradigm within a sociological sub-group governed by a Public Debate mentality. Or to put it another way, what should educators be using as a central teaching paradigm in coaching Public Debate? The narrative paradigm of Walter Fisher suggests an answer and a new role for rhetoric in academic debate.

THE NARRATIVE PARADIGM AND PERSUASION

The "narrative paradigm" of human communication was first presented formally by Walter Fisher in his award winning essay in *Communication Monographs*.[28] This seminal essay brilliantly synthesizes the concept of a narrative paradigm out of a nebulous body of earlier works. Fisher gives credit to W. Lance Bennett and Martha Feldman for their development of a similar "storytelling" paradigm to help explain how juries cognitively reconstruct events based upon what they hear during a court trial.[29] In addition, Fisher cites a handful of earlier studies on related attempts to develop narrative approaches to communication.[30] But aside from these few examples, Fisher concludes that he knows "of no other attempt to suggest narration as a paradigm."[31] I would offer at least one addition to Fisher's list. Narration, as a legal paradigm, was not an original concept of Bennett and Feldman's; it has been suggested as least as far back as Louis Nizer's well-known autobiography, *My Life in Court*, when he discusses probability and theatre as central metaphors in courtroom law.[32] Nizer makes a number of references to the narrative aspects of legal advocacy throughout his text. At one point he writes,

> Watch an audience in the theatre. So long as the characters behave plausibly under the circumstances in which they are placed, interest is held. At some point the action or dialogue may be false. The spell is immediately broken. The audience is jolted into the realization that it is only watching a play. Coughing and restlessness take over. The discerning critic may be able to analyze the defect the audience has reacted to automatically. The rule of probability has done its deadly work. If the credibility of fiction must meet the inexorable test of the rule of probability, how much more is the sworn testimony in the courtroom subject to

its radar accuracy in measuring plausibility?[33]

And in addition to the research cited above, there has been a great deal of scholarship on both narration and storytelling in the fields of oral interpretation, theatre, literature, cultural anthropology, and psychology.[34]

Fisher has said that whatever potential narrative paradigm has for enriching the study of human communication will have to be developed.[35] He has called for both a reconception of "public and social knowledge" in light of this paradigm and for further research using this paradigm based upon its demonstrated "usefulness in interpreting and assessing philosophical discourse."[36] I think that this paradigm also has tremendous potential as a practical rhetorical model for student debaters.

For the purposes of this discussion we will consider "narration" to be the story-telling aspects of a debater's presentation. And in this case, the "story" is those aspects of the message which imply a social/cognitive view of reality which speakers are striving to have their audiences accept. I.e., the narrative elements which lead debaters to call for the judge's ballot.

As a departure point from classical rhetorical theory, consider what Aristotle has to say about persuasion in his *Rhetoric*:

> Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion. . . . Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker [Ethos]; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind [Pathos]; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself [Logos]. . . . Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible. . . . persuasion may come through the hearers, when the speech stirs their emotions. . . . [and] persuasion is effected through the speech itself when we have proved a truth or an apparent truth by means of the persuasive arguments suitable to the case in question. (1355b-1356a)[37]

Aristotle suggests three broad modes or methods for achieving persuasive change: Ethos (Credibility), Pathos (Emotion), and Logos (Logic). But Aristotle lived before Einstein, and a great deal of current work in psychotherapeutic research has involved a relativistic view of human thought and action which suggests a fourth mode of persuasion. In fact, much of the early discussion in this paper is based on this relativistic approach—that human beings respond to their social/cognitive map of the world rather

than to the world itself. Thus, the fourth mode or method for achieving persuasive change is Perspective. If an individual can be influenced to "see" the world from a different perspective, he or she will change beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors to bring them in line with that new perspective.[38] This is what Paul Watzlawick, John Weakland, and Richard Fisch call "the gentle art of reframing."[39] This mental process is also based on the same basic assumptions which underlie many current theories of persuasive change, including Fritz Heider's Balance Theory, Charles Osgood and Percy Tannenbaum's Congruity Hypothesis, Leon Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, and Milton Rosenberg's Theory of Affective-Cognitive Consistency, namely, that individuals carry a relatively consistent set of ideas (cognates) around in their heads, that new information, ideas, or experiences can cause an inconsistency (imbalance, incongruity, or dissonance), that inconsistency is psychologically uncomfortable, and that the mind will automatically adjust beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors in an attempt to eliminate the discomfort and to restore consistency.[40]

This suggests a framework for a narrative approach to persuasion in Public Debate: Within the Public Debate sub-culture, any persuasive effort will involve a debater (having or lacking credibility) who is making a persuasive argument (which either does or does not have emotional significance) in the form of a narrative (which either does or does not make logical sense) to a lay audience (who will either embrace or reject the story's perspective). And it is important to note that the lay audience, rather than the speaker, decides whether the various debaters have credibility, their subjects are significant, their stories are logical, and the positions they are advocating are acceptable.

So here I will offer a practical set of criteria for debaters to use in adapting to their new sociological environment. Experienced debaters might use this to understand their new lay judges. Coaches can use this as a framework for coaching. And novice debaters can use this as both a yardstick and training regimen to comprehend and master the skills of Public Debate.

TEN NARRATIVE CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC DEBATE

The "narrative paradigm" as originally developed by Fisher, provides two basic criteria for assessing "narrative rationality:" narrative probability and narrative fidelity.[41] Kristine Bartanen describes these two criteria as she applies them to debate theory: "Narrative probability demands that stories be coherent, that their parts be orderly and logically related in such a way as to make the events they recount and account for comprehensible. . . . Narrative fidelity demands that stories 'ring true,' . . . that the narrative correspond with known facts, qualities conditions, or events."[42] The criteria offered below are essentially a more detailed and debate specific model.

This model assumes that any debater's message may be viewed as a narrative in which a new social/cognitive view of reality is being advocated. The ten criteria which follow, then, allow for the evaluation and comparison of that conflicting social/cognitive views of reality with to determine how compelling each persuasive message is likely to be. These criteria have been developed out of the four modes of persuasion described above.

Ethos (Character):

1. Narrator Credibility: Research findings have consistently supported the conclusion that source credibility is an important prerequisite to effective attitude change.[43] A variety of dimensions of ethos have been identified by various researchers, but an examination of the results of this research does not lead to a clear and consistent interpretation.[44] There would seem, however, to be at least four general aspects of narrator credibility which could serve as assessment criteria: Access (did the narrator have access to information about the story?), Expertise (does the narrator have the competence to understand that information?), Virtue (can the narrator be trusted to tell the truth?), and Attraction (is the narrator likable, friendly, supportive, interesting, dynamic, etc.?).

Debaters will have to earn their credibility from their actually knowledge of the issues they are discussing instead of their reliance on evidence cards. And a critical element in their presentations will be their ability to come across as both good and likable people. Credibility is the only criterion directed at the narrator rather than at the narration.

Pathos (Emotion):

2. Narrative Interest: Alan Monroe's classic "motivated sequence" model of persuasive speech begins with an attention step.[45] This is the important first step because, "to begin with, you must get people to attend to some problem, or to feel disorientation or discomfort strongly enough to want to hear more."[46] There is also considerable evidence available to support the conclusion that heightened interest leads to greater receptivity and an increased likelihood of acceptance.[47] This is hardly surprising—we all tend to welcome variety and shun monotony. A major goal of professional advertisers has always been to grab the consumer's attention and to stand out from the crowd.[48] Within the new sociological framework debaters should become very concerned with coming across as more interesting (to a lay audience) than their opponents.

3. Narrative Salience: A second emotional criterion for assessing a persuasive narrative is salience or closeness. It makes intuitive sense to expect that people will be more like-

ly to respond to a situation which affects them directly than one which is relatively remote. There is also a good deal of scholarship to support this position.[49] The importance of narrative salience is seen in Kenneth Burke's central concept of identification; "you persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his."[50] Or to put this another way, to persuade people you must first make your topic salient to then through a rhetorical process of identification. Here then is a real role for audience analysis in academic debate. Debaters can actually take a look at their judges and attempt to adjust to them instead of expecting their judges to constantly adjust to them.

4. Narrative Impact: A third criteria for evaluating the emotional elements of a persuasive narrative is by considering how important or significant the issues involved are to the target audience. "Impact," as defined in this set of criteria is distinctly different from "salience," although the two concepts are highly related. An issue is salient if it is "close" to the target audience; it has impact if is likely to have a serious emotional effect on that audience. An issue can be salient without having impact (selecting a brand of bathroom tissue); an issue can also have impact without being salient (watching a sporting event on television—unless of course you have a bet on the outcome). Public debaters will probably do well to consider both salience and impact when making their rhetorical adjustments. There is a consistent body of scholarship which suggests that our concern with a problem and our willingness to expend energy and resources in resolving it is directly related to our perceptions of the impact that problem will have upon our lives.[51]

5. Narrative Acceptability: Even if a narrative is interesting, relevant, and important, the persuasive message could be rejected if the course of action being suggested is not consistent with the target audience's motivations.[52] Many children have refused to take medicine because they didn't like the taste and many leaders have rejected otherwise intelligent actions because those actions would be politically unpopular. An important criterion in determining whether a persuasive narrative will be embraced or rejected is how acceptable the target audience finds the narrative's social/cognitive view of reality. A narrative argument in favor of import quotas will be most acceptable to workers in endangered industries and least acceptable to consumers in the market for imported goods. An narrative argument in a debate round which seems to be falling on deaf (or worse hostile) ears should be punted as quickly as possible. And an argument which seems to be hitting what sales personnel would call a "hot button" should be pressed for maximum advantage.

Logos (Logic):

6. Narrative Consistency: There is nothing unique about a debater trying to remain con-

sistent and to avoid contradictions. Internal contradictions and inconsistencies are the death of persuasion. Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, in their classic treatise on the new rhetoric of argumentation, state, "to assert a proposition and its negation within one and the same system, bringing out a contradiction which the system contains, makes the system inconsistent and thereby unusable. To display the inconsistency of a group of propositions is to expose it to a condemnation without appeal . . ."[53] This is true of both inconsistencies within the narrative itself and inconsistencies which exist between the social/cognitive views implied in the narrative and those subscribed to by the target audience. The consistency criterion, discussed here, is concerned with the "logical" issue of internal narrative consistency; a plausibility criterion, which will be presented below, is concerned with the "perspective" issue of external narrative compatibility. Narrative consistency is a well researched and supported criteria for predicting the success of persuasive appeals.[54]

7. Narrative Support: There is a large body of evidence which suggests that the use of supporting materials is of great value in framing persuasive messages.[55] Virtually every basic textbook on public speaking and argumentation stresses the importance of supporting evidence in persuasion.[56] From a narrative perspective this makes excellent sense since evidence is the integration point between an individual's social/cognitive reality and the social/cognitive reality implied in the persuasive message. Every claim made by the narrator is measured against the persuasive target's existing perspective and every example provided, which is consistent with both the narrative and the target's perspective, increases the probability that the social/cognitive view being advocated will be accepted, or at least be acceptable. The major difference here between narrative support in NDT and narrative support in Public Debate is a question of format. In NDT the accepted norm is sound-bites of evidence, ripped out of context and quoted from little cards. In public debate a much wider range of evidence is acceptable and a premium is placed on real familiarity with that evidence and the rhetorical ability to present that evidence persuasively.

8. Narrative Complexity: Watzlawick describes three studies by Stanford psychologist, Alex Bavelas, which strongly suggest that as the complexity of a narrative increases the more compelling that narrative becomes.[57] "What Bavelas . . . teaches us has far-reaching consequences: it shows that once a tentative explanation has taken hold of our minds, information to the contrary may produce not corrections but elaborations of the explanation. This means that the explanation becomes 'self-sealing'; it is a conjecture that cannot be refuted."[58] Occam's Razor, that the simplest solution is the best, is a scientific rather than a lay principle of thought; it requires a trained mind to systematically search for simple and eloquent principles governing the course of events. It is also well to remember that until the publication of Sir Francis Bacon's The Advancement of Learning in 1605,

what we currently think of as "scientific thought" was almost nonexistent.[59] Although the assessment of narrative complexity to predict the success of a persuasive appeal may seem to make intuitive sense, and some related research on cognitive complexity seems to lend this criterion a measure of support,[60] a great deal of additional work is necessary in this area. For debaters, this is obviously a double-edged sword. Complexity generally leads to confusion and confusion favors your opponent. However, too much simplicity as suggested by this criterion can also favor your opponent by making your arguments seem trivial or weak. So how much complexity would be ideal? This is a problem left to the debater, but one which might now be considered in light of the ideas presented here.

Perspective:

9. Narrative Plausibility: The important distinction between this criterion and that of narrative consistency, as I mentioned above, is that consistency is concerned with the internal question of whether the narration is logically consistent while plausibility is concerned with the external question of whether the narration makes sense based on the target audience's social/ cognitive perspective. In his 1985 elaboration on his earlier essay, Fisher redefined narrative probability as ". . . formal features of a story conceived as a discrete sequence of thought and/or action in life or literature (any recorded or written form of literature); i.e., it concerns the question of whether or not a story coheres or 'hangs together,' whether or not the story is free of contradictions."[61] Based upon the terminology of these criteria, this formulation defines the logical criterion of narrative consistency rather than the perspective criterion of narrative plausibility. But, however this criterion is labeled, the evaluation of message plausibility has been shown to be an important factor in the psychological process of decision-making.[62] Two general laws can be used to assess the narrative plausibility of a persuasive message: (1) Events involving biological actors must conform to the laws of human or animal nature; agents described in the narrative must behave in credible ways unless special explanations are provided for aberrant behaviors. (2) Events involving the physical world must conform to the laws of physics; actions described in the narrative must seem plausible to the target audience—a narrative which involves magic, for example, will only seem plausible to people who believe in magic as part of their social/cognitive reality. This is a case were paying attention to one's audience and adapting to the cues they present will be an important skill for Public Debaters.

10. Narrative Congruity: This criterion corresponds roughly to Fisher's original notion of narrative fidelity. I have chosen to relabel this concept for two reasons. First, I wish to avoid what I believe to be a serious semantic weakness in the use of the term "fidelity." The notion of fidelity seems to imply an objective and knowable reality with which to com-

pare the narration. (The term "high-fidelity" in electronics, for example, implies great accuracy in reproducing original music or other sounds.) My use of the term congruity is designed to emphasize that the narration is being compared to the social/cognitive view of reality. And second, an evolution in Fisher's thinking: The original conceptualization of narrative fidelity was, "whether the stories [people] experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives."[63] This seems consistent with my definition of narrative congruity. Fisher's 1985 elaboration, however, is so broad that it overlaps a number of the criteria suggested above. "Thus, one must be attentive to facts, particular patterns of inference and implication, and issues—conceived as the traditional questions arising in forensic (fact, definition, justification, and procedure) or deliberative (the nature of a problem and the desirability of proposed solutions) practices. . . . one considers questions of fact, relevance, consequence, consistency, and transcendent issue."[64] The narrative congruity criterion, as I am defining it, demands that a narrative not violate any important perspectives of the target audience. As a general rule, it can be laid down that the greater the congruity between a target audience's social/cognitive reality and the view of reality being presented in the narration, the greater the likelihood that the narrative will be accepted.[65] And here again, it is up to the rhetor to be both perceptive and adaptable.

CONCLUSION: THE EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC DEBATE

We have postulated that style in debate is governed as part of a social/cognitive system. We have identified feedback as the most critical element of that system and the misplacement of expert judges as the element which has promoted the excesses of the NDT style. It has been suggested that moving the experts from their role as judges to becoming the senior echelon of competitors is a structural solution which could reform the sociology of academic debate. The Public Debate Association is attempting this solution. It was then suggested that Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm would be an excellent rhetorical tool to help reform stylistic abuses of debate within this new sociological framework. And a set of ten specific criteria were presented for translating Fisher's paradigm from an abstract theoretical construct to concrete pedagogical one.

The Public Debate Association is an exciting experiment. Even if it is eventually demonstrated to be a failure it ought to generate a great deal of valuable information. But if it succeeds. . . Hopefully, the ideas presented in this little essay will help to promote the experiment's success.

NOTES:

[1] B. Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 73.

[2] See, for example: G. Berkeley, *Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous*, 1713; J. Locke, *An Essay on Human*

Understanding, 1690; D. Hume, *Treatise of Human Nature*, 1737, also *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, 1748; and T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 1651.

3   See, for example: R. Descartes, *The Meditations Concerning First Philosophy*, 1641; G.W. Leibnitz, *Nonveaux Essais sur L'entendement Humain*, 1701 (first published 1765); I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781; and G.W.F. Hegel, *Die Phnomenologie des Geistes*, 1807.

4   J. Piaget, *Structuralism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), p. 74.

5   A. Korzybski, *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics* (Pennsylvania: Science Press, 1933). See also, C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1923) and J.C. Condon, Jr., *Semantics and Communication*, 3rd ed. (New York: MacMillan, 1985).

6   S.I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972), p. 27.

7   B.L. Whorf, "Language, Mind, and Reality," in *Language, Thought, and Reality*, ed. J.B. Carroll (Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1956), p. 252.

8   Whorf, p. 257.

9   R. Rosenthal, *Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research* (New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, 1966). See also, R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1968).

10 S. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgment," in *Groups, Leadership, and Men*, ed. H.S. Guetzkow (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951), pp. 177-190.

11 P.L. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

12 R. Weaver, "Language is Sermonic," in *The Rhetoric of Western Thought*, J.L. Golden, G.F. Berquist, and W.E. Coleman (Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1976), p. 153.

13 Both Ernst Cassirer and Susanne Langer have written extensively on this relationship between symbolic artifacts and the creation and maintenance of culture. E. Cassirer, *An Essay on Man* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944), also *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, in 3 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955; and S.K. Langer, *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling*, in 2 vols. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967), also *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

14 J.A. Combs, *Nationalist, Realist, and Radical: Three Views of American Diplomacy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). For another interesting example of two completely different "views" of the same historic events, see *A Soviet View of the American Past* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1964), an annotated translation of the section on American History in the *Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia*, prepared by The State Historical Society of Wisconsin and edited by O.L. Burnette, Jr. and W.C. Haygood.

15 A. Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Bantam, 1981).

16 Plato, *The Republic of Plato*, trans. F.M. Cornford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964) part II, book IX.

17 A. Cirlin, "Public Debate: A Format For Making Global Connections," a paper presented at the 7th International Forensics Association Convention, London, England, 1997.

18 P. Watzlawick, *How Real is Real: Confusion, Disinformation, Communication* (New York: Vintage, 1977).

19 Watzlawick, parts I & II.

20 J.A.M. Meerloo, *The Rape of the Mind* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1971). For a contemporary example mind control and mental fragility, see Mary Smith's case study of the conversion of Patricia Hearst in *Persuasion and Human Action: A Review and Critique of Social Influence Theories* (Belmont: Wadsworth, 1982), pp. 21-23.

21 W. Sargant, *Battle for the Mind* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1957).

22 Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure," ibid.

23 R.B. Cialdini, *Influence: Science and Practice* (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1985), p. 233.

24 J. Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, trans. K. Kellen and J. Lerner (New York: Vintage Books, 1968).

25 V. Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* (New York: Pocket Books, 1980).

26 Packard, p. x.

27 A. Cirlin, "Judging, Evaluation, and the Quality of CEDA Debate," *National Forensic Journal*, Fall, 4 (1986), 81-90. A. Cirlin, "Comments on Ballots: What are We Saying and What are We Really Saying," presented at the National Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, 1986.

28 W.R. Fisher, "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument," *Communication Monographs*, 51 (1984), 1-22. This essay received the SCA Monograph Award in 1985.

29 W.L. Bennett and M.S. Feldman, *Reconstructing Reality in the Courtroom: Justice and Judgment in American Culture* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1981).

30 Fisher, p. 2. The following sources were mentioned by Fisher as examples of earlier efforts in this direction: L.W. Bennett,

"Political Scenarios and the Nature of Politics," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 8 (1975), 23-42; L.W. Bennett, "Storytelling and Criminal Trials: A Model of Social Judgment," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64 (1978), 1-22; T.B. Farrell, "The Tradition of Rhetoric and the Philosophy of Communication," *Communication*, 7 (1983), 151-180; W.B. Gallie, Philosophy and Historical Understanding (New York: Schocken Books, 1964); L.C. Hawes, "The Reflexivity of Communication Research," *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 42 (1978), 12-20; L.O. Mink, "Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument," in *The Writing of History* ed. R.H. Canary (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 129-149; C.O. Schrag, "Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Communication," Unpublished Manuscript, Purdue University, Department of Philosophy; R.L. Scott, "Evidence in Communication: We are Such Stuff," *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 42 (1978), 29-36; and H.C. Simons, "In Praise of Muddleheaded Anecdotalism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 42 (1978), 21-28.

31 Fisher, p. 2.

32 L. Nizer, *My Life in Court* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1963).

33 Nizer, p. 15.

34 Just as a sampling of some of the approaches being taken in this area, see I.A. Richards, *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgement* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1929); E.G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972), 396-407; M. Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53 (1967), 115-126; C.G. Jung, Man and His Symbols (New York: Dell, 1968); G. de Santillana and H. von Dechend, *Hamlet's Mill: An Essay on Myth and the Frame of Time* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1977); D.R. Hofstadter, *Gdel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid* (New York: Vintage, 1980); and S.B. Kopp, *If You Meet the Buddha on the Road, Kill Him!: The Pilgrimage of Psychotherapy Patients* (New York: Bantam Books, 1976).

35 Fisher, p. 15.

36 W.R. Fisher, "The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration," *Communication Monographs*, 52 (1985), 364.

37 Aristotle, *The Rhetoric & The Poetics of Aristotle*, trans. W.R. Roberts (New York: Modern Library, 1954), pp. 24-25.

38 See, for example: P. Watzlawick, *The Language of Change: Elements of Therapeutic Communication* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); G.R. Weeks and L. L'abate, *Paradoxical Psychotherapy* (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1982); M.H. Erickson, "The Confusion Technique in Hypnosis," *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*, 6 (1964), 183-207; R. Bandler and J. Grinder, *The Structure of Magic, I: A Book About Language and Therapy* (Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1975) and *The Structure of Magic, II: A Book About Communication and Change* (Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1976); J. Haley, *Uncommon Therapy: The Psychiatric Techniques of Milton H. Erickson, M.D.* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973); and W. Schneider, *Wrter Machen Leute: Magie und Macht der Sprache* (Munich: R Piper, 1976).

39 P. Watzlawick, J. Weakland, and R. Fisch, *Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), Chapter 8.

40 F. Heider, "Attitudes and Cognitive Organization," *Journal of Psychology*, 21 (1946), 107-112; C.E. Osgood and H. Tannenbaum, "The Principle of Congruity in the Prediction of Attitude Change," *Psychological Review*, 62 (1955), 42-55; L. Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957); and M.J. Rosenberg, "A Structural Theory of Attitude Dynamics," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24 (1960), 319-340, and "Inconsistency Arousal and Reduction in Attitude Change," in *Current Studies in Social Psychology*, ed. I.D. Steiner and M. Fishbein (New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, 1965) pp 121-134. See also, *Public and Private Conformity: Competing Explanations by Improvisation, Cognitive Dissonance and Attribution Theories*, ed. B.E. Collins (Massachusetts: Warner Modular Publications, 1973).

41 Fisher, "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm," 8.

42 K.M. Bartanen, "Application of the Narrative Paradigm in CEDA Debate," A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association National Convention, Denver 1985, p. 3.

43 See, for example: Cialdini, Chapter 5; S. Himmelfarb and A.H. Eagly, *Readings in Attitude Change* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974), sec. IIIA; K. Anderson and T. Clevenger, "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," in *The Process of Social Influence*, ed. T.D. Beiseker and D.W. Parson (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972) pp. 223-247; and W.N. Thompson, *The Process of Persuasion: Principles and Readings* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), chapters 3 and 4.

44 Cf., G. Cronkhite, *Persuasion: Speech and Behavioral Change* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975), pp. 173-174.

45 D. Ehninger, B.E. Gronbeck, R.E. McKerrow, and A. Monroe, *Principles and Types of Speech Communication*, 9th ed. (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1982), Chapter 8. It should be noted that Monroe's text has gained three co-authors and gone through nine editions since it first appeared in 1935, yet the motivated sequence has remained fundamentally unchanged.

46 Ehninger, et al., p. 146.

47 Thompson, chapter 9; R.T. Oliver, *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech* (New York: David McKay Company, 1968), chapter 6; and S. Millman, "Anxiety, Comprehension, and Susceptibility to Speech Influence," *Journal of Personality and*

Social Psychology, 9 (1968), 251-256.

48 Cf., Packard; E. Dichter, *The Strategy of Desire* (New York: Doubleday, 1960); C.P. Wrighter, *I Can Sell You Anything* (New York: Ballantine, 1972); and L. Kornfeld, *To Catch a Mouse, Make a Noise Like a Cheese* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1983).

49 Cialdini, chapter 7; Oliver, chapter 8; M. Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1960); R. Heath, "Variability in Value System Priorities as Decision-Making Adaptation to Situational Differences," *Communication Monographs*, 43 (1976), 325-333; and K. Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

50 Burke, p. 55.

51 Thompson, chapter 7; Oliver, chapter 11; Dichter, part I; D.J. Bem, *Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs* (Belmont: Brooks/Cole, 1970); A.H. Maslow, ed., *New Knowledge in Human Values* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959); and R. Buck, *Human Motivation and Emotion* (New York: John Wiley, 1975).

52 Himmelfarb and Eagly, section IIIB; Dichter, part II; M. Burgoon, M. Cohen, M.D. Miller, and C.L. Montomery, "An Empirical Test of a Model of Resistance to Persuasion," *Human Communication Research*, 5 (1978), 27-39; M.D. Miller and M. Burgoon, "The Relationship Between Violations of expectations and the Induction of Resistance to Persuasion," *Human Communication Research*, 5 (1979), 301-313.

53 C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971), p. 195.

54 Cf. Footnote 36. See also Himmelfarb and Eagly, section IV; Cialdini, chapter 3; Collins, *Public and Private Conformity*; Thompson, chapter 8; B. Russell, *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1948); A.N. Whitehead, *Modes of Thought* (New York: MacMillan, 1966); and C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, especially part III and the discussions of contradiction and incompatibility.

55 Cialdini, chapters 4 & 6; S.E. Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958); R.P. Newman and D.R. Newman, *Evidence* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969); and J.C. McCroskey, "A Summary of Experimental Research on the Effects of Evidence in Persuasive Communication," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 55 (1969), 169-175.

56 Cf., B.E. Gronbeck, *The Articulate Person*, 2nd ed. (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1983); D.J. Ochs and A.C. Winkler, *A Brief Introduction to Speech*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983); J.V. Jensen, *Argumentation: Reasoning in Communication* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1981); and R.D. Rieke and M.O. Sillars, *Argumentation and The Decision Making Process*, 2nd ed. (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1984).

57 Watzlawick, *How Real is Real*, pp. 48-51; P. Watzlawick, J.H. Beavin, and D.D. Jackson, *Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1967), p. 39; and P. Watzlawick, ed., *The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know?* (W.W. Norton and Company, 1984), p. 13. See also, J.C. Wright, *Problem Solving and Search Behavior Under Non-Contingent Rewards*, an unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1960.

58 Watzlawick, *How Real is Real*, p. 50.

59 Cf., L. Eiseley, *The Man Who Saw Through Time*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973).

60 Cf., W.H. Crockett, "Cognitive Complexity and Impression Formation," in *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, ed. B.A. Maher (New York: Academic Press, 1965), 49-58; J.G. Delia, R.A. Clark, and D.E. Switzer, "Cognitive Complexity and Impression Formation in Informal Social Interactions," *Speech Monographs*, 41 (1974), 299-308; J.B. Herman, "Cognitive Processing of Persuasive Communications," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 19 (1977), 126-147; and R.S. Wyer, Jr., *Cognitive Organization and Change: An Information Processing Approach* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1974).

61 Fisher, "The Narrative Paradigm," 349.

62 Oliver, chapter 10; Thompson, chapter 6; A.G. Greenwald, "Cognitive Learning, Cognitive Response to Persuasion, and Attitude Change, in *Psychological Foundations of Attitude*, ed. A.G. Greenwald, T.C. Brock, and T.M. Ostrom (New York, Academic Press, 1968) 147-170; R.E. McKerrow, "Rationality and Reasonableness in a Theory of Argument," in *Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research*, ed. J.R. Cox and C.A. Willard (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), 105-122; and W.R. Fisher, "Toward a Logic of Good Reasons," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64 (1978), 376-384.

63 Fisher, "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm," 8.

64 Fisher, "The Narrative Paradigm," 350.

65 In addition to those aspects of cognitive consistency theories which apply to the external elements of a narrative (cf., footnote 50), see Watzlawick, et al., *Change*; Watzlawick, et. al., *Pragmatics of Human Communication*; and M. Fishbein and I. Ajzen, *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research* (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1975).

AUDIENCE-CENTERED DEBATE:
A Collection of Essays on Theory & Practice

edited by Brian R. McGee
Texas Tech University

1. Which Audience?: Problems and Prospects for Public Debate

Brian R. McGee
Texas Tech University

Once upon a time, intercollegiate debate was inseparable from debate addressing a heterogeneous public audience. When students from different universities debated one another, they did so before relatively large and diverse audiences. Only with the advent of tournament debating some seven decades ago did debates begin to occur regularly in front of small audiences composed of one or a few judges. In one sense, this change made audience adaptation for student advocates a bit easier, since an audience of one presumably creates fewer adaptation difficulties. However, the shift to such audiences in tournament settings created a problem for those who served as judges. Specifically, should judges only ask students to adapt to the quirks of those individual judges? Or, should judges role-play larger, more heterogeneous audiences, or even Perelman's universal audience? The answer to this question that one provides will indicate what one believes is good pedagogy where intercollegiate debate is concerned. As early as 1928, A. Craig Baird would hint at the basis for the current controversy (and this SJF forum) concerning audience and judgment: "In judging the efficiency of an oral argument you should OF COURSE give chief consideration to the material or ideas rather than to delivery. In reality, however, audiences give great weight to presentation. . . . Though your arguments are a bit flimsy, you will often carry weight with the AUDIENCE, if not with an EXPERT JUDGE, by means of your superior delivery" (Baird 335; emphasis added).

The role of the audience in intercollegiate debate has had profound organizational

and programmatic implications in recent years. In the last three decades, the problem of audience has been responsible to some extent for the fragmentation of the debate community. A group of educators in the early 1970s would create what became the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) in part because National Debate Tournament (NDT)-style policy debate was increasingly dominated by a specialized lexicon and delivery practices only appropriate for a highly trained "expert" audience familiar with the theory and practice of intercollegiate debate. Today, while CEDA and NDT have undergone a rapprochement of sorts, many university forensics programs have abandoned NDT and CEDA for one of several alternative debate formats, each of which is alleged to have pedagogical advantages where the problem of audience is concerned. The criticism of NDT and CEDA as failing to train advocates for the public sphere still is salient for many observers of contemporary debate practice. Not a few of these observers have worried that the decline or death of some university forensics programs (or their shift to competition only in individual events) is linked in some way to the perception that intercollegiate debate is now divorced from its analogues in the real world of forensic and deliberative public discourse. In short, the perception that both NDT and CEDA are not audience friendly—at least when "audience" is understood as a large, heterogeneous group without extensive subject-matter knowledge or a background in academic debate—has led some forensics educators to create and/or seek out alternative debate experiences for their students.

In the following pages, several prominent forensics educators provide their own diagnoses of the ills many allege now afflict intercollegiate debate. The authors of two essays explicitly defend a version of contemporary debate practice in CEDA and NDT with their demanding evidentiary requirements and specialized delivery conventions, while other essayists advocate participation in alternative debate-sponsoring organizations and appreciation of their respective approaches to the problem of audience. In all cases, how judges act as audiences and students appeal to those audiences is central to the essays in this forum. Stated another way, what public is addressed by debaters and how appeals to this public are framed determine the pedagogical priorities of these authors. Even the de facto definitions of *audience* and *public* vary in important ways from essay to essay.

In his essay, *The Audience Standard: Twelve Years Later*, Robert O. Weiss reflects on the influence of his original essay titled *The Audience Standard,* which was published in the mid 1980s in *CEDA Yearbook* (now *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*). For many years, Professor Weiss has been a leading advocate of encouraging debaters to address a public audience in tournament debating, with *college administrator* offered as one operational definition of the public for whom intercollegiate debate should be intelligible. For example, by 1980 Weiss would complain that "debate had become too cloistered for its own good" and argue that judges drawn from outside the forensics

community would bring accountability to forensics practice (Weiss, *Going* 115). A few years later, Weiss would be one of many advocates of an audience-oriented approach in CEDA. While he notes in the current essay that his audience standard largely has fallen out of favor in CEDA, Weiss is comforted by the enthusiasm for audience-friendly approaches to debate in the new National Educational Debate Association (NEDA) and in parliamentary debate. Weiss's 1985 essay was frequently referenced by those working to create NEDA a few years ago, and the importance of Weiss's work in framing the ongoing discussion of public debate is signaled by the reference of several other essays in this SJF forum to Weiss's scholarship on the subject.

Interestingly, Weiss's current essay sheds some light on the changes in CEDA over the last decade. In some respects, Weiss implies that the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference, held in St. Paul, Minnesota, provided a snapshot of the struggle for the future of CEDA, where David A. Frank claimed that the CEDA community was then divided between the "Critical Thinkers," who presumably valorized complex argument and large quantities of evidence addressed to a highly skilled expert audience, and the "Rhetors," who purportedly also value high-quality evidence and analysis, yet bemoan the decline of "effective oral communication" habits by student debaters (Frank, *Rhetorical*, 77). The divisions between these two "political cultures," as Frank names them, hardly encourage a positive assessment of intercollegiate debate theory or practice. The most negative descriptions of these two cultures would put the Rhetors in the unenviable position of seeming to denigrate critical thinking skills, while the Critical Thinkers sometimes are portrayed rather parochially as being interested only in the technical sphere of argument found at forensics tournaments. Viewed from outside the debate community, one might conclude that both camps are "divorcing the tongue from the heart," as Cicero caustically described the division of rhetoric from philosophy in De Oratore. Of course, the Critical Thinkers usually insist that their students are capable of adapting to varied audiences when required to do so, and the Rhetors maintain that they encourage informed and analytically sound argumentation practices.

While Frank hoped in 1991 that the Rhetors and Critical Thinkers would learn enough from one another to prevent the departure of one camp or the other from CEDA, events some six years later seem to confirm that some of the Rhetors eventually did leave CEDA, given the creation of NEDA, the existence in recent years of Lincoln-Douglas debate divisions at many individual events tournaments, and the rapid growth of parliamentary debate in all parts of the United States. In his current essay, Weiss describes the "establishment disdain" of CEDA for an audience-centered approach to debate that attempts to make debate accessible to a heterogenous public audience. I find this description curious, since my own research six years ago, as reported at the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference, found CEDA coaches under age 30 then describing CEDA as

dominated by senior debate educators who preferred an audience-centered approach to the evidence-oriented, rapid-paced style of debate that several (but not all) of those younger coaches favored. One of my informants in 1991 even predicted that dissatisfaction with CEDA would cause some group to leave CEDA and form a new debate league (McGee 165). Of course, many junior and senior educators are still active in CEDA today, which suggests that divisions on the question of audience are not entirely generational. For example, the 1928 words of Baird, as quoted above, arguably are more sympathetic to the Critical Thinker position than to that of the Rhetors, despite Baird's legendary status as a rhetorical scholar. Nevertheless, what constitutes the "establishment" in CEDA has changed since the organization was founded in the 1970s.

When compared with Weiss's essay, Alan Cirlin's forum contribution, *A Public Debate Manifesto*, makes many of the same complaints about debate practice in NDT and CEDA that are made by Weiss. However, Professor Cirlin is less satisfied with parliamentary debate as practiced in the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), and the various international organizations that sponsor parliamentary debate. From Cirlin's perspective, too many parliamentary debates emphasize humor and delivery skills at the EXPENSE of argumentation and analysis, rather than as COMPLEMENTING argumentation and analysis. In response to his dissatisfaction with extant debate formats, Cirlin is one of several well-known debate educators involved in the organization of the new Public Debate Association (PDA), which sponsored its first tournament in the 1997 Spring Semester. While some readers may be skeptical concerning the need for still another debate organization in the United States, Cirlin devotes his essay to explaining the pedagogical benefits of an alternative to the other, more established approaches. Certainly the methods of topic selection and debate preparation used in PDA debate are novel and should create interesting opportunities for students who experiment with this new approach to competitive debate.

Darrin Hicks's essay, *Public Debate and the Ideal of Public Reason,* suggests a different approach to the definition of publicness implied by the essays of Weiss and Cirlin. Perhaps more than any other scholar in recent years, Professor Hicks problematizes the definitions of *public, audience, and reasonableness* that previously have operated in the dialogue between Rhetors and Critical Thinkers. While Hicks joins Weiss and Cirlin in conceiving of debate as part and parcel of education for civic life, Hicks's construction of "public reason" as a norm for evaluating the arguments of intercollegiate debaters diverges sharply from other notions of the "public" now circulating in intercollegiate debate. For example, while he is sympathetic to the public-debate project of Weiss, Hicks complains that Weiss and others have relativized reasonableness by reducing reasonableness to a "reflection of current public sentiment." Hicks's examples from public

debates over housing projects in Kansas City, Missouri, suggest that counter-intuitive argumentation, which is anathema for many public debate advocates, is neither absent from nor irrelevant for meaningful deliberation on matters of public import. From the perspective of Hicks, a proponent of parliamentary debate, the deficiencies of CEDA and NDT, with their arguably excessive emphasis on strategic and instrumental reason, must be balanced against the impoverished notion of publicness in contemporary parliamentary debate practice (and, presumably, in much of the forensics literature on public debate). While Hicks is not the first scholar to complain about the use of intuition as a criterion for evaluating tournament debating (e.g., McGee and Simerly; Klemz and Simerly), his critique of the presumed link between public debate and the advantages of intuitive argumentation is an important contribution to our disciplinary struggle over both descriptive and prescriptive assessments of public argument.

In his essay, *Audience-Centered Debate: In Praise of Principled Defeat*, David A. Frank takes a different approach than do the other forum contributors. Rather than addressing organizational culture and the recent history of organizational change in intercollegiate debate, Professor Frank concentrates instead on the ethical climate needed for principled audience debate. While Frank does not suggest that losing debates is typically desirable, he insists that some defeats ought to be admired because the losing debaters would not compromise their principles to persuade a particular audience. While Frank's position intuitively is inconsistent with the suasive aim of audience debate—making one's position compelling for a particular audience—his essay reminds us of our ethical obligations as educators and insists on the need to value students who adhere to the highest ethical standards, whatever their win-loss percentage might be. As educators, we certainly would not wish to send our students into debates in the public sphere if we believed that their objective was to win at all costs, yet we often devote far more time to the pragmatics of success in tournament debating than to discussions of our larger obligations to self, opponent, and audience in debate practice. James Darsey reminds us in his study of the rhetoric of Eugene Debs that we sometimes respect and value the discourse of rhetors who were failures in their own historical epoch, and these *failed* rhetors are admired and studied because we consider their ethical vision worthy of further understanding and emulation.

While the essays in this forum of Weiss and Cirlin are highly critical of current practice in CEDA and NDT, the two organizations are not without defenders. Kenneth Broda-Bahm's essay, *Recovering the Debate Public: A Real or a Counterfeit Audience?*, argues that the evolution of tournament debate in CEDA and NDT has important advantages for the teaching of argumentation and critical thinking skills. Professor Broda-Bahm doubts the value of attempts by tournament debate judges to model heterogeneous public audiences, since such efforts will provide only a caricature of the diverse

beliefs found in large audiences. Rather than alter current tournament debating to bring tournament practice in line with some version of an audience standard, Broda-Bahm suggests that university debate programs increase the number of public debates held for university audiences on campus. One particularly interesting suggestion made by Broda-Bahm is to hold audience debates involving a visiting debate program or programs prior to the beginning of traditional debate tournaments. According to Broda-Bahm, such a pre- tournament audience debate could become the "public face" of the tournament for university administrators and the general public. From Broda-Bahm's point of view, increasing the number of audience debates held each year would give students a realistic experience of audience debate without doing harm to the intense dialectical experiences now available at the typical CEDA/NDT tournament.

Joining Broda-Bahm in the ranks of those defending NDT and CEDA are Aaron R. Klemz and Greggory Simerly. In their interesting and provocative essay, *Public Forum Debate: An Ineffective Method to Increase Student Participation*, Klemz, a highly successful CEDA debater, and Simerly, the current Executive Secretary of CEDA, explain some of the pedagogical advantages of CEDA/NDT debate and criticize public debate as advocated by Weiss and others. For example, Klemz and Simerly charge that Weiss is unfair in his description of NDT/CEDA as encouraging counter-intuitive and inferior argumentation. Further, Klemz and Simerly claim that the cure offered by public debate proponents—intervention by judges to discount or ignore arguments that are counter to intuition—is worse than the disease, since such intervention discourages students from finding and learning what would presumably be the readily available good responses to such arguments. The central thesis of Klemz and Simerly's essay is that the current proposal to add "public forum" debate (PFD) divisions at CEDA tournaments will not attract NEDA and parliamentary debate programs back to CEDA and will do harm to the recent joint-topic venture between NDT and CEDA. While David A. Frank, Jeffrey Bile, and other participants at the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference mentioned above argued for the preservation of a heterogeneous CEDA community, Klemz and Simerly appear to conclude six years later that preserving CEDA's heterogeneity is not commensurable with organizational health and the spirit of community. From their perspective, several debate-sponsoring organizations are necessary to provide options for students and coaches with a wide range of pedagogical objectives.

Finally, in *The Question of Audience in Forensic Education*, David E. Williams offers an assessment of the audience question in contemporary forensics that encompasses the variety of competitive opportunities now available to our students. Beyond his suggestion that individual tournaments offer a variety of audience-adaptation opportunities to our students, Professor Williams's most controversial claim is that too much attention is paid to the paucity of adaptation efforts in CEDA and NDT. Instead, Williams maintains, as would Klemz

and Simerly, that the competencies taught to NDT and CEDA debaters should be valued, despite the specialized audiences that CEDA and NDT typically require. The better solution to teaching adaptation skills to our students, Williams avers, is to encourage crossover participation by students in different kinds of forensic events (e.g., both CEDA/NDT and individual events competition). While such a call for crossover participation is not unprecedented, Williams suggests to the reader of this forum that it may be unreasonable to expect any single forensic event to cultivate all desirable skills equally well.

In summary, these seven brief essays provide an array of perspectives on the problem of audience in intercollegiate debate. If my assessment at the beginning of this introduction of the causal linkage between the problem of audience and the fragmentation of the debate community is correct, then our next task may be to determine how we might agree to disagree on the audience problem while working together to keep intercollegiate debate healthy. Over fifteen years ago, David Zarefsky worried that the plethora of forensics-sponsoring organizations "harms us more than it helps. It fragments our loyalties and our energies, and it causes us to spend more than we need on . . . administrative detail" (124). One might conclude that the fragmentation problem has gotten much worse since 1980, with the founding or dramatic growth of CEDA, NEDA, APDA, NPDA, PDA, and other forensics-sponsoring organizations. As intercollegiate debate has been fragmented organizationally, the need to increase inter-organizational cooperation even further has never been more urgent. While Klemz and Simerly conclude that creating an "umbrella" debate-sponsoring organization would do more harm than good, perhaps exploring the problem of audience further could contribute to a better understanding of our differences as a community and provide a basis for future cooperation with one another, if not a consensus on how to address the problem of audience in intercollegiate debate.

WORKS CITED

Baird, A. Craig. *Public Discussion and Debate.* Boston: Ginn, 1928.

Darsey, James. "The Legend of Eugene Debs: Prophetic Ethos as Radical Argument." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (1988): 434-452.

Frank, David A. "Debate as Rhetorical Scholarship: Changing Delivery Practices in CEDA." *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings.* Ed. David A. Thomas and Stephen C. Wood. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1993. 75-95.

Klemz, Aaron R., and Greggory Simerly. "Public Forum Debate: An Ineffective Method to Increase CEDA Recruitment." *Southern Journal of Forensics* 2 (1997).

McGee, Brian R. "The Next Generation of CEDA Educators." *CEDA 1991: 20th*

Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings. Ed. David A. Thomas and Stephen C. Wood. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1993. 139-168.

McGee, Brian R., and Greggory Simerly. "Intuition, common sense, and judgment." *CEDA Yearbook* 15 (1994): 86-97.

Weiss, Robert O. "Going Public: Accountability in the 1980's." *Speaker and Gavel* 17 (1980): 114-116.

—. "The Audience Standard." *CEDA Yearbook* 6 (1985): 43-49.

Zarefsky, David. "Forensics in the Eighties: Challenges and Prospects." *Speaker and Gavel* 17 (1980): 119-124.

2. In Praise of Principled Defeat

David A. Frank
University of Oregon

The discussions concerning "audience-centered" debate often focus on judge competence and the value of expanding the judging pool to include judges who are not debate experts. While I believe we should expand our judging pools, my intent here is to deal with a major philosophical and pedagogical issue that attends audience centered debate, namely, how are we to teach students to make the right argumentative choices before the judges and audiences they address? My answer, in short, is that we should frame some failures to persuade or to secure a debate victory as praiseworthy principled defeats, and that students should be guided some principles in the argumentative choices they make, regardless of the audience or judge they are attempting to persuade. The end goal of academic debate should be the construction and cultivation of the debate student's rhetorical conscience, a notion I believe needs to be at the center of academic debate.

IN PRAISE OF PRINCIPLED DEFEAT

The students with whom I have worked have won their fair share of awards. However, the moments in academic debate I recall with the most pride are those in which our student debaters made good moral choices, sometimes leading to defeat. Do not get me wrong: I believe advocates should do whatever they can, arguing and acting within moral and ethical boundaries, to persuade their judges. Although competitive success is an important criterion for the evaluation of a debater's skills and habits of mind and speech, it is not the ultimate goal of academic debate.

Students engage in academic debate, according to Bill Hill's research, because they

enjoy competition and competitive success. Competition and competitive success are the driving forces that motivate students to conduct research, invent arguments, and to present them to an audience. Debate serves an important ego-function for students, for the joy of winning a debate round and the celebration that attends the awarding of a trophy can do much to build self-esteem and confidence. To gain the benefits of victory, student debaters must persuade a judge and an audience.

Given the advantages of competition and debate victory, the question those of us interested in the ethics of audience centered debate must consider is this: what are or should be the limits, if any, on the debate student's choice of argumentative strategy and tactics? This question, of course, is not new, for the ancient criticism of rhetoric is that the study and practice of persuasive discourse and debate is not concerned with justice, only with the manipulation of audiences. Socrates in the *Gorgias* demonstrated that argument and debate could be seen as a technique of power that the eloquent speaker could use to gain command of an audience, regardless of the truth or morality of the arguments presented. Far too often, this attitude prevails in the academic debate community, as the major objective becomes competitive victory, by any means. I need to pause and emphasize that there is nothing essentially noble about defeat, and that principled victory and persuasion should be prized. However, the objective of competitive success in audience-centered debate should be guided by principles: argumentative choices, regardless of the audience, should be made within ethical and moral boundaries. The rhetorical tradition that spawned academic debate established a set of principles, touchstones, and moral boundaries that speakers and debaters were expected to embrace. Namely this tradition holds that the study and practice of rhetoric should not be limited to a "public of ignoramuses," that persuasive success is not the ultimate criterion, that some ethical and moral limits should be imposed upon the speaker, and that the goal of rhetoric and debate is justice and the common good.

Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca in *The New Rhetoric* place the burden of moral and ethical choice making on the speaker when they wrote:

> Although orators, in their relationship to the listener, have been compared to cooks, and even to parasites . . . it must not be overlooked that the orator is nearly always at liberty to give up persuading an audience when he cannot persuade it effectively except by the use of methods that are repugnant to him. It should not be thought, where argument is concerned, that it is always honorable to succeed in persuasion, or even to have such an intention. (25;).

If we are to apply Perelman and Olbrechts-Tytca's aspirationalstatement to academic debate, we would need to consider the occasions in which a debater

would need to "give up persuading an audience" because the arguments necessary to achieve a debate victory would be "repugnant" to the debater. We would need to develop and explain for our student debaters when it might not be honorable to win a debate round, that it might be more honorable to lose, and that winning a debate round may not be the proper intention.

How are we to put these wonderful aspirations into practice? In some senses, this vision of academic debate may remind some of Don Quixote tilting at moral windmills. But I don't think our alternative should be Machiavelli's *The Prince*. My answer is that a primary objective of academic and audience centered debate should be to help students develop a robust rhetorical conscience, and that the principles guiding the choice of arguments would be rooted in this source.

AUDIENCE CENTERED DEBATE AND RHETORICAL CONSCIENCE

A rhetorical conscience is both an intuitive and a learned moral prism that guides humans and debaters in the artistic choices that need to be made when persuasion is the goal. The source of rhetorical conscience is the thinking process and the dialogue that the speaker has with oneself. Debater's do (or should) think about the choices they make when attempting to persuade. When such choices are problematic, they do (or should) result in a dialogue within the speaker and debater. That dialogue takes place between the debater and the debater's conscience.

In Hannah Arendt's penetrating analysis of conscience, she writes:

> It took language a long time to separate the word "consciousness" from "conscience," and in some languages, such a separation was never made. Conscience, as we understand it in moral or legal matters, is supposedly always present within us, just like consciousness. And this conscience is also supposed to tell us what to do and what to repent. . . . (190)

Arendt locates conscience in the "soundless solitary dialogue we call "thinking" and that people who do not engage in thinking are unable to evaluate their own thoughts and actions on moral grounds (191). Her analysis of Adolph Eichmann, the man who oversaw the Nazi's genocidal campaign against the Jews, revealed that he was evil in part, because he did not think about what he was doing, and therefore, did not engage his conscience.

Accordingly, I believe we should educate and cultivate the rhetorical consciences of our students. A first step we can take to achieve this objective is to frame and develop the moral principles needed that will allow students to keep persuasive and debate victories in context. As debate students think about what and how they argue, they will do so

with principles guiding the choices they make. The principles they consider must be those that they have taken as their own and that they believe have a worth more important than the trophy.

The source of these principles can be found in the American Forensic Association's *Statement of Ethics* and in the ethics codes developed by other forensics associations. Unfortunately, these statements are often ignored, and many debate students do not know they exist. The principles articulated in these statements identify standards of proper moral and ethical behavior in the debate context. Yet, they are not intended to be, nor can they offer a precise and legal declaration of right and wrong. Such judgments, as Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca teach us, must be made by the speaker in concrete situations.

If such statements are to affect debate behavior, and if we are to evoke the consciences of our student debaters, we will need to engage them in an ongoing conversation about ethical choices. One assumption I believe we should build into these discussions is that it may be more noble to lose rather than win a debate round if students are to remain true to their principles. I will conclude with two concrete examples dealing with the relationship and content implications of arguments debaters present.

Paul Watzlawick and others have taught us that all messages have relationship and content components. A debater will reveal something about his or her relationship with the audience and opponents in the style and content of the argument the debater presents. Pam Stepp's research has clearly revealed significant and serious patterns of sexual discrimination at debate tournaments. Women and students of color are significantly underrepresented in the debate culture, and far too often, sexual harassment is tolerated and opposition to degrading comments is dismissed as PC.

I know of several representative anecdotes that suggest this is true. I also know that some students, both male and female, have spoken out against such behavior, sometimes at the cost of speaker points and debate victories. Here, I would suggest, is an example of a rhetorical conscience at work in our debate culture. Rather than remaining silent in fear that competitive victory might be threatened, these students have demonstrated courage in the face of brutish behavior.

At the level of content, a rhetorical conscience can play a role. Audience adaptation is essential, but pandering should not be the primary impulse. Some audiences may want student debaters to present arguments that might be considered racist, or that the debaters themselves find repugnant. Rather than including such arguments in an attempt to secure a debate victory, a student's rhetorical conscience would lead him or her to the conclusion that an intent to persuade with repugnant arguments is less important than making the best arguments and losing.

CONCLUSION

If we are to encourage audience-centered debate, we should do so with some pedagogical goals in mind. First, principled debate victory should be a primary motivating impulse for our students. The principles should precede and frame the choices students make in attempting to win debate rounds. Without such principles, audience- centered debate becomes an activity dedicated to competitive success, at whatever cost. Ultimately, academic debate should provide students with the moral prism needed to make the proper decisions when attempting to persuade an audience.

This moral prism, I have suggested, is the rhetorical conscience students need as part of their equipment for living and arguing. I believe our task is to base any pedagogy of audience-centered debate on the nurturing and education of our student's rhetorical consciences. We can accomplish this objective by remaining in constant conversation about questions of debate ethics and by encouraging our students continually to engage in the "soundless solitary dialogue we call "thinking" about the choices they make in the debate round and how they will affect their audiences, both in their local and universal expressions.

WORKS CITED

Arendt, Hannah. *Life of the Mind.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977-1978.

Hill, Bill. "'Intercollegiate Debate' Why do Students Bother?" *The Southern Communication Journal* 48 (1982): 77-88.

Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1969.

3. *The Audience Standard*: Twelve Years Later

Robert O. Weiss
DePauw University

T*he Audience Standard* appeared originally in the 1985 *CEDA Yearbook* as a delineation of a debate judging philosophy based upon a public debate paradigm.

There it nestled comfortably with ten other listener-friendly articles, including a Jack Howe appeal for "an open season on squirrels," a Walter Ulrich proposal for giving judges referee-like powers to assess time penalties against a speaker who "is not understandable," a defense of counter-warrants by Tolbert and Hunt, several discussions of judging paradigms by Alan Cirlin and others, and a science fiction narrative by Charles Willard predicting that one day "CEDA would look exactly the way the NDT circuit looked in 1960 or thereabouts . . . . [Podlike] An alternate circuit starts to grow . . . ."

The public debate paradigm is simple enough to explain. It subscribes to the assumption that tournament debaters should meet the same standards of excellence that would apply in other public forums, ranging from the classroom to the legislative hall. Debate should constitute a model of the type of reasonable and accessible discourse that makes democratic deliberation possible.

The implications for debate set forth in the audience standard are fundamentally derived from what an audience would and should look for. For instance, any audience needs to know what a debate is going to be about, so a "whole resolution" approach to the announced proposition is expected. Public audiences need to base their decisions on consideration of significant key issues, so argumentation at the heart of the proposition is preferred to explorations of the periphery. (In Howe's 1985 essay, he quotes Sheckels as saying that debate is educating for citizenship and adds that "the citizens we are educating should be ones capable of, and willing to, explore the MAIN issues of a problem, and not the PERIPHERAL ones.")

Furthermore, public audiences want evidence that matters, and thus the audience standard rewards evidence that is suitably explained and documented for ready evaluation rather that mere quantities of snippets. Audiences also are expected to use some common sense, so an audience standard devalues the counter-intuitive as well as wild and improbable claims as a waste of their time and an insult to their intelligence. Then there's delivery. At the very least an audience (and a judge applying an audience standard) will require understandable presentation and may well go further to generate cognitive clues from elements of style and delivery by debaters. One final tendency for a public debate judge is a degree of interventionism, where the judge applies his or her own critical thinking processes in evaluating arguments employed and may even give direct indications of approval or disapproval.

The rationale for utilization of the audience standard implied in the 1985 essay included three advantages: (1) as addressed to the CEDA community of that time it is designed to reflect the distinctive original principles of that association as "the emphasis on an audience-centered approach to debate"; (2) this standard visualizes intercollegiate debate as training for citizenship and the improvement of civic discourse; and (3) it helps to meet an increasing demand for accountability in higher education by making

evaluation possible by those upon whom the forensics enterprise depends for its continued support.

Now, what has happened to the audience standard in the twelve years since its first appearance?

CEDA REJECTS THE AUDIENCE STANDARD

Well, for one thing CEDA has manifestly rejected it. Every development of organizational procedures and community norms in recent years has been detrimental to the audience-oriented philosophy and to audience-debaters and judges in particular.

The CEDA judging community has fully subscribed to parameterization, encouraging and almost mandating a plethora of peripheral cases, reinforcing the notion that to debate the same thing all the time would be "boring" for those competing in (or judging) scores of debates each season. Recent adoption of resolutions in the form of propositional functions puts another stamp of approval on very limited cases and the idea that the audience (or judge) is not to know what the debate will be about until he or she enters the room. (Moves toward revealing cases lists at least give some of the debaters a clue in this regard.) And the turn to full-year topics simply reinforced this trend.

The widespread adoption by CEDA of systems of judge "strikes" (even at the national tournament) and mutual preferred judge selection give students the means for avoiding the influence of judges utilizing an audience standard.

The limitation of national topics to policy propositions (another import from NDT) seems to have an effect on evidentiary usage and standards. Value questions demand more of the audience and more active judgment on the part of judges. Policy propositions tend to reinforce debating as a battle of empirically supported cards and is another cause for the common sight of debaters carting tubs of evidence from round to round.

Audience-oriented tournament philosophies were met with establishment disdain, and "public debate" divisions at a number of locations have failed from lack of support. Indeed, at its 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference, CEDA coolly rejected a task force motion, "Resolved, that CEDA recognizes the existence of real-world debate."

A CONVERSATION ENSUES

Notwithstanding the CEDA transformation, a dialogue concerning the desirability of an audience standard and alternative paradigms in tournament debate continues to smolder, represented most recently in this journal by John J. Miller's *A Critique of Audience Centered Debate: The Role of Argument and Oral Communication* and a response by David Grassmick, *In Defense of Public Debate: A Reply to Miller*. Most of the issues

involved are well represented not only in passionate hallway conversations but also in convention papers, journal articles, and conference proceeding, most notably in the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference proceedings. Complaints about the audience paradigm, like complaints about CEDA/NDT practices, keep an important conversation going about the nature of academic debate.

The most common support of the claim that the public debate standard is "detrimental to the educational aims of debate" is that it produces an "over emphasis on delivery" (Miller and many others). It is argued that audience and judge attention to delivery, if justified at all, is given at the expense of pure argumentation. In response it may be said that the apparent emphasis on delivery stems from the fact that delivery and style represent the most egregious faults of CEDA/NDT debating, apparent to all. Moresubstantively, the rhetorical position that delivery and style are inseparable from argument calls for further exploration. In any event the issue will continue as to how much, if any, emphasis a judge should put on elements of delivery and style.

A second complaint about the audience standard is that diminishes sophisticated argument. Critics expect academic debaters to strive for an excellence that audiences (and lay judges) are incapable of evaluating . Lines of argument are to be chosen for their probative force rather than their persuasive impact. This position reflects another genuine issue in the debate enterprise, the definition of what constitutes excellence in argument. One response to criticism is the observation that distrust of public argument entails distrust of the public itself. The audience standard rewards arguments that would be regarded as relevant and sensible to citizens trying to make societal choices and denigrates the irrelevant and peripheral as less realistic and productive. Grassmick delineates that vision well.

Not appearing so much in the literature, but a common complaint in web discourse and hallways is that the audience standard imposes "rules" that unduly limit student creativity and freedom. Budding Galileos are seen to be stifled. Many judges feel that debaters should supply the standards for evaluation of a debate and the judge should stay out of it. Once again, a legitimate issue regarding the functions of a judge is promulgated. A response, of course, is that a standard is a standard. If public argument is to have a positive function it should meet public expectations and allow normal decision processes to be applied. Also, one might add, there is a "you-too" position in circulation: Certain strange norms to which CEDA debaters must learn to subscribe are as coercive as any public philosophy "rules."

Controversies over these and other issues raised by the public debate movement are essentially but reflections of a purported great divide between two political cultures in forensics designated so pithily by David Frank at the 1991

Developmental Conference as the "Critical Thinkers" and the "Rhetors." The issues generated by discussion of the audience paradigm are perennial ones in rhetoric and communication.

THE AUDIENCE IMPULSE SURVIVES

Still, as the controversy swirls about it, the public debate ideal continues to have a degree of influence on tournament debating.

The most explicit example of the deliberate application of the audience standard is in the emergence of the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), an organization of approximately 50 institutions stretching from South Dakota to South Carolina and sponsoring tournaments regularly for a fourth year now. Most specifically, the formal *NEDA Statement of Objective and Procedures* states,

> "A specific statement of the climate expected to prevail at Association events may be found in Jack Howe's "CEDA's Original Objectives—Lest we forget" (*CEDA Yearbook* 1981) and Robert Weiss' "The Audience Standard" (*CEDA Yearbook* 1985). In explaining the NEDA expectations, the Statement includes such provisions as "Arguments should be supported with what a general listener would consider 'good reasons,'" and "Advocates should realize the substantial burden of proof assumed when one advances arguments that would be considered inappropriate in a public forum." Furthermore, "Debate should be practiced as a communication activity derived from principles inherent in the rhetorical tradition."

To help to enforce the audience standard, the Association mandates the random assignment of judges, lay judges in the judging pool, the provision for a "double loss" where neither team is in consonance with Association standards, allowing the judge to stop a round and render an immediate decision in cases of nontopicality or teams that "subvert the possibility of meaningful clash."

Even within CEDA/NDT there remain audience-oriented coaches and judges who feel they can have an impact. Some stated judging philosophies at the national tournaments apparently can still be identified as "audience discourse." In this year's tournament schedule, at least two CEDA tournaments are offering "public debate" divisions, where audience sensitivity is rewarded. The American Debate Association maintains certain "rules" that modify debates in the direction of accessibility. And recently CEDA has established a " Public Sphere Committee" to encourage public debate endeavors.

Other increasingly popular alternative forms of debate, not necessarily completely devoted to the audience standard, represent certain of its values. Parliamentary debate,

for instance, values understanding in the cranium above information stored in crates. And Lincoln- Douglas debate usually is associated with individual events that stress communicative expression that make them accessible to listeners.

Finally, there is some pressure for audience oriented approaches from the direction that formal argumentation studies take in the theories of Perelman and Habermas and in explicit statements in popular textbooks. In their textbook Bartanen and Frank declare that "we think that debate ought to be audience centered," while Rieke and Sillars say "we are adopting an audience- centered perspective on argumentation." One also cannot refrain from mentioning that *Public Argument* by Robert Weiss "adheres consistently to an audience-centered conception of argumentation."

PERORATION

In one debate I observed this spring, a judge highly regarded in CEDA actually "intervened" by calling out "clarity" to a debater who was blithering out of control. And even the most naive lay judge of a NEDA debate will insist upon some evidence. Thus there is plenty of room for exploration and adaptation of almost every aspect of argumentation.

The 1985 *Audience Standard* essay declares that "It is not necessary to contend that the audience perspective is better than any other model, for educational forensics has room for many approaches." Thus there are opportunities for exploration and mutual influence among these many approaches.

The Audience Standard was reprinted in *The Debate Educator* and has had fairly wide distribution as a reprint. It is still a good judging philosophy, in my honest opinion, and whether or not the specific provisions it entails are any further adopted, the vision of academic debate as a communicative activity subject to the same standards and expectations of discourse in any other public forum will remain.

WORKS CITED

Bartanen, Michael D., and David A. Frank. *Debating Values*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbruck, 1991.

Frank, David. "Debating as Rhetorical Scholarship." CEDA 1991: 20thAnniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings. Ed. David A. Thomas and Stephen C. Wood. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1993. 75-95.

Grassmick, David. "In Defense of Public Debate: A Reply to Miller."*Southern Journal of Forensics* 1 (1997): 229-244.

Horn, Gary, and Larry Underberg. "Educational Debate: An Unfulfilled Promise." *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Ed. David A. Thomas and Stephen C. Wood. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1993. 37-74.

Howe, Jack H. "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget." *CEDA Yearbook* 2 (1981): 1-4.

Miller, John J. "A Critique of Audience Centered Debate: The Role of the Argument and Oral Communication." *Southern Journal of Forensics* 1 (1996): 31-41.

Rieke, Richard D., and Malcolm D. Sillars. *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process*. 2nd ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1984.

"Statement of Objectives and Procedures of the National Educational Debate Association." *Journal of Public Advocacy* 1 (1996): 74-76.

Weiss, Robert O. "The Audience Standard." *CEDA Yearbook* 6 (1985): 43-49. Rpt. in *The Debate Educator* 3 (Oct. 1993): 1-4.

—. *Public Argument*. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 1995.

4. A Public Debate Manifesto

Alan Cirlin,
St. Mary's University

Some of the material in this essay has been taken from papers presented at the Pi Kappa Delta National Convention, Prospects Heights, Kentucky, 1997, and the 7th Annual Conference of the International Forensics Association, London, 1997. On the weekend of February 15-16, 1997, a new debate league, the Public Debate Association (PDA) was launched at an inaugural tournament hosted by St. Mary's University. Dr. Jack Rogers of the University of Texas at Tyler is serving as the first president of this new association. I am serving as its executive secretary. As this fledgling organization attempts to take wing, I can almost hear the shout arise, "why yet another new debate league?" I can also hear people wondering why a member of the forensics community with the stature of Jack Rogers would get mixed up in this project, much less lead it? On the surface we would seem to have plenty of debate associations to go around. In the U.S. alone we have the National Debate Tournament [Association] (NDT) and the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA); both are large national organizations. In addition we have the American Debate Association (ADA), which is primarily an Eastern organization, and the National Forensics Association (NFA), which sponsors an alternative Lincoln-Douglas debate topic.

We also have the Parliamentary debate leagues—the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), a student-run affiliation of Eastern debating clubs, and the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), a relatively new confederation, conventionally organized, centered in the Rocky Mountain Region, and clearly headed for national stature. Then we have the Canadian University Society for Intercollegiate Debate (CUSID) within easy striking distance of the northeastern schools—a student-run, parliamentary debate league with close ties to APDA. And this doesn't begin to cover the various international debate associations and programs from Britain to Asia and from Moscow to Australia. All around the world there are clubs and leagues that sponsor and/or participate in English-Speaking debate—most in the parliamentary and some in the NDT/CEDA style. So why yet another?

By way of an answer, let me ask the educators who come to these pages a question. Why are you spending a significant portion of your professional lives teaching and coaching debate? I mean, what are you actually trying to accomplish? If your answer involves the ego rush of having your students win big tournaments, this new association will probably be of little interest. If you're in it because of the immense salary and fringe benefits of coaching debate, this new league might be of even less concern (but please contact me as soon as possible and let me know where you are working and if there are any positions open). On the other hand, if you are primarily interested in coaching debate as an educational activity, hang in there. Have we got a debate alternative for you!

For years, my experiences with CEDA left me feeling like a co-dependent partner in a very dysfunctional relationship. The whole system seemed to be geared for the benefit of the large, well-funded programs. Students from smaller, less well-endowed schools were generally served up as cannon fodder at major tournaments, and I was the guy helping to do the serving. How were small programs supposed to effectively compete when the rules of the game had evolved to demand vast quantities of up-to- the-second, constantly shifting evidence and almost mandatory attendance at a widely scattered set of large and prestigious tournaments? And when I listened to what was actually happening in the final rounds among the supposedly best debaters, the activity struck me as pedagogically suspect (if not downright bankrupt). How were educators supposed to justify the rhetorical training their students were getting when measured against the typical speaking style demonstrated in the top CEDA/NDT debates?

NDT may have started out promoting a rhetorically sound debating style, but over the years it devolved into the rapid-fire, almost anti-rhetorical monster with which we are all familiar. When I debated in the early 1970's NDT debate was already inaccessible to everyday listeners. Jack Howe, feeling the same way, enlisting the aid of a small

set of like-thinking coaches and founded the Cross Examination Debate Association.[1] CEDA started out with the noble objective of bringing certain pedagogical and communication values back into what had become the highly stylized logic game masquerading as a rhetorical activity. And for a while it seemed to be working. But after 20 years of CEDA drifting progressively further from its starting point and constantly closer to its NDT roots, the two associations have recently reintegrated. So many coaches are turning to the British Parliamentary Style of debate as the only alternative.[2] (The ADA also claims to be a viable alternative, but it remains a relatively small East Coast debate league.[3]) The Parliamentary debate associations, from APDA to NPDA to CUSID to the Worlds Competition, do promote a decidedly superior speaking style. Compared with NDT and CEDA, Parliamentary-style debates are often considerably more fun for the participants and tremendously more fun for the audiences and judges. So, on the surface it might seem that Parliamentary debate is enough, and a second Public Debate alternative is hardly necessary. But while I grant these formats provide major advantages over the more traditional NDT and CEDA style debates, I still have serious pedagogical reservations with them. Parliamentary Debate as practiced by APDA, CUSID and NPDA and the current 4-team format used throughout Great Britain and at the Worlds Competition put far too little emphasis on the logical elements of argumentation. It's as if the baby has been thrown out with the bath water. So much emphasis is being placed on developing a theatrical speaking style, being creative, and having fun, that many of the rounds I've heard both here and abroad suffer from an excess of silliness. And almost all of them lack an acceptable level of logical rigor. This may not be an inherent flaw in these formats, but rather a result of current fads. On the other hand, I believe that the fundamental structures (format and rules) that govern the U.S. and British Parliamentary activities will almost guarantee that these or similar flaws will remain endemic.[4] So how might forensics educators combine the best of both worlds, keeping some of the rigor of the mainstream U.S. debate associations and admixing some of the rhetorical quality and fun of the parliamentary system? Is that even possible?

One clue comes from the fact that all the current debate styles are more the product of derivation than of design. I don't think that any of the popular formats were deliberately devised with specific pedagogical goals in mind. They all just sort of evolved out of earlier forms. The NDT format developed out of student debate societies, literary discussion groups, itinerant lecturers, and chautauquas.[5] The APDA & NPDA style has its roots in traditional British Union style debating which in turn owed a great deal to the Parliamentary system and the popular British Orators of the late 18th century.[6] The current British 4-Team format was created to allow the World Competition to run faster and with fewer judges.[7] These formats have certainly been influenced by educators, but

they were hardly created by them. And whatever the original shape and function, the current formats have evolved to where they no longer serve balanced educational ends.

If educators were starting from scratch and designing debate as a pedagogical activity, they would probably want to be sure that 1) it was in fact educational—that it reflected classroom principles of effective persuasive discourse (assuming, of course, that ourclassroom teaching makes sense), and 2) that it was fun—that is, enjoyable for the participants, judges, and observers. If the activity were unnecessarily complex and difficult they would streamline it; if it set up needlessly arduous barriers for new interested students to join, they would redesign it to fix that problem; if the entire activity seemed ridiculous to intelligent neutral observers, they would figure out what was wrong and make changes.

Public Debate was developed with exactly these educational goals in mind. It is an attempt to make the structural changes necessary to shape our debaters' speaking style and to make them adjust to their listeners' preferences. If your neighbors were driving too fast through your communal parking lot, you could ask them to slow down. You could post signs. You could hold political action meetings. None of these actions would be likely to have the desired long-term effect you were after. Then again, you could simply pour some speed bumps and your neighbors would, perforce, slow down. Public Debate is intended to be a kind of structural solution to the excesses of current styles of debate. Public Debate is quite intentionally debate for the Public.

Public Debate began as an experimental format when I was coaching at the University of Richmond. Having experienced NDT as an undergraduate and CEDA as a graduate assistant coach I felt that CEDA was definitely superior. Yet I was hardly satisfied with it. Then, while doing doctoral work, I attended an APDA tournament at the University of Chicago. I thought it was great. About this time I was also influenced by an SCA convention presentation on audience-centered campus debates using the British Union format. So when I took my first coaching position at the University of Richmond, we debated APDA as well as CEDA.[8] We hosted some of the touring CIDD debaters, and I was quite impressed with their speaking style. I also developed an appreciation of real world, real audience debate as manifested in a campus forum series we hosted as part of the basic public speaking course curriculum. I came to know that an audience-centered rhetorical debate style was possible and approximately what it looked like. I just didn't know how to achieve this effect in the context of a standard debate format at a formal tournament.

So I worked on creating such a format, which would capture the essence of what I found best in all these alternatives. I freely admit that some of my early attempts were disasters. And even the best of them had as many weaknesses as strengths. Then I left Richmond for a non-forensics teaching position in Indiana where I was able to do some

basic research on the mechanisms that had shaped modern academic debate.[9] This helped me to understand the structural elements that might be modified in my quest for an ideal format. It also convinced me that it was not just format, but a format in conjunction with a set of associated rules that determined debating style.[10] Then I took another coaching position at St. Mary's. When we started hosting tournaments we included an experimental format which I was then calling "parliamentary" debate. It was a big improvement over the Richmond format, although it still had some major bugs. But based on experience, that format and attendant rules kept evolving. I was certainly guided by the principles that I had unearthed in Indiana. But in truth the format matured as much by brute tinkering as by artful calculation. The main correcting influence was the feedback from the students and coaches who debated and judged this experimental event.

Eventually, I hit on a formula that seemed to work. A little fine tuning and a lot of experience later and I was convinced it represented at least one workable structural solution to the problem of the pedagogy of academic debate. But we needed a new name. With the formation of NPDA, the label "parliamentary" no longer seemed to fit. It never really fit to begin with, but I had always just ignored that as not being particularly important. But now, Lisa Coppoletta was pressing me to form a debate association around this new format, and I felt that if there were sufficient interest I'd be willing to give it a try. So what to call it? Lisa made a suggestion, based on an idea of Glenda Treadaway's, that we call it, *public debate*. That sounded right to me, and everyone I ran the idea past agreed. It seemed a perfect fit with what we were hoping to achieve. So with the support of Jack Rogers and a dozen area coaches, we have formed an association to promote this format and provide a series of tournaments where our students can go to practice.

In a nutshell, here is a description of the pubic debate format, its rules, and some of the underlying justifications:

> **Eligibility:** Public Debate is open to everyone including undergraduate and graduate students; high school students; alumni; retired individuals; attorneys, businesspersons, politicians, coaches and assistant coaches at all levels; etc. Everyone!

This encourages alumni to stay involved and coaches and graduate assistants to take an active role. When these super-senior debaters enter a round there is a certain awkwardness, especially when the super-senior is up against a freshman or a novice. The result is a particularly pleasant, high-ethos, and rhetorically sound style of debate. And since novices, as is always the case, are heavily influenced by the style of whomever is winning, this pleasant, high-ethos, high- logic, rhetorical delivery becomes the

major style to be emulated.

Judges: Anyone of reasonable intelligence can be used as a judge. It is recommended that judging pools be made up of as wide a range of backgrounds, abilities, and perspectives as possible. Tournament directors are encouraged to use lots and lots of class or volunteer undergraduate students as judges. And, of course, since the debate style that is common to this format is so pleasant for audiences to listen to, it is much easier to invite faculty members and administrators to judge as well. Debaters have grown to expect specially trained audiences. NDT and CEDA debaters frequently use a technical debate jargon and various abbreviations and acronyms that are difficult for lay audiences to follow. They quote evidence out of context and with minimal explanation in the justified expectation that their highly expert audience will already be familiar with the issues. And, of course, they reach appalling rates of speed in delivery because their audience is both able and willing to follow what they are saying. Obviously, with a high percentage of lay judges, debaters are forced to adopt completely different strategies, and classic persuasion somehow creeps back into their thinking.

Ballots: Since so many lay judges are involved, an official simplified ballot was designed to make it easy for them to fill out.

This new ballot is not a radical departure from current forms, but the layout is intended to be intuitively obvious for judges to complete. And the items for feedback in the point boxes have been designed with the rhetorical elements of persuasion in mind (Delivery, Courtesy, Impact, Wit, Logic, Support, Consistency, Coherency). There is also a fairly simple two-page set of instructions to judges to guide them through the judging process, from ballot-pick-up to administering the round to filling out the ballot to returning it.

Seating: Contestants are expected to seat themselves such that, from the judge's point of view, the Affirmative is on the left and the Negative on the right

This seating conforms to the ballot and also makes things easier for lay judges. It is an obvious innovation that cuts down on ballot and tabroom errors even among experienced judges.

Format: Public Debate uses a 5-2-7-2-3-4-3 Lincoln-Douglas format. No special preparation (prep) time between speeches is specified. This is left to the discretion of individual tournament directors.

There is no particular reason why a team version of public debate couldn't be adopted, but this would be a later innovation if the association is successful. In the mean time, it makes sense to begin with the Lincoln-Douglas version. In the L-D format the requirements of case presentation are much more relaxed. And, without having to coordinate with a partner, it becomes much easier for novices to get started in the activity.

> **Procedure:** Contestants meet in an extemporaneous preparation room 30 minutes before the scheduled start of the debate to select a topic. Each pair of debaters is offered five (5) topic alternatives. Ideally, these resolutions will vary considerably in tone and style (serious, humorous, policy, value, etc.). Each pair of opponents will independently select one topic from the list of five. Starting with the Negative speaker, each contestant will alternatively strike two alternatives until only one remains.

Why five topic choices? It seemed a good number. An odd number was necessary for an equal set of strikes; 3 seemed too few and 7 too many. Why provide topic choices at all? In part for fairness. Just as in selecting Extemporaneous and Impromptu topics, this allows debaters to strike topics they may feel particularly ill-equipped to handle. Moreover, providing a set of topics forces debaters to think more strategically about the relationships among topics, arguments, strategies, and audiences. If we want our students to learn audience analysis, this is surely one excellent device.

> **Tone:** The interpretation of the resolution and the "tone" of the debate will be set by the debaters and not by the topic. There is nothing inherently serious about one topic or humorous about another. The most serious sounding resolution might be treated lightly and the most ridiculous topic treated seriously. It is up to the debaters, most especially the affirmatives, to define the fundamental nature of the debate in their treatment of the topics.

> **Evidence:** Debaters ARE permitted to use reference materials during their preparation time before the debate begins. They may compile and use Extemporaneous Speaking type files, dictionaries, reference books, libraries, or anything else for that matter. They may also consult with teammates and/or coaches for ideas and advice. But contestants may NOT bring written reference materials into the round with them. No "reading" of evidence will be permitted. Contestants may not even copy evidence on to their flow sheets to be read during a speech. Evidence must be memorized or paraphrased for use during debates.

In this sense, a Public Debater may only use evidence the way a good Extemporaneous Speaking Contestant uses evidence. This is a required and not an optional rule of public debate. And this is a case where judges should be madeaware of this rule and instructed to count off for abuses. Serious violations of this rule should cause the judge to automatically award the decision to the opponent.

> **Fairness:** Debaters will, as much as possible, be left to their own devices. Affirmatives are allowed to define resolutions pretty much as they see fit. However, Affirmative Definitions must leave Negatives fair ground for the debate. If an Affirmative's case is too lopsided and/or used to define the Affirmative position as winning, this opens the door for the Negative to provide an alternate set of definitions. But the Negative can only redefine terms if the Affirmative has abused its prerogative. If the Affirmative can demonstrate adequate ground for the Negative when challenged, than the Affirmative definitions will have presumption. Here again, the judge is the final arbiter of definitional squabbles. Accusing the Affirmative of unfair definitions when this is clearly not the case should count heavily against the Negative.

I hate to get into this subject since it implies that judges will be required to understand and make decisions about at least some "debate theory." So the above explanation is provided mostly so that the debaters understand the rule. I would suggest that judges not be overly troubled with this ahead of time. It can always be explained to them when it becomes necessary; i.e., when the confused judge comes wandering back to the ballot station with a glazed look.

> **Nomenclature & Etiquette**: The two sides in a Public Debate will be known as the Affirmative and Negative. If debaters have a question or a problem they should ask about it during cross-examination and/or raise it as a point during their next speech. Debaters can always appeal to a judge after a round, but the decision of the judge is final.

Many of the niceties of Parliamentary Debate will NOT apply to Public Debate— there will be no "rising" to points of order, standing with one hand onyour head, heckling, etc. Public Debaters are expected to maintain a highly polite, civil, and professional demeanor during rounds Judges should definitely count off for abusiveness. And that, in essence, is just about it. To me, the most exciting thing about this new format in my role as educator is the responses of my students. I have been able to putargumentation and debate and even public speaking class students into the event, both as judges and as competitors, and their reactions have been almost uniformly and overwhelmingly positive. They get

excited about the event. They get pumped. They do not get intimidated, frustrated, or depressed, even after having gone up against such opponents as John English, Mike Fain, and Jack Rogers—coaches all, and all past winners of the experimental public debate division of the St. Mary's Diamondback Classic Tournament.

The critical point is that this new format has worked well in actual practice as an experimental event. It worked extremely well at the inaugural tournament last spring, which had some 55 entries. It remains to be seen how well it will work in broader application. But I have very high hopes.

NOTES

1. Jack Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA [In what was to become the first *CEDA Yearbook*], 1981, 1-3.

2. The founders of NPDA wrote into their constitution: Article II: Purpose of the Association, Section 1. . . . "The Association will promote competitive practices which ensure the long-term growth and survival of intercollegiate, cademic, and public debate by promoting a form of limited preparation debate which combines an emphasis on both content and delivery . . ."

3. Brett O'Donnell [President of the ADA], "Why the ADA Must Remain Vital," Extensions: *Newsletter of the American Debate Association*, September 1996, 1-1-3.

4. The reasons behind this assertion become clear in the description of the Public Debate that follows. It is the contrast between the format and rules that govern Public Debate and those governing the other debate associations that accounts for my belief that these other formats will not be able to promote stable and rhetorically balanced debating styles.

5. Austin Freeley, *Argumentation and Debate*, 9th Edition, Wadsworth:Belmont,, CA, 1996, 19.

6. Christopher Hollis, *The Oxford Union*, The Evans Brothers Limited:London, 1965.

7. Trevor Sather, Coordinator of the Debate Programs of the English SpeakingUnion (ESU), Private Conversation, London, March 14, 1997.

8. So far as I know, I was the only faculty coach involved in the activity. At least, during my three years at the University of Richmond I was the only faculty coach I ever encountered at an APDA tournament.

9. Cf., Alan Cirlin, "Judging, Evaluation, and the Quality of CEDA Debate," *National Forensic Journal,* IV, 2, Fall 1986, 81-90; and "Comments on Ballots: What are We Saying and What are We Really Saying," a paper presented at the National Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, 1986.

10. Of course, at this point I didn't know I was on a quest for a new and improved academic debate association. I just wanted something to use in the classroom and perhaps as a guideline for making rule changes which would bring CEDA debate back to be more in line with its original objectives.

5. A British Debater's Response to the Public Debate Manifesto

M. Whitmore
English-Speaking Union, London, England

"I found on my British tours that British speakers were serious or light, philosophical or trivial, reasoned or banal depending on the type of debate and the nature or wording of the motion." (Rodden, 1985)

I suppose it is only natural that, some thousand miles from home, I should feel somewhat slighted by *A Public Debate Manifesto* (Cirlin, 1998). I feel aggrieved because, despite articles such as Rodden's quoted above, the view of the British debating as some sort of terribly congenial, but not terribly serious after-dinner activity seems to persist amongst the American debate community here in the South.

With this in mind the aim of this article is twofold – firstly to offer an explanation as to the origins of this misperception, and secondly to advocate a way forward for the Public Debate Association which is removed from the notion of 'not wanting to be Worlds, Canadian or British in style.' This second part suggests that Public Debate is an extremely exciting development in forensics here in the US, but that the PDA should perhaps become more aware of that which it does share with these adamantly rejected formats, and what purpose can be served in providing experience for participation in these forsaken events.

As to the first part, as an English debater of some experience and with some success, I found Cirlin's comments interesting. In particular, I found his broadside about British debating placing "far too little emphasis on the logical elements of argumentation," to be contrary to both my own practice and the practice of most debaters I have encountered in the UK. On closer examination, however, the real root of Cirlin's prejudice against British/Worlds style debating (called Worlds style hereafter), was demonstrated: and it is almost entirely the fault of the British.

The problem is alluded to in the articles by Rodden and Skorkowsky (1971) – every time a US team tours the UK, be they the NCA team or not, English debating societies oblige with hospitality and attempt to show their American guests a good time. Invariably this involves being invited to take part in a showpiece debate in front of an audience. It would seem that these debates almost entirely are heavily audience centred, and rarely involve a panel of 'debate judges,' although some local dignitary may be wheeled in to increase the pageantry.

Since the competitive element is usually absent, the American participants see the 'typical British debater' as someone very eager to please the crowd, and perhaps very good at it, but they leave feeling dissatisfied that the British debater only tackled three points, whilst they attempted all twenty-nine.

In order for a true assessment to be made, American debaters need to see British tournaments in action. The British inter-varsity should come as no surprise to an American debater excepting the fact that it is run entirely by students, with students from the host university judging, but never competing. It is in this environment that the British debaters' logos is truly tested.

In my own opinion this is evidenced by the debating society of which I was a member at St Andrews, Scotland – with a 'glorious history' dating back to 1794 and an oak-panelled debating chamber formerly belonging to the Scottish Parliament, the audience and atmosphere was king. This meant that St Andrews would regularly suffer in inter-varsity tournaments at the hands of debating societies such as Leeds, Birmingham, Bristol or London, where the oak-panelling was absent, but the argumentation, structure and logicality were not. Only in the past few years have we managed to go any way towards reversing this trend at St Andrews.

Therefore I would argue that whilst grand, set-piece audience-focussed debates concentrate heavily on a speaker's *ethos*, the British inter-varsity by necessity MUST focus on logicality and structure – since in small rooms with three judges there is very little scope for mother-in-law jokes, and no audience to sway with your humour.

That this focus on argumentation is ingrained in Worlds style debate is immediately obvious to those of us who have participated at this event, and also to anyone reading the rules where it is made plain that the judges place an equal emphasis on manner and matter (D'Cruz, 1999).

One illustration of this fact has been the typical reaction of the audiences to the final of the World Universities Debating Championship – an event that, for the three years I attended, almost always seemed to be seen by observers as an anti-climax — an observation agreed on with Dr Iain Duncan, former Worlds Finalist, in conversation with the author. The reason of course being that the best debaters had been chosen by participating in a four-team event in small rooms with three judges to impress with their skill in argumentation. The final, an event in front of over six hundred debaters, dignitaries and organisers, is judged on the same criteria – the ability to debate in a logically consistent fashion supporting arguments with facts and evidence, as well as wit and humour. However all six hundred observers want to be entertained. The final is thus inevitably lacking.

Thus I would contend that Worlds-style debate is not the beast that Cirlin expects it to be. What then of Cirlin's stated aims as to why Worlds-style debate does not fulfil his pedagogical requirements (since it lacks 'an acceptable level of logical rigour')? When we consider this statement we are surely bound to ask what is it about Public Debate that prevents the same pathology? Although its aims are to provide for the argumentation that Worlds-style debating is perceived to lack, there is nothing about the format per se that necessitates any more logicality or structure than any other. No amount of box ticking will provide for that.

What Public Debate does provide for is the audience. The listener/evaluator/critic/judge is king. No longer can debaters seek refuge in the fact that the judge obviously

did not know what they were doing. The point is now that it is the debater's job to persuade anyone - from those they perceive to be the most inexperienced to those they perceive to have the most experience.

So what? Other than perhaps setting the record straight, what does this mean for Public Debate?

As mentioned above I have found Public Debate in the four short months I have been in the United States, to be an extremely interesting and exciting format.

Public Debate allows debaters in the US to experiment with actually persuading an audience in a way that American-style parliamentary debate never can whilst it is so rule focussed. American parliamentary debate fosters excellent communication skills, good analysis and the ability to speak extemporaneously, but the focus is never on 'the audience,' but always on 'the judge.' The necessity of identifying harms, values and criteria often leads poor debaters to fail to understand what these terms actually mean and how they can be used in an holistic sense, without necessarily spending the first few minutes of each speech saying '…and my value is….' The very fact that these terms are not immediately obvious to the layperson results in obfuscation and confusion should an audience be present.

Therefore although American parliamentary style has much to recommend it and a strong body of support, there clearly is a void. A void which now seems to have been filled by Public Debate. This same void is filled in any programme with a history of regularly offering its debaters the opportunity to participate in debates in front of an untrained audience.

This leads me to my final observation – in my opinion Public Debate is to be welcomed with open arms, but NOT because it provides more logicality than any other format. For me Public Debate allows movement away from the rule based approach of American parliamentary debate, and puts the focus of the forensic activity back on the person being persuaded. Although Worlds-style debate does not have such an automatic focus, the combination of *ethos* and *logos*-oriented debate in British, Australian, Canadian and others' style of debate at the Worlds, leads to their pre-eminence in that competition.

Debating in the United States is now in a dangerously strong position. American debaters have the benefit of enormous funding compared to their counterparts around the world. They have the benefit of academic support in the many communication-oriented faculties around the country. They have a strong tradition of debate as a pedagogical activity with value for the student, the university, the employer and the teacher, and they have thriving bloodlines of debate in their own right, in the guises of policy and non-policy debate.

It is my firm belief that 'The Third Way,' so beloved of Primeminister Blair, is now

here in US debating - between policy and non-policy there now exists a paradigm whose strength is its improvisatory nature: its absence of legalism which enables debaters to experience just what it means to hold the audience in the palm of your hand.

However, if it is to have the empowering effect that I suspect it has the potential for, then it must not start off by 'not being British.' Instead I would urge faculty to adopt Public Debate as the route to providing success at competitions such as Worlds, (in tandem with whatever other debate activities are undertaken) and thus to enable our debaters to learn what it must have been like for the orators of the areopagus to persuade their critics in an environment where it truly mattered.

REFERENCES

Cirlin, A. (1998). A public debate manifesto. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, Vol 2 No.4, 339 - 350.

D'Cruz, R. (1999). Rules for the World Universities Debating Championships, http://www.geocities.com/TheTropics/Paradise/6389/, 6th January, 1999.

Rodden, J. (1985) British University Debating: A reappraisal. *Communication Education*, 34, 308 - 317.

Skorkowsky, G. R. (1971). British University Debating. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57, 335 - 343.

6. Public Debate and the Ideal of Public Reason

Darrin Hicks
University of Denver

Every reasonable and rational agent, whether an individual, confederation of nations, or organization, has a way of devising and ordering its ends and of making its decisions accordingly. The method an agent uses to perform this task constitutes its REASON, which I understand to be an intellectual and moral power rooted in the political culture that defines the capacities of its members (Rawls, 1993). The political culture of the intercollegiate debate community, according to Frank (1991), has devolved into a choice between defining the capacities of its members in terms of critical thinking or eloquence. What bothers me about this choice, aside from the fact that it inscribes a Platonic division between speech and thought that contradicts everything we teach in our rhetoric courses, is that it treats training in critical

thinking and eloquence as the proper ends of debate.

While I think improvement in reasoning and speaking skills is central to a liberal education, I see these skills as a means used to foster and cultivate democratic citizenship and critical public deliberation. That is, the terminal value of intercollegiate debate is not that it is an extension of the classroom for training students to be rational and eloquent, but that debate has a unique ability to inculcate a democratic ethos—a willingness to listen and evaluate opponents' arguments, respect for minority and counter-intuitive views, the ability to justify one's convictions in public, and the willingness to risk one's deepest convictions in critical argumentation—makes it an indispensable technique of democratic governance. This is not a novel insight. Douglas Ehninger made the same argument in his 1958 critique of contest debating: "Debating must mean more than a convenient means for stimulating research or for teaching the techniques of argument. Any pursuit that expends the time, money, and energy it does must be a positive force for good. It must contribute in a direct and effective way to the making of better men and women and to the making of a better world" (p. 135).

Hence, when I am asked why I coach debate, my answer is not based on either educational or strategic goals. Rather, I offer an explicitly political justification based on my faith in debate's ability to cultivate democratic citizenship. Moreover, I am becoming increasingly convinced that intercollegiate debate should not remain an insulated activity but, rather, should actively engage the public sphere. Again this is not an novel idea. David Zarefsky, in his 1994 SCA presidential address, urged the debate community to focus on sharing its insights on political controversy with the public sphere. Gordon Mitchell (1995) suggests several ways that debate programs can engage in political activism designed to "broaden and deepen important public controversies by enhancing the claim-making capacity of all parties to the dialogue, especially including those presently excluded from discourse" (p. 5). A political justification of debate refuses to hold critical thinking or rhetoric as ends in themselves because such a justification is based on a normative conception of democracy that refuses to define political action solely in terms of a contest of argument and/or persuasion. Instead, democratic politics, at its best, is embodied in a dialectical exchange of reasons that transforms parochial self-interest into a focus on the public good.

The task for a model of public debate is to invent and sustain the conditions that make such an exchange not only possible but the guiding norm of debate practice. I read Robert Weiss's (1985) *The Audience Standard* as an attempt to carry out this task. Weiss contends that public deliberation should serve as the standard for assessing the accessibility and reasonableness of intercollegiate debate. While I agree with Weisss aim, that some forms of intercollegiate debate should embody the norms of public deliberation, I am hesitant to endorse his interpretation of what constitutes reasonable-

ness. In what follows I would like to suggest an alternative to the ideal of reasonableness set out in *The Audience Standard*. That alternative is what Kant (1784/1991) and Rawls (1989, 1993) identify as the ideal of public reason. I believe that the ideal of public reason provides a needed philosophical basis and defense of public debate. Furthermore, the ideal of public reason serves as a standard by which to critique and modify current debate practice.

We all know of the raging disputes over what normative conception of accessibility and comprehension should guide debate practice. I have very little to add to this dispute. I would simply point out that the research in the area of public deliberation suggests that the questions over argumentative form, including the debates over whether traditional models of reasoning and inference exclude minoritarian knowledges, are much more important in terms of their impacts to diversity and comprehension than questions of speed and the delivery skills of debaters (Sanders, 1997; Young, 1996; Hicks, 1995; Reed, 1990).

On the other hand, the normative conception of reasonableness guiding debate practice has received relatively little attention. There have been several essays (Trapp, 1993; Tuman, 1993) that call for a more rigorous application of reasoned inquiry in intercollegiate debate (e.g., demanding rigorous standards of evidence and inference) but the philosophical ideal of rationality and reasonableness underwriting debate is often left unexplicated. Weisss essay is an exception. Rejecting the CEDA/NDT communitys preference for treating argumentation as a user-organized activity and, hence, treating reasonableness as an ideal defined in and through the conventions of current debate practice, the audience standard locates reasonableness in the standards of public debate and deliberation.

Surely Weiss intended the audience standard as a normative conception of reasonableness to counter NDT's (and, now, CEDA's) tendency to relativize reasonableness. Yet, since Weiss does not set out any critical standards of what constitutes reasonableness in public deliberation besides the dictum to avoid counter-intuitive claims, the audience standard simply becomes a reflection of current public sentiment. Thus, the audience standard is no less relativistic in defining reasonableness in terms of current debate practice. Hence, as Gotcher and Greene (1988) argue, the audience standard amounts to another "posture" that can be arbitrarily imposed by the judge. Absent a standard to test the reasonableness of any particular judge's interpretation of public sentiment, the audience standard will be viewed, by many, as a justification for unaccountable, and therefore unreasonable, intervention.

However, I think Weiss is right to call for a form of debate that models public discourse. Parliamentary debate, for instance, strives to emulate the standards of

public debate and deliberation. Unfortunately, some parliamentary debaters, like some politicians, often confuse "public" communication with "mass" communication and reduce complex public problems to ideological slogans and issue soundbites instead of arguments. Of course, the best parliamentary debaters, like the best public servants, reflect on and speak to the ethical implications of policy dilemmas in a manner that actually reconfigures the context of public discourse. I think the crucial difference here, besides intelligence and skill, is that rather than defining the standards of reason and reasonableness of the public in terms of the lowest common denominator and prevailing public sentiment, the very best speakers strive to emulate the ideal of public reason.

The ideal of public reason does not refer to the heightened reasoning powers of the leviathan. Public reason refers to the common reason, understood as a means of formulating plans, putting ends in order and making decisions accordingly, of the public in its capacity as citizens constituting a polity. Rawls (1989), working from Kant's (1784/1991) discussion of free public reason, formulates public reason as the standard of reasonableness that ought to govern political discussion in a liberal democracy:

> Great values fall under the idea of free public reason and are expressed in the guidelines for public inquiry and in the steps taken to secure that such inquiry is free and public, as well as informed and reasonable. These values include not only the appropriate use of the fundamental concepts of judgment, inference, and evidence, but also the virtues of reasonableness and fair-mindedness as shown to the adherence to the criteria and procedures of common sense knowledge, and to the methods and conclusions of science when not controversial, as well as respect for the precepts governing reasonable political discussion (pp. 233-234).

The ideal of public reason is the standard to which citizens in a pluralistic society hold each other when advancing arguments about what constitutes the good. It is a standard that demands that citizens be able to explain their political convictions to one another in terms of a reasonable balance of public political values rather than by referring to comprehensive doctrines that may exclude others' deepest convictions. That is, when citizens are called on to justify their political convictions and votes in public forums they should be ready to explain the basis for their actions to one another in terms that others could reasonably endorse as "consistent with their freedom and equality" (Rawls, 1993, p. 218). Public reason contrasts with the nonpublic reason of churches, trade unions, neighborhood associations and other institutions constituting civil society. Nonpublic rea-

soning might include premises about the authority of sacred texts and modes of reasoning that might appeal to the interpretive authority of particular individuals (Solum, 1993). Public reason also contrasts with the technical and instrumental reasoning of corporations, scientific communities and bureaucratic organizations. However, when these institutions address each other and the public at large in public forums, they are expected to base their arguments on premises and modes of reasoning that are comprehensible and reasonably acceptable to all parties.

Of course, citizens draw their political convictions from their religious beliefs, community membership, occupational identities, and other nonpublic commitments. Moreover, they ought to be free to do so. Yet, given the irreducible plurality of doctrines that define our moral, religious, philosophical, and political convictions, a standard of public reason is necessary to distinguish the legitimate from the coercive use of political power. The exercise of political power is justifiable and hence legitimate only when exercised in a manner that is consistent with the freedom and equality of all citizens. For Rawls (1993), this "liberal principle of legitimacy" imposes a duty of civility, which is the obligation that citizens, as well as public officials, explain how their principles and policies, at least those that would affect others, can be supported by the values of public reason (p. 217). The duty of civility and standards of public reason do not apply to personal deliberations or those of voluntary associations. But the ideal of public reason and duty of civility do hold for political advocacy in public forums and in how citizens vote in public elections when fundamental process of government (e.g., the powers of the legislature, the scope of majority rule) or basic liberties (e.g., suffrage, freedom of thought and expression, and the protections of the law) are at stake.

The ideal of public reason, therefore, constitutes a standard of reasonableness that regulates argumentative practice in two ways. First, it regulates the production of arguments by serving as a standard for self-evaluation. Citizens can use the ideal as a guide for determining which of their arguments is acceptable for public discussion. Second, the ideal of public reason regulates the evaluation of argumentation by serving as a standard for political criticism. One can criticize another's arguments on the grounds that those arguments rest on premises and modes of reasoning that cannot be warranted by the standards of public reason, since those arguments transgress the limits of civility. This second role, while not assuming or justifying enforcement by the coercive use of institutional power, does not rule out the use of social pressure to encourage compliance with the standards of public reason (Solum, 1993, p. 733). By offering acceptable reasons and voicing disapproval of those reasons that transgress the limits of civility, citizens can use the ideal of public reason as a method of changing one another's political behavior. Moreover, the procedures of public deliberation not only regulate disagreement but actually constitute citizens that have the capacity and desire to engage in critical discussion.

Hence, debate governed by the ideals of public reason inculcates a democratic ethos and becomes a form of democratic paideia.

Unlike the audience standard, the ideal of public reason provides an account of reasonableness that is not simply a reflection of current public sentiment. To be sure, many people fail to recognize the distinction between public and nonpublic reasons, and often they do not evaluate their own and others' arguments according to this standard of public reason. Yet, people can, and sometimes do, recognize and accept these distinctions between the public and the nonpublic in particular cases. The IDEAL of public reason is a normative standard designed to regulate public discourse. It is a critical standard of reasonableness whose application can be accounted for and critiqued. Therefore, it avoids the relativism of accounts that treat reasonableness as the reflection of a community's argumentative practices and the charge that "publicness" is a standard justifying arbitrary judge intervention.

The ideal of public reason provides a stronger philosophical conception of reasonableness by which to evaluate debate practice than the standard of reasonableness implicit in the audience standard. It can also provide a starting point for a philosophical and political justification for Parliamentary debate (something that I am often asked to do by my friends and colleagues).

The CEDA/NDT union is excellent at modeling strategic and instrumental reasoning, a form of reasoning heavily dependent upon the ability to access and interpret large amounts of technical data. This strategic, instrumental reasoning dominates the decision calculus of most policy-making bodies, including the military, corporations, political think tanks, and large-scale bureaucracies. Not only does this form of debate provide a valuable service by training those who will be entering those fields, but it also has a potential to improve the decision-making practices of those fields by holding them to a standard of rational scrutiny. Yet, the demand for evaluating principles and policies in terms of their costs and benefits (because this form of analysis has an amazing ability to make conflicting positions commensurate) and flattening out reasoning into a pattern of linking sole causal links to catastrophic impacts (Crenshaw, 1993) may make this form of debate a poor, both normatively and descriptively, model of public deliberation.

Parliamentary debate, on the other hand, explicitly models the modes of reason constituting deliberation in public forums. First, by limiting the scope of topics to basic questions of governance and the application of a political conception of justice to particular cases the influence of instrumental reason is restrained. These questions demand to be evaluated in the terms of public reason. Secondly, by limiting the justification of principles and policies to appeals to generally accepted beliefs and the forms of reasoning found in common sense, in other words by limiting evidence to "public knowledge," parliamentary debaters are forced to translate specialized and technical information into a

public vocabulary. This does not mean watering down concepts so they are comprehensible to the "common person," who is a very dangerous mythical figure. Rather, it means that specialized knowledge must be cashed out in terms of the basic questions of governance and the application of political justice. Successful parliamentary debaters, just like successful public deliberators, conduct research. In fact, in the cases of public deliberation I have analyzed—one set of deliberations concerning the removal and storage of hazardous waste and another concerning the placement of public housing—the participants scoured technical documents, but none of them did so to bolster their claims with authoritative evidence. Rather, they needed to expand their knowledge of the issues and to understand how technical decisions interface with public questions concerning justice and fair representation. Members of the public who try to battle bureaucracies and private corporations by presenting the results of studies and other technical data will more than likely be outmaneuvered and silenced. However, those activists wh translate technical information into public reasons, and, more importantly, demand that government and corporate officials do the same, can, and often do, widen the scope of deliberation and force officials to account for their policies in terms of their impact upon democratic principles and political justice. It is just this sort of deliberation and this type of public actor that parliamentary debate strives to emulate.

In addition to providing a justification for parliamentary debate, the ideal of public reason can serve as the basis for interrogating and critique our current practices. I would like to briefly mention two such practices: judging and the paucity of cultural critique found in parliamentary debate rounds. First, judges should exemplify the ideal of public reason and the duty of civility. This entails understanding the ballot as an opportunity to make an argument rather than as a place simply to criticize debaters. Our decisions should be made on a substantive evaluation of the issues and furthermore this substantive evaluation should be held accountable to the standards of public reason. Moreover, judges should be ready to explain their decisions to debaters and should expect their reasons to scrutinized as rigorously as, if not more rigorously than, any argument advanced in the round. A judge who uses their position of authority as a means for demanding that debaters adapt to their personal and often arbitrary, preferences and who use their power to intimidate a debater who would ask for an explanation of a decision embodies the essence of incivility.

My second concern is the relative lack of second-order ethical reflection that is exhibited in parliamentary debate rounds. Social and political problems can be ethically analyzed on two levels (McCollough, 1991).The first level is in terms of a particular policy. The question becomes what is the best course of action to pursue in alleviating this social and political problem. The second level is that of the cultural context, or ethos, of the policy-making process. This entails analyzing how certainpopulations are targeted as

constituting a social and political "problem"and how various "plans" work by targeting the manners and morals of those populations for transformation via a host of policing practices (Greene, 1995). It also entails a focus on the discourse of policy-making and how it may work to exclude particular voices from public debate. CEDA/NDT has been somewhat successful in encouraging this level of reflection by embracing "critiques" as a legitimate argumentative strategy. (I say somewhat because I am concerned that the tendency to frame and evaluate these arguments in a cost-benefit calculus and present them as causal arguments constitutes something of a contradiction and, hence, a limitation of ethical reflection.)

Unfortunately, these second-order arguments are seldom seen in parliamentary rounds. I think it is because of an aversion to counter-intuitive arguments and the mistaken assumption that they are absent from public deliberation. Let me counter this assumption with an example. (Please excuse the truncated and simplified version of events I am about to give, since space limitations do not permit a fuller account.) In my research on a two-year deliberation over the placement of a public housing project in Kansas City, Missouri, I was astonished to hear from some of the residents of the housing project (Guinotte Manor) and the residents of the adjacent community (Columbus Park), who began as enemies, that their interests were reconciled when they realized that the housing authority and the developers profited from their antagonism. The "common-sense" perception that no one really wants public housing in their neighborhood circumvented proposals for distributing federal monies across the inner core of the city and, instead, was used to justify the current plan to rebuild a series of housing projects that placed 85% of the poor within a two-square mile area. While a "good idea," scattered site housing was described as an impractical policy option. When advocates from the neighborhood association called this assumption into question they were called naïve and racist, and the housing authority asked that they be prohibited from testifying before the city council and the federal court. However, by formulating their claims in terms of fair representation and the injustice of the policy to both the residents of the housing projects and the adjacent neighborhoods, they were allowed to speak. Once allowed to participate in the deliberations they were able to argue that the antagonism was actually a by-product of a distorted policy-making discourse that constituted the poor as a "social problem to be managed and the tensions between the "poor minority residents" and the "white middle class neighbors" as an intractable "political problem." Furthermore, they argued this "antagonism" was used to delegitimize any alternative policy options and, therefore, justify concentrated housing projects, which stood to generate a great deal of profit for the developers that were running the housing authority. (In Kansas City, as many other cities, the housing authority is under the receivership of a development firm.) While not all of these arguments in favor of scattered site housing were success-

ful, they were able to convince the city to reject the housing authoritys proposed plan and to convene a committee constituted of tenants, neighbors, architects, and public officials to draw up an alternative plan. The first phase of that plan was approved late this Spring.

I think this example should raise doubts to the veracity of the claim that counter-intuitive arguments are absent from public deliberation. It should also call into question any justification of a debate format or judging philosophy that is based on this claim.

Parliamentary debates should include and reward arguments that exhibit this second level of ethical reflection. The ideal of public reason is reflexive in the sense that it provides the grounds for its own justification and application. That is, public reason should be justified by public reason. If our principles and policies are truly justified by public reasons, then the methods of justification must be amenable to scrutiny. The residents of Columbus Park and the tenants of Guinotte Manor questioned the premises and modes of reasoning of those who made decisions about where they lived. When held accountable to the ideal of public reason these premises and modes of reasoning were revealed as unreasonable, but it took questioning the discourses of policy-making and advancing "counter-intuitive" arguments. If parliamentary debate is really a model of public deliberation, it must find ways to cultivate and foster these kinds of reasoning practices. As Kant (1784/1991) argued in his essay, "What is Enlightenment," the only standard that should constrain reason is reason itself.

This discussion of the ideal of public reason is far from comprehensive, and the full philosophical and political conception of reasonableness that could guide our debates as to what constitutes good debate still needs to be devised. I hope that this essay has made some inroads in disclosing how coaching debate is a political vocation and laid the groundwork for a vision of public debate that is both rigorous and comprehensible, both critical and reasonable.

REFERENCES

Crenshaw, C. (1993). Dominant form and marginalized voices: Argumentation about feminism(s). *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 72-79.

Ehninger, D. (1958). The debate about debating. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 44, 128-136.

Frank, D. A. (1993). Debate as rhetorical scholarship: Changing delivery practices in CEDA. In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary assessment conference proceedings (pp. 75-95). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Greene, R.W. (1995). *Malthus travels: A cultural history of the population crisis, 1945-1995.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Gotcher, J.M. & Greene, R.W. (1988). The role of the critic and the Audience centered

model of debate: problems and possibilities, *CEDA Yearbook,* 9, 88-95.

Hicks, D. (1995). Disagreement and democratic pluralism. In S. Jackson (Ed.), Argument and Values: Proceedings of the Ninth AFA/SCA Conference on Argumentation (pp. 302-307). Annandale VA: Speech Communication Association.

Kant, I. (1991). An answer to the question: "What is enlightenment?" In H. Reiss (Ed.), *Political Writings* (pp. 54-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (original work published 1784)

McCollough, T. (1991). *The moral imagination and public life.* Chatham NJ: Chatham House.

Mitchell, G. (1995). Time for an outward activist turn in academic debate. Paper presented at the seventh Wake Forest argumentation conference, Winston-Salem, NC.

Rawls, J. (1989) The domain of the political and overlapping consensus *New York University Law Review, 6*4, 233-255.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism.* New York: Columbia University Press

Reed, R. (1990). Are Roberts Rules of Order counterrevolutionary? Rhetoric and the reconstruction of Portuguese politics. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 63, 134-144.

Sanders, L. (1997) Against deliberation. *Political Theory,* 25, 347-376.

Solum, L. (1993). Constructing the ideal of public reason. *San Diego Law Review,* 30, 729-762.

Trapp, R. (1993). The need for an argumentative perspective for academic debate. *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 23-33.

Tuman, J. (1993). A response to Crenshaw's "Dominant form and marginalized voices: Argumentation about feminism(s)." *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 1993, 84-91.

Weiss, R. (1985). The audience standard. *CEDA Yearbook*, 6, 43-49.

Young, I. M. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 120-136). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

7. The Question of Audience in Forensic Education

David E. Williams
Texas Tech University

In my experience, I have observed few issues that have been so divisive to the practice of forensic education as the concern for audience in our competitive activities. The question most frequently arises in reference to evidence-oriented tournament debate (e.g., Weiss, 1985; Gotcher & Greene, 1988)

but is certainly not limited to that realm of forensic activity. Bartanen (1981) raises questions about the limitations of the laboratory experience in individual events that encompass a de-emphasis on the role of audience.

For some, the heart of the audience issue in forensics activities may be found in an apparent pedagogical inconsistency. We teach our public speaking and debate students that audience analysis and adaptation are of critical importance. However, we participate in an activity that would appear at times to limit, overly-restrict, or outright ignore the role of audience in the act of communicating.

In an attempt to alleviate this concern for some (and probably heighten the concern for others), two observations will be offered below. It would appear that there are some alternatives to current forensic practice that can be expanded and that would illuminate the role of audience in competition. It would also appear that we could take the bold position that there really is no problem with the role of audience in current forensic practice. Probably the least objectionable of these two observations posits that there are things we can do to incorporate further the role of audience in competition. Dean (1988) reported on proper means for training lay judges to serve as competent forensic critics. While many might bemoan the use of lay judges, these critics can be properly equipped with information about tournament procedures and event norms with a minimum of difficulty. It is also difficult to dispute the educational advantages of receiving feedback from a new set of audience members who can bring a different perspective to the encounter. Certainly this option has its limitations. Lay judges can be trained to adjudicate many of the individual event rounds and some forms of competitive debate such as parliamentary debate, and public debate. The use of lay judges for CEDA or NDT debate outside of law students and people with similar training would, however, be unrealistic.

Another option for increasing the role of audience in forensics involves the creation of new events that avoid Haught's (1989) characterization of the problem with audience analysis in individual events.

The individual events audience is always a nebulous amalgam of all those who judge individual events. There is value in having students learn the high standards of form, substance, and delivery which will satisfy that audience. Still, their sense of audience analysis and adaptation must become rather myopic. (p. 38)

Individual events have been created and tested that attempt to specify a role for the audience other than forensic judge. For example, reasoned response (Williams, Carver, & Hart, 1993) created a new audience role for the speaker to analyze and adapt to with each speech. Events such as sales speaking also attempt to specify to a greater degree who the speaker should consider as the audience. Parliamentary debate

attempts to create an audience, other than that of forensic coaches, by adapting roles from the House of Parliament. These events and others involve a changing of the role of audience in forensic competition. Whether they succeed in that area of instruction is certainly debatable.

The recent founding and development of the Public Debate Association sheds a helpful light on the issue of audience in forensics. While this organization is in its genesis, directors might opt to experiment with the activity or adapt it for non-competitive instructional use. A variety of public debate formats exist and can be used by forensic programs to teach other communities basic skills in advocacy. The format can also be used by forensic programs to provide a useful service function to the community. Who better to organize the campus public debates between competing student political parties during election time? This initial observation will likely have little effect on how tournaments and programs are directed in the future. These suggestions offer means for "tinkering" with the issue of audience in forensic competition, but there is clearly no all-encompassing solution to be found here. Furthermore, the ideas mentioned above almost exclusively focus on individual events and non-evidence oriented debate.

Now, let me make a more controversial observation. Would it be too bold to suggest that there really is no problem with the role of audience in CEDA and NDT debate? The focus of these evidence-oriented debate formats is clearly in the areas of research, issue analysis, argument development, and refutation. Would it be an insurmountable threat to forensics pedagogy to suggest that the current practice in CEDA and NDT is not meant to appeal to a universal or public audience? Rather, the debating practices that are engendered in these organizations are designed to develop competencies that require a specialized audience. The concerns about the debating practices in NDT and CEDA debate are summarized by McGee (1997) in this issue as use of a "specialized lexicon and delivery practices only appropriate for a highly trained 'expert' audience familiar with the theory and practice of intercollegiate debate." The use of rapid delivery, extensive arguments, a multitude of pieces of evidence, and speculative causal relationships between arguments lead to the criticism that students are divorcing themselves from the communicative nature and purpose of the event. While many issue regarding forensic education can enter the discussion at this point, we must focus on the role of audience and the educational benefits derived by the student. Does the CEDA or NDT student practice and learn a great deal about audience analysis and adaptation? No, probably not. Is that student going to graduate from his or her respective institution and be inadequately prepared to conduct these vital communication functions. Perhaps not.

However, to suggest that a CEDA or NDT student would not be able to learn and practice elements of audience analysis, adaptation and understanding would

seem to reveal a very microscopic view of the student's role in the activity. One would have to assume that the student did not receive adequate instruction on the role of audience in the college or university public speaking or debate course or any other course in the discipline that would presumably teach this element of communication. One would also have to assume that the student participates only in one of these forms of evidence-oriented debate and does not venture into Lincoln-Douglas debate, parliamentary debate, public debate or individual events. While the role of audience in these activities can be challenged, they certainly provide some opportunity for participants to develop audience adaptation skills.

There are also elements with the evidence-debate experience that provide the opportunity for students to tangle with the audience element. Some judging paradigms would suggest to students that efforts must be made to conform to some version of Perelman's universal audience. The "audience standard" obviously clarifies the position held by the adjudicator as doe the policy maker paradigm. Programs that are able to travel beyond their home geographical area also have the opportunity to experiment with regional adaptation (read cultural adaptation; e.g., Zarefsky, 1996). These students are exposed to the research, inference-making, and immediate adaptation abilities necessary when encountering an audience with different values, beliefs, or, at least, norms. The student is also able to observe directly the consequences of failing to utilize these skills effectively.

What this observation might ultimately suggest is that the role of audience in CEDA and NDT debate is not at all clear. Even if the role of audience is almost completely divorced from the debating practices in these organizations, that may not be reason for discrediting their work. It might be that the pedagogical function of these organizations is devoted to an emphasis on research, issue analysis, argument construction, and refutation, while the complexities of audience analysis and adaptation are left to be discovered in other venues. Until we see reports revealing that former NDT and CEDA debaters are failing in professional or post-college pursuits because they were unable to make the switch from the particular to the universal audience, it may be difficult to condemn these organizations on grounds of failing to incorporate the audience element in the debate process. This might be a useful research project for someone devoted to forensic education and outcomes assessment for our activity. While the search for a representative sample of former debaters may be somewhat challenging, the results of such a study could help to settle some of the disputes regarding the role of the audience and other important issues in forensics pedagogy.

UNDERVIEW — These observations might be regarded as anything from whimsical to something approaching accuracy; however, they do seem to high-

light one important truism concerning forensic activity. The benefits of crossover participation in forensics are numerous and should be considered by educators. Typically, crossover participation will either refer to an individual events student who does publicaddress and interpretation events or a student who competes in both individual events and some form of debate activity. The latter form of crossover participation may be the best means for students to educate themselves on the role of audience in communication. While crossover participation is not always an easy venture, it might be one of the most educationally beneficial and intrinsically rewarding approaches to forensic activities. Crossover participation should now encompass an additional element, that being the community. Forensic education reaches its glory when our students pass on their knowledge to other "students." Whether these other "students" are high school debaters, community groups, or those college and university political supporters who need help in organizing a public debate, we are all served better when we encourage our students to work with these "audiences."

REFERENCES

Bartanen, M.D. (1981). Are new events needed to enhance a laboratory experience in argumentation? In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 405-414). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Dean, K.W. (1988). Judge training for individual events: Case studies for calling for clarification not prescription. Journal of American Forensic Association, 24, 251-257.

Gotcher, J.M. & Greene, R.W. (1988). The role of the critic and the audience-centered model of debate: Problems and possibilities. *CEDA Yearbook*, 9, 88-95.

Haught, K.W. (1989). Justifying the present with one eye on the future: Criteria for the selection of events categories.   In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events*. Mankato, MN: Mankato State University Speech Department.

McGee, B. R. (1997). Forum introduction: Public debate and the problem of audience. *Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2. Weiss, R.O. (1985). The audience standard. *CEDA Yearbook*, 6, 43-49.

Williams, D., Carver, C., & Hart, R. (1993). Is it time for a change in impromptu speaking? *National Forensic Journal*, 11, 29-40. Zarefsky, D. (1996). *Public speaking: Strategies for success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

8. Public Forum Debate: An Ineffective Method to Increase CEDA Participation

Aaron R. Klemz & Greggory Simerly
Southern Illinois University

Public forum debate (PFD), as an alternative division inside of CEDA, has been offered as a solution to declining participation in CEDA debate. Its proponents see this divison as a potential alternative to draw back programs that have abandoned resource-intensive policy debate for arguably less demanding alternatives, such as parliamentary debate and NEDA. While there is no doubt that there are many difficulties for attracting new programs, we believe that a decision to include PFD as a division of CEDA would not resolve these entry barriers except to define them out of existence.

This is a time of dramatic change in intercollegiate debate. The NDT's decision to use the CEDA topic has caused a rapprochement that will forever alter the debate landscape. Many university forensics programs from both organizations have found a common interest in promoting and teaching policy debate, and many think these commonalities portend a new period of inter-organizational cooperation. However, trying to be all things to all schools is a task made impossible by the diverse and conflicting educational goals held by coaches and programs. CEDA would be better served to increase, refine and improve outreach efforts to encourage new programs to debate in our organization by more traditional means.

When contrasted with other debate-sponsoring organizations, the CEDA/NDT version of policy debate requires more intensive research to compete. This is one of the most educationally valuable aspects of policy debate compared to PFD. Academic research skills both improve the quality of an undergraduate education and are valuable tools for life in the "real world." Policy debate enhances both the breadth and depth of research. Policy debate topics are generally broader in scope, and an emphasis on parametric cases creates a need for specialized research and more detailed knowledge of the topic area. Using specialized judging also enhances the need for and educational value of research. Having arguments evaluated by a critic who has done research in the topic area, coached teams on topic arguments and who is familiar with the rigors of CEDA/NDT debate subjects debaters' arguments to more rigorous evaluation, forcing debaters to be more sophisticated in their analysis and more thorough in their research of the topic area.

Of course, the advantages of participation in CEDA/NDT debate are not universally acknowledged. For example, many advocates of a public debate paradigm can find no value in any argument that could be regarded as counterintuitive. In the current forum, we believe that Robert O. Weiss mischaracterizes the practice of CEDA/NDT debate in the following passage when comparing it to a public debate paradigm:

Audiences also are expected to use some common sense, so an audience standard devalues the counter-intuitive as well as wild and improbable claims as a waste of their time and an insult to their intelligence . . . . One final tendency for a public debate judge is a degree of interventionism, where the judge applies his or her own critical thinking processes in evaluating arguments employed and may even give direct indication of approval or disapproval. Counterintuitive arguments are easily beaten in most cases, and it is undoubtedly true that there are many bad arguments in CEDA/NDT. However, there are few (if any) critics that view "wild and improbable claims" as good arguments in the CEDA/NDT community. The fact that these critics have more knowledge of the topic itself makes them even more predisposed against poor arguments because they are more likely to recognize them as such. The key difference is that while skilled judges may be predisposed against these arguments, they are not inclined to reject them out of hand, as Weiss suggests public debate judges would. Removing responsibility for answering these "counterintuitive"arguments from debaters only shields debaters from a valuable lesson. No argument in "the real world" is so ridiculous that it can be simply ignored. We teach our students poorly when we teach them to ignore or discount arguments they disagree with or find "wild and improbable." The training needed to dismiss poor arguments in a cogent fashion is another valuable skill PFD fails to offer students.

Policy debate also offers students an opportunity to learn better analytical and reasoning skills than PFD can. Gotcher and Greene describe the role of critic as "a representative of the 'public' with particular needs and interests demanding reinforcement or change" (89). The judge's assumption of the role of the general public is radically different from the requirements of nearly all other judging paradigms advanced by debate theorists. PFD advocates point to this focus as a desirable educational means to accomplish the goal of training communicators who will function well in the "real world." For example, Brydon (1984) argues that "when debaters enter the post-college world, as business-persons, attorneys, politicians, parents and just plain citizens, they need to adapt to a variety of audiences, not just trained debate coaches" (87). However, what he and others fail to realize is that nearly all real-world communication activity takes place in a specialized context. Addressinga business meeting, presenting a paper at an academic conference and participating in a PTA meeting all require persuasion of an audience

with specialized knowledge of the topic. There are few circumstances where the "general public" is truly the intended audience in real-world communication activities. If we deign to teach real-world skills, then skilled judging best serves that purpose.

Skilled judging also increases argumentative sophistication and rewards detailed research and analysis. Since most advocates of PFD want a whole resolutional approach to arguments (or at least more "representative" approaches), there would be no incentive for or reinforcement of strong research skills. PFD advocates explicitly recognize that public debate would be shallower, else they would not use this fact to argue that policy debate is too unaccessible to new programs, though this arguably is one of the least important access issues. However, it seems more likely that this dispute has more to do with conflicting pedagogical goals than simply being a resource issue.

This is an admittedly brief justification of the value of policy debate. Defending evidence-oriented team policy debate has received much more detailed attention elsewhere, and this is not the place for a comprehensive review. It suffices to say that we find policy debate as practiced now to be an educationally superior option. This is not to say that some will disagree with this characterization, nor does this indict programs that have chosen other forms of debate as more appropriate for their programs. On the contrary, parliamentary and NEDA debate offer alternatives that can be more desirable to some programs as a result of differing educational goals or resource limitations. However, we believe the educational benefits of CEDA/NDT debate are on the whole greater than these alternative forms of debate. Our focus as an organization should be to make "our debate" more accessible to new programs rather than to change our practices radically.

We risk both the organization and the practice of policy debate if PFD is made a division of CEDA. Trying to make CEDA or any other debate association an "umbrella organization" under which all forms of debate are encompassed is an unworkable and unwise strategy. The growth of CEDA in the 1970s and 1980s was an expression of discontent with the direction that NDT took. Now this institutional divide has been made irrelevant by NDT's decision, beginning in 1996, to use the CEDA topic. This was made possible only with the recognition that NDT and CEDA were far closer on many issues than had been true before. The shifting landscape of debate associations and their relative membership is inevitable as programs and coaches seek out forums consistent with their goals. If programs feel more comfortable with the educational experience of parliamentary debate, for example, there is little CEDA can do to draw them back.

Additionally, the idea that CEDA needs to increase its membership substantially tooffer a quality educational experience is fundamentally flawed. While some new programs may choose to participate in public forum CEDA, this new division would target programs that have left CEDA for NEDA and parliamentary debate. However, the inclusion of this division would either fail to attract these programs back or would do so only

at the expense of the fragmentation of the organization. The initial offering of such divisions would almost certainly draw teams from extant CEDA/NDT schools. If successful, the new division would likely lead to programs dropping out of policy debate to participate solely in public debate divisions. These "defections" have to come first, before any school that has left CEDA will come back. Many schools have adapted their travel schedules, coaches, and resource commitments to suit best their participation in other organizations, and it seems unlikely that a tiny division of public debate at CEDA tournaments will be enough to break these institutional affiliations.

If PFD does grow and attract a substantial number of NPDA, APDA, or NEDA programs, this would usher in another host of cohesion problems for CEDA. Undoubtedly, with each new member school of CEDA voting on the topic, change to a value or fact resolution becomes a distinct possibility. If that change were to occur, the CEDA/NDT crossover "experiment" will come to an end, and traditional NDT schools would once again choose a different topic and likely take many current CEDA schools with them. The diversity of debate organizations today is a more positive development than most of the alternatives. Schools founding and joining NEDA have found a community that we assume has relatively consonant views on debate practice and pedagogy. Similarly, the growth of participation in parliamentary debate associations (especially NPDA and APDA) has been fueled by demand for a less demanding alternative to evidence-intensive policy debate. It seems doubtful that there is a "happy medium." Even if CEDA could strike a new "balance," it would only do so at the expense of other programs, which could leave many current CEDA member schools dissatisfied with CEDA's new direction. In short, the issues of recruitment and retention of CEDA member schools should be about making our activity as attractive as possible to new programs without substantially changing our focus. Some things that can accomplish this are robust novice and junior varsity division at regional tournaments to create learning opportunities for young debaters. Perhaps a way can be found to get volunteers (especially graduate students and undergraduate coaches) to "adopt" a squad and act as an assistant-on-loan to another new program part time. Perhaps we should decrease junior varsity and novice rounds to six rounds or less. Providing a round off for these divisions would allow fo seminars taught by coaches from other schools about debate theory or research skills. Frankly, for all the knowledge we can share, we do surprisingly little to assist new schools and new coaches. It's this kind of outreach that has a better chance of increasing recruitment while avoiding the ideological conflict that would inevitably come with the PFD alternative.

We should abandon an attempt to create an umbrella debateorganization with the inclusion of PFD as a division of CEDA. Let us instead focus on making our activity as inclusive as possible by other means.

WORKS CITED

Brydon, S.R. "Judging CEDA Debate: A Systems Perspective." *CEDA Yearbook* 5 (1984): 85-88.

Gotcher, J.M., and R.W. Greene. "The Role of the Critic and the Audience Centered Model of Debate: Problems and Possibilities." *CEDA Yearbook* 9 (1988): 88-95.

Weiss, R.O. "'The Audience Standard': Twelve Years Later." *Southern Journal of Forensics* 2 (1997).

9. Recovering the Debate "Public": A Real or a Counterfeit Audience?

Kenneth Broda-Bahm
Towson State University

Before there were tournaments, the way in which one college or university would debate another was fairly direct: One school's team would travel to the other school and they would debate, in front of an audience. Often teams would string together several such events and go on a debating "tour." As the debate tour gave way to the debate tournament, teams were able to debate many more schools in much less time at a fraction of the cost. Much was gained, but one thing was lost: the audience. Debate tournaments established their own context in a setting in which debates moved from the auditorium to the common classroom. The new audience, the solitary judge, quickly became a specialist in possession of a very specific way of viewing, structuring, and talking about the debate. Debate developed into a powerful tool for developing skills in analysis, research and criticism. The rhetorical role of presenting ideas in a clear and lively fashion to an untutored audience largely vanished from collegiate debate.

This increased distance between debates and audience has led to persistent calls for a recovered audience in academic debate. Some voices, have called for a reorientation in theory. These arguments have ranged from the belief that presumption should be based on the natural-state opinions of the audience (Sproule, 1976), to the argument that issue importance should be determined by the audience's "issue agenda" (Bartanen & Frank, 1983, 1987), to the concept that reasoning which best comports with a public's rationality should be preferred (Weiss,

1985), and finally to the belief that debate should be viewed as a narrative in which audiences freely evaluate arguments "in terms of their own cultural beliefs, values, and experiences" (Hollihan, Riley, & Baaske 1985, p. 818).

Other voices have called for a reorientation in debate structure and organization. While the Cross Examination Debate Association's original goal of "striking a balance among analysis, delivery, and evidence" (*CEDA Constitution*, Art. 2, Sect. 1) reveals the purpose of fostering a form of debate that is closer to audience standards, more explicit attempts in this direction can be found in newer organizations. The newly formed National Educational Debate Association has dedicated itself to promoting "the stylistic and analytical skills that would be rewarded in typical public forums (i.e., courts, congress, the classroom, civic gatherings, etc.)" (*Statement of Objectives*, Sect. 1). The organization is dedicated to an explicitly audience-oriented view of appropriateness: "Ideally, a debate is an exchange that, when witnessed by a member of the general public, would be viewed as comprehensible and enlightening" (*Statement of Objectives*, Sect. 1).

Common to all of these perspective and prescriptions is the view that it is possible and desirable to alter tournament-style debating so that it conforms to the normative standards which once governed the intercollegiate debate: the views of the audience. This brief essay seeks to offer some agreement and some disagreement with this project. While the goal of recovering the audience is important and desirable, the MEANS of manufacturing that audience from within the tournament experience has little to recommend it. Specifically, I will argue that it is AD POPULUM and ill suited to the tournament environment for judges to attempt to impose an "audience standard" on the debate. At the same time, it is possible and desirable to recover the once-common practice of intercollegiate debate in front of a large and non-specialized audience. Avoiding a Counterfeit Public: The Dialectical Debate Laboratory

Contemporary tournament debate as it has evolved seems to have three qualities that SHOULD differentiate the activity from public standards of communication. First, debate should be seen as primarily normative rather than descriptive; second, debate should be seen as primarily dialectical rather than rhetorical; and third, debate should center on critical thinking by students rather than on the opinion-leadership of judges. Those familiar with the tournament debate environment know that the activity can often be highly specialized and opaque to the untrained observer. This is due to the fact that tournament debate ideally seeks not a mere reflection of ordinary discourse but a NORMATIVE evaluation and exploration of argument. This uniquely critical function of the activity should not be ignored or overshadowed by description: It is not enough for a teacher of forensics to tell students how argument occurs in everyday discourse or in some specialized arena. The teacher has a critical function as well. In addition to the "is" question, the educator must also be concerned with the "should" question. (Kay, 1983, p. 932).

If debate's critical function leads to the adoption of tournament styles and practices different from those found in everyday speech, that in itself can only be considered an indictment of debate if debate is seen as functioning primarily as a mirror held up to society. Given the primacy of the critical function, the RESULTS of an educational technique are a far better measure of its success than the appearance of that technique to the inexperienced observer.

Consistent with this normative emphasis of academic debate is its tendency toward the dialectical. While some have argued or assumed that tournament debate is by nature primarily rhetorical, this position fails uniquely to justify the activity. As long as rhetoric is defined as "the general rationale for persuasion" (Natanson, 1955), a primary emphasis on rhetoric as persuasive presentation fails to capture those elements that make the academic debate tournament a unique and important laboratory exercise. As noted by Lee and Lee (1987), using "improved communication" as a central justification for tournament debate is analogous to using "improved reading skills" as a central justification for the study of American Literature.

Perhaps the best support of tournament debate as dialectic lies in the fact that debate does not aim for persuasion so much as it aims for the creation of a dynamic form of knowledge: critical thinking. The forensic educator seeks to promote in students a capacity to evaluate evidence and arguments critically. This emphasis on rational decision-making characterizes the practice of debate as a uniquely critical way of knowing: Debate is a special type of symbolic interaction, a way of knowing with special emphasis on the creation, practice, and evaluation of message units - the materials, form, and argumentative inference patterns - as they effect decision making. (Douglas, 1972, p. 180)

This development of critical thinking patterns among debaters has been called "one of the most extensively documented benefits of the debate activity" (Colbert, 1987, p. 194). But the realization of these critical thinking benefits depends on the placement of the burden of rejoinder on the debaters rather than on the judge. If the judge can introduce argumentation on a ballot, or ignore argumentation in the round, then the central burden on the debater to introduce and refute arguments is proportionately reduced. When substantive intervention is allowed or encouraged, the debater is able to rely on the judge's decision, RATHER than upon reason giving. Tournament debaters should not be encouraged to take things on faith, or to believe a proposition simply because a judge or traditional practice supports it.

To practice otherwise would be to encourage an AD POPULUM standard within an educational laboratory. Usually defined as an appeal to "mass enthusiasms or popular sentiment" (Walton, 1987, p. 33-34), the AD POPULUM fallacy should be thought of as more than simply a bias for the majority's opinion. The appeal to "the gallery" (Damer,

1987, p. 115) or to a specific powerful audience can be considered argumentatively suspect as well. The trend toward audience-centered debate is premised on the value of arguing from premises that can be expected to be enthusiastically accepted by a particular audience, which in this case is the judge. While such a practice may be basic to persuasive discourse, it represents a turn away from argument.

The essential problem is that structurally, the tournament debateexperience does not include an audience. While of course individuals may watch, the only actors in a tournament debate round are the debaters themselves and the judge, not the audience. The most that the "audience-centered" debate tournament can hope for then is the use of a single critic (usually, a trained critic) who is trying to REPRESENT the standards and the opinions of a common audience. This counterfeit audience arguably compounds the AD POPULUM problem. Not only are critics relying on unquestioned assumptions, but they are relying on what they EXPECT TO BE the beliefs and the standards of common people. A caricature of "audience standards" is likely to be more conservative than the actual audience, with its variety and capacity for change, would be. Intuitively, a trained argument critic trying to mimic the predilections of the common audience seems to be more offensive to argument practice than an actual audience ever could be. Promoting a Genuine Public: The Rhetorical Debate Forum

The forgoing discussion should not be taken to imply that rhetoric, persuasion, and audiences are unimportant considerations. They are just not suited to the tournament debate laboratory. For this reason, skills in popular persuasion and advocacy should be sought in venues other than the tournament. If we are truly want "audience-oriented" debate, then what we need is an actual audience. Faculty members, students, representatives of community organizations and other interested observers are the logical choice for enforcing a true audience standard. Rather than trying to graft such individuals into the tournament process, through the use of "lay judging," it seems more appropriate and less awkward to let the audience remain that: an audience, a large group of people assembled to witness and perhaps evaluate a common event.

On-campus debates have a long history in academia, but they are arguably overshadowed by the tournament format. Mark Woolsey (1996) has argued for example that "campus debates or intramural debate contests have become nonexistent on most college campuses" (p. 2). While international debates, parliamentary debating societies, and the occasional intramural debate tournament may demonstrate that on-campus debating is not dead, it is clear that the vast majority of the energy of most of the national debate- sponsoring organizations is focused on the intercollegiate tournament. Given the demands of competition, it is also quite likely that a clear majority of program directors' time is also directed away from the campus and away from potential audiences.

Certainly a greater number of on-campus debates could serve the functions of teach-

ing common standards of persuasion and educating audiences without sacrificing the argumentation laboratory that tournament debating has become. As a compliment (but not a substitute) to current debate activities, programs should expand the practice of on-campus debating. Public debates can be incorporated in argumentation and public speaking classes, integrated in student government and elections, connected to on- campus political clubs like College Republicans and College Democrats, or linked to international traveling teams. One additional way to promote audience debates would be to reprise the invitation-style debate of the previous century: a team from one school can travel to another school for the purpose of debating in front of an audience. The travel need not be an additional expense. Hundreds of schools already travel every weekend to debate tournaments across the country. Adding a public debate on the Thursday or Friday evening before the beginning of the regular tournament is an easy and inexpensive way to promote audience debate in conjunction with the tournament schedule. Such an addition can also provide a tournament with a "public face" that will allow administrators and members of the general public to develop a positive association of the debate program and the debate activity.

Certainly, it must be admitted that any audience debate may include aspects that are not argumentatively ideal (just as any tournament debate may include aspects that are not rhetorically ideal). Debaters in front of an untrained audience may be tempted to mimic conventional forms of political rhetoric, to appeal without justification to premises that they know their audience will support, and to restrict their own critical thinking to the popular palate. In exchange, however, debaters will improve their ability to explain, to adopt, and to persuade.

Historically, debate has moved from an audience-centered forum to a tournament centered laboratory. Rather than arguing over whether debate should be pushed back or not, perhaps it is time to consider the complimentary function of each of these perspectives. A debater who develops her research skills and analytical abilities in a tournament setting and then expands her advocacy and persuasion skills in a public forum is likely to be both a careful thinker as well as a skilled advocate.

REFERENCES

Bartanen, J. & Frank, D. (1983). The issues-agenda model. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 69, 1-9.

Bartanen, J. & Frank, D. (1987). The issues-agenda model. In D. A. Thomas & J. Hart (Eds.), *Advanced Debate* (pp. 408-416). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Colbert, K. (1987). The effects of CEDA and NDT debate training on critical

thinking ability. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 23(4), 194-201.

Damer, T. E. (1987). Attacking faulty reasoning (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Douglas, D. (1972). A need for review: Forensic studies in contemporary speech education. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 8(4), 178-181.

Hollihan, T. A., Riley, P., & Baaske, K. (1985). The art of storytelling: An argument for a narrative perspective in academic debate. In J.R. Cox, M.O. Sillars, & G. B. Walker (Eds.), *Argument and social practice: Proceedings of the Fourth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 807-824). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Kay, J. (1983). Rapprochment of world 1 and world 2: Discovering the ties between practical discourse and forensics. In D. Zarefsky, M. Sillars, & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Argument in transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 927-937). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Natanson, M. (1955). The limits of rhetoric. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 41(2), 133-139.

Sproule, J. M. (1976). *The psychological burden of proof: On the evolutionary development of Richard Whately's theory of presumption.* Communication Monographs, 43, 115-129.

Walton, D. N. (1987). *Informal fallacies: Toward a theory of argument criticism.* Philidelphia: John Benjamin.

Weiss, R. O. (1985). The audience standard. *CEDA Yearbook*, 6, 43-49.

Woolsey, M. J. (1996, November). A historical look at the advantages of intramural debate tournaments. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. San Diego, CA.

Edited by David Berube
University of South Carolina

Two years ago, a well-intentioned member of the policy debating community asked me to look into the falling numbers of persons with terminal degrees and hired on a tenure line in directorship positions of intercollegiate debate programs in the United States. After a cursory review, I learned that the subject was complicated and heated. Claims that a certain type of instructional hierarchy in debate was preferred over another had never been critically examined. Some colleagues were highly defensive about suggestions that they were academic inferiors. Others seemed disassociated from institutional peculiarities and appeared supercilious in their insistence that terminal degrees made a person intrinsically a better director and coach.

The following forum begins with some talking points. They are exceedingly controversial and stipulative only. They are observations made simply to focus the following brief articles. Not all these talking points are addressed below, but I hope they may stimulate discussions on the EDebate listserve and in follow-up commentaries in this journal and others.

1. Talking points

Roy Schwartzman
University of South Carolina

1. Three traditional roles for directors of debate

1.1. **Administrator**: keeps track of finances, chooses tournaments, does paperwork, perhaps solicits funds, rarely judges rounds.

1.2. **Peer Counselor**: an elder confidante and intellectual partner to the debaters. The Peer Counselor usually is an accomplished debater, but always has detailed knowledge of the arguments, evidence, and strategies relative to the specific topic.

1.3. **Coach**: expert teacher who builds and improves programs by recruiting novices, developing basic skills of debaters, and improving skills of veterans.

2. Several economic and social forces have driven a wedge between these roles. The traditional roles have been separated and polarized, leading to the degeneration of each role. Hence, the new roles

2.1. **Administrators have become Clerks.** (cf. Benda, 1928/1969). They are figureheads in the activity who might run tournaments well, but contribute little to the intellectual side of the activity. The coaching is done by a phalanx of assistants, some former debaters completing undergraduate degrees, other pursuing graduate degrees, and still others simply are paid card-cutters.

2.2. **Peer counselors have become Surrogate Debaters**. Coaches often function as surrogate debaters and contribute vigorously to individual debate rounds by researching and cutting evidence, preparing arguments, and feeding strategies to debaters. As a result, the debaters themselves become adept at delivering but not developing or defending arguments.

2.3. **Coaches have become Managers in the sense of baseball teams**. Stars at other institutions are courted and recruited. Developing talent is sacrificed to investment in proven "stars". The activity therefore becomes unfriendly to novices, especially to walkons. The "free agent" phenomenon is disturbingly common, with students transferring solely to improve their competitive debate possibilities.

3. The problems associated with role redefinitions are compounded by externalities. What relationship, if any, between roles and concomitant externalities are examined in the subsequent essays. Featured issues include:

3.1. **Lack of advanced degrees among debate coaches**. Without an advanced degree, it is difficult to become assimilated into an academic department. This separation contributes to intellectual marginalization of debate.

3.2. **Inappropriate academic reward system**. At most colleges and universities, especially research institutions, scholarship garners the rewards. But the traditional roles of debate coaches tend to be focused toward teaching and service, both of which are deemphasized academically.

3.3. **De facto elimination of tenure**. With the evaporation of tenure-track positions, debate coaches find no point in making scholarly contributions to their field. Instead, they become temporary proprietors of programs.

3.4. **The scholar coach has become anachronistic.** The practice of debate has continued to insulate and separate itself from vibrant intellectual currents (feminism, narrative theory, marginalized voices), superficially borrowing from them while contributing nothing in return.

REFERENCE

Benda, J. (1969). *The treason of the intellectuals* (R. Aldington, Trans.). New

York: Norton. (Originally published 1928)

The forum begins with two brief reviews of debating as practiced abroad. Both Professors Kargacin and Whitmore come from very different debating cultures. Their reflections offer unique insight into the roles of directors of debate and coaches in the former Yugoslavia and in Great Britain.

2. The State of the Debating in Serbia and the Role of Coaches in the Karl Popper Debate Program

Tomislav Kargacin
Association for Creative Communication & Debate, Yugoslavia

The countries of the former Yugoslavia have been introduced to debating some four years ago. It started as a high-school program within a larger context of a "Regional Debate Program", a project initiated by the Open Society Institute, which was to encompass Eastern European countries and countries of the former Soviet Union, with the basic idea of inculcating debate in countries that had no previous experience in the activity whatsoever.

For that purpose a new format was put together, combining elements of parliamentary and policy debate, a three-on-three debate with cross-examination, a format later named after Karl Popper (hence Karl Popper debate program). Since the program was primarily designed to attract an ever-increasing member of participants, both teachers and students, on one hand, and to encourage debating in English in order to improve communication in multi-lingual communities, as well as between the countries in a highly politically sensitive area, some of the essential features of the activity, probably, had to be modified - above all, to perpetuate the activity at a relatively simplistic level of competition.

Complex arguments were avoided when advocates did not defend their own positions. Rebuttals were given by speakers who did not introduce the constructive argument. The dueling oratories sacrificed more complicated and sophisticated arguments. The proponents' underlying assumption was, namely, that by avoiding complex arguments and sophisticated ideas the activity would be more accessible and popular. Of course, this did not deter everyone from introducing a sophisticated argument in order to win, but that is clearly exceptional.

Another feature to increase participation and reduce the competitive feature of the activity appeared at the last annual international tournament. Students from different

countries were teamed up in order to reduce competition. This fact clearly shows that other means can be brought in to temper the competitive features of team debating.

From the beginning, an apprehension was present and that was that making the debate more complex might turn possible participants off. This is just partly true. Although a certain increase of students in debating can be noticed locally, on the whole, at least in Serbia, the number of students involved has fallen. There are several different reasons for that. For sure, those more advanced students do not find the activity challenging enough.

Using specialized language is discouraged. As I experienced it, however repulsive it might seem at the beginning, specialized language enhances the sense of belongingness to a community. Participating in the same activity is sometimes just not enough, an outward "sign of trade" is needed, and using the same language is by all means not insignificant. Last but not the least, it makes teaching easier.

My point is that the original intention of the program demands somewhat different means. Reducing debating is unsophisticated argument and unspecialized language is not beneficial to the activity and the participants. Speaking of Serbia, the entire idea of debating was not received well.

The ideological odium of the establishment that surrounded the initiatives of the Open Society Fund is probably the major cause of the fact that debating has not been accepted yet in schools (it has been organized form the beginning in "clubs" instead) and has pretty little chance to be in the near future. Apart from that, even people involved in the program from the beginning showed little interest in the activity.

The development of the program required, naturally, organizing seminars on local and national levels: educating teachers and teaching students, providing materials - both debate manuals and research packets, "supervising" work in local clubs (that is—offering help in technical matters, sharing information of whatever kind etc.). Since there is no set resolution research, packets are prepared ad hoc, or sometimes "recycled". There is no fixed tournament schedule, so tournaments are organized according to agreements reached at meetings held prior to them.

The role of coaches was essential to the whole project in that very aspect: make debating accepted in the community. The coaches' task is to run tournaments, while the financial support was provided by the Foundation. Moreover, coaches are involved in popularizing debate in the community, organizing "presentation debates", public debates etc.

Before the annual international tournaments, each year a camp was organized for debaters. For these again materials would be prepared, students selected, consultants chosen and guests invited in accordance with the Foundation.

Last year a collegiate program was instituted. The American parliamentary

debate format has been accepted as the official form of debating among university students. The universities in Belgrade and Podgorica (Montenegro) introduced college debate as an extra-curricular activity. However, recent events made the situation hang in the balance, at least in Serbia.

An up to a point neglected aspect of coaches' work is work with students. This might seem a bit paradoxical at first, but it is understandable, if we bear in mind how underestimated the importance of argumentation skills was from the beginning. It was believed to be more important dealing with stress, self-esteem, fear and whatnot, or to talk about some new area of knowledge. Years passed until the first "debate theory workshop" started. Oral critiques, as, in my opinion, one of the most effective teaching tools, were banned from tournaments, thus practice debates become an increasingly important way to achieve direct communication with students. Both teaching theory and critiquing have been partly taken over by more experienced students, although they are sometimes reluctant to work with freshmen.

For various reasons, the most difficult issue to be dealt with in the future is getting students involved both on high-school and university level. The fact of the matter is: debate hasn't been accepted in schools and students overwhelmed with curricular, co- and extra-curricular activities eschew from taking up another one, especially if it is—and debate is—time-consuming.

As the Fund for an Open Society will soon stop being the exclusive promoter of the program (the organization has taken a form of NGO), the latest tendency is to create coaches/managers, who would be able to provide financial support for the program.

To sum it up - the current state of affairs shows that the future of the debate in Serbia is going to be uncertain.

3. Role of the Coach in British Debating

Marc Whitmore
Graduate assistant parliamentary coach, Arkansas State University.
Graduate from the University of St Andrews, Scotland

As a new arrival in the midst of the American debating scene, it is a pleasure to contribute in any way possible to the process of cultural exchange between British and American schools of thought on this subject. Although some articles have been written on British debating (see Rodden 1985, Skorkowsky 1971 for commentary and bibliography), many areas of cross-pollination remain

untapped. At a time when concerns are being raised about the practicality and feasibility of tenure track forensic positions, it is therefore perhaps useful to consider some of the issues which affect an arena in which no such educators exist—Britain provides a prime example.

As Rodden points out British debating is entirely student run—this must in part be due to the almost total absence of communication departments in universities in which debating is a serious student activity. This, coupled with the limited budgets afforded to the activity in the UK, is the principle reason for the absence of debate coaches per se.

Such absences are not to say that coaching does not occur, however training of debaters usually occurs in two ways, as befits the often schizophrenic British debating society—firstly the debater learns to handle herself in front of an audience in a public debate, and secondly the debater is involved in training programs and inter-varsity tournaments.

Although modern commentators fail to accept the fact (Cirlin 1998), it remains true that British parliamentary debate serves two functions—that which serves to entertain, and that which serves to educate. As such the public debate in front of a large audience provides a good proving ground for honing skills of audience adaptation, humour, fluency and other issues of ethos. The other forum, that of inter-varsity tournaments, provides the arena for developing critical thinking, logicality, reason and argument—logos.

The first area is usually left to the individual speaker to develop. At St. Andrews and many other British universities, competitions such as the Maiden Speakers' Competition (for first time speakers) provide a step up on the ladder of many debating societies, where speaking in front of large audiences is considered a privilege. Other opportunities, such as those afforded by giving floor speeches, allow a speaker to develop her or his style, rapport with an audience, and a reputation. Other than encouragement from older debaters, very little is done, to my knowledge, to prepare individuals for this event.

As the British tournament scene continues to grow, pressure to achieve results is increasing proportionately, and anxious Student Unions are requiring tournament wins and trophies in order to justify funding what is considered by many to be an elitist activity. This has resulted in many societies in recent years instituting regular training sessions, and using older, more experienced debaters as trainers. As late as 1997 St. Andrews Union Debating Society specifically appointed one of its committee members to be responsible for the training program.

If this seems rather amateurish, it should be remembered that evolution in British debating is driven by students. With an average time-to-degree of three

years, no country-wide organization, limited funding, and a total lack of commentary, or journal based discussion of debate, students in British debating tend to concentrate first and foremost on their own development. Occasionally promising debaters will travel to less important tournaments with a more experienced partner, or practice debates will be organized, but essentially there is a complete absence of organized, theory-based, pedagogically sound training of any description.

Despite these chronic handicaps, it seems fair to say that the British don't fair too badly—the twin burdens of public debate and inter-varsity tournament debating seems to result in good debaters (in my opinion), but it is also true to say that the continuity offered by the American system has much to recommend it. Whether it be an humble graduate assistant (such as myself) coaching, or a full-time tenure-track coach/director of forensics, the coherence, and strategic benefits are enormous, and constitute one of the single biggest advantages the US debate community has over the British.

REFERENCES

Rodden, J. (1985) *British University Debating: A reappraisal*. Communication Education, 34, 308 - 317.

Skorkowsky, G. R. (1971). British University Debating. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 57, 335 - 343.

Cirlin, A.(1998). A public debate manifesto. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, Vol 2 No.4, 339 - 350.

Professor Kargacin argues that more theory and a stronger argumentative focus would improved secondary and collegiate debating in Serbia. Professor Whitmore, while articulating a remarkably successful mentoring system in Scotland, perceives a strong advantage to a more formal educator-student coaching situation. Both systems will strive for models to incorporate into debate education and the United States serves as a powerful template for replication abroad. What we do may have a greater importance than can be estimated here.

In the United States, policy debate has shifted from terminal degree tenure line appointments in the role of directors of debate and/or forensics to the renewable term appointment. As such, young scholars with newly acquired doctoral degrees and an interest in debate education are finding fewer opportunities for an academic appointment. Whether this is a function of the changing role of the

director, its perceived position by academic administration, or the market of employable persons is examined in the following narratives. Professors Sheffield and DeLaughder defend the renewable term system. Dean Johnson adds that it may simply be an inevitability. On the other hand, Professors Jarvis and McDonald notice some serious drawbacks.

4. The Renewable Term Appointment

William Sheffield
California State University, Northridge

A recent thread on EDebate centered on the issue of Directors of Forensics and Tenure. More specifically, the thread examined the relationship between the role of Director of Forensics and the need for a terminal degree. A content analysis of the thread has lead me to examine my own experiences over the last eight years as a Director of Forensics on a series of term contracts. My analysis will include a brief description of my own situation, a quick examination of the trend toward term contracts for Directors of Forensics, the implications and perceptions associated with this trend, answering misperceptions, and some conclusions drawn from this discussion.

I have served as a Director of Forensics at three different institutions over the last eight years. At all three institutions I was on a term contract, ranging from one-year to three-year renewables. The level of involvement in the department varied, ranging from a "token" member of the department to an active member of the department. It has seemed as though my involvement in departmental affairs, outside of involvement with the forensics program, has increased over the years. At my current institution, I have been accepted as and expected to function as an active member of the department. In the 3 _ years since being here, I have been on the department's awards committee and the undergraduate committee. I am involved in departmental decision-making with the exception of those issues involving tenured members of the department (i.e. Tenure Committee, Personnel Committee, etc.). In addition, I have been an active member of the department when it comes to research. Although my position (non-tenure, term contract) doesn't require research or publication, I have been active in my research in the area of forensics. Over my eight years

as an instructor at three institutions, I have participated in approximately 15 presentations at various conferences and conventions. My level of involvement as a faculty member and Director of Forensics is certainly comparable to the level of involvement of other faculty members in my department. The major difference, however, is the lack of opportunity for tenure within my department.

Examination of position announcements over the past years leads one to note that most of the forensics positions advertised are term contract positions requiring only an M.A. degree. The thread on EDebate also seems to support this perception among participants in the forensics field. Occasional announcements call for the terminal degree and offer employment on a tenure-track basis. There exists a notion that the term contract positions are offered as a stepping stone for those interested in continuing their education at the Ph.D. level.

There are several implications associated with the trend of term contracts for Directors of Forensics. The first implication is that the Director of Forensics is viewed as being an inferior position, someone who is not necessarily an integral part of the department faculty. The

teaching load tends to be lighter, and typical requirements within the department are not a burden to the Directors of Forensics so that they can focus on running the forensics program. They are not viewed as equals with other members within the department. The second implication is that it is cheaper and more cost effective to hire a Director of Forensics at the M.A. level on term contract, rather than hire a Ph.D. in a tenure-track position. This also means that Ph.D.'s rarely apply for term-contract Director of Forensics positions. Subsequently, the chances of tenure without a terminal degree are slim. Last is the implication that a Director of Forensics at the M.A. level tends to have less clout than a tenure-track Ph.D. This means less ability to negotiate the long-term viability of the forensics program when it comes to budget and other resources. There is the perception that the Director of Forensics with a Ph.D. lends credibility and respect necessary to maintain a program, especially in times of crisis such as budget and/or program cuts.

First, a supportive communication climate within the department is vital to the role of the Director of Forensics. Regardless of the degree held, a Director of Forensics is powerless without the respect and support of other department members. At my current institution, department members are respectful of my role as both a department member and Director of Forensics. They help in recruiting students from classes and sharing P.R. from our tournament competitions.

Second, coaching quality is not compromised by the lack of a Ph.D. In fact, there are several successful models of leadership in which the Director of Forensics did not possess a Ph.D. (Central Oklahoma University, Emporia State University, etc.), and

they are also active and productive members of their departments. Therefore, they are tenured members of their institutions. This would seem to refute the notion that Ph.D.'s are necessary for program respect and survival; the M.A. as Director of Forensics seems to be a viable model for forensics programs.

Lastly, Ph.D.s may actually be a detriment to forensics programs. Time commitments to other departmental responsibilities limit the ability for Directors of Forensics to lead and guide a program fully. Additionally, once A.B.D.s receive their Ph.D., they begin to think about leaving the activity. The demands of responsibility and time often leads Ph.D.s to move quickly into full-time teaching positions and away from involvement in the forensics community.

Directors of Forensics can still have status and power within their department regardless of their degree. My own experience attests to the notion that the M.A. can be as productive in their department in ways that are not traditionally associated with tenured faculty members. Publication and conference opportunities are equally accessible to the non-tenured professional as they are for tenured faculty members. Perhaps it is time to reconceptualize the tenure requirements for Directors of Forensics. There are several successful models in which M.A.s were afforded tenure. Considering the viability of tenure for the M.A. or the term-contract M.A. must be done on a case-by-case basis. Blindly arguing that all Director of Forensics positions should be filled by Ph.D.s ignores the ability of M.A.s to contribute to the activity and their respective departments in an equally productive manner.

5. M.A. Term Appointment - A Personal Narrative

Kenneth DeLaughder
Eastern New Mexico University

As a current graduate assistant nearing my entrance into the world of debate coaching with a Masters, I believe the contract system provides a valuable entry-level opportunity. First, I think that the system makes available positions based upon the professional ability to coach a team that might otherwise go to candidates with doctoral degrees. This makes it easier for those of us who wish not to concentrate on the research/teaching part of the job, but on the coaching part of the activity to continue.

Second, I think many the graduate assistants in the policy community are frankly a little burned out by the need to be a coach/student/teaching assistant.

The current system sets up places where some time can be taken before getting a doctorate, while still keeping connections and building a coaching reputation. I personally would not even consider jumping right into a doctorate program, my undergraduate career was extended to debate, and my masters progress has been somewhat slowed. I need the break.

Lastly, let us face it, it is cheaper to hire M.A.s than doctorates. Many programs would cease to exist if all of the coaching staff, or even just those with the title of "director" had to be matched to the pay scale of a full tenure track Ph.D. position. In an era of declining budgets where many universities move to more part-time faculty, debate is just getting its part of the budget axe. Until universities divert more resources and the issue of graduate assistant burnout among the policy ranks is addressed, I think the current system works out just fine. Besides, some positions are advertised as doctoral level tenure track positions but end up being filled by an M.A. because no one has the higher degree.

6. M.A. Term Appointment - A Personal Narrative

Jason Jarvis
Augustana College, Rock Island, IL

I decided to take my three year, non-tenured position at Augustana for three primary reasons. First, I was ready to take some time off from the academic grind. While I have been presenting papers at academic conferences, I have enjoyed my time away from school. On the whole, I was burned out after going directly from undergraduate to graduate school. I felt that a term appointment would give me time to decide if a Ph. D. was in my future and also allow me to focus my efforts on teaching and coaching.

Second, I felt that Augustana was a good fit for me, as it had a small student to teacher ratio and allowed for a large amount of individual interaction between faculty and students. In my mind this was a huge benefit of the college since both Emory (undergraduate degree) and Wake Forest (graduate degree) were similarly situated private institutions.

Finally, Augustana offered me a substantial salary compared to my other choices. I have extensive debts and student loans from Emory and the salary made up for what I considered to be a lackluster location (I am a tried and true Southerner and the arctic cold of the Midwestern corn did not appeal to me at all).

While I think that this job has allowed me time to reach conclusions about my future in academia and as a debate director, I also feel somewhat frustrated by the terminal nature of the position. The largest drawback I see to the proliferation of non-tenured positions is that they create a barrier to the educational interaction between students and directors. I believe that this is inherent in the length of the contracts and is a direct result of the devaluation of the educational power of the director.

The relationships that needs to be formed to create a successful and productive work environment require time. Currently, I have a sophomore who has a huge amount of potential. She and I work very well together and have reached a level of comfort and trust that allows us to honestly give and receive criticism from one another. She has the potential to be a force on the national circuit over the next two years and is a hard enough worker to acheive those goals. She is also adamant that I continue to work here through her senior year. She has repeatedly told me that she would not like having to start over with another assistant coach. However, professionally it makes very little sense for me to stay at Augustana if another position opens up or to delay graduate school when I will INEVITABLY lose my job. The reality of this situation has become abundantly clear as the year has progressed. It and has led me to experience some trepidation about the plight of non-tenured students as directors/coaches.

I think that administrators do not appreciate how difficult it is to successfully establish a rapport with students that allows a productive interaction between the educator and the student. I think that there is also a failure to acknowledge the importance of continuity for good of the team and the team members. For these reasons, I feel that the proliferation of positions which turn over as opposed to secure/tenured positions will only hurt those who teach and participate in the activity.

7.Policy Debate Reappears

Glen Johnson
The Catholic University of America

Debate disappeared at Catholic University twenty years ago, when the faculty line of the coach was abolished along with the Speech half of the Speech and Drama department. Last year, a group of students approached me about reviving policy debate, and I became de facto director. I could afford to do this because, first, I am a tenured full professor, and second, I am an administrator with experience in shaking loose enough funding to get a zero-budget program off the ground. I secured an experienced debate coach

part-time, paying him primarily by scheduling a forensics course and hiring him to teach it. I got a Dean's commitment for one semester of travel. Therefore, we fielded a debate team in Fall 1998. They have been successful, and my regular tours of campus with trophies in hand have assured our second semester.

It worked; we are here. I do not think we could have started any other way. What happens now? We try to keep the tide rising. I can renew the lecturer appointment of our coach as long as he is willing to put up with the arrangement.

Will we ever have a full-time director of debate? I doubt it. Policy debate has prestige (even educational!) value, but it is high cost, low-numbers, and not revenue producing. At best, I would see a regular faculty member taking on debate half time. Alternatively, a half time, non-tenure-track, renewable appointment as director is possible. There's precedent for that with the faculty, our E.S.L. director, as well as athletic coaches. Of course, both of these are fragile arrangements, essentially dependent on a dedicated individual.

When that person goes, so does the program (like what happened at Catholic twenty years ago). For now, we keep debating. In addition, we continue to look for a wealthy benefactor.

8. Tenure and Coaching: A Necessary Relationship or Antagonism?

Kelly M. McDonald
Western Washington University

T he practice of granting tenure to faculty is a long held tradition in American colleges and universities. Professional academic associations, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), defend tenure on grounds that it codifies the professional standing of university professors and is essential to preserve academic freedom (Tierney and Bensimon, 1996, p. 25). However, colleges and universities around the nation are increasingly turning to part-time, limited term faculty in lieu of full-time, tenure track faculty to cover a variety of course sections (Lyon, 1997). This trend is also echoed in the selection of directors for college debate and speech programs. This has the net effect of diluting the professional standing of debate and speech coaches, undermining the important mentoring and scholarly contributions made by coaches and will in the long term, be detrimental to the long-term health of debate and speech programs.

While a number of successful programs are directed by limited term, part-time fac-

ulty, students, or individuals holding staff positions, the decline of tenure track director of forensics positions is a harbinger of a professional crisis for individuals seeking a career in higher education who wish to remain active in debate and speech. This essay will outline some of the conflicting tensions faced by directors, and advance a principled case for tenure track directors of forensics in terms of the professional contribution of the coach and program.

In general, the interests that come to bear on university faculty and colleges and universities can be seen as coming from two sources: internal and external audiences. Internally, all faculty members—including directors of forensics—are accountable to other faculty within their academic unit and across campus. Given that part-time faculty members are traditionally exempt from advising or publishing, other faculty must bear additional burdens of professional and scholastic advising. Moreover, in an era of strained college and university budgets, "productive" departments in terms of scholarship output may well be rewarded with additional resources—including hires—before less productive units. Thus, a telltale sign of an academic program or department in trouble is the over reliance on part-time, adjunct faculty (Foster & Foster, 1998, p. 30). The typical division of labor for a university faculty member is divided down the lines of teaching, research and service. Attention to these three areas is a matter of concern both for internal and external audiences. As the success of academic units, whether departments, colleges or universities, relies on the ability of their faculty to complete work within each area, directing a competitive debate and speech program presents a number of obstacles to individuals looking to be maximally successful in each area. Time spent traveling and participating in tournament competition is time that trades off with one's ability to be in the classroom or developing their academic research program. As state legislators and/or members of the public continue to push for greater "accountability" within higher education, assessments of productivity in terms of scholarly output, SCH (FTEs), and graduation rate indexes will become increasingly important measures of the health of a program or academic unit. Full-time, tenure track faculty, holding the terminal degree in their field, are best able to fully participate in departmental governance, development of scholarship critical to the health and sustainability of their unit, and provide the highest quality of teaching and mentoring to all upper and lower division students within their department.

Tenure, quite simply, is one of the few means of ensuring institutional support for a program or department. The health and growth of an academic unit requires attracting and retaining good students, fostering intellectual growth among staff and students and developing an educational climate where continued intellectual development is possible. On all counts, the over reliance on part-time faculty hurts these measures. However, the traditional tripartite division of labor for a university faculty member must, to some

degree, accommodate the unique commitments and role of a director of forensics. While colleges and universities may have increasingly challenging expectations for tenure and promotion, there is no necessary reason why directors of forensics should not be successful in either. As a full-time, tenure track faculty member, one has more bargaining power within your academic unit to reflect the increased professional commitments that you accept. This increased standing may be useful, for example, in receiving increased staff or coaching support. As a full fledged member of the department, your service on departmental admissions, review or curriculum committees can increase your visibility to other faculty which will be useful when you are going up for advancement. The challenge for all directors, of course, is to balance the conflicting interests of directing a competitive debate or speech program and maintaining an appropriate level of professional involvement. However, the absence of professional involvement within your department and college is a certain way to jeopardize your career and the longevity of your program. Finally, it is important that directors consider negotiating a tenure contract with their department soon after they arrive to begin work. This can give directors the important guidance necessary to ensure the work which they pursue will be rewarded when at the time of tenure and promotion. Two very useful resources in setting out criteria for tenure are the Quail Roost document printed in the Winter 1994 edition of *The Forensic* and the proceedings from the 1984 developmental conference at Northwestern University. Donn Parson edited the proceedings, *American Forensics in Perspective*, that were published by SCA. There is a very useful article by Craig Dudczak and David Zarefsky on standards for tenure and promotion with an excellent discussion by audience members that follows.

REFERENCES

Dauber, Cori, & Panetta, Ed. (1994, Winter). Quail Roost Conference, *The Forensic*, 79(2), p. 16-25.

Dudczak, Craig, & Zarefsky, David. (1984). Promotions and tenure standards, p. 23-35. In Donn W. Parson (Ed.), *American Forensics in Perspective*, Annandale, VA: SCA.

Foster, David & Foster, Edith. (1998, January-February). It's a buyers market: "Disposable professors," grade inflation and other problems. Academe, 26.

Lyon, John. (1997, May-June). Tenure in practice: A call to action. *Academe*, 83(3), 12-13.

Tierney, William G., & Bensimon, Estela Mara. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Professor Sheffield has found ways to become integrated in departmental policies and procedures and maintained a publication record, but he may be exceptional in that

regard. He argues that debate coaches might be viewed as "educational specialists" much like ESL hires and could be considered for tenure at that academic rank and level. He argues that Ph.D.s once receiving tenure leave the activity while Professor McDonald argues that individuals with terminal degrees wishing to continue in debate education are seeing fewer opportunities.

Professor DeLaughder makes the important point that any relationship between quality of coaching and the possession of a terminal degree may be incidental at best, an argument enhanced below in Professor Kerr's response. DeLaughder also sees the renewable contract as a way to save debate programs from extinction by budget conscious academic administrators, a situation validated by the remarks by Dean Johnson. McDonald disagrees and believes the long-term success of the program may be partially dependent on the stature of tenured directors.

Professor Jarvis offered a passionate defense of tenured contracts in terms of the educational interests of the coach-student relationship. Renewable contracts simply fracture the continuity which he feels is important to the educational vitality of debating students.

The following article is meant to be contentious. Written in the style of the devil's advocate, Professor Schwartzman examines a plethora of concerns highlighted in the opening "talking points". He challenges us to reconsider suppositions about debate and our complaints about the "state of debate". He makes two telling arguments about marginalizing the activity and marketing of debate to academic administrations. Professor Kerr's response is meant to bridge some of the intergenerational concerns addressed below. He draws his point of view as a renewable term coach with an advanced degree in government and international relations. He represents a new wave of young debate coaches who came to debate from fields other than speech and communication studies because they truly enjoy the activity.

9. Dismantling The Debate Ghetto

<div align="right">

Roy Schwartzman
University of South Carolina

</div>

A disturbing development in competitive debate is the appearance and expansion of a ghetto. This low-status and even lower paid community is inhabited by experienced debaters who either do not graduate, postpone graduation in order to continue debating as long as possible, or graduate and remain in the activity to prepare arguments and evidence for active debaters. I will describe each kind of tenant briefly, then propose that we who defend the value of debate have inadvertently caused these populations to persist. Yes, we are the slumlords.

My disparaging metaphoric portrayal of these tenants is meant to highlight their dubious status, an unfortunate contrast to their past glories as debaters. Suspended in a professional limbo, their lack of advanced degrees shuts them out of faculty lines while their continued attachment to debate restricts their willingness to seek other avenues of activity. The choice of "ghetto" is deliberate and apt. Members of a ghetto are marginalized by the community at large, a position all too familiar when debate coaching is being administratively redefined in the same category as a secretary or an athletic coach (without the latter's pay scale). Tenants of the ghetto also contribute to their own marginalization when they limit their associations with and appeal to professional and academic communities beyond the circle of competitive debate.

Certainly debate occupies no moral high ground over athletics in this regard. When athletes fail to graduate, they generally either have not met academic requirements or move on to lucrative professional careers. The "stars" of debate, participants who have reached the highest levels of the activity as competitors, risk not leaving the activity soon enough—a condition quite the opposite of athletics. The "professional debater" has the status of a "professional student". Instead of moving on to full-fledged coaching (an option that has itself been ghettoized by the transformation of coaching jobs into non-renewable or non-tenure appointments) or to other occupations that involve putting debate skills to use, debaters are tempted to loiter in the debate community. These recently active debaters, lacking an advanced degree and close to the same age as present debaters, face many difficulties if they do linger in the activity. If they coach in some capacity, their lack of professional standing renders it difficult to discipline or regulate programs. Suspended somewhere between the roles of undergraduate student and administrator, they are viewed as peers without authority to make or enforce decisions. Even the peer pressure to excel might be ineffective in this case, since the ex-debater is not exactly a peer and thus cannot model all the behaviors expected of an active participant.

Paradoxically, the very people who lament "There goes the neighborhood" have contributed to the conditions that have marginalized the debate community. The customary defenses of debate have focused on the activity's intrinsic and extrinsic value. Debaters are often encouraged to join and remain in the activity because of its intrinsic value. This scope of benefits highlights the manifold skills and pleasures obtainable through debate: research, organization, time management, the thrill of competition, the social joy of associating with bright minds and discussing contentious issues. Anyone involved in debate knows these benefits and urges others to share them. The problem arises when the intrinsic benefits of debate are understood as unique to this activity. The familiar post-tournament letdown reminds debaters that the world beyond debate rarely contains—and even more rarely rewards—the impassioned exchange of ideas

and strategic maneuvers found in debate. If debaters believe that competitive debate is the only (or primary) forum that yields such generous intellectual and social dividends, then they may do more than remain in the activity by pursuing a coaching or teaching career in the future. Instead, they may try to reclaim those pleasures by remaining as close to their previous competitive environment as possible, not leaving the enclave of debate that induced those happy experiences. The danger arises when ex-debaters try to relive those happy times by sheltering themselves from other surroundings that could become intellectually and socially stimulating in their own right. Hence the ghetto begins. The former debater is reluctant to leave the familiar neighborhood, thus withdrawing from other social situations. The ostracism also is reciprocated beyond debate, where the debater's intellectual abilities have rarely been applied to situations beyond debate. In the parlance of capitalism, the debater's skills become ever less "marketable" as they are applied only in the world of debate.

Certainly debate does pay extraordinarily high dividends for participants. Many, if not most, debaters who participated in the activity any length of time would designate debate as one of the formative experiences of their lives. Members of the debate community, however, must recognize that the value of the activity lies in extrinsic as well as intrinsic benefits. Debate is a specialized community, but it remains a community within and alongside other communities of teachers, businesspeople, social activists, etc. The debate community becomes a ghetto when these relationships of intersection and containment degenerate into self-enclosure—the very definition of a ghetto. Former debaters erroneously believe they can recreate the pleasures of their past. They fail to realize that the joy of seeing others benefit from debate is akin to, but different from, the former joys of their own participation. Perhaps the greatest mistake that contributes to the debate ghetto is the attempt to achieve or relive one's own glory vicariously through current participants.

To dismantle and arrest the spread of the debate ghetto, the extrinsic value of debate should receive renewed emphasis. Such a stress on extrinsic value, far from undermining intrinsic rewards, firmly establishes debate as a full-fledged intellectual partner with other activities. Indeed, by focusing on how the skills developed through debate connect with other realms of intellectual, professional, and social life, debate still occupies a valuable but less isolated spot in a debater's realm of experience. As Jacques Barzun (1989) observes, knowledge can serve immediate, technical ends (e.g., winning a debate round), or it can serve "less visible ends by guiding thought and conduct at large" (p. 111). The latter function, which Barzun (1989) labels "cultivation" as opposed to "know-how," deserves further attention. Exactly how can the extrinsic value of debate be emphasized in ways that will minimize the stagnation of former debaters and contribute to developing more cultivated people?

1. Concentrate on how debate communities are built and maintained. Here one would ask how people find common ground to establish and renew human relationships. In debate, part of the answer lies in sharing basic ground rules and discussion of a precise topic. John Dewey (1939) recognized that some sort of consensus on values (e.g., preferring reasoned discussion to violence) is necessary to avoid tyranny. How can such agreements on ground rules emerge outside debate? One possibility could be for ex-debaters to help foster common ground in their lives beyond debate. For example, how can employees galvanize as a community despite their disagreements and physical isolation from each other? If debaters can maintain ties across the country in a competitive activity, certainly co-workers could learn from debaters a few hints on how to cultivate collegiality across the hallway.

2. Recognize and foster the changing roles involved with debate. Stagnation results from failing to recognize that the pleasures and rewards of a debaters differ from those attendant to mentoring. Coaches need to help debaters realize when and why their roles change. For example, the senior with moderate talent may find that her role has evolved from "star" of the team to mentor and role model for incoming novices. In this instance, connectedness with others takes precedence over outstanding individual achievement, although the latter usually receives the glory (Gilligan, 1982).

3. Evaluate the achievements of debaters on several levels. Most important, the prevailing role of a debater need not be defined on a single dimension, such as trophies garnered or amount of evidence produced. The familiar measures such as poundage of hardware or stacks of paper might be augmented with considerations such as how much a debater's partners improve as a result of their collaboration.

4. Encourage debaters to transfer their debate skills to other arenas and to find analogous intellectual forums beyond debate. If debaters limit their research skills to "cutting cards" for arguments to be used in debate rounds, then some benefits of debate never extend past the walls of classrooms where debates occur. As debaters expand their intellectual capabilities to other arenas, debate increasingly will be seen as a path to success in those arenas. This lesson might prove difficult, since it requires recognizing when one must depart from debate proper and use debate skills as tools beyond the tournament setting. At this point, the coach might need to depart from the role of technical manager and instead shoulder some concern for the personal development of participants (Bellah et al., 1985, pp. 44-46).

Probably the truest test of what debate can offer is the attempt to recruit and retain novice debaters. For newcomers, the value of debate must be manifested in what debate can enable them to do well in a variety of circumstances. In this sense, debate is a pure means, albeit one with rewards and delights along the way. If those who are involved with debate understand that its lessons remain with the participants and enrich

their other activities, then perhaps the tenants will vacate the ghetto and the slumlords will foster communities without walls.

REFERENCES

Barzun, J. (1989). *The culture we deserve* (A. Krystal, Ed.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Bellah, R. N., et al. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York: Harper and Row Perennial.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Freedom and culture.* New York: Paragon.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

10. The Debate "Ghetto": A Response to Schwartzman

Paul Kerr
University of South Carolina

I am not a perfect match for Dr. Schwartzman's description of a resident of his "debate ghetto", but I find his characterization of coaches who do not possess advanced degrees or have tenure-track teaching positions to be disturbing and insulting. The inhabitants of the "ghetto" contribute significantly to the activity and should be valued as important colleagues. Schwartzman's criticisms are misplaced. While we should certainly encourage students to pursue professional careers in academia if they so desire, it is disingenuous to describe the careers of coaches who do not possess advanced degrees as "stagnant". Rather than heaping blame on the coaches themselves, we should examine their employment opportunities in an effort to develop coaching positions with both better pay and status.

Schwartzman's description of the "problem" of non-teaching coaches is wrong for at least three reasons. First, he ignores the valuable contributions such coaches make to the activity. Second, he conflates the economic realities of the academic/debate world with a normative assessment of the career aspirations of those people who choose to coach debate without advanced degrees or tenure-track teaching positions. Third, he inaccurately equates coaching merit with the possession of an advanced degree.

The coaches Schwartzman describes are an integral part of the debate community. They are often the coaches who travel the most, do the most research, supervise skill

drills and speech redos, and assume most of the judging responsibilities. Moreover, they almost always do so for precious little compensation. Rather than people who merely seek to relive their debate glory days, they perform a valuable service which few people are able to provide; the number of programs having difficulty filling graduate assistant positions testifies to this shortage. Schwartzman criticizes these coaches for ignoring the extrinsic values of debate while failing to acknowledge that their efforts are vital to many students who wish to receive these benefits. His analysis justifies the current situation in debate where those who do the most often receive the least in terms of professional respect and monetary compensation.

Schwartzman's analysis of the career aspirations of many young coaches (or what he characterizes as a lack thereof) ignores the economic realities of the debate world. I do not believe that any debate coach seeks to be marginalized. Rather, it is the academic profession which undervalues their contributions. The fact that there is a group of coaches who are of "low status" and underpaid is more indicative of an exploitative economic relationship than it is of personal failings on the parts of individual coaches. Suggesting that certain coaching positions lack merit merely because they are undercompensated and are not respected by institutions of higher learning is illogical. While it may be true that it is necessary to get an advanced degree in order to secure a university teaching job, that does not excuse colleges and universities from providing fair compensation to employees who do not have such credentials. Simply put, the "tenants" Schwartzman describes deserve better.

The third problem with Schwartzman's analysis is that he employs the standard of an advanced degree to evaluate the merits of debate coaches. There are numerous examples of excellent coaches without Ph.D.s and inferior debate coaches with Ph.D.s. While Schwartzman derides the "intrinsic" qualities of debate, there are those who enjoy debate precisely because it offers the opportunity to interact with intelligent and interesting people, educate younger students in a valuable activity, and to perform meaningful, intellectually stimulating work. There are few other jobs which offer these opportunities. If there are younger coaches who want to coach debate without jumping through the hoops required for a career in academia, it seems that they should have the opportunity to do so. It is rather arbitrary to designate underpaid debate coaches as inferior, simply because they exercise their right to choose an interesting occupation.

The debate community can maintain a supply of talented coaches by increasing the pay and status of currently "marginalized" coaches—those who, in the words of one tenured professor, "cut cards for minimum wage". Rather than blaming younger coaches for their status and telling them to get their collective act together, perhaps we should raise the "minimum wage". The debate community needs to adapt to the changing labor market for debate coaches (fewer tenure track jobs and

more people who are willing and able to coach debate, but who do not wish to jump through the required hoops of academia) by creating more non-teaching staff positions which pay more than $8-10,000 per year. Though this may sound unfeasible at first glance, it is no less fantastic than telling graduating debaters that they must endeavor to obtain a tenure-track teaching position when the supply of such positions is dwindling. The tenants of the ghetto are valuable—the community needs to recognize that. Critiques such as Schwartzman's are hardly conducive to increasing respect for younger coaches.

11. The Future of Debate is What We Design it to be

David M. Berube
University of South Carolina

I would like to highlight some areas for deeper consideration. While no one can deny the prevalence of renewable terms appointments, the forces behind the trend needs to be better understood. Here are six observations.

First, is it demand pull or supply push? This is a serious issue. Are we convinced that it is the financial exigencies of academic support for competitive debating which force hires at non-terminal rank? Could it be equally plausible that the supply of non-terminal degree candidates have flooded the market of employables such that it is a "buyers" market? Colleges and universities are often grossly unprepared to compare the qualifications of applicants in our activity due to its seriously specialized nature. If debate education is not viewed as an inherent component to undergraduate liberal education, it should be unsurprising that departments select directors from a pool of "specialists" much like athletic departments select outstanding sportspersons for coaching positions. An interesting alternative suggested by both Sheffield and Johnson might involve defining the role of directors and coaches as "educational specialists" and tenuring them at that rank. This option has been used by modern language departments who often find some of their finest teachers are people with years of speaking experience in the field rather than years of academic instruction. Whether individuals tenured at that level would have the same academic clout as their compatriots with terminal degrees is also unclear.

Second, are there ways to separate the director-coach conflation? Some settings have selected to hire the director on a terminal degree tenure line and coaches on renewable contracts. While this option is relatively rare and frequently associated with large graduate programs in speech communication, the model would provide the activity with academically statured spokespersons and defenders and provide opportunities for "special-

ists" to continue participating in the debate education of other students much like the British system articulated by Whitmore.

Schwartzman argues that as educators we have a duty to encourage our students to complete their education and move on with their lives. An undergraduate debater is not having a "career" while competing—there is no professional debate circuit. What careers exist involve debating educators. While it is easy to understand his defense of a realistic time frame to complete a baccalaureate degree, many students find personal and professional satisfaction is delaying post-undergraduate education. DeLaughder, Jarvis and Kerr offered strong defenses of "specialist" coaching as a period for personal growth and maturation. My personal experience involved coaching throughout my educational training over a period of nearly twenty years. Their personal observations are hardly unique and nearly every educator has advised some student to "take time off" before continuing their professional educations. Nonetheless, voluntarily submitting to be an "exploitable" does not speak to the interests of anyone but the volunteer.

Third, is the ghetto so bad? Kerr argues that coaches need to be paid better. He has struck a powerful chord. Too many of "specialists" are grossly underpaid. This reality underscores the roles they play in academic hierarchies which view graduate students as cheap labor. They person many sections of the basic course. Assistants hired as graduate students are entering a symbiotic relationship with the college and university which exchanges instruction and training for service. On the other hand, when department chairpersons decide to hire a "debate specialist" with low academic rank, an individual who is not engaged in graduate study, chairpersons do not understand that while a graduate teaching assistant may spend a few dozen hours each week preparing and completing instruction, debate "specialists" dedicate more hours and highly discrete expertise. Also, they see that "specialist" as a staff member in the department, a transient and an exploitable. Furthermore, chairpersons are reluctant to go that route because it may open too many claims for comparable "specialists" associated with other departmental programs and activities. They view "specialists" as chattal because they often view competitive debating as a club activity, often a drain on departmental resources. There are two additional problems: as McDonald and Schwartzman warn, hiring "specialists" can further distance programs from departmental operations. and "specialist" term coaching makes debating seem more extra-curricular, if not athletic, which even further detaches the activity from its academic setting weakening arguments for its continued existence and often anchoring its continuity to competitive success (a dangerous prospect). Finally, few programs have the resources to hire "specialists" outside of departmental budget lines. While "specialists" may want more compensation, academe simply has few lines for them. Those programs which can are usually "pet" projects of a college or university Dean, Provost or President, and they can, and often do, change. What then?

Fourth, are we making room for everyone? There is an intergenerational rift among the directors and coaches in academic debating. DeLaughder and Kerr suggest that Ph.D.s may not be the better coaches. It is arrogant on the part of the "dinosaurs" to reject the ideas and contributions of the "turks" because they don't have terminal degrees. However, it is equally chauvinistic to reject what directors and coaches with terminal degrees have to offer. While they may not be as efficient at the Lexis-Nexis terminal, they have an intensive education in argumentation theory and other specialized fields. We are fortunate that some remain actively coaching once they reach the ranks of associate or full professors. There must be room for everyone and that means respect in both directions.

Sheffield wrote they leave the activity after being awarded tenure. While this may be the case with many tenured directors and coaches, it remains unclear why they leave. It might be any of the following: the activity does not encourage them to stay (their ideas are often marginalized as "old" and there are few "in the trenches" roles for them to play in the activity), the promotion award systems in academic settings may devalue their research and service such that they find themselves unable to move up the rank ladder, the subjects of debating seasons may be insufficiently engaging (debate resolutions have mostly become international political discussions), argument development has become stagnated (many arguments forms are simply excluded from practice), and debate subject research is often unexploitable (a season's research usually ends up in the corner of a room and trashed a year later).

McDonald's case is clear—tenure is important. A tenured director or coach is a powerful advocate. Colleges and universities make a decision when they choose to tenure an individual. Simply put, they decide the individual is someone they want as a colleague, a colleague for life. When a debating program is challenged, a tenured director or coach can mount a robust defense. The mostly arcane hierarchy of college and university academe grants the most authoritative voices to their tenured and highly ranked professors. Furthermore, any effort to degrade a debating program must confront the tenaciousness of a disenchanted tenured faculty member who tends to be vocal, articulate, and troublesome. That factor cannot be underestimated in the academic calculus of deciding which programs are important and which need to be trimmed back. No department wants a disgruntled tenured faculty.

Fifth, are we capitalizing on our scholarship? As just mentioned, debate subject research needs to get out to others. Some intercollegiate debaters have a better understanding of international affairs and domestic politics than most information mediators and academics. We need to take what we learn and disseminate it. We need to find a way to restructure our research into publications and other mediums. If we can tell the world, especially our colleges and universities, what we do is important beyond itself, we will

have taken an important step in convincing them what we do is worth their time and investment. For example, consider starting a policy studies center on your campuses. Involve your debaters and other non-debating students who would be willing to engage in research and dissemination of debating resolution subject information. Grant money is available for such ventures either in-house or from foundations.

Sixth, are we selling ourselves short? As long as academic administration sees the activity as a marginalized one, it is unlikely the resources needed to hire a terminal degree tenure track director or coach and to compensate "specialists" at non-poverty levels will ever be there. Debate is not being marketed well in the United States. We have allowed the activity to become one which is extremely foreign. We cringe when faculty colleagues, especially administrators, decide to attend tournaments we host. We select "certain" rounds for them to attend and often orchestrate debates which might be more accessible to them. When we host on-campus debates, we select formats unlike ones we use in competitive debating. Though Karagcin is correct in his defense of specialization, over-specialization can be a very dangerous quality in academic programs during tough financial times.

If we market our debating programs as integral to academic preparation for a liberal arts education, our arguments for program support, especially instructional support, might be more effective. Having started a few collegiate debating programs and converting a few others into national programs, I am offering some important suggestions:

1. Design programs as curricular or co-curricular activities. Introduce courses about debating on many levels. Having a course which offers a credit hours for participation is not enough. Of course, getting courses approved is only the first step. The next step involves soliciting enrollment by publicizing the course: contacting pre-professional advisement and other departments, especially pre-law and political science, posting flyers around your campus where students likely to pursue degrees in law will see them, and taking every opportunity to discuss what you do with colleagues and administrators. In addition, market debate tournaments as laboratories for classroom instruction. For example, our participation course is called "debating laboratory" and we even have a sign on one of our squad room doors calling it the "debating laboratory". Finally, follow Schwartzman's advice and market your courses and activities as skills courses which undergirth other academic studies. Debating is to philosophical disputation as calculus is to biochemistry.

2. Publicize your programs. This often involves developing personal contacts with college and local newspaper staffs. Send press releases to them and every and any other person on campus who you feel "needs" to learn about debating. You must also participate on college or university committees where important networking can take place. One of the most important things a director or coach can do is participate in faculty senate or other

similar governing organizations.

3. Publicize yourself. Directors and coaches have a duty to their students. Debaters invest an incredible amount of their personal time and resources to participate. Though they may enjoy what they do, they sacrifice incredible personal capital in debating. While colleges and universities applaud their outstanding students, they market their outstanding faculty. Solicit every opportunity to make yourself more visible on campus. Run for teaching and research awards, teach pro bono courses in special programs, especially any which happen to be the "pet" project of academic administration. Outreach to your community and offer your services as consultants to clubs, organizations, and media outlets: do local radio talk shows, appear as a resource on local TV news shows, and offer your expertise to local newspaper journalists. Be visible.

4. Diversify. Debating has to involve more than travel to intercollegiate tournaments all over the United States and abroad. On-campus activities are critical to the success of your program and its visibility. Host on-campus intercollegiate and secondary school tournaments. Also, invite your colleagues, admissions people, department chairpersons, and academic administrations to your high school tournaments. Ask them to speak and hand out awards. Create special awards for on-campus and community advocates. Have on-campus activities like exhibition debates on issues relevant to your civic and collegiate community. Encourage your debating students to participate in philanthropic activities and guest appearances in your community.

5. It's a business, stupid. Colleges and universities are always worried about budgets. Debating programs tend to service few students and the per student expenditure is often completely disproportionate to any other activity on a campus other than athletics (which tend to fund themselves). Johnson's article makes that crystal clear.

Don't sell your programs based on national rankings; they are nice, but they are fickle. In the fat years, your program may soar. When the lean years come, as they will undoubtedly, you have left your program defenseless. Furthermore, national ranking procedures are easily cheated. For example, national awards have been won by programs which field beginning and advanced debaters in novice and junior divisions at large yet undercompetitive tournaments. Some directors sell their programs based on national championships which hardly reflect competitive reality. Interviewing for a job, a college president once asked me if I could maintain the national ranking of the program. I informed him the national ranking about which he was so proud was grossly inflated. And I didn't get the job.

Also, one day someone will ask about the "national" rankings at which point you will need to explain the difference between the C.E.D.A., N.D.T., A.D.A., N.E.D.A., N.P.D.A., etc. If the conversation persists, you might have to explain that there are at least three varsity and junior varsity national championships, etc.

Decisions are made altruistically and pragmatically. While educators, like ourselves, feel our institutions should do what's right, they often act in ways we find academically and pedagogically indefensible. If we decide not to dirty ourselves and engage them on the turf upon which they make their stands, we are disserving our programs. Directors and coaches unwilling to market their programs should retire from the activity and join the traditional instructional faculty.

Your best marketing tool is your potential alumni base. Contact a member of your development office and take some time making the case that debate will produce the type of alumni most likely to give back to the university. All colleges and universities are concerned about producing an influential and philanthropic alumni pool. In terms of alumni building, debate seems much less cost intensive when framed in terms of generating longer-term revenue sources.

I wish to thank all the individuals who contributed to this forum and hope we can design a model which will make debate education a more important part of liberal education in this country and abroad. Before we can solve the problems associated with renewable term and terminal degree tenure line appointments, we need to market what we do much better. Whether the future will include a balanced mix of terminal degree tenure lines, educational specialists, and other situations will be wholly dependent on our continuing existence. Schwartzman makes a powerful claim when he metaphorically challenges us to avoid the pressures of marginalization. Unfortunately, many of those pressures are our own doing and must be resolved before we all go the way of the "dinosaur".

FORUM:THE DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS:
Issues and Ideas

1. Component-Based Forensic Participation: Using Components to Build a Traditional Team

Michael Dreher,
Bethel College (Minnesota)

One of the issues that confronts a department that sponsors an individual events and/or debate team is whether or not to require students to participate on the team in order to earn credit or to fulfill graduation requirements. The justification for such requirements is that forensics is an integral part of the department, and serves a pedagogical function. Since forensics does serve a pedagogical function, many schools choose to offer academic credit for forensic participation. Other schools require forensic participation, but do not offer academic credit. Still others embed forensic participation within specific courses. Examples of each type of program are offered in the appendix.

The distinction between each of these programs is significant for at least three reasons. First, departments that require forensic participation often have made decisions about what types of speeches students will be expected to perform. For example, requiring students to give platform speeches such as informatives or persuasions, or requiring students to engage in a certain style of debate is typical. Second, programs that incorporate component requirements into classes often spend some instructional time dealing with forensic conventions. Finally, the distinction is important because tournament choices and tournament entry sizes are affected by the choices of individual programs. The author's institution used to take 17 persuasions to a single tournament, which greatly influenced the running of the tournament.

Departments that compel forensic participation have a unique situation regarding the dynamics and socialization of the forensics team. Within the team, two different

kinds of students emerge: students who are on the team because of academic require-ments, and students who are non-majors who have joined the team for developmental, social, or other reasons. This paper will discuss how these dynamics affect the compo-sition of the team, implications as far as speech and communication departments and, by implication, pedagogy are concerned, as well as some future directions for directors.

FORENSICS AND THE BLENDED TEAM

Directors of forensics face particular challenges when having to integrate significant numbers of majors (and other students) within the forensics program. For example, at the author's institution, every major must at some point participate in several forensics tournaments. Forensic participation is compelled in at least two courses. This situation does provide several advantages. First, it guarantees that there will be some forensic par-ticipation, and helps to ensure that there will be a sufficient budget for forensics. In addi-tion, component-based participation can be helpful because positive student experiences can lead to further recruitment for the team. As students go to tournaments, they com-municate their experiences to their peers. However, there are several problems that any department that chooses a required team approach must address. In this paper, I will outline four of those problems, and propose remedies for each of them.

CREATING TEAM UNITY IN REQUIRED PARTICIPATION SYSTEMS

The first problem blended forensics teams must deal with is that required forensics par-ticipation makes it more difficult to create team unity. If students are only required to attend one or several tournaments, the constitution of the team changes dramatically from tournament to tournament. In addition, coaches from other programs do not have a chance to identify particular students as representing the institution. There are two solutions to this problem. First, whenever possible, students should have to earn par-ticipation components in multiple courses. Not only does this give students multiple chances to attend tournaments, but this also reinforces the value of forensics to stu-dents. They see that forensics is important, whether they are taking a course such as persuasion, public speaking, argumentation and debate, or so on. In addition, students should be allowed and encouraged to attend several tournaments during the course of the semester. Historically, at the author's institution, the persuasion and argumentation and debate courses required students to attend two tournaments. While this allowed some students to be recognized

A second problem directors have to address is that it is hard to build an individual speaker's skill levels, especially if they are only required to attend a couple of tourna-

ments. One of the benefits of forensics is that a speaker can, especially given an extended period of time, greatly improve their public speaking skill. When students only attend one or two tournaments, they do not have a chance to really refine or polish particular speeches. This forces the director to make decisions about what is more important: the ability to revise the same speech and learn the editing process, or to gain experience in a variety of different kinds of settings. Most component or requirement based programs require the students to attend three tournaments, with varying requirements for the numbers of speeches to be completed.

A third problem that must be addressed is that students who are fulfilling academic requirements have little incentive to do well, other than personal motivation. Performance is not a criterion for fulfilling the component; therefore, doing what is necessary is often valued.

While there are many potential ways of solving this problem, I will suggest two ways. First, students can be awarded extra components for doing well. My region of the country has many 3-round debate tournaments, for which students earn one component. Our rule is that if students compete in three or fewer rounds at tournaments, they earn one component. If they compete in more than three rounds, they earn two components. This gives them a slight extra incentive to do well, because they can earn components more quickly by performing well. In addition, when students see their peers performing well, they are more likely to perform well. Second, it is a part of our requirement that a student must see a coach before the entry can be taken to a tournament. If the coach feels like the topic is poor and would not do well, then the student would not be allowed to take the speech to the tournament.

A fourth problem inherent in the required participation design is that it is easier to lose good people. Once students have figured out they have met their requirements, they are not as likely to stay in the program. There are several possibilities to encourage this. First, students can be encouraged through special "invitations" to encourage them to consider themselves as part of the team. These invitations should be done in such a way that they are meaningful to the student. Special "invitation-only" tournaments are one option; the thought is that students are selected to go because the coaches really thought they could do well. Second, students should be given opportunities to talk about their experiences. This can be done within their classes or other classes within the department. As students hear that competition is a positive experience, especially from a peer, they are more likely to engage in the activity.

DEPARTMENT PEDAGOGY AND FORENSICS PEDAGOGY: DO THEY BECOME SYNONYMOUS?

One of the key issues for forensics teams with component requirements is the peda-

gogical justification for the team's existence. The goals of the department are often written with regard to the requirements of the regional accrediting agencies. In most cases, justification for the team's existence are included in these documents. Schools that offer courses in forensics have to justify their practicums with references to the pedagogical value of forensics.

The director must ask herself or himself about the goals of the program and the goals of the department. Should the goal of forensics be to promote skill development in a single area, or to promote a wider array of skills? This will make the difference between requiring all of the components in a single area as opposed to requiring multiple areas. For many programs, this question includes whether students should be required to participate in both debate and individual events. Directors must also confront the question of whether components can be earned outside of actual forensic competition, such as through public debates, work in the tab room at a tournament, or other non-competitive situations. Directors must also consider how long students have to complete the components.

As much as possible, students should be encouraged not to complete their components within a few weeks, or even one weekend. Some students will still seek opportunities to do this because of work or other responsibilities. In cases such as this, the director should still seek to welcome the student and encourage them throughout the weekend.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Given that performance-based education is rapidly gaining strength, both on the high school and on the college levels, what do we do about it? How can we as forensic educators use this movement to our advantage? I would suggest three potential future strategies.

First, the success of the forensic team requires a blended team at as many tournaments as possible. Group norms establish quickly; tournaments where all students are meeting requirements are less likely to see the importance of the team concept and instead see the experience as "something that has to be done." Even if one student attending the tournament is on the team and not fulfilling requirements, the group dynamics change. Both sets of students, however, can teach each other. Students who are attending tournaments to fulfill requirements should be questioned about how theories they have learned relate to the forensic setting. With a public speaking class, this is fairly obvious. Students should be asked questions about the delivery of students they competed against, as well as about the content and organization of their speeches. Advanced students, such as those in a persuasion class, can be asked questions about which types of appeals are more likely to succeed within a forensics tournament. We can also debrief argumentation and debate students by asking them to consider the

arguments run against them, and have the students speculate about their effectiveness as logical appeals. No matter what the class, there should be something within the tournament that students should be able to compare to their classwork.

Additionally, performance outcomes should be established that are not based on placing at tournaments. Students can be rewarded for doing well, but should not be punished for particular circumstances. At one tournament we attended, one of our parliamentary debate teams went 0-3, but with good speaker points. The reason they went 0-3 is because they debated the top three teams in the tournament. Does this mean that they did poorly? Many of us would suggest that it was the luck of the draw. Within either a component based system or a credit-based system, evaluating performance must include considerations such as the tournament draw as well as the judges the students had. Part of the component requirement is that students also practice in the coach's office. Willingness to work, as well as preparation, while not easily quantifiable, should be included in the evaluation of components or credits. At the author's institution, if students do not prepare for the tournament, their entry will be dropped and no components will be earned.

Finally, students could be evaluated on their willingness to adhere to a team concept. We often encourage students to watch the speeches of their teammates or events that they might enjoy or participate in later. Both of these ideas can be included in the evaluation of the student. Students should be asked about what they think about events. The goal, however, is that students should want to encourage their teammates, rather than be compelled to encourage their teammates.

We must ultimately assess what we want students to learn from going to tournaments. Such goals differ from program to program, but to observe effective speakers and learn from them is certainly a part of most director's goals. In addition, most directors would agree that students need to improve their public speaking and research abilities, and that forensics should help to reduce communication anxiety.

CONCLUSION

Component-based systems seek to encourage students to have a basic knowledge about the world of forensics, as well as to give them a taste of forensics by trying a couple of different events. Ultimately, the director in such a program has to make forensics more appealing to students within and outside the major. This paper is a start in the discussion of how forensics might be made more appealing to those within the requirement system. It is hoped that directors who have forensics requirements will be able to use those requirements to ultimately broaden the activity.

APPENDIX 1: SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS THAT REQUIRE FORENSIC PARTICIPATION FOR GRADUATION, OR ALLOW FORENSICS TO MEET A SPEECH/COMMUNICATION MAJOR

This list is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather, to give the reader a sense of how some schools integrate speaking requirements within the major. All information was taken from individual school's on-line catalogs:

School:	Type of Requirement:	No. of Units:
Bethel College	Component2-3	(4 or 6 if no media option taken)
Augsburg College	Course Requirement	1 to 3
North Central College	Course Requirement	4 , 1-3 hrs
Wisconsin-Platteville	Course Requirement	1
Wisconsin-Stout	Course Requirement	2
Cal State-Hayward	Course Requirement_	1
Eastern New Mexico Un.	Course Requirement	4
Bradley University	Course Requirement_	1
Humboldt State Univ.	Course Requirement	4, 1-3 hrs
Willamette University	Alternative Requirement_	NA
Wisconsin-Oshkosh	Course Requirement	2

Notes

1. Units are semester credits, except for North Central College. North Central's system is a class-credit system. For that school, I am defining "unit" as 1/6 of a course credit, since students can earn from 1/6-1/2 a class-credit for forensics.
2. Augsburg has two options: a non-credit practicum or a version of the basic course which utilizes forensic tournaments. Majors must select the practicum and can also select the basic course with forensics.
3. Requirement can be met in other ways, including radio, television, musical theater, or theater.
4. Can be met through internship.
5. Secondary Education Majors only.
6. Students must complete a public speaking course, or individual events or debate.
7. See Perelman, Chaim and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

2. Too Much of a Good Thing: The Director of Forensics and Wellness

Steven J. Venette,
Concordia College

Patricia A. Venette,
North Dakota State University

Many members of our community have taken the opportunity this forum section provides to emphasize the many benefits of forensics. Certainly, we cannot disagree. Participation in speech and debate activities is an excellent way to foster both intellectual and spiritual development. At the same time, we find ourselves pondering the question that H. B. Summers asked in 1936, *Can we have too much of a good thing*? Many discussions, both formal and informal, have taken place to assess the effects that forensics has on the wellness of those involved. Of course, assessing wellness

is not new in forensics, but more focus on the role of the forensics director would seem worthwhile. To meet this end, three important issues must be addressed. First, briefly, a working definition of wellness will be established. Second, the impact of forensics on holistic health will be addressed. And third, what directors can do to improve wellness will be explored.

There are many possible definitions of wellness. Instead of becoming mired in a lengthy discussion of these many possible definitions, a working definition can be gleaned from the field. Wellness can be operationally defined as physical and mental health. Physical health might include rest, eating habits, exercise, and abuse of stimulants and depressants. Mental health might be associated with social experiences, self-betterment, confidence, emotional support, and critical thinking skills. While physical and mental health may not be the best definition in existence, it serves its purpose and provides an appropriate scope for evaluation.

Studentsí physical heath is certainly impacted by forensics. A universal complaint seems to be that there is not enough time to sleep, and that people are tired. Also, nutrition can be challenged both on the way to tournaments (Burger King again!) and at the competition (nothing starts a day like frosting and caffeine). Although some might disagree, carrying visual aids or debate tubs from round to round probably should not be oneís major form of exercise. Tobacco and drug use (including alcohol) continue to be a problem for many in our community. Forensics certainly does take its toll on our physical health.

The common reasons why we participate in forensics directly relates to mental wellness. Speech and debate allow us to create satisfying relationships on both personally and professionally. Working on speeches and preparing for debate provide intellectual stimulation. Everyone finds satisfaction in a job well done. Even though there are many advantages to mental health, forensics also has a negative impact as well. Often, students lose perspective and devote too much time to competition, to the detriment of classes and relationships. Perhaps stress is an indicator that a student is struggling and growing at the same time, but too often the stress is allowed to grow and become unhealthy. Finally, competition can conflict with studentsí spirituality. For example, tournaments that include Sunday morning rounds can be a burden.

Ultimately, we must discover what directors of forensics programs can do to overcome these limitations. Information is the key. Probably the most important thing that a coach can do is be informed about her or his studentsí needs. Coaches rarely, if ever, intentionally make decisions that limit studentsí ability to make healthy decisions. If a problem does occur (like taking vegetarians to the House of Flesh), it is usually due to a lack of communication. The solution to many physical health problems is easy; talk to your students.

The second solution might not be as easy. Careful consideration needs to be given to travel schedules. Directors might want to reduce the number of tournaments that

their team will attend. Complaints about the long season are heard every year, but there is no rule that a team has to go to all of the possible tournaments. Maybe it is time for directors to downplay the competition to promote health. Of course, this conclusion has not been popular with many coaches, but perhaps there is some middle ground. Coaches might limit the number of events that students can compete in to help them find time to relax, eat, talk to friends, etc. Directors should also discourage students from attending all tournaments. There must be time to participate in community events and maintaining relationships outside of forensics. We must always recognize that occasionally students need a break.

Many actions can be taken to help promote physical well-being. Healthy food can be brought on trips. Teams can have a regular activity that includes exercise (such as volleyball or basketball). Students may not take advantage of these opportunities, however, if they are not taking their health seriously. We need to be good role models for our students so that they might find a proper perspective.

Directors can also go beyond what they currently do to help students develop mentally. By its very nature forensics is a social activity. Competitors talk to each other, the team bonds in the van, and many tournaments have parties. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for coaches to assume that these social activities are sufficient. The importance of being social within the context of forensics cannot be downplayed, but we must also remember that students need social experiences outside of speech and debate. Some teams have experimented with ìadoptingî a campus theater production (helping out with odd jobs, and enjoying the performance). Other teams gather at a restaurant to play video trivia. The particular activity is not important; the time spent together without the shop-talk can help everyone maintain a proper perspective.

Coaches can also further education in practice sessions. It is not enough to simply recommend changes. The rationale behind those suggestions is important too. Proposing a change might help make that particular speech or argument stronger, but explaining how that decision was reached will provide insight into how the event works, and students will be encouraged to develop their own philosophies for the events that they enter.

In order to promote satisfaction with the work that has been done over the course of a season, and career, a record should be kept of the progress that a student has made. Video taping performances throughout the season allows the competitor to easily identify areas where improvement has taken place. Additionally, these videos could become a part of a portfolio that the student could keep and update. By the way, these portfolios might come in handy when trying to justify a programís existence (not that we are ever asked to do that)!

Finally, directors need to be sensitive to studentsí spiritual lives. It might seem obvious to some that coaches should not impede involvement in religion; we often do, how-

ever, ask students to make decisions between forensics and faith. Some schools have taken the stand that they will not enter tournaments that have rounds on Sunday mornings. Others will not travel on religious holidays. Regardless, it is imperative that directors are sensitive to the needs of individuals on the team.

Pan-ultimately, it is our responsibility as directors to model appropriate behavior, both physically and mentally. We must demonstrate that we are concerned with our own health and well-being. We should remind ourselves and others that forensics is educational not only for those competing, but also for those listening critically to what is being presented. Yes, coaches learn at tournaments too. By demonstrating that we follow an unwritten code-of-conduct based on the values and principles that tie our community together, students learn to respect the activity. For all of these reasons, the increased attention that wellness has received is appropriate. Forensics is an enriching experience, but that does not mean that there are no areas for improvement. Everyone associated with speech or debate, especially program directors, must work vigilantly to protect the wellness of all those involved. Can we have too much of a good thing? The answer increasingly seems to be yes. But with proper perspective, and a few changes, we can find an suitable balance.

3. Institutional Circuit Rider is the Future of the DOF

Daniel Cronn-Mills,   **Kirstin Cronn-Mills**
Mankato State University   **Concordia College**

The direction and future of directors of forensics (DOF) is of continuous concern to the forensic community. Indeed, the health of intercollegiate forensic programs are directly bound to their directors. A strong DOF can maintain and strengthen a program at an institution, while a "weak" director may send the strongest of programs into obscurity.

Our purpose is to illuminate the future of the DOF position in intercollegiate forensics predicated on recent trends we have observed in the activity. The picture we portray is not met to be indicative of any particular program or region of the country, but constitutes a composite of the DOF position as a whole.

A future many would like to see in forensics involves tenured Ph.D.s directing programs across the country. The forensic community knows from experience such a likelihood is not likely to occur. According to Gill (1990), the anticipated lifespan of a DOF is a six-year maximum. The reasons directors quit are familiar to most in the activity (e.g., demands on time, demands of research/publication for retention/tenure,

demands from one's family). Directors who continue beyond the six-year threshold are beating the odds, and a director who commits a career to forensics is a rarity. We believe, in light of such evidence, the DOF is facing a perilous future.

We contend the "circuit rider" is an appropriate metaphor for visualizing future DOFs. A circuit rider travels from town to town plying a trade in each community for short periods of time. A circuit rider adapts to the situation, circumstances and needs in each community, while engaging in no long-term community involvement. We believe the DOF is facing such a future. A circuit rider DOF is identifiable by repeated short-term commitments with various institutions and forensic programs. A circuit rider DOF accepts responsibility for a forensic program knowing they will be required to move on in a few years.

The circuit-rider situation is promulgated by three specific factors. First, long-term involvement by a DOF with one college/university community almost always entails the individual be eligible for tenure. Second, colleges and universities across the country are, however, expecting tenurable faculty to hold terminal degrees (most commonly the Ph.D.) and to engage in teaching, departmental and university committees, to conduct research, and to submit manuscripts for conventions and journal publication. Finally, the demands to meet tenure requirements are often in conflict with the demands for running a sound forensic program. A DOF who teaches and coaches four days a week and then spends Friday-Saturday on the road at a tournament has little time left to meet traditional tenure-track responsibilities. Tenure-track DOFs have four options: run themselves ragged to meet both forensic and traditional tenure-track expectations; abdicate traditional expectations to run the forensic program (and in the process lose the chance for tenure); abdicate forensic responsibilities to meet traditional; resign from the DOF position and seek a non-DOF faculty position.

Each option is detrimental to the forensic program and/or the individual trying to direct the program. The most common choice is the first option—try and do everything—with an unfortunate result. The director, after five to six years of doing it all, is physically and emotionally burned out. The director receives tenure and then steps down from the DOF position, leaving it open for another new faculty member to repeat the above process.

Institutions have a habit of responding to such occurrences by converting the DOF position from tenure-track to fixed term. Fixed-term appointments rarely require a Ph.D. for a DOF. A master's degree is usually sufficient. A fixed-term position appears on the surface attractive to both institutions and forensic persons seeking employment. The institution saves money by not hiring a Ph.D. and has an easy position to cut when budget issues arise. The forensic person sees the position as attractive since one can gain employment without "suffering" the hardships of a graduate Ph.D. program. A fixed-term DOF is a circuit rider. A person accepts a short-term appointment at a school, knowing after awhile they will need to move onto another school.

Three specific disadvantages for intercollegiate forensics result from the integration and perpetuation of DOF circuit riders. First, circuit riders are unable to provide long-term continuity to a forensic program. The success of many forensic programs hinges on effective relations between the DOF and university administration, the university student body, and the local high school community. Administration and/or student governments establish the budget for a program, and the influx of new students for a program comes from the high school community. A new DOF every few years harms the continuity of these relationships.

Second, circuit riders often lack an authoritative voice in department policies and issues. A circuit rider rarely has the opportunity to accrue any seniority in a department. Therefore, fixed-term appointments must often bend to the whims of the institution (e.g., courses to be taught, times when courses will be taught, squad room space, supplies for the program). A fixed-term person, in order to be renewed, must be willing to accommodate administrative and departmental requests.

Finally, circuit riders are detrimental to the long-term stability of the activity for two reasons. First, a fixed-term faculty member is normally the first position to be cut when faced with budgetary constraints. The DOF and the forensic program are not viewed as intrinsic to the department/institution but, rather, as disposable commodities. Second, forensics requires an infusion of fresh, talented, dedicated, and trained DOFs. However, the perpetuation of circuit riders is detrimental to graduate programs providing forensic-related coursework. Graduate-level coursework in forensics is necessary to maintain a strong conceptual and theoretical foundation for the activity. Graduate courses at most institutions are taught by Ph.D. faculty members. Since circuit riders hold only the master's degree, they are usually not permitted to teach graduate-level courses. Forensic course are, under such circumstances, either canceled or taught by persons with limited forensic background or dated forensic experience.

The future we illustrate is bleak and we have no specific suggestions for improving the situation. Many of the above dilemmas have been addressed by the discipline in previous decades, yet the problems continue. We implore the forensic community to recognize and address the issue of circuit riders before irreparable damage is done.

REFERENCE

Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 179-188.

4. Solving for a Healthy Future: Creating National Standards for Training Future Directors of Forensics

Thomas A. Workman,
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Recently, I was asked by my department chair to respond to an inquiry from a colleauge trying to justify the existence of a debate and IE program to his administration. Participation had declined in the past few years, the team wasnít capturing the success it had in the past, and most importantly, the hasty resignation of the Director of Forensics there at the end of the summer gave the administration the perfect excuse to eliminate the program altogether.

Such a situation has become all too common. Despite the recent efforts by both branches (NDT and NIET) of the American Forensics Association to address the health of the activity, the viability of forensics programs across the nation continues to be threatened. At the heart of this dilemma, however, is a far greater concern: the number of ìgoodî directors, who serve as the heart of the activity and the main advocate, soul and custodian of their programs, seems to be diminishing. Many, under the umbrella condition of ìburnout,î leave the activity for more fertile (and less toilsome) ground in academia. Many others simply leave the college or university altogether, working within the college setting only because it was the home of the forensics program.

Though labeling the current trends in the careers of our nationís forensics directors as problematic may be an overstatement, a number of articles, papers and presentations have called our attention to the growing concern of career burnout, program reduction and/or elimination, and the declining health of the activity for coaches and directors (Burnett and Danielson, 1992; Bartanen, 1996; Jensen, 1996). Bartanenís 1996 report of a national survey sponsored by the Guild of American Forensic Educators notes that well over half of the respondents did not expect their careers to continue beyond five years, with nearly two-thirds of respondents stating that they would be leaving the activity by the end of the century (p. 17).

Many causes for this problem have been explored, yet substantial evidence exists correlating the decline of long-term careers in forensics education to improper or non-existent training of those pursuing such a career (Bartanen, 1996; Burnett and Danielson, 1992; Gill, 1990; Hassencahl, 1993; Jensen, 1993). Jensen (1996) goes as far

as to state, ìWith evidence pointing toward limited careers in forensic coaching and poor training for those entering the forensics profession, we can see the tenuous foundation for forensic education. Our activity is only as strong as the training of the professionals that teach itî (p. 2). One notion is that, as untrained or poorly trained coaches begin their positions, they are not fully equipped to handle the sheer magnitude of tasks that require a wide array of skills — from bookkeeping to public relations. Their training and experience in public speaking, oral interpretation, debate and even competition is undermined by the day-to-day operations of a program. Moreover, they may be approaching these tasks in ineffective and non-efficient ways, creating more stress and hence a higher probability of burnout. Training cannot remove the stresses that surround a directorís work, but it can better prepare the coach for those stresses and enable the coach to work more productively and efficiently.

Given this causality, one solution to the growing problem of coach and program burn-out seems to be better education for the future forensics educator. Yet very little has been written on the subject, with only a handful of approaches presented (Bartanen, 1996; Hassencahl, 1993; Larson-Casselton, 1991). We as a community are just beginning to realize our need for formal training in forensics administration and education; itís no surprise that weíve not yet begun to build the road.

Luckily, the basic structure for such training currently exists in the graduate programs and assistantships offered at universities across the country. Historically, a student wishing to pursue a career in forensics education begins such work as a graduate assistant with a speech team while enrolled in a masters program in Communication Studies. Yet, sadly, Bartanen (1996) reports that less than half of all universities with graduate programs have a course in forensics direction and administration, and Hassencahl (1993) paints an even bleaker picture for doctoral students, despite consistent findings that such a course can prove to be a key foundation to formal instruction in forensics education (Jensen, 1996; Leland, 1996; Workman, 1996). Without curriculum, training is received through experience, which, though meritorious (Leland, 1996), leaves training as widely disparate and unstructured (Jensen, 1996). Clearly, the graduate program, and the Ph.D. program in particular, serves as the perfect place for such professional training, as it can provide both curricular and experiential training for the future coach, similar to an apprenticeship for any established profession. Hassencahl (1993) remarks that only six Ph.D. programs offer coursework in forensics (p.2), yet perhaps it is not the number of programs offering on-the-job training as the quality of training these programs provide, and more importantly, the utilization of these programs by those wishing to pursue a career in forensics education.

One problem has been the wide range of programs and approaches to training. As seen in the Hassencahl research, some graduate programs offer forensics education

curriculum, others do not, or offer classes sporadically. The main mode of training, if it can be called such, has been the use of the graduate assistantship in forensics as the opportunity for experience in forensics coaching and direction. Here, too, the actual training that takes place is as unique as the programs themselves. Some assistants are given consistent guidance, mentoring and feedback from their directors. Others are simply involved in tasks and are forced to glean knowledge from their work rather than from a formalized program of training. Without a clear sense of what such training entails, or national standards for such training, the road to careers in forensics education remains no more than a dirt path, and one that few even realize they must travel.

Clearly, it's time to begin building the road. We must understand that the multiplicity of organizational models that we now have for the training of future coaches and directors is hurting more than helping us. It is no surprise that with as many modes of training now available, we see employment in the activity with as much diversity of structure — programs run by tenured faculty, adjunct faculty, hired part-time staff and in some cases student volunteers. More importantly, we must realize that the link between burnout and training may very well be caused by the multiple models of training we provide.

A CALL FOR NATIONAL STANDARDS

We all know that, when detailing elaborate solutions, talk is cheap and actions speak louder than words. Producing better coaches through better training will require support from national forensic organizations, university department administrators, and individual coaches who serve as the important recruiting officers for the new army of undergraduate competitors who will consider a career in coaching. By adopting national standards for training, national forensics associations can serve a vital role in paving the road to better coaches, but it means that they must become involved in prescribing or demanding curriculum from university programs. Yet, a statement of national standards for director/coach training would, in fact, legitimize the activities of many university programs striving to provide excellent training to their graduate students, and provide consistency in the scope of training offered across the nation.

There is certainly more to study, to discuss, and to explore in this area. Yet, our discussions must not override initial action, or the laying of a foundation to get the work started. As Jensen (1996) so aptly warns us, ì. . .we can ill-afford to place our programs in the hands of poorly trained educators. To do so is not fair to our institutions, to the educators faced with making choices they are not prepared to make, nor to the students who are directly impacted by the abilities of their teachers. Most importantly, it is not fair, nor is it healthy for our activityî (p. 12). The first step is to declare a standard that serves as a map for those traveling. The construction of this road may take time, but the results are well worth the effort.

NOTE:

Portions of this article were presented at the 1997 Developmental Conference for Forensics Rice University, Houston, Texas, August 13 - 16, 1997

REFERENCES

Bartanen, M.D. (1996). *Teaching and Directing Forensics*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarlsbrick.

Bartanen, K.M. (1996). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, Part I. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 81, 1-21.

Burnett Pettus, A., & Danielson, M.A. (1992). Analysis of forensics program administration: What will the 1990ís bring? *National Forensic Journal,* 10, 11-18.

Carver, C., & Larson-Casselton, C. (1990, August). Mentoring relationships and programs: Applications to the forensics community. Paper presented at the Individual Events Developmental Conference, Denver, CO.

Colvert, A.L. (1993, November). *Coaching and counseling: Where to draw the line*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Danielson, M.A., & Hollwitz, J. (1993, November). Evaluating directors of forensics: A job-analysis approach. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association,   Miami Beach, FL.

Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-188.

Hassencahl, F. (1993). The status of graduate courses designed for directors of forensic programs. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79, 1-5.

Jensen, S.L. (1993). A survey analysis of regional and national programs and competitive trends in collegiate forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 78, 1-10.

Jensen, S.L. (1996, November). Unifying research and teaching: Pedagogy for the transition from forensics competition to education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Leland, C.M. (1996, November). Training to take the helm: Pedagogical and practical issues in the supervision and teaching of graduate forensic assistants. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

McBath, J.H., Ed. (1975). *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Shelton, M.W. (1996). Another glance at the want ads: Forensic Positions 1990 through 1994. *National Forensic Journal*, 14, 45-57.

Workman, T.A. (1996, November). The Directing Forensics course: Its necessity in the communication studies curricula. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

4. Judging Philosophies as a Concern of the DOF

Tim Borchers,
Moorhead State University

At the most fundamental level, forensics is about designing speeches and performances that will have an intended effect upon a certain audience. While great care is taken by students and coaches to design speeches with the audience in mind, it is not surprising that students receive widely disparate ballots with regards to audience analysis. In one round, a student may receive a high rank and praise from the judge for having a "excellent topic for this audience." In the next round, the student may receive a low score and the question, "Why should I care about this issue?" In short, it is difficult to determine the typical forensic audience. This uncertainty is frustrating for coaches and students alike and ultimately leads to diminished educational value for this activity. This short article explores the "problem of audience" in individual events competition. I contend in the final section of the article that this problem can be addressed by the development of judging philosophies on the part of coaches and judges.

THE AUDIENCE

Initially, I contend that the audience is not sufficiently understood in individual events competition. Judges, coaches, and students have different expectations of the audience. I wish to focus on two questions: who are the students in the round? and who is the judge in the round? The first question, concerning students in the round, may seem a bit strange. After all, students who watch and participate in rounds appear to be just that: students engaged in forensic competition. That is, the students are college students who have spent time and energy constructing their speeches for presentation. They also know that they are audience members who must give their close attention to the speeches of their opponents in the round.

Who else could the students be? They could be Members of Congress persuading each other to vote a certain way on a certain bill. They could be reporters for Primetime Live, Dateline NBC, or 20/20 encouraging the public to take heed of a new social prob-

lem. The students could be special interest lobbyists pushing for the development of their program or idea. They could be entertainers performing poetry, comedy, or drama. Or the students could be scientists informing the audience of technological breakthroughs. There are countless possibilities for who the students can be and in any given round, there is probably some combination of all these expectations present.

In light of student expectations, we should ask, "Is the judge's perceived role in the round congruent with student expectations?" The short answer is "not always." On the most basic level, the judge is supposed to evaluate the effectiveness of each speech in the round. Ideally, the judge has special training that he or she brings to bear on the speakers. Other than these most basic assumptions, the judge's role is not made clear by either the rules or practice of forensics.

Some judges see themselves as dialecticians, engaging in advocacy with the speaker. These judges argue with the speaker's interpretation of literature, their answer to the extemp question, or their use of persuasive strategies. Other judges consider themselves as members of the audience—college instructors and students—who simply have a ballot to fill out after the speeches. These judges may fully recognize their biases in making the decision, but because they are simply audience members, feel they do not need to put these biases aside because all audiences have biases. Another view of the judge is that he or she is a "blank slate" who has no preconceived notions about topics, speakers, etc. This person tries to put aside all biases when making the decision and will accept whatever the speakers say without intervention. Finally, some judges may view themselves as representative of the "universal audience" identified by Chaim Perelman_. That is, the judge attempts to view the round through the eyes of a rational person who knows how to evaluate the relative strength of weaknesses of arguments. I argue that there is no consensus about judging paradigms in intercollegiate forensics.

PROBLEMS

The lack of clarity about the audience creates three main problems. First, an ill-defined audience diminishes the educational value of the speech and debate activity. Forensics is designed to offer students practical experience in public presentations. Nearly every theory of communication begins with the audience. From Aristotle to Kenneth Burke, audience is an important factor in the theory of the discipline. Without a clear understanding of audience, we can not adequately apply communication theory to our activity. Students do not utilize the knowledge available to craft their speeches and thus miss the opportunity to experience a "real world" communication event.

As a result of the previous discussion, students construct speeches according to what wins and forensics is reduced to a "game." At previous National Speech

Communication conventions (formerly Speech Communication Association), panelists have discussed the "unwritten" rules of forensic events. For instance, it is an "unwritten" rule that persuasions follow a problem-cause-solution format. Or that third person literature is not performed. While these rules may be true of the "typical" forensic audience, they may not always be educationally sound and they are not universally applied. As a result, those who best "play the game" are rewarded by judges. Those students who try to appeal to a wider audience sometimes lose out.

Ultimately, the problem of audience results in discouragement for both competitors and coaches. How many of us have had to tell a bright, energetic student that "things just aren't done that way." This statement may be an important observation about the nature of the particular forensic audience in question, but it does not satisfy the student's expectations of the event. Other students who craft their speeches with a particular—and seemingly relevant—audience in mind sometimes run into judges who use a different paradigm to evaluate the speech. Coaches become frustrated with the activity and turn their attention to other aspects of the academic life.

NECESSARY COMPONENTS OF A JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Complete consensus on who the audience should be in forensic competition will probably never be achieved. Perhaps we should not even attempt to define "the audience." In the "real world," after all, audiences are often very ambiguous. However, as Directors, coaches, and judges, we should develop a judging philosophy and discuss this philosophy with our colleagues, graduate assistants, and students. Judging philosophies that are truly useful go beyond personal feelings about the role of teaser in oral interpretation, for example, or the number of main points used in an extemporaneous speech. Instead, useful judging philosophies must address the current and traditional theory of the discipline and how those theories influence what we perceive to be effective communication. What follows are my perceptions of what should constitute a judging philosophy.

PUBLIC ADDRESS AND LIMITED PREP

First, the judge needs a "Theory" of Public Speaking." The judge should address questions such as:

> *"What role should evidence play in the speech?"*
> *"Does the evidence have to be absolutely current?"*
> *"What role should the speaker's use of widely held premises play in a speech?"*
> *"What role should emotion play in the speech?"*

"Is it possible for a speech to be persuasive which does not conform to an Aristotelian model of persuasion?"
"What topics would be interesting to a rational person?"
"What role does logic and causation play in public speaking?"
"What jokes might a typical audience find offensive?"

In addition, judges should examine their knowledge of more specialized events such as rhetorical criticism/communication analysis to be sure that they understand the particular nature of the exercise. In summary, judges should question their most basic assumptions about public speaking to be sure that those assumptions are valid.

ORAL INTERPRETATION

For the oral interpretation events, judges should start by asking themselves, "What is the purpose of oral interpretation?" Oral interpretation has been defined in various ways: as performance, as argument, as an exercise in reading, etc. Judges should have a clear understanding of what they see as the purpose for the activity. In addition, judges should ask themselves, "What is literature?" Does magazine copy constitute literature? What about literature published on the world wide web? In addition, judges should evaluate their position regarding literary merit. Current theory suggests this concept may no longer be an appropriate guide for oral interpretation. Finally, judges should evaluate the meaningfulness of the traditional genres. They should ask themselves, "What makes poetry poetry?" These questions will assist judges in making decisions about their philosophy of oral interpretation.

CONCLUSION

Audience is a central concern of those who communicate. The various definitions of audience pose special problems for coaches, students, and judges in forensic competition. There are many perspectives of judging and this confusion has implications for the activity. I have argued that it may not be prudent to force judges to be uniform in their practices, but that judges should at least have a philosophy that guides their decisions. Ultimately, coaches and judges should not only be fluent with the nature of forensics, but they must be up to date in the reading and use of contemporary communication theory. Judges who are well grounded and write educational ballots will ensure the continued success of forensics.

5. Strengthening the Position of the DOF

Jeffrey D. Brand,
North Dakota State University

The Director of Forensics occupies a difficult position in academia. The responsibilities of the DOF go beyond the traditional professional categories of teaching, research and service. The job description is as varied as the number of positions in the country. It is a role that requires time consuming devotion to an activity that can offer limited rewards and rare job security. Our activity is populated by many good people, who are willing to sacrifice much to give to an activity they believe is valuable to their students.

It is time that we as an activity find ways to strengthen our position, to be able to fulfill our responsibilities in a supportive environment. In 1995, the National Communication Association appointed a Task Force on Discipline Advancement. It was created to respond to difficult times being experienced by communication programs. Forensics is faced with similar challenges. The advice of the Task Force is relevant to our activity as much as it is to the field of communication as a whole.

The Task Force report provided suggestions designed to improve the status of the discipline in the eyes of other academic fields. In our situation, we need to use some of the same advice to raise our position within the communication discipline itself. Three suggestions in the report provide a blueprint for forensics to follow to improve our standing. The report argues that to be effective, we would need to emphasize high quality, centrality to the mission of communication, and to build our interdisciplinary connections. As a guide these recommendations offer ways for us to build our standing within the communication discipline and to other audiences.

Forensics promotes training in communication skills which can go further than in-class experiences. The quality of that experience needs to be emphasized outside of the forensics discipline. Misconceptions abound about the competitive speech and debate experience. Common complaints about rates of speed in debate or formulaic individual events keep us from identifying the benefits of the activity.

Debate promotes strong research and reasoning skills which go beyond most in-class speaking or writing assignments. The time and commitment of debate competitors manifests itself in skills which can be successfully transferred to a variety of professional experiences. Once removed from the competitive debate environment, debaters are more than capable of using effective delivery and other communication skills. Evaluations of debate based on the competitive environment do an injustice to the excellence which the activity promotes. These benefits need to be made evident to others in the discipline.

The same concern exists for individual events. The competitive environment tends to hide the accomplishments of the speech experience. Few students only limit themselves to a single event or type of event. As a complete experience, this combination of events teaches students a variety of skills they will adapt to their future experiences. We teach students these skills in focused activities which emphasize certain abilities. The final product is a student who can demonstrate a wide variety of skills.

For debate and speech we need to promote the scholarship necessary to demonstrate what coaches have known all along. Comparisons should be made between the educational environment offered in the classroom and in the competitive environment. If the laboratory metaphor for forensics still has merit, we need to conduct the experiments necessary to prove our value. We produce an excellent product, skilled student communicators. They serve their universities and colleges in addition to serving their own future careers. Within the communication discipline, and to other departments and parts of the academic field, we need to emphasize the quality we produce and back that up with relevant evidence.

One means of demonstrating the excellence that represents forensics is to demonstrate its importance to the central mission of communication programs. Programs will exhibit differences in their missions. We must identify the missions or goals of our individual departments and place our programs squarely within those parameters. If part of a research institution, then forensic scholarship needs to be developed and encouraged. If teaching is the central focus of the college, these contributions deserve to be promoted. Land grant institutions have a tradition of service to their communities, forensics as a service activity can be promoted (Brand).

A useful exercise, rarely performed by forensics programs, is to write mission statements. To put down on paper tangible plans and goals for a program will help give it focus and coherence. These can be shared with other department members and administrators. Establishing a basis for evaluation would help a program demonstrate its successes. Working these out in conjunction with departments provides some common understanding and a place to start building bridges from. When a forensic team undergoes a transition in leadership, the mission statement can be a guide to future leaders and participants in the program.

A final response we need to pursue is to build our contact and relationships with other disciplines. We are interdisciplinary, especially in the students we work with. We need to help other departments learn to value their majors experiences with our activity. The legal community has long recognized the values inherent in debate and speech experiences. Some law schools offer specific scholarships to debate students interested in legal training. Baylor University, for example, offers two Leon Jaworski Scholarships for outstanding student debaters.

The leadership of Pi Kappa Delta have been building their connections to the

National Forensic League. By making contacts with the high school forensic community, we open our activity to the participation and awareness of a large and active body of teachers and administrators. Similar outreach is being attempted by the Cross Examination Debate Association.

We need to be a valued source of information and experience for a campus. In this past semester alone, my program has made connections with a variety of activities and organizations outside of our communication program. We are using our experience and expertise to help other fields build and employ communication skills for greater learning. For example, we have made contact with our state 4-H organization which is looking to update and evaluate its high school public speaking experiences. Our student activities organization has used members of our debate team to perform a public debate on campus during its alcohol awareness week. Our students provide coaching assistance to local high schools. Coaches have helped teachers in other departments to conduct in-class debate activities. A masters research proposal is being developed using competitive speech as a model to help prepare students for judging competitive livestock events. Each of these experience touches members of a larger community, one that extends beyond forensics coaches and contestants as well as departmental colleagues.

All of these recommendations require time, energy, and expertise. We must get beyond thinking of ourselves as simply a competitive activity. Recent debates to limit the forensic season, to certify judges, or to restructure events are fine for the purpose of influencing the competitive speech and debate tournament. They do not, however, alter the environment these tournaments exist in. An environment where coaches move through programs like a revolving door, where tenured coaches leave the activity after their dues have been paid, or where programs are cut or diminished because they do not have an informed audience with advocates beyond the DOF to represent themselves when faced with imminent extinction.

At the beginning of this paper, I argued that we must work harder to represent our activity more successfully. The Director of Forensics is a forensic educator, a member of the communication discipline with special skills and knowledge which can be shared throughout the academic environment. It is time that we, along with our national organizations and colleagues, begin to tell our story and to establish a place for ourselves in the discipline.

REFERENCES:

Brand, J.D. (1996). Collegiate Forensic Outreach to High Schools: Supporting the Forensic Community. *National Forensic Journal*, 14, 37-44.

National Communication Association. (1996). Advancement of the Discipline. (An executive summary may be found on the NCA homepage, http://www.natcom.org