DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 688 CS 506 851

TITLE	Proceedings of the Developmental Conference on the Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta in the Forensic Community (St. Louis, Missouri, March 22, 1989).
INSTITUTION	Pi Kappa Delta. National Council.
PUB DATE	22 Mar 89
NOTE	102p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Audience Awareness; *Debate; *Educational Planning; Higher Education; High Schools; *Long Range Planning; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Objectives; *Persuasive Discourse; Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*Debate Tournaments; Educational Issues; *Pi Kappa Delta

ABSTRACT

Reflecting the ideas, suggestions, and criticisms offered by members of Pi Kappa Delta as to the organization's future role in the forensic community, these proceedings deal with organizational structure and processes; competitive and noncompetitive outlets; pedagogy and research; and inter-forensic organizational cooperation. The papers are as follows: "The Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta: Our Challenge for the Year 2000 and Beyond" (Dor R. Swanson); "Ethical Principle in the Forensic Organization" (Don Brownlee); "Organizational Structure and Process: Are Changes Needed to Carry Pi Kappa Delta into the Future?" (Robert A. Ridley); "A Proposal to Change the Procedures for Gaining Membership in Pi Kappa Delta" (James E. Norwig); "A Proposal to Increase Student Participation within the Ranks of Pi Kappa Delta" (Susan Miskelly); "Expanding the Audience-Centered Nature of Debate: An Analysis of Non-Competitive Outlets" (Rita K. Whillock); "PKD--Opportunities for Campus and Community Enhancement" (Margaret Greynolds); "A Discussion of Awards at the National Tournament: Do We Need To Change?" (Pamela S. Joraanstad); "Key Issues in Forensic Pedagogy and Research" (Carolyn Keefe); "Documenting Innovation and Tradition: Research Opportunities for Forensic Educators" (Kristine Bartanen); "Strengthening the Tournament Experience: Developing a More Explicit Set of Expectations for Our Judges" (Colan T. Hanson); "Interforensic Organizational Cooperation: The Increasing Need" (Sally A. Roden); "Ethnic and Cross-Cultural Challenges in the Role of Honorary in the Forensics Community" (L. Crowder Churchill); and "Forensic Assistance Program" (William A. Yaremchuk). Recommendations of four working groups are included. A list of participants concludes the report. (NKA)

Published by
Pi Kappa Delta at
North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105

For additional copies, write or call:

Harold Widvey, Secretary-Treasurer
Pi Kappa Delta
Department of Speech Communication
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007-1197
1-605-697-6132

FORWARD

The idea for a developmental conference on the future role of Pi Kappa Delta in the forensic community came from a need felt by the leaders of the organization to listen to the advice of its members. These proceedings reflect the ideas, suggestions, and criticisms offered by members of the organization and were presented as papers in St. Louis, Missouri, as a part of the 1989 National Convention and Tournament activities sponsored by Pi Kappa Delta.

The conference offered four working groups, each featuring different aspects of the organization: Organizational structure and processes; competitive and non-competitive outlets; pedagogy and research; and inter-forensic organizational cooperation. Panelists presented papers, respondents commented, and together, these groups developed recommendations to become a "legislative agenda" for the future leaders of Pi Kappa Delta.

These proceedings present the papers of the featured presentations and the recommendations that were forthcoming. In addition, the keynote address delivered by Professor Don Swanson is included.

The papers for the proceedings were edited based upon guidelines provided to each presenter. These proceedings represent the best copy possible from the papers submitted for inclusion.

The developmental conference was well received. Pi Kappa Delta plans to offer additional conferences as a part of its biennial convention and tournament in future years. It is the hope of the National Council that these proceedings will provide a resource to Pi Kappa Delta faculty, students, and alumni members, and to the forensic community, at large.

August 1, 1989

Robert S. Littlefield
Conference Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward III

The Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta: Our Challenge for the Year 2000 and Beyond 1
Don R. Swanson

Ethical Principle in the Forensic Organization 11
Don Brownlee

Organizational Structure and Process: Are Changes Needed to Carry Pi Kappa Delta into the Future? 15
Robert A. Ridley

A Proposal to Change the Procedures for Gaining Membership in Pi Kappa Delta 20
James E. Norwig

A Proposal to Increase Student Participation Within the Ranks of Pi Kappa Delta 27
Susan Miskelly

Expanding the Audience-Centered Nature of Debate: An Analysis of Non-Competitive Outlets 29
Rita K. Whillock

PKD - Opportunities for Campus and Community Enhancement 33
Margaret Greynolds

A Discussion of Awards at the National Tournament: Do We Need To Change? 41
Pamela S. Joraanstad

Key Issues in Forensic Pedagogy and Research 45
Carolyn Keefe

Documenting Innovation and Tradition: Research Opportunities for Forensic Educators 53
Kristine Bartanen

Strengthening the Tournament Experience: Developing a More Explicit Set of Expectations for our Judges 61
Colan T. Hanson

Interforensic Organizational Cooperation: The Increasing Need 68
Sally A. Roden

Ethnic and Cross-Cultural Challenges in the Role of Honorary in the Forensics Community 73
L. Crowder Churchill

Forensic Assistance Program 87
William A. Yaremchuk

Recommendations 93

THE FUTURE ROLE OF PI KAPPA DELTA: OUR CHALLENGE FOR THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND

Don R. Swanson, Keynote Speaker
Willamette University

A Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament is a time to celebrate. We do that well with our rituals and spirit of fellowship. But we cannot afford to be complacent. We must not only celebrate; we must examine. In particular we must examine to see if we are true to our roots. We must examine to see whether we live up to our stated goals. The National Council is to be commended for recognizing the need for examination and establishing this developmental conference. We should be very grateful to Robert Littlefield who deserves our thanks for his energy and commitment to developing a quality conference.

I have been reflecting as I prepared to speak to you. I have thought about why I love forensics, why I chose this profession, and why I have continued as a forensic educator for a quarter of a century. And the more I reflected, the more I considered questions and answers that seemed commonplace, but aren't expressed as often as they ought to be. So I will express them generally as the crises I see forensics facing, the opportunity Pi Kappa Delta has to be instrumental in shaping the future and the challenges of forensic leadership.

Pi Kappa Delta faces a future full of challenge because the educational activity of forensics faces significant challenges. Some in the forensic community even feel that forensics faces a challenge to survive. In general, I view two major crises. The crisis of elitism and the crisis of ethics.

The Crisis of Elitism

On most campuses, if forensics is to remain strong it cannot promote excessive elitism. Because forensics tends to attract bright students who aspire to future leadership, there is a type of elitism present. But a problem exists when the activity of forensics develops participation barriers that significantly limit the ability of quality students to participate. Now if the phrase "significantly limit the ability to participate," was examined as a debate proposition we would have to define terms. We have various operational definitions of how selective we can and should be. Some parts of the country offer three divisions of forensic events, novice, junior, and senior. Other areas offer one open division. The American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament was established to be a highly selective national tournament. For 117 years, the Interstate Oratorical Association National Contest has included only the top two orators from each state. The National Forensic Association National Tournament qualification procedure allows for a broad range of participation. The National Debate Tournament, that was traditionally highly selective, has become less selective over the years. The Cross Examination Debate Association is under pressure to establish selective qualification standards for participation. The arguments for and against tournament inclusion or exclusion are familiar to us. But simply discussing the qualification procedures for tournaments does not address the crisis of elitism. Routine opera-

tional behavior and the degree of entry level barriers provide a better definition of the level of elitism that is present. I do not presume to be able to clearly define the level of elitism that is present in all of the various facets of forensics, but I know that a problem results when we allow it to become too elite. To illustrate, I turn to the familiar historical example of policy debate.

Witness the crisis that our activity NDT debate found itself in by becoming more elite. The entry level barriers, esoteric presentation style, selective judging pools, and excessive research demands, all combined to enhance the elite nature of the activity. As high school team debate increasingly adopts the same elite features, they are experiencing a resultant drop in participation. NFL President Frank Sferra related to me recently that high school team debate has experienced an 8 percent decrease in participation during each of the last three years. In an article in the October 10, 1988 issue of *The New Republic* entitled, "The Decline of Debate: Pull It Across Your Flow," Michael McCough, a former debater, examines high school policy debate. His discoveries and discontent with the evolution of debate, are not a surprise to speech educators, and provide an explanation for the decline of debate. ". . . form comes to dominate content . . . the power of the flow pad is what moves . . . the real debate takes place on the notepad, not at the podium. . . . Quantity of arguments, however, comes at the expense of quality . . . the absurdity of the argument will not be held against you. In the surreal world of abstraction that is debate, one argument is as good as another--provided that it is supported by a 'quote card' from an expert. . . ." McCough characterizes speakers using "robotic effect," the "drill instructor mode," and an incomprehensible speed that ". . .sounds like the motormouth in the Federal Express commercials." The article goes on to point out what I consider to be the root of the problem, the incestuous elitism of debate. "The 'debate community' is so inbred that many judges . . . are ex-debaters, and thus votaries of the flow sheet." When it is suggested that "lay" judges be used, ". . .the prevailing feeling is that they should not. The resistance to "lay" judges points up a dirty secret about debate; a lot of its attraction is based on snob appeal." And as debaters often say, ". . .it has nothing to do with the real world."

I have quoted McCough's article at length because his observations shatter the illusions of many parents and educational administrators who support debate. They support debate because they believe that it is ". . .an oasis of liberal learning in the intellectual desert." But as debate evolves what is it really? Where is it going? Is CEDA debate capable of remaining true to its roots and maintaining an audience orientation and an application of sound rhetorical principles? Many observers say that question is already moot. Can the NDT survive? Can the American Debate Association revive policy debate? Will the move to Lincoln-Douglas debate in high schools preserve opportunities for students to debate with an audience orientation? Because I have focused on debate to illustrate, please do not think that individual events are immune to elitism. Should public speaking competition appeal to the public? Is the public qualified to judge forensic events? What have we accomplished if we have trained students only to appeal to a "qualified" forensic critic? What have we done when we take the act of public communication and make it essentially a private act? In short, what if we are creating an elite group of people whose

key skill is to talk "forensics" to each other? For many forensic educators answers to these questions raise ethical issues.

The Crisis of Ethics

I am concerned about the state of current practice in debate. As a coach, I have witnessed an evolution of debate practice that is reflected well in McCough's comments. Questions regarding debate practice are questions of ethics to me. I recognize, as Carolyn Keefe does in her textbook chapter, "Debate Ethics and Morality," that ". . .individuals directly concerned with the activity of debate do not agree about the domain of ethics, what constitutes ethical behavior, and to what degree ethical standards can and should be enforced." However, one of my favorite professors, William S. Howell, has written that "ethical considerations in human events surface only when they are consciously classified as significant issues. Most of the time, people carry on their day-by-day activities with never a thought about the moral rightness or wrongness of what they are doing. Occasionally, however, doubts about the morality of their own actions or the activities of others do become a matter of concern." We all know that there are many who love debate and forensics who have serious concerns about its contemporary state. We should worry. There are a lot of speech doubts about the morality of many contemporary debate practices. What if we are alienating the key people whose support we most need?

Is it not a professor's responsibility to profess what he or she has studied and contemplated? Do we as professors profess the standards and principles of sound and competent rhetoric? Have we been true to the traditions and intent of forensic education. Do we, as rhetoricians, advocate effectively for what we believe? I believe in "good" rhetoric which I define in the following manner.

Good rhetoric is not incomplete rhetoric. Contrary to what some debate practitioners would espouse, complex rhetoric is not necessarily better rhetoric. Even information theorists indicate that information overload does not constitute good rhetoric. Good rhetoric adapts to the audience, a dictum which does not imply that the rhetorician selects only a highly selective subset of the audience to appeal to. The good rhetorician is capable of following the Ciceronian model and explaining in a manner that the ordinary listener can understand. The good rhetorician works to accomplish excellence in all of the canons of rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery.

Do I assume too much when I assume a rhetorical perspective for forensics practice? Has the traditional rationale for forensic education not been that it teaches the principles of rhetoric and serves as a laboratory for rhetorical skill development? Isn't it an ethical stance to insist that our forensic activities reflect the teaching of all of the canons of rhetoric. Is it not also an ethical stance to expect, as Carolyn Keefe does in her discussion of "Debate Ethics and Morality," that debate should "develop an appreciation of systematic change as a basis for democratic action. . ." and ". . .foster concern for interpersonal relationships in the debate community"? It is an ethical question when we ask: does the content of our forensics teaching prepare

students to deal with the reality of how rhetoric is applied in the "real world"? But how is rhetoric applied in the real world? Don't worry, be happy! This theme represents the most successful song lyric and Presidential campaign theme of this current academic year. Don't worry, be happy! It has appeal, and behavioral impact, but is it ethical rhetoric? The ethical expectation of accurate representation is something we all learned a long time ago. We learned that "saying something, doesn't make it so." For example, isn't there a tinge of demagoguery to presidential candidate Bush saying "I want to be known as the education president," and then in his first month in office proposing further cuts in the federal education budget? Would it not be unethical for me to assert that we face no significant challenges as forensic educators, or to say that because Pi Kappa Delta is strong and healthy in 1989, it will remain so in the future? Are we demagogues when we extol the goal achievement of our forensic programs? Are we ethical when we justify forensics to those who support our programs?

Pi Kappa Delta's Challenge

Pi Kappa Delta is unique among all the forensic organizations. We are unique because of the types of institutions and forensic programs that affiliate with Pi Kappa Delta. We are unique because we cherish and nourish our history and culture. We are unique because we strive to accomplish a balance between the various purposes we serve. We are unique because we do not just manage tournaments; we seek to lead our members to a quality forensic experience. The Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta states:

> It shall be the purpose of this fraternity to stimulate progress in and to further the interests of intercollegiate speech activities and communication in an effort to provide functional leadership training for life, to foster beneficial competition in intercollegiate speech and communication activities, and at the same time encourage a spirit of fellowship, brotherly cooperation, and incentive to achievement.

A concise statement of our mission then is to provide functional leadership training, foster beneficial competition, encourage fellowship, and provide recognition for achievement. How does that differ from other forensic organizations? All would certainly express their reason for existence as to provide, encourage and regulate intercollegiate competition. Perhaps our mission is not drastically different. But I think our emphasis is somewhat unique. We state that we stimulate speech activities "in an effort to provide functional leadership training." It is stated first and provides an overarching reason for doing what we do.

Pi Kappa Delta colleges and universities are special and perhaps even unique. Perhaps stereotypes are unrealistic, but I would speculate that by comparison to non-Pi Kappa Delta Schools, Pi Kappa Delta schools are more likely to have a forensic program that enjoys strong support from an academic department of speech communication, more likely to be funded through stable academic funding rather than student government controlled funding, more likely to be a school with a strong commitment to liberal arts education, and more likely to enjoy

significant moral support from the campus community. Now if these features of my stereotype are accurate, there is a casual connection to be drawn. Pi Kappa Delta schools are affiliated with this honorary because of its rich tradition and its goals. What does this broad stereotype indicate? It indicates that Pi Kappa Delta schools have the ability to take a leadership role in maintaining quality in the intercollegiate forensic experience.

Because of its basic mission, its history and its people, Pi Kappa Delta is destined to lead the forensic community. Perhaps I can best explain this proposition by an analogical application a field of study of managerial leadership.

In my own teaching of leadership, I have a fondness for a variety of concepts. The general concepts of leadership are fairly simple. In their 1987 book, *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done In Organizations*, Santa Clara University professors James Kouzes and Barry Posner's research has caused them to discover five basic behavioral commitments in the cases of "best leadership." They not only considered a variety of major leadership studies, but worked with the American Management Association in a comprehensive study of 1500 managers. (Note the debate coach trying to provide an adequate source cite.) I have borrowed the Kouzes/Posner labels because I think they represent concepts we all recognize, and they fit the challenge of forensic leadership that Pi Kappa Delta faces in the future. They are "challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart." My guess is that just listening to these labels, you have a feel for how they fit the leadership of Pi Kappa Delta. I am fortunate to be able to speak to you today and assert some ways in which I believe these commitments are fulfilled by Pi Kappa Delta and to open a discussion of how Pi Kappa Delta might fulfill its commitments in the future. I am also fortunate that I am free to generalize since I precede the real work of the developmental conference where carefully developed ideas will be deliberated.

We are all familiar with leadership bromides. Their value is to stir our concern. Our shared concern is finding methods that might enable us to bring leadership concepts to fruition through our actions. How does Pi Kappa Delta act, and how can it act in the future to provide functional leadership training for life?

Challenging the Process

To challenge the process really means to search for innovation that will improve the activity. Pi Kappa Delta has always taken the lead in studying the rationale for and then trying new approaches to forensic competition. In 1987, President Gary Horn said, "Not only have we been willing and able to change to meet the needs of members but on many fronts we have been the first to make new and innovative moves." The reference is to that historical legacy of innovation that we are all proud of. As Horn pointed out, we can look at our recent innovations. For example, we took the lead in advancing CEDA debate to our national tournament, and we worked to diversify the scope of individual event opportunities. We work to nourish our members after they graduate by supporting alumni chapters. We are having this developmental conference today.

We are actively pursuing innovation. James McGregor Burns in his seminal volume on leadership could well have been referring to Pi Kappa Delta when he said, "The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people's enduring needs." Our innovations tend to endure because they are based on our commitment to our goals.

Our challenge is to continue innovation. Change simply to have change has not been a Pi Kappa Delta goal; the goal has been to discover the innovations that improve our pedagogy and practice. How can we now challenge the process of forensic education and competition? Many of us have ideas, and we shall hear stimulating ideas for change this afternoon in our developmental conference.

Inspiring a Shared Vision

The simple fact that we are engaged in this developmental conference today indicates our desire to share our vision of forensics education. Many fraternal colleagues have preceded us and shared their vision with us. Sharing the vision is an important process.

Those who view an honorary's role narrowly may criticize with the claim that the leadership consists of the dinosaurs who are no longer the most active forensic directors. When I was younger, that criticism may have appeared valid to me, but the more I learn about organizational culture, the more I realize we need the dinosaurs. We need "the Order of the Beards," and the Hall of Fame. The history, tradition, rites, rituals, and anecdotes about past Pi Kappa Delta heroes are to be cherished. They are to be cherished because they provide the real sense of "we" as a community, dedicated to common goals, moving forward to meet our timeless aspirations.

Our challenge is to not only challenge the process and work to improve forensic practice, but also to share that vision with others.

Enabling Others to Act

The theory of organizational leadership embodies the tenet that successful leadership will come from building a coalition of supporters and collaborators. For forensic programs to be successful they need the support of a number of constituencies. Rather than discuss all of those groups, I will focus on the most important support group we can have. It i the group that provides our most significant resource and raw material.

I believe that we frequently fail in our meager efforts to gain the support and collaboration of our secondary school forensic colleagues. They view us with suspicion and frequently feel that our only interest in them is to grab their tournament fees and recruit their outstanding competitors. Some send their students to summer forensic workshops conducted on a college or university campus. Too frequently they have a highly negative reaction to much of what their students learned. And they blame the entire forensic community for the kind of training their students receive in these workshops. There is a disturbing trend in too many school districts to employ a non-teacher as the forensic coach. This hired gun usually lacks training in rhetoric or argumentation, and

focuses the program's energy on filling the trophy case. By the way, have you ever asked high school forensic coaches about their academic background in the field of speech communication? I challenge you to survey coaches at the next high school tournament you sponsor. In the survey ask if they have taken courses in public speaking, argumentation, oral interpretation, rhetorical theory, or the pedagogy of directing speech activities. When we realize their educational deficiencies, we begin to understand why the students that come to our programs from theirs, lack an understanding of the principles that underlie forensic practice. Secondary forensic educators, who are serious about providing quality forensic instruction, face an enormous task. Why is their forensic program different from the various competing activities that Optimist, VFW, American Legion contests, model legislative assemblies and model UN. Secondary school forensic programs should be different because they are grounded on a solid base of forensic and rhetorical theory. Many teachers would like to feel comfortable turning to us as a resource. Many of these educators simply want to know that we share common concerns and educational goals for our students.

Our challenge is not only to strengthen all of our members to be better forensic competitors, coaches and critics, but to work with all members of the forensic community to strengthen the activity. We enable others when we teach them what we know and believe. We must examine Pi Kappa Delta's past educational efforts and develop methods to reinstitute, refine and extend those efforts. You will hear some excellent ideas addressing this challenge this afternoon.

Modeling the Way

Contemporary forensic practice is largely a result of modeling behavior. Students model the behavior of other competitors and of their judges. We serve as powerful models in many of our coaching techniques. But perhaps our most significant impact derives from how we model rhetorical criticism as a forensic judge.

All of us who are members of the Order of Instruction and serve as judges in our national tournament, bear a responsibility by virtue of our designation as members of the Order of Instruction. I do not believe that as we enter a round we are just a "judge" placed in the competition to render a technical decision. We are forensic educators placed in a critic/judge position in order to foster the personal growth of the student competitors. If I am serious about my designation as a member of the Order of Instruction, the implications are: I cannot function as a tabula rasa judge. If I am to fulfill my moral responsibility as a Member of the Order of Instruction, I must function as an interventionist educator. There are some things I cannot leave outside the door as I enter a competitive round of speaking. I cannot leave outside, or refuse to apply, my knowledge of the self-evident truths of the world, or my knowledge and experience with rhetoric, argumentation and communication theory. I challenge you, as you judge in this and other tournaments, to remember your pledge as a member of the Order of Instruction. If you remember the pledge you will not just play judge, you will instruct! I know, some might point out that we interventionists, are a minority. So what? We have the solid basis of

forensic tradition and rhetorical theory to back us up. Those contemporary gamesmanship practices that do not reflect the theory of our academic discipline are ripe for criticism. We, members of the Order of Instruction are the critics. If we have a commitment to the goals of our honorary, we will model the appropriate judge behavior. Remember the Pi Kappa Delta motto: "The art of persuasion beautiful and just." Our motto is not "The science of winning a ballot, expeditious and strategic."

Encouraging the Heart

Our motto not only indicates our aspirations for our rhetorical endeavors, but it also sets a socio-emotional tone.

Perhaps it is difficult in the heat of competition to consider the true emotional nature of relationships in the forensic community. Yet any of us who reflect on our own competitive experience realize it is the relationships that endure long after the pot metal tarnishes and the plastic flakes away from the trophies we collected. Ask any Pi Kappa Delta national officer why they are willing to put forth enormous effort on behalf of the organization, and they will respond that they love the activity and want to give something back to the activity which has given them so much. Ask any Pi Kappa Delta competitor what they remember most about a national convention and tournament and they will respond with stories about the comradery of their team and the new friends they made. Yes, I think it is fair to assert that Pi Kappa Delta members love the art of persuasion, beautiful and just. But as members, we also share a fraternal love for each of our colleagues in the fraternity. That love takes the form of an active celebration of each other's accomplishments, an active recognition of excellence, active help and support to enable all to improve their communication skills, and active fellowship that builds the comradery of Pi Kappa Deltans. That is a cultural feature of our honorary. In the corporate world, organizations would envy and strive to accomplish what Pi Kappa Delta has accomplished. Deal and Kennedy in *Corporate Cultures* identify the key features of a strong culture in an organization as the "shared values," the "heroes," and the "rites and rituals." Organizations wishing to build a stronger culture are encouraged to engage their members in the definition and repeated expression of their core values. They are taught that those values are hollow unless they are operationalized in their organizational behavior. The values are constantly reassessed in light of the ongoing life of the organization. It is important to note that the stories need to be retold of those who were instrumental in developing the organization and its core values, i.e., the heroes should be celebrated. And organizations wishing to have a "strong culture" are taught to institutionalize their "rites and rituals." The positive recognition and reinforcement that rites and rituals bring to a culture, creates a climate of mutual support that enhances both individual and organizational growth.

What would an organization culture scholar discover in doing a cultural assessment of Pi Kappa Delta? Our initiation ritual reinforces our shared values. Our rituals have not changed significantly since our founders put them into words almost 80 years ago. The rhetorical standards we value continue to be refined and enhanced by research, but the basic rhetorical standards we

apply to our activity fount from those that Aristotle developed. The members of the Pi Kappa Delta Hall of Fame are our heroes and their inspiration lives on in our anecdotes, our records, and the excellent volume of history that has been compiled by our historian, Larry Norton.

What changes does the next century hold for Pi Kappa Delta and forensics? Where is our "place"? I refer to our "place" in the manner that Joshua Meyrowitz defines it. In 1984 his book, *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*, won the Speech Communication Association Golden Anniversary Book Award. He says that "social roles (i.e., social 'place') can be understood only in terms of social situations," and we should strive to understand how the "ways we transmit and receive social information" are changing. How will society's rhetorical practices change and how should forensic education confront those changes?

We as communication scholars and practitioners living in an information age may confront challenges and pressures on forensic education that we are unable to envision today. Enrollment trends indicate more students desire to study communication. Roger Ailes, communication consultant and debate coach for Presidents Reagan and Bush, preaches that "You are speaking the message," and aspiring politicians see value in refining their speaking skills. The relationship of communication skill to personal success is atopic of frequent discussion. Thus, we know that there will be a demand for education and activity designed to increase oral communication skills.

In *No Sense of Place*, Meyrowitz envisions computers "democratizing information access." A friend who is a management scholar recently related similar thoughts, and I think a paraphrase of his comments illustrates how change may affect our concerns. In the past information has always been power. But with the increasing universality of computers in management, all organizational leaders will have access to the information they need to decide and support their decisions. Power will increasingly be held by those who can communicate the information. Those individuals who stand out above the crowd, who truly become successful leaders, will be those who have developed the outstanding oral communication skills to be able to persuade others to act on the shared information.

I am not a futurist, and I tend to be amazed by the pace of change in our society. So I am not going to attempt to play futurist, but I can wonder, express hope, and raise questions.

I wonder--what will our concerns be at the Pi Kappa Delta Convention in 2001? I wonder--will our mission and our tournament procedures be the same? It will be intriguing to look back over the 12 years since this developmental conference and discuss the innovations that have occurred. I hope that in 2001 we take stock and see that Pi Kappa Delta has asserted a leadership role and is a successful advocate for forensics with groups like the ACA, Association of Communication Administrators, and is showing the way for programs maintaining forensics as a co-curricular activity on a majority of American campuses. In 2001, I hope that we find Pi Kappa Delta has a significant relationship with forensic education services to secondary schools. And as the fine secondary

school programs view the Pi Kappa Delta model, they strive to maintain a strong relationship to the curriculum rather than functioning as just another club or extra-curricular activity. In 2001, I hope we experience enormous pressure from our alumni chapters for increased interaction with them. I hope that we find our alumni are not only eager judges of our competition but that our old alums are welcomed as judges by our student competitors. But most of all, I hope at our convention in 2001, we are all still finding enlightenment, the thrills of competition, and the warmth of the support of our Pi Kappa Delta brothers and sisters.

But the future may well be framed by some of the general questions I have raised today. When you consider your perspective, my questions may or may not be on target for you, but my guess is that some of them stir a reaction. What if we abandon the mission of providing functional leadership training? What if we fail to innovate and challenge the process? What if we fail to share our vision of forensics? What if we fail to work to strengthen all elements of the forensic community? What if we fail to intervene with our values and knowledge when we function as critic/judges? What if we fail to maintain the unique culture of Pi Kappa Delta? What if we create an elite group of people whose key skill is to talk "forensics" to each other? What if we alienate the very people whose support we most need?

If we do not answer the nagging questions about our activity, we cannot expect those outside of the forensic community to listen, respect or support forensics. What if we do not address these questions?

REFERENCES

Burns, J.M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Deal, T.E., and A.A. Kennedy. *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Howell, W.S. *The Empathic Communicator*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1982.

Keefe, C., T.B. Harte, and L.E. Norton. *Introduction to Debate*. New York: MacMillan, 1982.

Kouzes J.M. and B.Z. Posner. *The Leadership Challenge: How To Get Extra-Ordinary Things Done In Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

McCough, M. "Pull It Across Your Flow." *The New Republic*. October 10, 1988. pp. 17-19.

Meyrowitz, J. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media On Social Behavior*. New York: Oxford, 1985.

Parson, D.W. *American Forensics In Perspective*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Assoc., 1984.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLE IN THE FORENSIC ORGANIZATION

Don Brownlee
CSU Northridge
Northridge, California

This paper explores the ethical principles that should ground the structure of any educational organization. Comparisons are made to the organization documents of other academic organizations.

The above statement establishes the founding principles upon which Pi Kappa Delta currently is structured and operates. Any proposed changes in organizational structure imply that either current structure fails to meet these principles or additional principles for the organization are warranted. The following pages establish the general ethical principles that serve as the foundation for academic associations and organizations.

Beyond questions, Pi Kappa Delta is an academic organization. The purpose identifies intercollegiate activity as central to Pi Kappa Delta. Article III, detailing the organizational structure, only provides for undergraduate chapters at colleges and universities. Pi Kappa Delta would not exist outside of this academic environment.

The Role of Ethics

Ethics has become a vital concern in American society. The ethical standards of government leaders have received considerable coverage by this nation's mass media. Equally important to the American public are corporate ethics. From truth in advertising to concerns for environmental degradation, businesses confront ethical dilemmas.

Educational institutions have not been overlooked in this growing awareness of ethics. Stories in the media have reported on problems with athletic recruiting, racism on campus, fraud in scientific research, as well as questionable faculty conduct. "Educational institutions are finding themselves in the position of being challenged to develop guidelines for their members along various fronts, all falling under the rubric of ethics," claims Rachelle Hollander of the National Science Foundation.[1] These ethical concerns apply to faculty, administrators and students alike.

Educational organizations demonstrate their concern for ethics in a variety of ways. Most academic organizations have adopted formal codes of ethics. William Howell describes the evolution of these codes:

> Prescribed standards evolve from the experience of many, many people over considerable periods of time and hence tend to be uniform and stable, at least as compared to individual interpretations. Prescribed ethics in a community can be consolidated in a list of "should" and "should not" statements that define approved ways of living for members of that collective.[2]

These codes are not necessarily recent reactions to the ethical dilemmas confronted in academia, as the National Education Association's first code was adopted in 1929. Since that time, dozens of other organizations have constructed their own codes to identify the standards of conduct they believe appropriate to their discipline.

Ethical concerns of an organization are not exclusively located within such codes. Articles II of the Constitution embodies Pi Kappa Delta's ethical standards as much as would any code. Are these ethical standards adequate for grounding the structure of Pi Kappa Delta? A consideration of the ethical principles of other organizations will address this question.

Ethical Principles

What values should educational organizations promote? Robert Brown and LuAnn Krager suggest five: autonomy, nonmaleficence, beneficence, justice and fidelity.[3] These principles are heavily based on the work of Tom Beauchamp and James Childress in the development of biomedical ethics.[4]

Autonomy refers to freedom of choice and action. Beauchamp and Childress explain:

> The autonomous person determines his or her course of action in accordance with a plan chosen by himself or herself. Such a person deliberates about and chooses plans and is capable of acting on the basis of such deliberations . . . .[5]

Educators should aim to develop students capable of establishing their own goals and acting to accomplish those objectives. Academic association guidelines that promote student autonomy are consistent with these ethical principles.

The maxim primum non nocere - "above all, do no harm" - well describes the concept of nonmaleficence. Educators must avoid intentionally doing injury to students or placing students in situations that create substantial risk of harm. Such considerations include the need "to know the personal and professional demands on the student's life" and "to be sensitive to the student's time and competency limitations."[6]

While closely related to nonmaleficence, beneficence requires that individuals contribute to each other's well-being. Nonmaleficence is negative, avoiding action. Beneficence, on the other hand, is a positive duty placed on those involved in education to enhance each individual's worth. This principle is consistently found in almost all ethical codes of the education profession.

Justice, in the view of John Rawls, is best equated with fairness, rewarding each person with what they are due.[7] In other words, equals should be treated equally, regardless of concerns for race, gender, or socioeconomic status. This ethical principle is embodied in the vast number of statutes promoting educational equity in our schools and across the nation.

The final principle of fidelity involves faithfulness or loyalty. Fidelity demands that the concerns of educational participants for each other's well-being extend beyond the confines of the classroom or campus. All educational participants are to remain faithful to each other outside the instructional context.

Principles for Pi Kappa Delta

Does Pi Kappa Delta's Constitution promote these principles? Without examining the entire document, we can consider the organization's purpose statement for an answer. Autonomous students appea to be a clear objective of Pi Kappa Delta. The purpose indicates that PKD will "provide functional leadership training for life." Beyond the confines of the university, PKD graduates will be capable of independent action, even leadership. The purpose statement specifically speaks of "beneficial competition" and provides for fidelity through its emphasis on "fellowship" and "brotherly cooperation."

The one ethical principle that is ignored in the purpose statement is justice. Article II fails to explicitly mention efforts to promote equality or fairness either among individual members or chapters, though that may be implied from statements in other articles of the Pi Kappa Delta Constitution.

Should there be changes in the Constitution? If so, and if Pi Kappa Delta views itself as an educational association, then those changes should be grounded in fostering one or more of the above mentioned principles. The rational selection among various courses of organizational action can best be made only when consideration of the ethical standards that serve as a foundation for our activity are included in the deliberations. If proposed revisions in the structure of Pi Kappa Delta have no sound educational justification, then they should be suspect.

By no means should these ethical principles be the only factors involved in the evaluation of Constitutional change. The pragmatic concerns for whether changes will function as proposed or whether the objective of the changes will be negated by other ignored aspects of the organizational structure or culture must, likewise, be elements in our calculations. We cannot adopt changes in Pi Kappa Delta's structure merely because they appear consistent with certain higher standards that we endorse.

Nevertheless, we should begin with a firm ethical foundation in any modification of PKD. No matter how small the change, we send a message when we either endorse or contradict important ethical principles of education. We may be about other objectives than educating our students, but that goal should never be far from our deliberations.

NOTES

[1] Denise Magner, "Rash of Ethical Lapses Spurs Colleges to Study Their Moral Responsibilities," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1, February 1989, A11.

[2] William S. Howell, *The Empathic Communicator*. (California: Wadsworth, 1982), p. 188.

[3] Robert Brown and LuAnn Krager, "Ethical Issues In Graduate Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, 56, 1985, p. 403.

[4] Tom Beauchamp and James Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

[5] Beauchamp and Childress, p. 59.

[6] Brown and Krager, p. 406.

[7] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*. (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971).

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS: ARE CHANGES NEEDED TO CARRY PI KAPPA DELTA INTO THE FUTURE?

Robert A. Ridley
Southwest State University
Marshall, Minnesota

The paper will review three articles of the Pi Kappa Delta Constitution: Article III relating to leadership, expenditures, and correspondence; Article IV relating to admission and retention of members and chapters; and Article X relating to amendments. Following a review of the articles, the paper will recommend specific changes, from which the work group will draft resolutions to be presented to the National Convention for ratification at a business meeting.

The Development Conference on the future role of Pi Kappa Delta in the Forensic Community is to be held on Wednesday, March 22, 1989, in St. Louis, Missouri. Papers will be presented in various work groups, including Organization Structure and Process, Competitive and Noncompetitive Outlets, Forensic Pedagogy and Research, and Interforensic Organizational Cooperation. This position paper will be part of the work group considering Organizational Structure and Process and will focus primarily on leadership as stated in Article III of the Pi Kappa Delta Constitution. To a lesser extent, the paper will address Article III - expenditures and correspondence, and Article X - amendments. Following a review of the articles, the paper will recommend specific proposals, from which the work group may draft resolutions to be presented to the National Convention for ratification at a business meeting.

Article III - Organization is composed of three divisions: the Local Chapter, the Province Organization, and the National Organization. For the purpose of this paper, only selected articles dealing with the National Organization will be considered. A brief review of the articles is provided and have been edited to conserve space.

Article 352 states:

> The elective officers . . . shall be a President Elect and five general council members. Of the five general members, two shall be student representative, one man and one woman.

Article 353 states:

> The elective officers shall be chosen as follows: at one of the first business sessions of the National Convention, the three general council members . . . shall be placed on a preferential ballot and submitted to a vote of the Convention. The highest candidate shall be deemed elected President-Elect.

Article 353.1 states:

> The elective officers . . . other than the President-Elect, shall be chosen at a later meeting of the National Convention in the following manner: the Nominating Committee shall submit as candidates the names of five or more persons, three of whom at least have not previously served on the National Council. Other nominations may be made from the floor, . . . the three candidates with the highest ranking shall be deemed elected to the National Council . . . .

Article 355 states:

> The National Secretary-Treasurer shall be nominated by the National Convention and shall serve a term of four years and shall be eligible for an additional term of four years. A third term of two years is possible upon the unanimous recommendation of the National Council and a two-thirds vote of the National Convention.

Article 359 states:

> The National Council shall be composed of the National President, the President-Elect, the five general council members, and the immediate Past-President, and the National Secretary-Treasurer, each of whom shall be a voting member.

In a modern organization, meeting the needs of the membership by selecting the most qualified candidates for office should be a priority. The PKD Constitution no longer provides this opportunity in the most efficient manner, and more thought should be given to the selection and election of final candidates. Article 353 is relatively new and is designed to accommodate a smooth transition to the Office of the President. The leadership scenario anticipated for St. Louis, however, is likely to challenge the very basis of this article. At the time of this writing, one council member chose not to seek re-election to the National Council and one council member has withdrawn as a President-Elect candidate. The result projects the third and final council member, President-Elect by default. The issue is not the qualifications of any one council member, but rather PKD membership not having the opportunity to make a choice. A proposed constitutional amendment regarding Article 353 will be presented for membership approval at a business meeting in St. Louis. It states that the President-Elect shall be chosen as follows: "The nominees for the office . . . shall be three council members, excluding any member who notifies the President . . . of the person's desire to be excluded . . . ; the election shall be by mail ballot . . . ; the election process shall be completed thirty (30) days prior to the National Convention . . . ." This amendment includes two separate issues. I support electing officers prior to the National Convention, however, the amendment does not address the issue of a possible election by default. The first criteria allows one or all three council members to exclude themselves from the process. In short, the problem anticipated

for the President-Elect election in St. Louis can continue to occur under the proposed amendment. The amendment simply will not solve the problems of the President-Elect process and should be rejected in favor of a more workable proposal.

Article 353 presents a secondary issue regarding elections: ". . .the three general council members . . . shall be placed on a preferential ballot and submitted to a vote of the Convention. The highest candidate shall be deemed elected President-Elect." Herein lies the problem. Past national conventions have found nominating committees hastily constructing candidate slates for the National Council, nominations slipped under doors at the eleventh hour, etc. At a business meeting each candidate is given a short amount of time to "sell themselves," and the Convention, within a matter of hours, is forced to make leadership decisions that will affect the organization for years to come.

Article 353.1 identifies a final area of concern by stating, ". . .shall serve for two years or until their successors are elected." This issue will be addressed later in the paper. The leadership issue then is threefold: election by default; preferential ballot submitted to a vote of the Convention; and two year terms of office. I propose several possible solutions. First, the President-Elect and the National Council should not be elected at the National Convention. Amend the constitution for election of officers to be similar to that of the Speech Communication Association, for example. The Nominating Committee would generate a slate of candidates for the National Council, possibly retaining the preferential process. Once the slate is established, each candidate would be asked to address their qualifications, PKD philosophy, etc., to be published in *The Forensic*. Prior to the National Convention, each chapter would be provided with an official ballot. Returns could be tabulated and announced at the Convention. To help insure no election be decided by default, while also providing better representation, I also propose the National Council be enlarged by two members, for a total of seven, of which two might be student representatives. The five council members would be elected for staggered terms, two members with two year terms and three members with four year terms or vice versa. As an additional benefit, this option would also ensure continuity of council business regardless of election outcome. It is possible under the current constitution to elect three new council members resulting in chaos to ongoing business.

Perhaps a more controversial option would be to enlarge the Council by two and shift student representation to ex officio status. Student input is important and highly desirable, however, long term commitments are not possible. A Past-President said it best, ". . .we have had so many come and go, I'm not even sure who the student representatives are at the present time." If student representation is important, then, I propose they be elected the same as other council members for the same term of office. Article 354 specifies election timelines plus one representative is to be from, ". . .the Undergraduate Chapter which is to be host to the National Convention. . ." and one from, ". . .one of the other Undergraduate Chapters in the host province." It would seem that Article 354 is designed to utilize student representation for the sole purpose of providing assistance in hosting the National

Convention. I propose either making student representatives ex officio members or equal partners on the Council. Finally, if the latter is adopted, the Convention needs to rethink the host school, host province requirement. While it might be an administrative convenience to have two student representatives selected from the province hosting the Convention, it might be more important to have quality student representatives, regardless of province. A final option could retain student representation, limited to one vote, while moving a current Council position to ex officio status. One of the more troubling leadership articles is contained in Article 355, which allows the National Secretary-Treasurer to serve up to twelve years, with full voting privileges, while the normal term of office for other Council members is limited to two years. If student representation were to be limited to one vote, then the National Secretary-Treasurer to ex officio status, might prove to be warranted especially if the Secretary-Treasurer and another Council member, both from the same school, would serve office simultaneously. It might not be desirable for any one school to have two votes on business issues and this situation could occur following the upcoming elections. At the very least, I propose the reduction in the possible length of office for the National Secretary-Treasurer. The key elements to the most workable proposal would include: elections prior to the National Convention; increasing the size of the National Council including staggered terms; re-evaluation of student representation roles; better balance in terms of office; and moving the National Secretary-Treasurer to ex officio status.

Restructuring Article III - leadership, is the most important issue addressed in this position paper. Of somewhat lesser importance, but still in need of evaluation, is Article III - expenditures and correspondence, and Article X - amendments. These articles will be reviewed briefly, followed by possible recommendations for change.

Article 351.3 enables the National Council to ". . .have the power to vote expenditures from the National Treasury." Considerable discussion has taken place within the last few years regarding the treasury balance, which I have been told, is dangerously low. It would seem the reason for the current balance is due to a large computer purchase. I support the need to computerize PKD, but to do so to the extent that day-to-day operations become threatened raises serious questions. Some of the questions I recently posed to current Council members were: Is there a check and balance system to insure the treasury does not become depleted? What expertise did the Council rely upon to make the computer purchase? Was an outside agency consulted to insure the correct type of equipment was purchased? Could the purchase have been made over a three year period to avoid such a drastic drain on financial resources? While some of these questions may have been raised, I am left with the impression the Council acted on limited internal advice. If this was the case, I am not confident the Council acted in the best interests of the membership by threatening the financial stability of the organization.

To alleviate crisis financial management, I propose that a limit or percentage be established which the treasury could not fall below without a vote of the membership. It might be wise to formulate some sort of check and balance system to allow for payment of necessary expenditures while at the same time

maintaining financial stability. The issue of finances is delicate because I have not had the opportunity to investigate the financial records of the organization. I also do not wish to sound like the Council deliberately took action to jeopardize financial stability. On major equipment purchases, however, the Council could have taken more time, consulted outside expertise, and spread the purchase over a number of years.

Article 362 presents an interesting dilemma for PKD membership. It states, ". . .the National Council and the Governors of the several provinces shall have power to compel correspondence from Undergraduate Chapters by the assessment of a fine. . . ." The article proposes a fine for failure to comply, however, there is no enforcement possible. Also the irony of this article is that while chapters may be fined for lack of correspondence, the Council and/or Governors cannot. In one province, in a National Convention year, the Governor has not sent any correspondence to the membership. I propose striking any and all articles, such as 362, which cannot be enforced. Secondly, correspondence from the Council and Governors, as well as the Undergraduate Chapters should be strongly encouraged.

Article X addresses amendments to the PKD Constitution. It states, ". . .may be amended at a regular National Convention by a two-third's affirmative vote, . . . or by a three-fourth's affirmative vote in the referendum. . . . All proposed Amendments to the Constitution must be in the hands of the Chairman of the Constitution Revision Committee by May 1 of the year preceding the National Convention." I fully support the concept of a PKD Development Conference, however, if work groups are to draft resolutions to be presented to the entire convention for ratification, Article X will be a major obstacle. While careful consideration should be given to any and all amendments, it seems inappropriate to spend considerable time and effort to host a PKD Development Conference only to have ratification delayed two years. Because the National Convention only convenes every two years and if the Development Conference concept should continue, I propose the membership seriously consider changing Article X to better facilitate draft resolutions.

This paper has attempted to evaluate several important articles in order to answer the question, "Are changes needed to carry Pi Kappa Delta into the future?" While the current Constitution has effectively served the membership in the past, changing times and circumstances continue to remind us that evaluations and changes are necessary to better meet the needs of Pi Kappa Delta. I encourage free and full debate on the proposals contained in this paper. I sincerely hope the results of the Development Conference are beneficial and the ideas presented, debated and ratified, strengthen Pi Kappa Delta for the future.

A PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE PROCEDURES FOR GAINING MEMBERSHIP IN PI KAPPA DELTA

James E. Norwig
Louisiana Technical University
Ruston, Louisiana

It is argued that a rationale exists to 1) modify the membership rituals, 2) abolish or discourage pledge periods, and 3) change those provisions of the constitution which make membership dependent on an affirmative vote of members of the local chapter. Specific suggestions for such changes are advanced.

The Louisiana Delta Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta held its pledge ceremony on a recent Thursday night. The classroom where we hold our meetings was suitably darkened, lit only by the prescribed three candles. Our chapter officers - not in black robes, but formally dressed - stood at the front of the room. A representation of the Key was beside them. At a signal from the chapter president, I led the perspective members into the room and then sat down to watch and listen to what I consider to be a rather charming little ceremony. This particular enactment, however, proved to be unique (in my experience): one of the candidates said "no." No, he had not expressed a willingness to accept the invitation to membership; No, he was not willing to submit "to all reasonable behests of the Order" during a pledge period.

It saddened me to hear one of my students reject membership in this organization, but I was proud of him for doing so. After having worked with him for almost an entire forensic's season, I knew that there was no more passionate practitioner of "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just." Yet, I believe that it was his adherence to values inherent in that principle which led him to decline membership in an organization, the name of which signifies those very words. No, he was not certain that he desired membership which, from his perspective, might do nothing more than confer a "superior" status; No, he would not agree to submit to "tests of fidelity, intelligence, disposition, and character." He was not wrong for hesitating to accept membership; I think that we were wror for asking of him what we did.

This incident has stimulated me to examine the procedures by which we admit new members to Pi Kappa Delta. This examination has led me to conclude that serious consideration should be given by the national organization to 1) modifying the rituals related to gaining membership, 2) abolishing or discouraging pledge periods, and 3) changing those provisions of the constitution which make membership dependent on an affirmative vote of members of the local chapter.

Before discussing each of the changes mentioned above, I feel that the subject of Pi Kappa Delta tradition should be addressed. Tradition is important to the spirit of Pi Kappa Delta, together with a shared interest in speech activities, it is what binds us together. Yet, an important part of that tradition has been change. Our national tournament is the most obvious example of that. At one time there were debate elimination rounds; then there were none;

now they are back. Once there were three individual events, including discussion. Now there are ten, but discussion is gone. Once there was no announcement of "place" as awards were distributed, but now that is done. As each of these changes were made, there were those (including myself) who thought "Pi Kap will never be the same," but it is.

Ritual of Membership

Article IV, paragraph 414, of the current Pi Kappa Delta Constitution states:

> It shall be the obligation of each Undergraduate Chapter to require all new members to take the initiatory pledge. A ritual initiation approved by the National Organization shall be given to each new member, but such initiation shall not be secret.

I do not question the reasonableness of this requirement, but of the means which are available to implement it.

Those means are found in "Rituals and Ceremonies of Pi Kappa Delta" which includes both a short form and a long form "initiation of new members" ceremony. Either form apparently meets the constitutional requirement, although the long form does so in a more long-winded manner. Both forms require the initiates to hear a commentary on the purposes and ideals of Pi Kappa Delta and explanation of the symbolism of the triangle and the key, and a "charge" from the president. Both require an affirmation of the new members' allegiance to Pi Kappa Delta, although the gravity of that affirmation is considerably greater in the long form (in which the candidates swear an oath of allegiance "in the presence of God and these witnesses") than in the short form (in which the candidates "promise" allegiance).

Those of us who have been a part of Pi Kappa Delta for several years have probably developed a sense of reverence for the symbols of the Order and, especially, for the phrase "The Art of Persuasion, Beautiful and Just." It is, I think, a mistake to assume that same reverence to be present in nineteen year old college students for whom participation/excellence in forensics is primary, and membership in this (or any other) forensic fraternity is secondary. (Can any coach at this development conference deny knowing of students who became members of Pi Kappa Delta so that they could attend the national tournament or in order to build their resumes?) Yet, both versions of the initiation emphasize that reverence at the expense of actually communicating/inculcating the philosophy underpinning them. I suggest that this can have at least two negative outcomes: 1) the new member can deduce that this is rather a silly organization, thoroughly enjoy the national tournament, record the membership on his/her resume, and then forget it or 2) the organization can miss a golden opportunity to focus the new member's commitment toward principles, rather than toward artifacts.

Either of these outcomes might follow from any or all of the following "perceptions" of the present initiation ceremonies (Note: These perceptions are not the result of a survey, although several are based on remarks I have

heard over the years, nor do they necessarily reflect my beliefs. They are meant to suggest plausible inferences which might be drawn by perspective members with a less than perfect understanding of Pi Kappa Delta.):

1) The overall tone is pompous and self congratulatory. ("Upon you rests the responsibility of forensics at this college. . . ." ". . .the triangle indicates the strength and endurance of our order, the beauty of our fellowship, and the accuracy with which we pursue truth and justice.")

2) The discussions of the motto and symbols approaches mysticism and suggest an emphasis on icons. The emphasis on slogan and symbol can suggest a "not of this world" orientation.

3) Both ceremonies identify Pi Kappa Delta as an organization concerned with "persuasion." Many persons qualify for membership without ever participating in events commonly perceived as persuasive; the ceremonies fail to recognize their place in the organization.

4) Both ceremonies are examples of obfuscation (a lovely word, meaning "to make obscure," the use of which usually exemplifies its meaning). Perhaps the most obscure portion of either ceremony is the charge given to the initiates at the very end of the ceremony:

> Whatever things are true, whatever things are honest, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report; if there be any virture, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

Neither speaks directly to what it is that the organization does for the student or what the student can do within Pi Kappa Delta.

5) In either ceremony the initiates pledge their "allegiance" to Pi Kappa Delta. My Webster's defines allegiance as "devotion or loyalty to a person, group or cause." Given that the initiates' knowledge of the organization is imperfect at best, and that much of what we do in forensics promotes skepticism, such a pledge - as a meaningful commitment - may be premature.

6) Fraternity handshakes are seen by many as anachronistic. It is easy to view such a handshake as quaint, silly, or as an indication that Pi Kappa Delta is a "secret" and/or "social" organization. Ending the ceremony in such a way can trivialize the experience for the initiates. (We teach our students of the importance of not "breaking mood" at the end of a speech, but that is often the effect of all that two-handed handshaking.)

7) The long term initiation, if implemented as written, gives strong indications that ours is a secret and perhaps quasi-religious order. (There are guards at the door. The initiates are admitted only after one guard has knocked three times. If possible, the active members wear black robes; each of the initiating officers holds a lighted candle and either a gavel,

a triangle, or a representation of the Pi Kappa Delta key. The initiates must swear an oath and then kneel to hear "the charge.")

Suggestions for revision:

1) Replace the two initiation forms with a single ritual so that all new Pi Kappa Deltans are inducted into the Order in exactly the same manner.

2) The new ritual should be written with communication in mind, rather than ceremony. The message should be aimed primarily at the persons who are joining.

3) The ritual should address the relationship between the organization and the individual member, and the relationship between Pi Kappa Delta and forensics. Rather than emphasizing abstractions and the "awesome" responsibilities of being a Pi Kappa Deltan, it ought to convey that his/her membership will have positive benefits for both the member and forensics.

4) Emphasis on (but not the mention of) symbols - the key and the triangle - should be avoided. The symbols could well be used as explanatory devices, rather than - as is currently the case - major organizational elements.

5) It should be conveyed in the ceremony that all those who engage in oral communication are persuaders, i.e., that poetry readers and after dinner speakers belong in Pi Kappa Delta just as much as orators and debaters.

6) The new member should be required to pledge her/his allegiance to the ideals inherent in "The Act of Persuasion, Beautiful and Just," rather than to the organization itself. He/she might also express that his/her purpose in joining is the furtherance of those ideals.

7) The fraternity handshake should not be used as a part of the ceremony.

8) The new ritual should avoid any suggestion of secrecy, elitism, or quasi-religion.

9) The old rituals should remain available (i.e., should be periodically published); their use for purposes of historical continuity (tradition) and/or optional reaffirmation of membership should be permitted. It may be appropriate to allow their use in addition to the new ceremony, but it should be made clear that they cannot be used in lieu of it.

The Pledge Period and Ceremony

Although not constitutionally required, "Ritual and Ceremonies of Pi Kappa Delta" recommends that perspective members be required by the local chapter to participate in a pledge ceremony (the one described in the introduction to this paper). That publication suggests that they be required to "pass a creditable examination on the history, purpose, and constitution of Pi Kappa Delta . . . which places emphasis on . . . the requirements for the different degrees and

orders in the society and the different jewels in the key." During the pledge ceremony, the perspective members are required to indicate their willingness to accept the invitation to membership and to "do the bidding of members of our Order and to submit to tests of fidelity, intelligence, disposition and character."

The procedures can be viewed as objectionable for the following reasons:

1) The examination over relatively specific material which is not of immediate concern to the new member (except for the purpose of passing the examination), is an unnecessary annoyance and, for many students, may equate that information with the "useless information" which they are so often required to memorize for classes which the university imposes upon them.

2) Taken literally, if a pledge examination is required, a member qualified by experience and disposition, may fail to become a member of Pi Kappa Delta because they "can't get their jewels straight." (If new members are "expected to pass a creditable examination," the possibility of failure must exist).

3) The suggested procedure in which the candidates are questioned about their errors and possibly required to look up the answers in the presence of the active members, and the aforementioned pledge to "do the bidding," etc., have at least the potential to be demeaning to the individual.

4) If the candidate is, in fact, "required to do the bidding . . . (etc.)," the potential for abuse exists even though the pledge requires submission to only "reasonable behests." Who, after all, is to determine what constitutes a "reasonable behest."

5) Tests of "fidelity, intelligence, disposition, and character" are, in almost all cases, unnecessary and likely to strike the candidate as such. Usually the members have worked with or around the individual for several months, and probably have spent many long hours in the confines of a van with that person. If such exposure does not reveal a person's qualities, nothing will.

Based on the above, I make the following suggestions:

1) That the use of a formal pledge period would be discouraged, and that a candidate's membership in Pi Kappa Delta should be in no way dependent on participation in such a period.

2) The present pledge ceremony should be abolished. In its place might be substituted an "invitation" ceremony, during which the perspective members are informed about the purpose of Pi Kappa Delta, and their interest in the organization is acknowledged with a formal invitation to membership.

3) The use of formal examinations should be abolished. However, perspective members should be required to familiarize themselves with the organi-

zation, by reading, viewing, or listening to materials about its history, purpose, and organization. They should also discuss the organization with one or more persons who has been a member for a significant period of time. (Their coach will, it is hoped, be such a person.) We should seek to stimulate sincere interest, rather than "memorization."

Approval by the Undergraduate Chapter

The constitution, Article IV, paragraph 401, provides:

> Each candidate for membership in this fraternity shall make application in writing on the official form. The Undergraduate Chapter shall then make an investigation of the eligibility of the candidate, and, after a two-thirds affirmative vote of the active members of the Undergraduate Chapter, shall recommend the candidate for membership."

In practice, it is rarely necessary for the chapter to investigate the eligibility of the candidate, other than to verify that she/he is "in good standing" at the college where enrolled. The student's record of forensic participation will normally be a matter of common knowledge, which in the case of persons minimally qualified, can be verified by team records. In any case, the candidate's eligibility is a question of <u>fact</u> - the person is either eligible or not eligible, and no vote (other than one which changes the constitutional definition of eligibility) can change that.

What valid purpose does requirement of a two-thirds affirmative vote serve? I submit that the answer is "none."

There are, however, two other purposes served by such a vote, one innocuous and the other insidious. The first is to make the extension of membership an honor and psychologically satisfying. Being "elected" signifies that the "electors" approve of the candidate. Certainly there is nothing wrong with conveying such approval. There are, however, instances in which the candidate is disliked by several members because of personal characteristics, lifestyle, political belief, or other such factors which are perfectly valid criteria for selecting friends, but have no bearing on the person's qualification to be a member. We would like to think that no Pi Kappa Deltan would vote on such a basis, but we ought not to forget that our members are people - and people sometimes cast votes for irrelevant reasons.

If there is no legitimate purpose served by the vote, there is no reason to create a situation in which membership can be denied for irrelevant reasons. I suggest that the requirement for a vote by the undergraduate chapter be removed from the constitution.

There may, of course, be cases in which an applicant has shown by her/his behavior that he/she is not in sympathy with it or its philosophy. An individual who has repeatedly fabricated debate evidence or habitually tries to distract opponents during competition would be such a person. In such cases, it should be made possible to present, debate (ideally hearing from the

application), and vote on a resolution of disapproval of the application. Such a provision would provide a mechanism for excluding persons of "bad character" from membership, while allowing them a "day in court" without permitting exclusion on irrelevant grounds.

Conclusion

I am under no delusion that the changes I have suggested would alter the fundamental nature of Pi Kappa Delta (something which does not need doing) or even bring in a significant number of new members. I do believe that these changes would modernize the Order, help to make it more attractive to new members (perhaps stimulating some to a greater involvement in it), assure that all members are required to meet the same standards for membership, and would more clearly reflect the purpose for which it exists. They will, I suggest, make the Order more clearly "Beautiful and Just" to those on whom its future depends.

REFERENCES

The Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta. 1988-1989.

"Rituals and Ceremonies of Pi Kappa Delta," found appended to *The Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta*. 1986.

A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE STUDENT PARTICIPATION WITHIN THE RANKS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

Susan Miskelly
Bridgewater State College
Bridgewater, Massachusetts

This paper addresses the need to increase the students' role within the organizational processes of Pi Kappa Delta. Suggestions for broadening the levels of student involvement are offered.

Intercollegiate forensics is an activity with a high level of student involvement. They are involved in debating, giving speeches, and helping to administer intercollegiate tournaments. However, they are not involved in the governance of forensic organizations. As members of the college forensic community, Pi Kappa Deltans are proud of a history of student involvement in the organization. In fact the element which makes Pi Kappa Delta unique among honorary forensic fraternities is early initiation of students into the organization. However, the fraternity fails to capitalize on the early entry for the benefit of either the organization or the student. This paper will suggest the advantages of increasing the length and depth of student involvement in Pi Kappa Delta by altering the governance structure of the organization.

Pi Kappa Delta is one of hundreds of academic associations. These associations "have a primary role in self-identity, communication, and bonding of members of the profession," according to Burton Clark in his book, *The Academic Life* (p. 249). The attitude within Pi Kappa Delta has been to emphasize the bonding through the "spirit of fraternity." Although our attitude is one of respect, the structure of the organization does not reinforce the concept of bonding. The constitution of Pi Kappa Delta creates a National Council in Article V. The Council has ten members, but only two, or twenty percent, are students. Even these students are not representative of the entire student population, since they are elected from the province which is hosting the convention. On a regional level, only one constitutional officer of four is required to be a student. The structure seems to imply some classes of membership are more equal than others.

Does the structural shortchanging of Pi Kappa Delta's student members have an effect? The organization and the students suffer a loss.

Louis Benezet, a research professor in Human Development and Educational Policy at SUNY Stony Brook, points out that cognitive psychologists accept that students can become a dynamic factor in college governance. However, Pi Kappa Delta seems to have reacted as many academic organizations by advocating student involvement "but not in my discipline" (Chickering, p. 711).

A review of the literature on the impact of college on students shows that a majority of researchers in the field concur that a high level of student involvement is a positive factor in education (Korn, p. 9). As an academic organization, Pi Kappa Delta has the ability to alter its structure to increase

student involvement. The increased student participation can be a key to learning (Stark, p. 22). Students will not be the only beneficiaries of this increased involvement. Researchers suggest that the effectiveness of organizational policy is positively impacted (Alexander, p. 24). By increasing student involvement, Pi Kappa Delta could improve the education of its students and have positive impact on policy.

What should some of the considerations be in attempting to increase the level of student participation? First, a system of representation should be developed which would guarantee a national student perspective. Second, students at all organizational levels should be represented. Many colleges have committee systems which have membership rotated over a several year period. The purpose is to insure historical continuity and provide input from new members. If students were allowed a several year period of membership on national and regional levels, they would learn the systems of the organization and be able to make stronger suggestions for change. Pi Kappa Delta installs students early in their academic careers and a system of early service should be feasible.

In order to keep Pi Kappa Delta functioning well, we will need to rely on a built-in hierarchy which acknowledges to ongoing commitment of faculty. But we should not miss the wisdom to be gained from listening fully to all constituencies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, J.M., and J.S. Stark. *Focusing on Student Academic Outcomes: A Working Paper*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1986.

Chickering, A.W., and Associates. *The Modern American College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Clark, B.R. *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Korn, H.A. *Psychological Models of the Impact of College on Students*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1986.

Pi Kappa Delta. *Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta*.

Stark, J.S., and M.A. Lowther. *Designing the Learning Plan: A Review of Research and Theory Related to College Curricula*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1986.

EXPANDING THE AUDIENCE-CENTERED NATURE OF DEBATE: AN ANALYSIS OF NON-COMPETITIVE OUTLETS

Rita Kirk Whillock
University of Alabama - Huntsville
Huntsville, Alabama

This paper investigates options for expanding debate opportunities beyond the competitive arena. The argument is advanced that by doing so, we can increase the presence of the organization, as well as the prestige of the activity among the public at large.

Over the last few years, debate has undergone tremendous change. Not over ten years ago, coaches openly denounced the advocates of CEDA/value debate for their concerns over what was thought to be trivial matters such as delivery style, audience involvement, two topics per year, and national ranking systems. Yet the coaches, who felt denied a fair hearing by the "power-brokers" of NDT over these and a host of other issues, found a receptive audience with a newly formed group, the Cross Examination Debate Association. We all know the results of their willingness to accept and incorporate new ideas. CEDA is now a preeminent forensic organization with one of the largest active memberships of the debate communities.

Today the debate community faces a similar challenge. There are a host of concerns which are not being addressed by any major forensic organization--concerns which have long been expressed but have yet to gain a hearing with any of the major associations that could assure their success. These issues center around the need for teaching debate as an audience-centered activity.

Perhaps one reason for the neglect of these issues is that they do not center on debate as an exclusively forensic event. Instead, debate is viewed as a vehicle for instructing the public on the key issues of the day. Such debate does not require speaker points or large forensic budgets. And yet, such public debates permit high visibility for a small forensic team within their own academic and social communities.

Of course, any team could host a public debate and gain the visibility benefits without the support of a forensic organization. But such squads would not be made to feel a part of the debate community at large and would also be denied national recognition for the work they accomplish. The fact that no other group is addressing these concerns provides an opportunity for Pi Kappa Delta to reassert itself as a premier organization.

Frankly, there is another reason why we should consider responding to these challenges. Pi Kappa Delta now faces an identity crisis unparalleled in our history. We do not provide the sort of rigorous competition sponsored by the other organizations. For those schools who want such competition, there are a host of other tournaments available which not only provide competition but do so at much more reasonable rates. Nor does Pi Kappa Delta have a unique, positive identity among the forensic community. We are not competitively-based on

national rankings. But neither do we have the clout a national honorary should possess. It has been a long time since I have seen students wear their PI Kap pins when not at our own tournaments. The honor of our fraternity must be restored.

By this point, some of you are probably disturbed at my indictments. I hope you are. But moreover, I hope you will spend a few minutes considering both the veracity of these claims and the opportunities that will inevitably result as we address these vital issues.

Our first challenge must be to restore the non-competitive outlets for debate which have become virtually extinct. This is not a new proposal but rather a return to our foundations. PI Kappa Delta was formed because of the desire to promote intercollegiate debate activities. Yet with the exception of tournaments, there is no formal mechanism for arranging debate contests.

To address this concern, I suggest we institute a debate-match schemata. Using our provinces as competitive districts, participating schools could be matched against one another in a series of public debates. The schemata might be similar to those employed by the athletic conferences. Initially we would need to identify the schools who would like to participate. Then, with the help of the province governors, matches would be scheduled. At the end of the season, the "Final Four" (those schools with the best records) would meet one another for the province championship. Should we find it one day to be desirable, this could eventually result in a national tournament as well.

Like any new idea, there are a number of potential problems (like how do we certify judges for these contests, what happens if too many schools want to participate, how do we involve universities with large numbers of debaters, would we use the CEDA, NDT or other topics). But these can be resolved through developmental conferences such as these. For example, we might finally be able to use that army of PI Kappa Delta alumni who reside in or nearby the host campus as judges. This might be an opportunity for us to re-involve them in the forensic community and simultaneously build up support for our activities. Other issues might similarly be resolved.

The advantages to such a system are numerous. To begin, it offers schools with limited travel budgets a way to compete more frequently. Since presumably half of the time, teams would compete at their home campus, travel and the related fiscal pressures would be reduced. Second, schools could schedule the debates around other campus activities such as athletic contests, breaks, or exams instead of having to miss important activities because the only close tournament was arbitrarily scheduled in conflict with other academic events. Third, the public and the university community could become more involved with the debate program. Not only would they be provided an arena to support their home team, they would also become more educated on the issues being debated. Fourth, this would promote the "good" public debate style CEDA initially sought to encourage since it forces debaters to talk to people instead of hurl citations past them. Fifth, it can serve as an educational tool for students in basic classes. As one of my students over this term remarked, "I feel I have become more competent as a speaker over this term but I would still feel inse-

cure if I met someone like Morton Downey." This was interesting in light of the fact that as a judge, I have already become so conditioned to the dead bodies on the flow that they no longer move me. Such public debate would encourage us to teach our students how to deal with the complex emotional issues which accompany our rational discourse--and with audience members who feel passionately about the topic. Sixth, schools could profit from such activities regardless of the size of their teams. Since this is a school match, the individuals who debate for Alabama-Huntsville in one tournament might be different from the team who represent us in the next. It would not matter, then, whether I have one team or seventeen. I only need to front one team for the competition. Larger programs have more options. They could rotate the teams involved. They could use it as a reward system. Or they could designate one team for this type of debate while maintaining other teams for travel on the CEDA or NDT circuits. Yet regardless of the size of the team, students would have the opportunity to receive regional, and perhaps even national recognition for their efforts. Finally, such debates could encourage fellowship among members of our organization. Visiting students could be accomodated in one of the dorms, facilitating interaction with the other squad. Visiting coaches might enjoy the hospitality of one of the faculty at the host university helping us to form academic alliances as well.

Should Pi Kappa Delta pursue the adoption of such a proposal, we could begin to once again assert ourselves as an honorary organization. Instead of deferring to other organizations for the rules under which we conduct our contests, we will be setting the standards. This organization has prided itself on the fact that our national and province tournaments are not like all the others--that we are different. And yet in debate, there is no difference between our tournaments and other competitive outlets. While recognizing this activity would not preclude us from conducting our usual tournament activities, the inclusion of these public debates would provide our tournaments with an uniqueness we have somehow lost.

Imagine for a moment that at this tournament in St. Louis the province champions were to engage in competition. Perhaps the St. Louis civic groups would sponsor the debates. The contests might be judged by prominent lawyers, politicians, and business executives. Given the level of community involvement, there would almost certainly be media coverage of the events. The topic for the debate would be timely--perhaps on the proper role of labor unions, the propriety of import restrictions, or the feasibility of a "mommy track." Issues such as speaker responsibilities and decision rules would become strategies debaters choose not issues within the contest. Debaters would not yell "Hasty G!" But would explain how the opponent committed a logical fallacy by jumping to an unwarranted conclusion. Who knows? Maybe people would start listening to college debaters again because the debaters would be using arguments to persuade audiences, not to offend their sensibilities.

Our membership brochure contends that "for over half a century, Pi Kappa Delta members through research, leadership, and service have nurtured, encouraged, and promoted higher ethics and increased proficiency in the use of the spoken word as the means of clarifying, guiding, and protecting the democratic processes of our American heritage." In order to accomplish those

objectives more fully, the time has come to restore public debate to its rightful place within our organization.

PKA - OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT

Margaret Greynolds
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Since 1912, Kentucky Alpha Chapter of PKA has worked to support and enhance communication development for its members through structured campus and community involvement in an expanded speaker's forum/program. This paper will review the conception and expansion of such a program, its benefits to participants in promoting communication excellence, as well as its long range function to promote networking for future professional contact for employment and/or references.

According to Peterson, Godhaber, and Pace, "Through communication, people find, establish, and foster close relationships; world powers negotiate treaties and make decisions that affect millions of people; industrialists coordinate the efforts of thousands to produce goods and services; protests are expressed; clubs are formed and sustained; civilization is created; wars are waged and civilizations are destroyed; people are hurt and helped; and love is created and crushed. Clearly, communication--especially effective communication matters."[1] Obviously these authors had in mind exactly the same kind of communication which our founders envisioned when they spoke of "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just" and when they formed an organization which allowed its members the opportunities to test themselves in a multitude of ways in order to discover their strengths and to improve their weaknesses. Since many of our members over the years have developed the skills which were polished through Pi Kappa Delta participation into world renown communication abilities in business, government, education, community service, and church activities, this paper will explore some of the noncompetitive outlets which have been established historically and continued and expanded at Georgetown College within the Kentucky Alpha Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta in order to suggest opportunities for enhancing communication to the degree suggested by the authors of *Communication Probes*.

In order to provide a clear understanding of the climate which has produced a very productive interaction between the college and community at Georgetown, a brief background of the type of competitive environment from which Pi Kappa Delta was formed in 1922 is important. Georgetown College had a long and strong tradition of group interaction for the enhancement of communication skills. Two literary societies, Tau Theta Kappa and the Ciceronian were both founded in 1839. The first was incorporate the same year, and the latter, the following year, in 1840.[2] These two groups rivaled each other for members. Each had a large, well-furnished hall with a selected library of about four thousand volumes which served as an important adjunct to the college library.[3] My students certainly would have envied their early counterparts these facilities and their source materials which were so readily available. They would have been amazed also at the membership of each society which averaged around eighty members.[4] In the mid-1800's, there were fewer opportunities for

exciting activities, and the weekly meetings held by the societies featured programs which included oration, declamation, debate, reading, and criticism.[5] Remember, this was prior to the distractions of television and motion pictures, and audiences were trained to listen and enjoy two to three hour speeches. Because this organization was prior to the Civil War, and speakers were featured entertainers.

The memberships of the early societies were limited to the male students. It was near the end of the 1800's when some of the colleges began to admit female students; some of the societies became coeducational and new societies were organized for the female students. Undoubtedly, because Georgetown was Baptist, and hoped to keep the men and women separate as long as possible, it was one of the first schools to organize a society solely for woman called the Euphian Society which was formed in 1871.[6]

The literary societies were founded primarily to enhance the social, literary and speech offerings at the early colleges. These groups initiated many speech activities and set up the framework for academic debate. These societies were organized to give students opportunities which were not available in the curriculum. For almost one hundred years, the literary societies furnished the major part of training in communication in colleges, and, in fact, these organizations provided the basis for many of the speech and theatre programs which were developed in many of the Kentucky colleges and universities.[7]

As you can see, very early in the tradition of Georgetown was established the importance of group membership for the enhancement of communication skills and expansion of opportunities for using those skills. In order to test those abilities even further, Georgetown joined with three other Kentucky colleges to form the Kentucky Intercollegiate Oratorical Association in 1887. This association staged an annual contest to select the best orator in the state.[8]

Group support from outside audiences encouraged the development of these associations because they provided large groups of people to attend the competition. In 1891, the annual contest was held in Georgetown, in the Scott County Courthouse. A student from each school sought to outspeak the entry from the other, and like athletic contests today, the event drew many students from both campuses. According to the press, the audience, wrought-up by the contest, literally took the town apart. The member institutions were so concerned about the "evils" surrounding the oratorical contest that there was a danger that this contest might be the last of its kind. The faculty of Kentucky University took the lead in punishing its students by announcing the withdrawal of that institution from the association. The reasons given were that the contest interfered with the regular studies and caused a tendency toward dissapation and drunkenness. The faculty also feared the students would gamble on the outcome of the contest.[9] Apparently, some things about college administrations and their opinion of student behavior have not changed over the years. Although a religious institution, Georgetown did not withdraw its membership even temporarily; apparently, its administration was as long-suffering as it is today.

Debate as a competitive event began later than oratory, although the early orators certainly appear to have been debaters of a sort. In 1906, Georgetown College joined with three other colleges and universities to form the Kentucky Intercollegiate Debating Association in order to "discuss in public leading questions of the day, and in this way develop ready and useful speakers."[10] Later this state organization joined with other states to form a larger group to offer stronger competition and the development of more communicative opportunities for skill enhancement.

In some of the colleges and universities of Kentucky, literary societies continued during the early years of the twentieth century. In most cases, these societies served as a supplement to classroom instruction rather than functioning as the total speech program as they had in the nineteenth century. The nature of the societies changed as the purpose was enlarged to include different types of dramatic activities. In some cases, the topics of debate were not of the serious nature they had once been. In 1906, two societies debated the topic "Resolved: That there is more pleasure in pursuit than in possession." The school paper reported that the negative side won the debate.[11]

These early societies usually met once a week with a program that consisted of a debate, a dramatic reading, and sometimes a discussion. No wonder that the members of our groups are so versatile today, they were like those earlier members who set the standards for interest and participation in a wide variety of events and contests designed to improve communication and to develop more fully the exchange of ideas among intellectuals The founding of our chapter of Pi Kappa Delta preceded the reorganization of the speech program by seven years. Miss Rena Calhoun, a graduate of the college in 1910, was employed in 1929 to develop the curricular and extracurricular activities in accordance with what she had experienced at Georgetown and what she had learned while completing her graduate work at Columbia University.[12] Under her direction and with her encouragement, the chapter flourished until she turned over its direction to others in the mid-1950's. She preserved, for our current members, records of meetings and copies of all *The Forensic* which the college received as a part of its membership. While a number of those issues have been taken or destroyed over the years, she lovingly placed all that remained in my care when I was first employed by the college in 1970, put in charge of the competitive speech activities, and made the sponsor of the Kentucky Alpha Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta. She remained near the campus and was involved actively in our activities, as well as those of the dramatic organization, the Maskrafters, until she left Georgetown at the age of 92 to return home to take care of her older brother and sister. Apparently, forensic and teaching burnout was not a part of her generation's response to the many hours of travel and student involvement which is part of our activities.

Because Miss Calhoun remained with the school for such a long period of time, she offered a continuity which many programs do not enjoy. While she did not remain the sponsor of our chapter throughout her entire tenure, she offered those individuals who were immediately involved with the competitive activities the stability and support needed to sustain a strong base for financial and emotional needs. She also encouraged the same kind of community involve-

ment which the older literary societies had stimulated. She understood the need to allow students to come into contact with those individuals who are involved in daily communication tasks. Her encouragement and frequent suggestions aided me in developing a large network of opportunities for members of our chapter to practice their communication skills in realistic situations and to debate ideas with individuals who have the power to make changes within the system and within society.

As a result of the long-established tradition of excellence through competitive and non-competitive outlets, Georgetown College students today have easy access to opportunities for structured campus and community involvement in an expanded speaker's forum. While we do not have an established speaker's bureau as it exists in many colleges and universities operated by the department or the institution, we have an excellent shared relationship with the organizations within our community and on our campus which affords members of our forensic team many opportunities to share interpretive and persuasive or informative materials with people outside our discipline. This program which was developed and expanded initially as a community service project has grown from having as its major benefit for students, the promotion of communication excellence, to a secondary and perhaps more beneficial aspect, the establishment of a network of professional contacts for employment, references, and future personal and professional involvement.

As an individual who had been reared in Georgetown, a community of ten thousand, I had a distinct advantage with regard to the development of these outlets for non-competitive enhancement opportunities. As a junior high and high school student, I had been actively involved in speech activities, both competitive and non-competitive. I had attended Georgetown College as an undergraduate, and had entered both debate and speech competitions. I had enjoyed a measure of success in those activities, while having a large number of opportunities to speak to local civic groups and to take the message of the speech team to many other campus organizations; therefore, it was somewhat easier for me to make initial contacts than it might have been for a person beginning such a program in a new town or on a new campus. However, it was ten years from the time of my first employment to my return to the Georgetown campus, so I can identify readily with the needs of the person beginning such a program.

Virgil L. Baker, who was a professor of speech at the University of Arkansas, delivered a speech to the Communications Seminar sponsored by the General Extension Service for Red Cross Volunteer Workers in 1965 in which he discussed the role of human values in communication. As he said, "Values are the goods of life, without which we cannot be human beings."[13] His speech reminded the audience members that "our value systems differ according to the particular daily roles we take as afforded by our functional institutions: the home, school, church, library, hospital, occupations, social institutions, and the like."[14] If we are to be able to adapt our set of values to those of others who will surely differ from us in selection of those priorities which fuel our choices, then we must have the opportunity to interact with others and to examine their ideas. What better forum can be found for the exchange of ideas than a civic club, community or church group, or the chapter develop-

ment of a fraternity or sorority. Baker pointed out in his address that people with highly specialized value clusters find it difficult to communicate with those whose set of values differ. "For example, teachers may communicate at their best only with teachers, executives with executives, scientists with scientists, doctors with doctors, lawyers with lawyers, and architects with architects."[15] If we accept his premise as true, then we can see why it is so very important for members of our chapters to be involved with multiple groups in order to enable them to have ample opportunities for audience adaptation which they may use later in their business, social, and professional contacts. Former students have written often to express their appreciation for the opportunities which they had in college to speak to a variety of groups and to learn that the same value cannot be communicated to the members of Kappa Alpha fraternity, officers of the Baptist Student Union, delegates to the Jewish Women's Leadership Conference, and combined members from the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Georgetown Garden Club. Whether the subject is gun control, ozone depletion, government overspending, need for the expansion of college scholarships, a thematically developed interpretative examination of child abuse, acceptance of death, or simply ways to use laughter for health and healing. Any student or group of students can benefit from the opportunity to take their researched, practiced, and polished performance into the arena of the business luncheon or obligatory club program in order to see whether they can hold the attention of the audience and to discover whether they have analyzed their audience members well and adapted to their needs and values. A program that does not take into consideration its listeners dies more quickly than a weak after-dinner speaking round, and often is more convincing than any ballot ever written that the student needs to rework his or her approach to the subject. While the students might like to blame the judge or competitors in a round for his scores, they have no one to turn to but themselves when the audience at a banquet or meeting becomes restless or merely nods off.

Kim Giffin and Bobby R. Patton in *Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication* discuss the importance of our search for self-identity through our interaction with others, suggesting in agreement with Mead and Erikson that we form our identity largely as a reflection of the perception of ourselves by others. As Giffin and Patton point out, your self-concept develops through contact with others, and dishonesty with self and others undermines the self-concept.[16] Therefore, any opportunity to assist young people in finding who and what they are, as well as what they might hope to become, is a worthwhile mission. A speech forum which brings students into contact with people from various walks of life who possess differing values and goals for their lives offers the students the avenues through which to develop and maintain their self-esteem. As the authors say, "Effective maintenance of self-esteem requires the same kind of behavior that developed it in the first place -- exposure, feedback, and honest attempts at desirable change."[17] Seldom do we get as many competitive and non-competitive chances to express our ideas and to seek open and honest responses to them than we get while competing in college forensics and while polishing our communication skills as student speakers. Therefore, a program which is designed to take ideas to those individuals who have the power and the money to implement them is a wonderful way to teach students how to operate as effective members of their business or profession and as meaningful citizens in our political process.

The values of a community and campus speaker forum for the members of Pi Kappa Delta have obvious interpersonal benefits. Such group activities also promote the development of leadership qualities by providing opportunities for creative and critical thinking, while also fostering healthy interpersonal relationships. As members expand their contacts, particularly on campus, they serve as channels for other members to become knowledgeable about total campus organizations, activities, and interests which they might never have explored without the stimulus of the initial contact. Independents and Greeks learn to respect each other; the performers come to appreciate the athletes; and the scholars learn the value of those involved in student government or publications and many other worthwhile campus activities. Likewise, students who have never heard of AAUW, AAUP, Kiwanis, Rotary, 4-H, American Legion, Junior League, ACLU, or WMU will expand their awareness of the kind of networking which is so valuable both personally and professionally through the contacts made with others involved in community and church causes, and in the social interaction that takes place in regular meetings of groups that both form our society's goals and implement their achievement.

In order to expand similar activities on your campus, you might wish to follow some of the procedures which we have found effective. First, contact your dean of student life or whatever individual on your campus who is administratively responsible for student activities. The office of such an individual will have a list of all the officers for all campus organizations. Begin your contacts by writing, calling, or directly approaching the president of those groups on campus who seem most likely to have an interest in the subjects or programs which your students have prepared or which they have researched for class projects. Request an opportunity for presenting a program to these groups for their banquets, chapter development, or special programs for recruitment, holidays, or special interest. Once these initial campus contacts are implemented, your chapter may find it necessary to recruit speech team members just for the non-competitive activities in order to meet the needs of the campus requests.

Regardless of the volume of campus requests, you should within the first year of your program be able to offer a similar service for community groups. The local Chamber of Commerce will furnish you with the names of the presidents of all the organizations in your community. Again, evaluate your resources and subjects for programs, and then contact the presidents with a request similar to that one extended to campus groups. You will find that some civic groups seem especially anxious to involve you in their program planning since they must furnish a program for each week. Once your initial contacts are made either personally or through some means of formal communication, be sure that you have a sheet of program possibilities which you can offer to the president or program planner for his or her consideration. Eventually, you may be able to provide a formal program outline which would be available for distribution, but you may want to maintain a lower profile until you have a strong organization and multiple programs available, as well as the finances to support the printing of such a document. Within a very short time, you will find your reputation well-established as an excellent communication resource for programs and your college or university will reap the benefits of such contacts. Our development office has reported having gotten contributions to the

general fundraising campaigns from people who said that their initial awareness of the college and its programs was stimulated by a student program. I wish that I could report that the forensic activities had been directly aided in the college budget as a result, but while that is not the case, our funding is stable and our programs are encouraged by the administration, probably in part as a result of these campus and community contacts.

One of the major reasons that many members of Pi Kappa Delta have benefitted from their involvement in the activity has been the chance to put their communication skills into competitive situations in preparation for equally competitive situations in their professional careers. However, as an organization dedicated from its inception to the promotion of persuasion in all its forms in everyday interpersonal situations, as well as professional and vocational, Pi Kappa Delta is the perfect group to support exchange of ideas and information in a non-competitive setting.

Charles Larson reminds us, "Whether a message goes from government to governed, political candidate to voter, news media to citizen, or advertiser to consumer, mutual confidence and trust are desirable for complete communication."[18] He goes on to say that: "Democratic decision-making through vigorous and free debate of issues assumes access to accurate and trustworthy information."[19] What better way to train an effective citizenry than to offer them well conceived and constructed ideas developed by young people who will assist them in the future in making wise decisions based on the best kind of persuasion. Certainly our students trained much more effectively than most in both speaking and listening, will enable our discipline to live up to its ultimate responsibility to our social heritage and our future survival.

Linkugel, Allen, and Johannesen establish clearly why our activity at this Developmental Conference and our existence as an organization is so important. Regardless of where we live, or what job we pursue, our communication activities, indeed "speech alone is a universal fact of man's social heritage. . . . Man's social existence gives rise to forces within every man that compel him to speak. He may read, he may observe, he may listen, he may feel, he may experience a multitude of internal and external forces that communicate meaning to him, but he will speak. He may speak to be seen and to be heard, to impress others and to impress himself, to question and to answer, to teach and to learn. His subject may be grand or mundane, important or trivial, simple or complex, but he will speak."[20] If we as human beings are so compelled, then we as teachers of the discipline have the unique and rewarding task of offering as many opportunities as possible for every student to engage in and to improve his or her use of "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just" in every competitive and non-competitive situation possible.

NOTES

[1] Brent D. Peterson, Gerald M. Goldhaber, and R. Wayne Pace, *Communication Probes* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1981), p. 3.

[2] *Acts of the Kentucky Legislature 1838-1840*, p. 202.

[3] Alvin Fayette Lewis, *History of Higher Education in Kentucky* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), p. 160.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 182

[6] James F. Hopkins, *The University of Kentucky: Origins and Early Years* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1951), pp. 171-173.

[7] *Catalogue of Potter College* 1879-1898, p. 27.

[8] Hopkins, p. 176.

[9] *Lexington Daily Press*, March 25, 1981.

[10] *Catalogue of Transylvania University* 1912, p. 47.

[11] *The Green and Gold of Ogden College*, October, 1906, p. 11.

[12] Interview with Rena Calhoun, Professor Emeritis of Speech at Georgetown College, conducted by Dr. Randall Capps of Western Kentucky University, May 16, 1967.

[13] Virgil L. Baker, "The Role of Human Values in Communication: The Responsibility of Communicators," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, May 1, 1965.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Kim Giffin and Bobby R. Patton, *Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication* (New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1981), p. 34.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Charles U. Larson, *Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1985), p. 224.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Wil A. Linkugel, R.R. Allen, and Richard L. Johannesen, *Contemporary American Speeches* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1977), pp. 4-5.

A DISCUSSION OF AWARDS AT THE NATIONAL TOURNAMENT: DO WE NEED TO CHANGE?

Pamela S. Joraanstad
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

This paper poses discussion questions regarding the determination of awards for contestants at the National Pi Kappa Delta Tournament. The history of awards for speech and debate at the National Tournament over the last 75 years is examined. Possible avenues for change are explored.

David A. Thomas (1974) wrote: "Our departments do not dislike forensics but, at the same time, do not understand how forensics programs fit their aims and purposes. Therefore, the crucial task for forensics programs is to articulate them to the departments, and demonstrate how forensics programs can be significant in the achievement of departmental objectives" (p. 239). Indeed, forensic directors and forensic organizations have attempted to meet the challenges and demands of changing times. Once again, it is time for Pi Kappa Delta to reevaluate many aspects of its organization to meet the growing needs of its membership. The national tournament and convention constitutes a major part of our membership in the organization. Therefore, it is necessary to examine relevant issues with respect to the national tournament. Specifically, do we want to suggest some changes in the format in determining awards? To offer some discussion questions with respect to this issue, a history of events followed by potential areas of discussion will be addressed.

History of Pi Kappa Delta Events

Historically, debate has played a key role in Pi Kappa Delta. The original constitution of Pi Kappa Delta included an Order of Debate (Norton, p. 130). In 1922, provinces were allowed to try debate with elimination rounds at their provincial tournaments. By the 1926 convention, participation had doubled in the tournament. Each team competed until defeated twice, and gold, silver and bronze medals were awarded to the top three teams (Norton, p. 131). The debate tournament format seemed to follow this method until approximately 1938. Norton wrote that "all debate teams participated in eight rounds of debate with no winners declared. All teams winning six debates were awarded an 'excellent' ranking" (Norton, p. 132). Pi Kappa Delta had evolved from elimination rounds to double elimination to declaring no winners at all. This philosophy and practice continued through the convention of 1947. The number of wins determined awards. "All teams debated 8 rounds with no elimination rounds. Teams winning 7 or 8 debates were rated Superior. Teams winning 6 debates were rated excellent and teams winning 5 debates were rated good" (Norton, p. 133). The only change in this system came in 1951 when the number of wins was replaced by percentages of contestants (10% - superior; 20% - excellent; 30% - good).

The sixties brought a variety of changes to debate including the introduction of mixed-team debating. In 1965, due to the growing popularity of cross-

examination debate, it replaced mixed-team debate. An overall winner of the debate division was declared. "Power matching was used in later rounds with hidden quarter-finals and semi-finals. The final debate determined a championship team" (Norton, p. 134). The final major change to the debate divisions involved the adoption of CEDA debate of 1981. NDT and CEDA remain a part of the current convention with Open and Junior divisions of each. At the 1987 Convention in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, both divisions of CEDA debate began elimination rounds with octo-finals.

Individual events at the national convention centered around a few events for many years. Specifically, oratory and extempore were the only events offered. "During the forty-five years from 1924-1969, no new individual events had been added to the National Convention program. Then the flood gates were opened and for the next seven conventions, six individual events were added" (Norton, p. 146). The trend for awards for individual events has remained relatively the same as for debate. The type of award has shifted from medals to certificates to plaques; however, the method for determining awards has continued to follow the 10-20-30 percent formula.

The history of debate and individual events has evolved over the last 75 years. As we assess the future of Pi Kappa Delta and the course which we wish to pursue, some discussion questions merit our attention.

Discussion Questions

As Pi Kappa Delta plans for the year 2000, an evaluation of the philosophy of award-giving is essential. Three major questions arise out of the history of awards at Pi Kappa Delta Conventions:

(1) Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to continue the practice of elimination rounds for debate at the National Tournament?

(2) Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to continue the practice of not having a final round for individual events?

(3) Is consistency between debate and individual events in determining awards desirable?

A brief examination of these three questions should provide a basis for our discussion.

The Questions

Question 1: Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to continue the practice of elimination rounds for debate at the National Tournament?

Throughout the history of debate at the National Tournament, the philosophy of awards has not been consistent. The early tournaments declared winners. This seemed to be the practice until 1938 when teams were awarded superior, excellent, and good ratings depending on wins recorded. Norton reports that Secretary Finley "reiterated the basic philosophy of Pi Kappa Delta when he

made the following statement: 'We need to decrease the emphasis we have formerly placed upon winning. We need to take a definite stand in favor of extensive rather than the intensive program of forensics in all our colleges'" (Norton, p. 132). We have returned to elimination rounds in debate and have declared winners for each division of debate. Several questions which come to mind include: Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to continue the practice of elimination rounds? Is our membership supportive of this practice or do they wish to have a tournament which is different from CEDA Nationals in format? Would a tournament which offered six-eight rounds/powered with a superior-excellent-good awards on the 10-20-30 percent be attractive to our membership? Should the tournament utilize a random draw with the previous awards structure?

The membership of Pi Kappa Delta appears to desire the current practice of elimination rounds. The nature of debate (win-loss as opposed to ranks) lends itself to having elimination rounds. The practice of elimination rounds is an accepted format for most invitational tournaments which leads me to suggest that the current practices be retained.

Question 2: Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to continue the practice of not having a final round for individual events?

Individual events awards have fluctuated throughout the 75 year history of Pi Kappa Delta. The type of award given (e.g., certificate or plaque) has changed; however, the method determining award winners had remained relatively consistent (10-20-30 percent). Some questions with respect to individual events include: Since place winners are determined to count as qualifying legs for the AFA-NIET, does Pi Kappa Delta wish to advance contestants to a final round to more accurately determine place winners? Does Pi Kappa Delta wish to keep the awards structure intact so that as one coach stated, "there exists a refreshing alternative to the other individual events national tournaments"? These questions concerning individual events merit discussion.

The membership of Pi Kappa Delta has overwhelmingly voted to maintain the present system of no final rounds (Estes Park, CO). One possible alternative would be to have a fourth round with the top 10 percent of the category participating. At the National Convention in LaCrosse, the largest category was prose where 14 contestants received superior awards. These fourteen contestants would compete in fourth round which would be used to determine placing for the event. I support the continuation of present practices with the possibility of adding a fourth round.

Question 3: Is consistency between debate and individual events in determining awards desirable?

The remaining discussion question centers around the desirability of consistency in awards between debate and individual events. In debate, some would say that we have recognized the competitive nature of the event and have responded accordingly. Others would argue that by declaring winners, we have lost the fundamental philosophy of fraternity as emphasized by Pi Kappa Delta. Individual events declare winners but do not determine these winners on the basis of final round competition. Should finalists be declared in individual

events? Should awards be determined consistently for debate and individual events?

The nature of the two categories makes the lack of consistency manageable. In debate, the only way to judge a round is to determine a winner and loser. In individual events, rankings are utilized among six contestants. No winner or loser is really determined. Because of this reason, I find no real inconsistency to exist. We should treat each as separate categories.

Conclusion

By briefly examining the history of debate and individual events at the National Tournament, some areas of potential discussion have been identified. Perhaps, we will decide that we wish to maintain our present format of awards. Even if that is the case, discussion by the membership of Pi Kappa Delta will have determined the course for our future.

REFERENCES

Norton, L. *The Art of Persuasion Beautiful and Just: A Seventy-five Year History of Pi Kappa Delta*. Henry, IL: M&D Printing Co., 1988.

Thomas, D.A. "Forensics Shock: Making Forensics Relevant to Tomorrow's Higher Education." *Communication Education*, 23 (1974), pp. 235-241.

KEY ISSUES IN FORENSIC PEDAGOGY AND RESEARCH

Carolyn Keefe
West Chester University
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Whenever forensics takes on the adjective cocurricular--as opposed to extracurricular--those associated with the program have a responsibility to consider the issues pertaining to pedagogy and research. This paper will identify the key issues, as well as report on a recent survey regarding preparation for the role of director of forensics.

"Behind every strong Pi Kappa Delta chapter is a strong sponsor." This is the oft-stated claim by PKD Hall of Fame member Theodore O.H. Karl who by virtue of mental acuity and many years of service was a highly qualified observer. If, as Ted Karl suggested, the sponsor holds the critical position within the chapter, and if we further acknowledge that solid chapters form the basis of national strength, then we on the Forensic Pedagogy and Research Task Force should examine the elements that contribute to making the sponsor an outstanding educator and thus enhance the entire honorary.

In an attempt to generate both information and recommendations that would be useful in our discussion, I conducted a survey among PKD schools on training for the position of director of forensics. The assumption was made that in most cases the person in charge of forensics would also be the chapter sponsor. In mid-January 1989, a five-part, two-page questionnaire was mailed to the sponsors of the 218 undergraduate chapters listed in the 1988 Pi Kappa Delta Directory. Sixty-one questionnaires were returned, providing a 28 percent response rate from both the active and inactive chapters claimed by the honorary.[1]

In this paper, I will first report on the survey by stating each question and summarizing the responses. Second, I will identify some of the important pedagogical and research issues that emerge from this study.

Report and Summary of the Survey on Training for the Position of Director of Forensics

Components of Training

The first question is a relatively open one, aimed at discovering what the subjects consider preparation for their directorships:

> 1. What training, if any, have you had for your role as director of forensics? This question includes formal training such as courses and seminars and informal training such as working in an associate capacity under a director of forensics. Please describe the training

and indicate its length. If you took one or more courses in forensics, provide the name(s) of the course(s) and the school(s).

The initial question achieved its purpose in generating categories.[2] Shown below is a summary of the experiences (exclusive of tournament competition) that in the minds of the subjects constituted their training for directing forensics:

High School Level
- Taking courses related to forensics
- Coaching as a peer
- Coaching as a professional

Undergraduate Level
- Taking courses related to forensics
- Taking courses in directing forensics
- Teaching courses related to forensics
- Coaching as a peer
- Coaching as a professional
- Serving as an assistant director of forensics
- Serving as an associate director of forensics
- Assisting with tournament management as a peer

Graduate Level
- Taking courses related to forensics
- Taking courses in directing forensics
- Serving as a graduate assistant in forensics

Miscellaneous Activities
- Attending workshops/conferences on forensics
- Participating in workshops/conferences on forensics
- Directing workshops/conferences on forensics
- Attending convention programs on forensics
- Participating in convention programs on forensics
- Practicing law

Calculating the number of subjects within each training category was not a goal of the study, but being able to discover how many subjects considered themselves untrained when they accepted the position was anticipated. Five out of the 61 subjects, or 8.2 percent claimed no formal or informal training. One said the job came as "a pleasant surprise"; another who had "no training whatsoever" has been a director and coach for over thirty years.

Finding out which undergraduate and graduate schools provided PKD forensic directors with their training was unrealized. Many respondents failed to provide this information or used indiscernible abbreviations. Rather than giving a skewed list of institutions, no names will be repo ted.

Adequacy of Training

The second question hinges on the first one and was to be omitted by the subjects without training:

> 2. Provided you had some training, was it adequate for undertaking the role of director of forensics? _____Yes____No. If no, in what areas were you underprepared?

The responses from the 56 subjects with some training are summarized below:

TABLE 1

Was Training Adequate?

	Number of Respondents	Percentages of Respondents
Yes	33	58.9
No	16	28.6
Yes/No	5	8.9
Omits	2	3.6

Of particular note is the 28.6 percent of the subjects who do not feel that their training was adequate and the 8.9 percent that are ambivalent about it. The areas mentioned as weak are: formulating program philosophy and goals; administrating the program including budgeting, fund-raising, recruiting, and handling public relations; dealing with the school administration; managing a tournament; coaching debate and individual events, especially oral interpretation; motivating students; counseling students; and developing organizational skills.

Roles of Forensic Participation

The third question pertains to forensic competition itself as a training ground:

> 3. As a student or alumnus(a) have you ever competed in forensics? _____Yes_____No. If yes, please reply further:

	High School	College/University
I.E. only		
Debate only	_____	_____
I.E. and debate	_____	_____
Total number of years	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Alumni

Events _____

Approximate number of tournaments _____

Has this competition helped you in your role as director of forensics? ____Yes____No. Please explain your reply.

Thirty-nine of the 61 respondents (63.9 percent) were in forensics during high school and 49 (80.3 percent) were collegiate participants. Thirty-six (59.0 percent) of the subjects were involved in forensic activity on both levels. For only 7 individuals (11.5 percent) has the competitive component been absent from their training. Two ambiguous responses had to be declared invalid.

Table 2 below presents the data relevant to experience in high school and undergraduate competition. The information regarding alumni participation is inconclusive and therefore is not shown. That part of the questionnaire seemed to confuse some respondents, apparently those from provinces where alumni events are nonexistent or uncommon. With the misunderstanding of the alumni section came the collapse of the crucial question about the value of forensic competition. Evidently, some subjects concluded that the value question referred only to alumni events. Of the 30 who did respond, 29 (96.7 percent) claimed that their competitive experience has been helpful to their work. Some of the benefits that have accrued from forensic participation are: 1) the transfer of learning--know-how, insight, and empathy, 2) career direction-setting, and 3) facilitation of the shift from student competitor to forensic professional. The strong endorsement of forensics by the participants who completed the value item gives justification for assuming that a high proportion of the 22 omits and the 2 individuals would also have been positive had the question been stated more clearly.

TABLE 2

High School Experiences in Forensics

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents	Number of Years
Individual Events Only	6	15.4	10
Debate Only	3	7.7	7
Both I.E. and Debate	30	76.9	85

College/University Experience in Forensics

Individual Events Only	9	18.4	25
Debate Only	4	8.2	13
Both I.E. and Debate	36	73.5	119.5

As can be calculated from the above data, the 39 respondents with high school forensic training have an average of 2.6 years of experience on that

level, whereas the 49 respondents who participated as undergraduates can claim an even higher average of 3.2 years. Examination of the raw data further reveals that 36 (59.0 percent) of the subjects were in both high school and college/university forensics.

Role of Forensic Literature

The fourth question inquired about the training usefulness of written materials:

> 4. Has the literature on forensics provided training for your role as director of forensics? ____Yes____No. If yes, what particular sources have been of most value?

Eighteen (29.5 percent) of those polled denied that forensic literature had contributed to their role training. But most of the remaining 43 subjects (70.5 percent) who responded positively mentioned specific titles and/or general categories. the most frequently cited sources are *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensic Association, The Forensic, CEDA Yearbook*, and the *National Forensic Journal*. Numerous books on debate, coaching, forensic program administration, and tournament management have also proven to be helpful to the respondents.[3] Additionally, convention papers and published orations serve in a training capacity.

Recommendations for Training

The fifth and last question is open-ended, although the thrust of the survey may have suggested certain directions for response:

> 5. What recommendations, if any, do you make for the training of the director of forensics?

When the numerous ideas that came from this question were combined and distilled, the following recommendations emerged:

Training for the director of forensics should include,

- *a strong background in forensic competition (both individual events and debate)
- *undergraduate opportunities for learning various programmatic tasks
- *attendance at a graduate school that places strong emphasis on forensics
- *a graduate assistantship in forensics
- *a course in directing forensics that provides grounding and experience in administrating the program, coaching, judging, giving

ethical decisions, prioritizing domestic and professional obligations, and counseling students

*courses relevant to forensics such as rhetorical theory, argumentation and debate, public speaking, oral interpretation, and speech methods

*service as an assistant/associate director of forensics

*the development of a coaching philosophy

*the development of a judging philosophy

*concentration on being a good teacher with a clear educational philosophy

*the reading and use of forensic literature

*regular counsel from veteran coaches about all aspects of the program

*familiarization with the philosophies as well as the history and future prospects of the various forensic organizations

*attendance at professional conventions on the state, regional, and national levels

Forensic educators should,

*establish a forensic track in a few strong Ph.D. communication programs across the country

*offer directing forensic workshops and short courses at professional conventions

*place greater emphasis on coaching as an educational opportunity

Important Pedagogical and Research Issues

The survey has contributed to our understanding of what PKD directors of forensics regard as their training for their multi-faceted role. It includes acquisition of both theory and practical experience on three educational levels (high school, undergraduate, and graduate), in scholarly organizations, and in related professions. For one subject, this training harked back to the earliest derivation of the word forensic--legal argumentation.

As diverse and extensive as the training of the subjects has been, a sizable number of respondents indicated that their preparation was absent or

present but inadequate. This finding points to an important issue for our task force discussion: What steps should be taken to improve the training of forensic professionals?

Almost 90 percent of the subjects first entered the world of forensics through the challenge and risks of competition. Those who expressed their opinion on how forensics had equipped them for their professional role were almost unanimous in praise of it as a teacher.

In light of this strong endorsement of forensics, we might well wonder if the directors whose education has not included rounds in debate or speech should be offered the opportunity by making alumni events accessible throughout the country. The task force might want to consider this suggestion, which, if recommended as policy, would have to revise the current PKD rule that permits entry only to former undergraduate members of the fraternity.

Although this survey establishes the training value of forensic literature for many PKD educators, the fact that almost 30 percent of the group takes the opposite position raises a question about the relevance of the corpus. Inasmuch as Pi Kappa Delta publishes *The Forensic*, the task force could well address the place it plays in forensic pedagogy. Already acknowledged through the survey as useful for training, the journal might run a symposium on some of the areas that subjects indicated were deficient in their backgrounds.

Within the recommendation section of this paper, the PKD directors have provided enough generative ideas to keep researchers busy until the next biennial convention. Questions such as these can be investigated:

> Which schools now offer courses in directing forensics?
>
> Are the existing courses in directing forensics meeting the needs of the forensic professional? If not, what changes should be made?
>
> Which schools provide the best opportunity for graduate assistantships in forensics?
>
> Is there a relationship between any of the components of training and program success, however that may be defined?
>
> What is meant by a coaching philosophy? What approaches can it take? Do these various approaches produce different results in a forensic program?
>
> By what standards should the teaching of the forensic educator be measured?
>
> How can the resources of veteran coaches be utilized to promote forensic training?
>
> Can a theoretical basis be built for the judging of individual events such as has been constructed by Cross and Matlon (1978) for debate?

The issues and research questions specified in this paper have taken their orientation from the forensic training survey that focuses on the PKD forensic director. But beyond these inquiries are the numerous pedagogical concerns that revolve around the educational needs of the student. Thus any progress we might make today in penetrating the assigned task force area must be considered merely spadework, that done with a handheld implement, not by an earthmover.

But spadework has its place in our honorary. As is amply evident in Larry Norton's (1988) *The History of Pi Kappa Delta 1913-1987*, growth has come in incremental changes that were initiated and carried out by those who cared deeply about forensics and the fraternity. If each of us makes a commitment to turning over a single pedagogical and research question, the combined effort will provide material for a second edition of *The History*. The account will relate how forensic research has brought the strength of enlightenment to sponsors and a heightened sense of professionalism to everyone in Pi Kappa Delta.

NOTES

[1] Personal interview with Harold Widvey, PKD National Secretary-Treasurer, March 23, 1989. The actual number of active chapters is always less than those listed in the directory; therefore, some of the questionnaires went to schools from which a reply could not be expected. Approximately 170 chapters were considered active at the time of the survey. On this basis, the questionnaire return rate was 35.8 percent.

[2] The fact that the first question is relatively open-ended makes it useless as a measure of how many subjects actually participated in the categorized activities. Some subjects may have failed to mention certain of their training experiences. In a preliminary study such as this one, however, the open-ended question can elicit replies the researcher might not have anticipated. See R.L. Ebel, *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 4th ed., 1969, p. 1401.

[3] Two bibliographies useful to the director of forensics are W.L. Benoit, *Argumentation Theory*, 1985 and D. Brownlee, *Coaching Debate and Forensics*, 1988. Single free copies are available from Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Suite E, Annandale, VA 22003. Many of the sources regarded as helpful by the survey subjects are listed in these bibliographies. For a philosophical, educational, and professional orientation to forensics, see J.H. McBath, *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1975) and D.W. Parson, *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics*. (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1984). Neither was mentioned by the subjects.

REFERENCES

Cross, J.D. and R.J. Matlon. "An Analysis of Judging Philosophies in Academic Debate." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 15 (1978), 110-23.

Norton, L. *The History of Pi Kappa Delta*. Henry, IL: M&D Printing Co., 1988.

DOCUMENTING INNOVATION AND TRADITION: RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES FOR FORENSIC EDUCATORS

Kristine Bartanen
University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

This paper will discuss research needs both within and outside the tournament setting. Preliminary results of research at a Northwest Forensic Conference tournament will be among the illustrations. Proposals will be offered based on both the opportunities and constraints facing educators interested in forensic research.

Nearly one hundred years ago, Booker T. Washington spoke to the Cotton States Exposition of 1895, and through the use of an extended metaphor, urged his audience to "Cast down your bucket where you are" (Reid, 1988, p. 523). While there are many reasons why our situation is analogous neither to that faced by the ship lost at sea nor to that of the Southern audience to whom Washington spoke, his advice provides a sound theme for a discussion of research opportunities for forensic educators. Unlike the crew of the distressed ship, we recognize the fresh water on which we sail; we have defined forensics as scholarship, and we speak of the tournament as laboratory (McBath, 1984, p. 5). But perhaps we can today discuss some means for making our buckets less leaky and their lifting less of a strain.

I will identify three general areas of renewed research attention and propose some resolutions (which you may or may not choose to discuss later this afternoon) that may help to facilitate research work.

Documenting Innovations in the Tournament Setting

The forensic community does not lack for innovators or innovations, and I will not attempt to chronicle those contributions or their creators. Perhaps because our rhetorical roots make us sensitive to exigencies needing remedy, and probably because we function in a competitive setting, we frequently try new speaking strategies and educational methods. Theodore Walwik (1969, p. 44) has explained how an "activity program" perspective has made our research on strategic innovations less than systematic:

> [S]uppose a director of debate conceives of a new or refined argumentative technique. The idea is attractive so he tests it by persuading his teams to use it and, ultimately, his teams are successful. In a sense, that process of idea formulation and testing through trial and error is research. There is less need, however, to report the findings in a systematic fashion through a journal article or convention paper. If the innovation is worthy it will be noticed and soon copied by his colleagues throughout the land. Admittedly this process is imprecise and not systematic, but

the fact remains that forensics people do not depend upon published reports for intellectual cross-fertilization.

I think that we ought to take issue with the final portion of Walwik's explanation to an even greater degree than has occurred over the past decade. We ought to research and document our innovations. In particular, we ought to study more systematically and to share with others more regularly our innovations in forensic pedagogy.

As a case study, I will discuss innovations undertaken by directors of forensics in the Province of the Northwest to illustrate both research opportunities taken and research opportunities missed. In the late summer of each year since 1982, the Northwest Forensics Conference has held a coaches meeting as a vehicle for airing concerns, orienting new coaches, and getting organized for the upcoming competitive season. Among the issues discussed this past fall, was ballot format and scoring. Both of these concerns were addressed via experimentation at the fall NFC tournament, which this year took place at Puget Sound.

To test ballot format, we used a different ballot form for each of the three preliminary rounds in the twenty individual events offered at the tournament. In round one, we used a ballot with no criteria; in round two, we used a ballot with the criteria proposed by the 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics (Murphy, 1984, p. 90); and in round three, we used the criteria plus a "reason for decision" space. Ballots were printed on two-part NCR paper so that duplicate copies of all ballots were available for content analysis; in all, 1111 ballots are being analyzed in this study. Research questions include: 1) Does ballot form influence judge responses; 2) are particular criteria used more, or more useful, than others? This was a research opportunity taken. What would have made this a better study--the research opportunity missed--would have been a two-wave follow-up survey. We should have asked judges at the conclusion of the tournament for feedback regarding their use of the various ballot forms. Questions about ease of completion; relative value of the criteria in ranking, rating, and critiquing student presentations; and use of "reason for decision" would have been both appropriate and helpful. In addition, we should have mailed a short survey to coaches shortly after the tournament to gain input regarding their perceptions of the usefulness of the various ballot forms in coaching their students.

Since the ballot is our primary means of communication in the tournament setting, we ought to be conducting more research on this pedagogical too. As the NDCF proceedings note (Murphy, 1984, p. 88): "If one area of tournament direction has been ignored, it has been ballot construction. Quite often, the configuration of the ballot seems to match the paper available."

The Puget Sound tournament also experimented with a 1-5 rather than a 1-4 ranking system for individual events. The primary rationale for using the 1-5 scale was reduction of ties in advancing students to elimination rounds and in determining places in finals. Comparisons of results using the 1-5 system versus results of a 1-4 system had been used to show the following: In advancing to elimination rounds, 18 breaks were "clean" and two were tied using the 5

point system; 14 breaks would have been clean and 6 tied using a 4 point system. In determining places in finals, the 5 point system did not impact 10 ties, helped a potential tie situation in 6 instances, and created a tie situation in 5 instances. Four students advanced to elimination rounds under the 5 point scheme who would not have done so had the lowest rank been a 4; eight students did not advance who would have if a 1-4 system had been used. In final rounds, 4 students took 4th place who would have been 3rd place winners under a 1-4 system. So we learned that the 1-5 system eases tabulation procedures in advancing students to elimination rounds but is not sufficient to reduce tie-breaking in determining awards. What did we not learn? What is the impact on competitors of a 1-4, 1-5, or 1-6 ranking system? How do judges respond to the use of a wider or narrower scoring range? Which scoring system better promotes the educational process of competitive forensics? Professors Littlefield (1986, 1987) and Hanson (1987) have recently published helpful information on tabulation procedures at our national tournaments; the opportunity for further research in this area remains. As Robert Weiss (1984, p. 9) has noted: "These methods are not completely arbitrary: they are derived from specific decision rules and values. Perhaps it makes a difference to us whether we subscribe to some value such as majority rule and perhaps it doesn't, but in each case we should explore the value implications of the procedure we use."

A third, and final, case in point: since its inception, the Northwest Forensics Conference has had a successful history of educational seminars at tournaments. A variety of formats has been tried, including a day-long "interpretation festival" run opposite debate rounds at the University of Oregon; multiple, concurrent individual events seminars run during a debate round at Pacific Lutheran University; and several "pre-awards-lag-time" forums. We have heard expert commentary on CEDA topics early in their season, students forensic criticism speeches, advice on preparation for national tournament, suggestions for adapting speeches to entertain "real" audiences from a successful member of the "knife and fork" circuit--just to name a few. We have had student-faculty discussions on the state of CEDA debate and on issues such as ethics, multiple entries, collapsing divisions, and Sunday tournaments. This year, the Puget Sound tournament experimented with a series of oral-critiqued final round seminars. Have we ever: sought feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches, studied the impact of a seminar on its audience, or shared our experimental insights with colleagues in other parts of the country? We have another research opportunity missed.

Clearly, we have opportunities as forensic educators to pay greater and more systematic attention to our teaching methods. The suggestion is not a new one; our literature contains recurring calls for study of tournament format, events, and practices (Zieglemueller and Parson, 1984, pp. 43-44). We are inventors; we need also to document our innovations.

Documenting Innovations in the Rhetorical Tradition

The Sedalia Conference bid forensic educators to reaffirm "our roots in and our close ties with academic departments of speech communication" (Nobles, 1974, p.75). There are many ways in which that reaffirmation occurs. One area in which we might do better is in bridging rhetorical and forensic scholarship.

We could do a better job of "translating' innovations in rhetorical theory for forensic students, many of whom are not speech communication majors and many of whom do not enroll in formal coursework where they might be exposed to good textbooks in the field. We could do a better job of bringing results of critical studies of "real-world" communication events to the forensic setting. For example: In 1985, the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* published a special issue to honor the memory of Chaim Perleman in which scholars discussed Perelman's theories of analogy, dissociation, and universal audience. Where is the scholarship by a forensic educator which brings, for example Perelman's insights on values in the *Realm of Rhetoric* (1982) to CEDA debaters? Richard Weavers' *Ethics of Rhetoric* (1953) includes his articulation of a hierarcy of argument forms. Where is the scholarship by a forensic educator which makes the implications of argument from genus, similitude, and circumstance useful for debaters? Many of us do rhetorical criticism of contemporary public discourse. For example, Pi Kappa Delta sponsored a panel at a Speech Communication Association Convention of the not too distant past on which a group of forensic educators presented case studies of argument in contemporary controversies. With no denigration of the authors intended--some of them are my closest friends--would it not have been insightful to include, on the panel or in the papers, implications of critical findings for competitive speakers and debaters?

My point is this: We tend to write our research in rhetorical theory and rhetorical criticism for other theorist and critics. We tend to emphasize historical, effects, social, and theory-developing orientations (Andrews, 1983). Could we not emphasize also, when appropriate, pedogogical applications for forensic students? Forensics is attacked at times as too remote from the "real" world situations. Perhaps we could do a better job not only of making forensics more applicable to the real world, but also of making our studies of the real world more applicable to forensic students. We have a research opportunity, then, in documenting rhetorical insights for forensic students and teachers.

Documenting our Forensic Tradition

In 1979, Lee Polk (p. 39) argued forcefully for research on the tradition of forensics itself. He noted:

> By understanding the reasons for the relevance of debate and forensic training in previous times, teachers of forensics can develop the perspective necessary for evaluating the relevance of the present forensic establishment to the needs and interests of the contemporary student. Johann Huizinga, the great Dutch cultural historian, warned many years ago that later generations often inherit only the forms of their ancestors' institutions without understanding or feeling the spirit which made those institutions relevant and meaningful at the time they were invented or created. Huizinga's warning that what is vital in one generation can become sterile in another, and his insistence that we retain the spirit as well as the form of our institutions, serves as

> persuasive justification for studying the evolution of the forensic establishment in American education.

Polk's call for research on forensic history is as relevant today as it was nearly twenty years ago. Perhaps it is even more compelling as we watch the diamond anniversaries of professional associations and forensic honoraries approach and pass. Larry Norton (1987) has made an outstanding contribution in documenting the history of Pi Kappa Delta. The videotape interview with Homer Veatch for the last PKD convention was also an important, albeit smaller, undertaking. There are several opportunities for substantial research in this area. We need to continue the history of PKD. We can build province histories as well. Part of this effort will include a commitment to proper archiving of materials. We also need to take advantage of audio, video, and transcribing technology in formulating an oral history of our activity. There are many wonderful teachers--"giants" of our field--from whom we could learn a great deal if we but took more time to ask.

Proposals for Forensics Research

More time . . . perhaps that is the constraint which impacts forensic educators most profoundly. It would be a redundant waste of the precious resource to expand on the problem here. Other difficulties we face in conducting research in forensics include a scarcity of appropriate vehicles for dissemination of research, a lack of financial resources, and a problem with "respectability." In this final section of the paper, I will offer some resolutions which may assist those interested in forensic research to overcome constraints they face.

1. **Pi Kappa Delta should urge each province to elect a province research officer and/or province historian.** These individuals could be charged with maintaining historical records, as well as coordinating study, recording, and dissemination of innovative forensic practices in their area. Walwik (1969, p. 45) offers a helpful insight in this regard:

> The current definition of a 'forensics person' centers essentially upon the question of whether the person is active as a forensics coach. With some notable exceptions, to leave coaching is to leave forensics. A strong commitment to and interest in research by the forensics community would provide another means of academic expression for those no longer interested in active coaching. Moreoever, the experience and insight of these men [and women] applied to research while unfettered by the demands of coaching and travel could produce much of real significance for our whole discipline.

In other word, in seeking province research officers or province historians, Pi Kappa Delta could tap its reservoir of former chapter sponsors or "alumni coaches" who still are very supportive of the organization.

2. **Pi Kappa Delta should investigate the possibility of a summer research seminar for forensic educators.** Summers often provide the only opportunities

that active coaches have for conducting research. In lieu of summer teaching or work at summer forensic institutes, perhaps coaches could have the opportunity to apply for participation in a summer research seminar in forensics. PKD ought to contact the National Endowment for the Humanities regarding their "Summer Seminars for College Teachers" program and if appropriate, recruit an appropriate seminar leader to apply for this program.

3. *The Forensic* should include a "Research Notes" feature on a regular basis. Some of the reports of innovative practices or tournament related research projects will not be of article length, nor may they be of interest to the wider audience of *Speech Communication Teacher*. A regular, refereed section of the journal for shorter research pieces would support research efforts and offer a means of disseminating results to a national audience. This section of *the Forensic* might be seen as a parallel to the Western Speech Communication Association's new *Communication Reports*.

4. Pi Kappa Delta should sponsor, at SCA or PKD conventions, "poster" programs for the dissemination of forensic research. These programs, used by the elementary and secondary school interest groups of SCA, as well as by our colleagues in the natural sciences and psychology, allow for dissemination of information on teaching methodology and research projects, as well as extended discussion with particular researchers if one is so inclined. Such sessions might be a more fruitful way of bringing together persons interested in particular aspects of forensic research than are more formal panels that draw an audience of only three or four.

5. Pi Kappa Delta should establish a permanent home and [illegible]ing for its national archives. Commitment of time and resources to this endeavor is essential if we are to maintain the documentation of our history and traditions for future teachers and students.

6. Pi Kappa Delta should urge the Council on Forensic Organizations to publish a guide to resources for research on forensics. At the present time, PKD does not have the financial resources to establish a research fund of its own. Such funds do exist, however, at least among several of the regional associations. Who is responsible for administration of funds in any given year, what the application procedures are, what deadlines exist, etc., are matters not widely known among forensic educators. A resource guide would be a helpful publication for forensic researchers.

7. Pi Kappa Delta should present at least one oral history interview at each national convention. Commitment to such a project would be one means of building an oral history collection and of honoring key contributors to the organization.

The final resolutions of this paper address the problem of "respectability" for forensic research. Many of us have read about or experienced personally, charges that forensic research is "less respectable" than other scholarship. Department colleagues or evaluation committees may tell us that we lack a coherent research program if we attempt to do work both in forensic research and, say, rhetorical criticism. We may denigrate our own forensic-related work

as we talk about doing our "real" scholarship in summers or other breaks from the competitive season. Proliferation of formal convention programs may give the impression we seek quantity over quality scholarship. I believe that we could improve the respectability of forensic research in two ways: 1) we need to provide appropriate vehicles for dissemination of smaller studies, work-in-progress, etc., (see resolutions 3 and 4); and 2) we need to recognize and reward excellent research efforts. Toward the latter end, I propose:

8. **Pi Kappa Delta should institute a research award, to be presented at each biennial convention, to honor the best forensic scholarship of that two-year period.** The recipient(s) of this award could be chosen by the National Council or a specially appointed subcommittee. Nomination procedures could be published in *The Forensic*, along with a follow-up piece honoring the winner(s).

9. **Pi Kappa Delta shoud institute a "President's Panel" or a "Competitive Panel" among its SCA allotted programs to highlight the best of the forensic research submitted for convention presentation.**

While urging his audience to take advantage of opportunities existing in their midst, Washington also claimed that "there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem" (Reid, 1988, p. 523). While we need not fall victim to Washington's flaw of denying tillers the chance to become poets, we can support fully and proudly the "tillers," those forensic educators who--as social scientists, rhetorical theorists and critics, or historians--choose to document the traditions and innovations of our field by conducting quality research in forensics.

REFERENCES

Andrews, J.R. *The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism*. Macmillan, 1983.

Dearin, R.D. "A Special Issue to Honor the Memory of Chaim Perelman, 1912-1984." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 22 (1985), 63-95.

Hanson, C.T. "Seeding as a Tournament Practice: Scheduling Elimination Rounds." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 23 (1987), 206-09.

Littlefield, R.S. "An Analysis of Tabulation Procedures Used to Produce Contestants for Elimination Rounds at National Individual Events Tournaments." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 23 (1987), 202-05.

Littlefield, R.S. "A Comparison of Tabulation Methods Used by Two 1985 National Forensic Tournaments." *National Forensic Journal*, 4 (1986), 35-44.

Murphy, J. "Individual Events." In *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics*. Ed. D.W. Parson. Speech Communication Association, 1984, 37-48.

Nobles, W.S. "Report from the President: Continuing Challenges and Prospectives for Progress." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11 (1974), 72-75.

Norton, L. *The History of Pi Kappa Delta, 1913-1987*. M&D Printing, 1988.

Perelman, C. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1982.

Polk, L.R. "Historical Research in Forensics: Its Status and Guidelines." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 7 (1970), 36-41.

Reid, R.F. Ed. *Three Centuries of American Rhetorical Discourse*. Waveland, 1988.

Walwik, T.J. "Research in Forensics: An Overview." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 6 (1969), 43-48.

Weaver, R. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Henry Regnery Co., 1953.

Weiss, R.O. "Four Methods of Computing Contest Results." *National Forensic Journal*, 2 (1984), 1-10.

Ziegelmueller, G. and D.W. Parson. "Strengthening Education Goals and Programs." In *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics*. Ed. D.W. Parson. Speech Communication Association, 1984, 37-48.

STRENGTHENING THE TOURNAMENT EXPERIENCE: DEVELOPING A MORE EXPLICIT SET OF EXPECTATIONS FOR OUR JUDGES

Colan T. Hanson
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

This article explores what standards might be used to help strengthen the critic-judge component in the forensic tournament. The argument is made that expectations of the critic-judge are not always clear to the judge; that judge training is sometimes a neglected areas of forensic education; and that certain practices of unschooled judges are counterproductive to the educational objectives of the forensic experience. Additionally, this paper argues that judge expectations need to be communicated more effectively to judges.

Tournaments are traditionally represented as a learning experience for the participants (Parson, p. 9). As professionals in the forensic community, we have devoted a lot of attention to issues related to the development of the student performer but much less attention to the development of the critic-judge. In some situations we have presumed that the critic-judge is an all-knowing person capable of functioning as a peak performer with a set of judging criteria which are not explicitly articulated, nor in some instances are those criteria actually communicated on the ballot. We can and should be doing more to assist in the development of schooled critic-judges for use in our forensic tournaments. I would like to recommend that Pi Kappa Delta take the initiative in developing a training program to assist forensic programs with the task of strengthening their individual judge training efforts. Several issues need to be addressed in this call for developing a program which will help strengthen the critic-judge component in the tournament setting: What are the attributes that we attach to a good judge; how can we develop those attributes in a critic-judge training program; and what can we do to cultivate the presence of those attributes among critic-judges in context of the administration of the forensic tournament.

In characterizing the problem of a critic-judge's behavior in the tournament setting, it is important to emphasize that the problem is a problem only insofar as we have chosen to label some behaviors as being contrary to the values we endorse as educators. For example, if a judge should appear to exhibit an attitude of favoritism toward competitors from a particular school, the behavior constitutes a problem only insofar as educators have chosen to embrace fairness as a positive value in the tournament setting. There are a number of positive judge attributes which might be regarded as outcome objectives of a judge training program. The literature discussing judge behavior in forensics encompasses suggestions from forensic educators and forensic competitors. In exploring some of those ideas, Holloway, Keefe, and Cowles (1989) note:

> Replies in this category [Judging] further confirm that students perceived the ballot as instrumental to learning. Ninety-one percent of the subjects agreed or strongly agreed that ballots help them improve in forensics. This high

> affirmation for the ballot does not negate the fact that some students did not think that judging is fair, either in individual events or debate. Over a third of the subjects took a neutral position on both items related to this matter.

One goal we might want to realize from a training program is that of creating a perspective that the judge will need to function as learning facilitator. Hanson (1984) in remarks shared at the National Developmental Conference on Forensics underscored the importance of viewing the judge as a learning facilitator:

> Often forgotten in the scurry to obtain the necessary number of judges needed to make the tournament run is the fact that the judge has a principal role to play, that of an educator in the evaluative setting. With no academic preparation, is it reasonable to assume that the critic turned loose on the competitors is a competent critic? Creating a condition of competency in a critic necessitates as much if not more educational training than does creating a condition of competency in the forensic competitor.

If the tournament setting constituted an ideal construct, we would be safe in assuming that all judges were also competent educators. Unfortunately, tournament administrators know only too well that not all judges are capable of being characterized as educators. Some judges, while capable of rendering an impartial rating and serving as rater so that a tournament can be held, are not schooled to function as educators in the learning situation.

The judge that adopts that attribute of educator-critic must be comfortable serving in that capacity. Rogers (1983) suggests that there needs to be a dimension of realness in the educational setting:

> When the facilitator is a real person, being what she is, entering into a relationship with the learner without presenting a front or a facade, she is much more likely to be effective. This means that the feelings that she is experiencing are available to her, available to her awareness, that she is able to live these feelings, be them, and able to communicate them if appropriate. It means that she comes into a direct personal encounter with the learner, meeting her on a person-to-person basis. It means that she is being herself, not denying herself (pp. 121-122).

As a goal of a training program, we might attempt to develop a judge that is capable and comfortable of functioning as a genuine educator. Rogers goes on to note that because the educator is a real person with thoughts and feelings, "students grow by being in contact with someone who really and openly is" (p. 122).

What other attributes do we seek to develop in the individual judge? Swanson and Zeuschner (1983) suggest that the critic ought to be a person who

focuses criticism on the process and product of the student's performance, and not on the student as a person. The perspective that Swanson and Zeuschner attach to the judge's evaluation, in part, characterizes an attribute which we might label as maturity. Implicit in the process of judging, is the need to offer criticism in a manner which is not antagonistic but constructive to the learner. Judges capable of offering criticism in a manner which focuses on the outcomes of the student's choices in performance rather than seeing those outcomes as the nature of the student as a person, may help bring a level of maturity to the judging scene which is more healthy for the contestant. Swanson and Zeuschner also suggest that the criticisms of a student's performance be geared toward presenting the student with options or "alternatives rather than absolutes" (p. 105). The mature judge will recognize that the students need feedback and direction on what they have attempted, not a prescription of what they must do to win. Maturity signals an ability to avoid the temptation to vicariously substitute yourself for those actually competing in the tournament round. The mature judge avoids delineating how s/he would perform or analyze a reading/speech and focuses on the process of responding to the student's actual performance. The attribute of judge maturity is closely related to the notion of being able to sustain a measure of personal distance from the actual process of competing. Students responding to a survey on traits of good and bad judges (Hanson, 1988) seem to suggest that they expect judges to be fair and to respond to the student in a manner which is neither biased or prejudiced. A program designed to produce better judges, then, would seem to need to address the issue of judge maturity if we expect objectivity from the critic.

The top six attributes associated with "good" judges, according to the student survey (Forensic, p. 20), were:

1 writes concise, helpful, truthful comments in a sufficient amount that you can learn from them.

2 pays attention, shows genuine interest in the speaker.

3 not prejudiced, biased, or partial against a school or a contestant but gives fair treatment to all.

4 actively listens, looks at contestants, doesn't just write but gives feedback.

5 makes contestant feel comfortable, smiles, is polite.

6 knows the event and its rules.

The top six attributes associated with "bad" judges, in that same survey were:

1 seems inattentive, no eye contact, writing

2 looks bored, uninterested, not listening carefully

3 appears uninvolved, doesn't want to be there

4 is rude, impolite, insensitive, smug

5 seems biased against contestant/school, show partiality

6 judging an event they don't know anything about (p. 21)

The student responses on the survey help clarify in a more focused manner, what ought to be some of the expectations of judges in the forensic community. Items appearing on the survey which have not yet been dealt with relate to the judge attributes of decorum, climate setting, responsiveness, and ethical integrity.

In an attempt to develop a training program which strengthens the quality of judges in the tournament setting, dealing with the issue of decorum might seem unnecessary. Behavior which is usually attributed to young teenagers sometimes finds its way into the tournament setting. Apparently, in some rounds of competition contestants engage in making faces at their opponents while those individuals are performing; some contestants seek to stack the audience with friends that respond only to their respective performances; some competitors attempt to disrupt their opponents' performances by talking loudly or creating nonverbal distractions; and some exploit their personal rapport with the judges in the round by employing flattery and deceit in their conversations with a judge(s). Behaviors like those just described happen, in part, because judges fail to take charge of the situation or are a party to those behaviors. Obviously, some attention in a training program ought to include dealing with discipline and disruptions in the tournament environment. Conflict in the tournament setting occurs because we find, to borrow a phrase from Hocker and Wilmont (1985), that the individuals are competing for rewards and they choose to interfere with each others effort to attain a particular goal. A positive judge attribute would help the critic-judge manage the conflict in a manner that protects the educational integrity of the contest situation.

Understanding the process of creating a positive climate in the tournament setting is another attribute that ought to be included in a judge training program. Goldhaber (1986) has suggested in the context of climate in an organization, that climate is a measure of people's expectations of the way they think things should be. The judge needs to be able to facilitate a positive climate in the tournament setting, if we want to afford the contestant all that a tournament experience has to offer. Part of the process of climate setting might include things like introducing yourself as the judge, providing feedback to the students' performances, behaving in a manner which underscores the notion of fairness and impartiality; and employing assertive behavior to manage disruptions.

Contestants seem to be very concerned about the responsiveness of the critic-judge in the round. They are obviously more interested in the facial responsiveness of the critic than they are in the number of hairs on the critic's head. How many times as a judge have we assumed that we were being attentive and responsive to the contestant while we sat there frantically

trying to record all of our salient observations on the student's ballot. Using Wolvin and Coakley's (1988) categories of listening behaviors, the critic-judge can be described as listening as a "critical listener" in the contest setting--listening with the task of having to make a decision using a set of criteria. As any judge would readily testify, listening in the capacity of a person having to make a critical comparative judgment, can be energy-intensive and exhausting. In preparing a judge to function as an educator-critic, some training ought to be devoted to the improving of one's listening abilities.

One final dimension of a training program for judges might include a dialog on sustaining the ethical integrity of the tournament experience. In some instances tournaments have been delayed in their schedule because some contestants have deliberately arrived late for rounds as a means of attempting to gain some advantage from speaking last in the round. Should tournament judges be involved in monitoring that type of behavior? Obviously, it is difficult for a tournament judge to be aware of contestant behaviors which border on the unethical if they are not aware that such practices take place. Should the judge intervene in a contest room, if s/he observes one student deliberately trying to create distractions for the person performing? Should the judge be encouraged to take corrective action if s/he discovers that a contestant has falsified information or distorted the storyline of a literary selection? Such topics are issues which are becoming more commonplace in a number of tournaments. To strengthen a judge's ability to deal with those issues, an awareness of those problems needs to be addressed in a training program.

While the list is not intended to be exhaustive, the attributes of a critic-judge which should be addressed in a training program should include: Creating an educational frame of reference; developing assessment competencies; cultivating a sense of comfort in serving as educator-critic; developing an ability to separate criticism of the process and product from criticism of the person; cultivating a sense of maturity; creating a sense of flexibility in the process of offering criticism; developing a sense of decorum for the judge; creating a sensitivity to the process of climate setting; expanding upon the listening competencies of the critic; and fostering a clear sense of ethical integrity, as well as exploring means that a judge might use to sustain the integrity of the contest experience.

The next major issue to be explored in this paper addresses the process we might employ to develop a judge training program. The first section of this paper could be taken as part of the design portion of a training program. The most fundamental step in the design phase of a training program involves a focused identification of the objectives of the program. Specifically, we need to ask: what do we want this program to do for us? An additional step in the design phase of the training program would involve deciding on what kind of training model we should employ. Once those objectives were in place, we could then move forward with the process of developing the training model and putting it into use.

My initial recommendation is that Pi Kappa Delta establish a national steering committee to pursue the objective of developing a judge training program that could be used by all its membership to help them strengthen their

efforts at training judges. The initial tasks of the steering committee might encompass identifying the salient attributes of a well-trained forensic judge, and exploring what might be the most effective training model for this program. My general sense is that a training model which makes use of a videotape program might facilitate the potential for widespread distribution of the training program. In addition, the training program ought to be one which is more encompassing than a lecture of do's and don't's. The program might encompass formats which include: A panel discussion; an interview; illustrations of positive and negative tournament practices; opportunities for small group case study discussions; role-playing experiences; and finally, some type of assessment of growth on the part of the trainee-judge. The training model ought to be produced in a manner which makes it available for a nominal cost to Pi Kappa Delta chapters. Province gatherings might also seek to become involved in the process of training educator-judges by sponsoring programs related to that issue. The task of enhancing the quality of judging for our students is a responsibility which rests with all of those committed to the continuation of competitive forensics. Pi Kappa Delta's commitment to the development of a judge training program would be another major act of leadership on its part, to carry forth the recommendations of the 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics.

The final issue to be addressed in this paper, focuses on what can we do to cultivate the presence of positive attributes of/among judges in the forensic tournament setting. One of the steps we can take as tournament participants is to provide positive reinforcement for good judge behavior when we witness it. Another action we can take when serving as a judge is to engage ourselves in an "active" state as a listener. Third, we can experiment with the process of trying to create a more positive climate in the tournament room when serving as judge. Fourth, we ought to crystallize the judging paradigm we employ in both debate and in individual events. Fifth, as critics, we should make an effort to focus on the positive and to be more instructional in the comments we make on the ballot. As tournament directors, we ought to continue to make use of our ballots which provide criteria of evaluation for the critic-judge. Additionally, we ought to continue our efforts to strengthen the ballot we employ in both speech and debate activities. The individual speaking events ballot might be further refined to add a point system which might prove easier for the critic-judge to employ. Further, the individual speaking events ballot might include a space for reason for the decision of comparative standing in the round. Obviously, the possible steps that we might take to strengthen the competitive tournament experiment could be endless. The important thing is that we not lose faith in our commitment to strengthen the educational experience for our students. An open mind and a fraternal spirit can help us accomplish great progress in the days ahead.

This paper has attempted to suggest that we can strengthen the tournament experience for our students by developing a more explicit set of expectations for our critic-judges. The tournament experience can readily be diminished for the student when s/he is subjected to aberrant judge behavior. The task before us involves: identifying positive judge attributes which we would like to see become a part of all judges; developing a training program which we can employ to disseminate our standards to our membership and the forensic community; and

perpetuate the standards which reinforce positive judge attributes within our current tournament setting.

REFERENCES

Coakley, C.G., & A. Wolvin. (1988). *Listening*. (3rd ed.). Dubuque: W.C. Brown Publishers.

Goldhaber, G.M. (1986). *Organizational Communication*. (4th ed.). Dubuque: W.C. Brown Publishers.

Hanson, C.T. (1988). Student's beliefs about good and bad judges. *The Forensic*, 73(4), 13-21.

Hanson, C.T. (1984, September). *Thoughts on the Evaluation of Students in the Individual Speaking Events Tournament Setting*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics, Evanston, IL.

Hocker, J.L., & W.W. Wilmot. *Interpersonal Conflict*. (2nd ed.). Dubuque: W.C. Brown Publishers.

Holloway, H., C. Keefe, & R. Cowles. (1989). Who are pi kappa deltans. *The Forensic*, 74(2), 1-12.

Parson, D. (Ed.). (1984). *American Forensics in Perspective*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to Learn for the 80's*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Swanson, D.R., & R.F. Zeuschner. (1983). *Participating in Collegiate Forensics*. Dubuque: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers.

INTERFORENSIC ORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION: THE INCREASING NEED

Sally A. Roden
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas

If we in Pi Kappa Delta heed the words of thinkers and scholars as truths, then we have a responsibility to promote, not only individual abilities in communication, but also we have a responsibility to promote ethics in young performers. Direct instruction in individual ethics may also serve as a natural springboard to interforensic organizational ethics and cooperation. By accomplishing this, we will provide an opportunity for young people to learn and experience personal growth while we fulfill some of the very ideas and ethics which initially led us to teaching and coaching.

Ralph Waldo Emerson defined eloquence as "the art of speaking what you mean and are." Cicero taught his students that "feelings of the hearers are conciliated by a person's dignity, by his actions, by the character of his life. . . ." Aristotle believed that the individual man is a member of society; in politics the good life of the state exists only in the good lives of its citizens. As recently as 1974 a report from the Second National Development Conference on Forensics stated, "For Forensics to promote educational goals, the vitality of human interaction, and socially responsible actions, communication must be guided by a robust moral vision. Such a vision includes not only minimum standards of conduct, but also higher goals to which people should aspire." If in Pi Kappa Delta we heed the words of these thinkers and scholars as truths, then we have a responsibility to promote not only individual abilities in communication but, as coaches, we have a responsibility to promote ethics in young performers. This paper will examine the responsibility of the Pi Kappa Delta educator to help young people sort, select and set into priorities certain values that determine individual ethics. This instruction in individual ethics may serve as a national springboard to interforensic organizational ethics and cooperation.

In helping young people address ethical priorities, a forensic educator has to deal sensitively with the issue of whether or not one value takes precedence over another. Different values lead to different ethical judgments. Who is to decide whether one standard is right or wrong or whether one standard of ethical behavior applies universally and for all time? Before answering these questions, however, perhaps a common definition of "ethics" is needed. According to J. Vernon Jensen, ethics address the "moral responsibility required in making intentional and voluntary choices in oughtness in relation to such basic values as rightness, justice, goodness, truthfulness, and virture." William Morris defines ethics as "the study of the general nature of morals and of the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others."

The issue of teaching values and ethics may be sensitive, but possibly not as sensitive as one might at first imagine. Instead of teaching right versus

wrong or ethical versus unethical, ethical standards might be presented on a continuum as Don Stewart suggests in his article, "A Standard of Ethics for Argument." He suggests that ethical quality can be placed on a seven-scale continuum that ranges from highly ethical to highly unethical. If young people are taught by Pi Kappa Delta educators that varying degrees exist in judging ethical standards, the likelihood of evaluating others with fairness may be increased. A scale or continuum could provide a greater tolerance for differences in ethical behavior and more of a sensitivity to these differences. Additionally, young people may tend to experience increased respect for others with differing talents, goals, and perspectives.

With Pi Kappa Delta educators teaching ethics and encouraging greater tolerance for differences, interforensic organizational cooperation will be enhanced. A greater feeling of cooperation among the organization will benefit the welfare of all students. Coaches will have increased pride in striving to help all students fulfill their potential. A true cooperative attitude developed among chapters of the organization will fulfill Article II of the Pi Kappa Delta Constitution which states that the purpose of Pi Kappa Delta is "to encourage a spirit of fellowship and brotherly cooperation." By teaching degrees of values, we will provide the extra incentive for acceptance and cooperation among the organizations of this fraternity on a national level.

As coaches of forensics, we have an additional opportunity to strengthen and guide young people in their formation of a set of values and to strengthen their guidelines for ethical behavior and the decisions of everyday life. At the fullest, forensics should help students establish life skills and values related to commitments and loyalties. As members of an honorary fraternity, coaches and students should support each other in order to provide a total growth experience. To attain this enhanced unity, the activities of forensics should promote group values and socially oriented values. Forensics as a performance area serves as a curricular and co-curricular laboratory for improving the abilities of students in research, analysis and oral communication. Forensics also develops social and interaction skills. Coaches working in the area of forensics have access to additional dimensions that most classrooms do not afford. We coach young people for competitive events, and we travel with them on weekend trips to tournaments and festivals. In our roles as Pi Kappa Delta educators and as everyday practitioners of communication, we must acknowledge our responsibilities for helping young people establish their own consistent ethical systems while challenging each in his or her individual pursuit of excellence.

Coaches should teach that all students and competitors must be recognized as persons to be respected and not as objects to be exploited. If coaches concentrate on competition as the primary dimension of education, they will leave their students seriously deficient. A great deal of wisdom and care is needed as we nurture inexperienced young people, many of whom are still highly impressionable. We should provide learning opportunities whereby value judgments and ethical behaviors are strengthened, and through interforensic organizational cooperation we are working together to achieve this common goal.

An obvious response at this point is to ask how might we accomplish all this and according to whose specific standards. First, our concerns should be

for the educational mission of the forensic activity, and secondly, we should be sensitive to the problems inherent in the often highly competitive forensic area. It becomes the responsibility of the forensic educator to maximize the opportunities for ethical and behavioral development among all participants. We should emphasize learning even above competitive success. We should discourage actions and competitive behaviors that serve only personal ambition. Coaches should not encourage or condone young people who may seek to rewrite portions of an author's work, invent definitions involving unwarranted shifts in the intent of the meaning of words, or fail to maintain a respect for the integrity of the language or literature. Spoken words need to be guided by a strong sense of honesty. In a competitive situation, one could argue, situational ethics may allow a certain relaxation of basic ethical guidelines because of the unique competitive circumstances. However, the temptation to distort truth or falsify facts in order to win a competitive event most definitely is not justified by any standard of ethics. Students should be taught to accep' maturely both winning and losing. It is the duty of the coach to oversee the preparation of the competitors to insure that they part'cipate fairly, honestly, and in such a way as to avoid behaviors which are deceptive, misleading or dishonest. Responsible young competitors should be discouraged from making hasty generalizations and the resultant fallacies in argumentation. Instead, young competitors in forensics should be encouraged to use valid evidence to explain and support ideas. Sources of information should be objective and qualified. If these qualities are encouraged in student reasoning, invalid analogies may be avoided. As a basic educational practice, both sides of an issue should be researched in order for students to learn the facts as well as the ability to state facts truthfully. Coaches have an obligation to see that young competitors act responsibly in their desire to win. We need to encourage self-discovery, social knowledge and the pursuit of good for all. We should support and reward young competitors who make ethical choices and who avoid any unethical behavior. Competition through forensic activities should be an aesthetically and educationally enriching experience. Consequently, a renewed and significant commitment of our time and energy is needed to teach values vigorously and explicitly and to ensure that forensic competition directly encourages these values. In the pursuit of good for all, a useful alliance of cooperation within the organization will be formed.

Coaches also need to promote respect for others. Behaviors by students which belittle, degrade, demean or otherwise dehumanize other competitors should not be allowed. More emphasis within the fraternity should be placed on fellowship and on developing a feeling of shared enthusiasm. Coaches should foster respect for opponents, colleagues and critics. Attitudes can be analyzed to evaluate the level of ethics of an entire forensic program. Standards of conduct toward others may reflect the value statements of coaches and the schools they represent, both as coaches and as judges of competitive events. We in Pi Kappa Delta should place increased value on the time we spend together. Because all students deserve the benefits of each judge's attention and efforts, the educator as judge and coach must model fair treatment of all students. A judge/coach should act as a primary reinforcer of ethical behavior by applying his or her expertise as judge in good faith. It is the responsibility of judges/coaches to be well informed and, therefore, able to make appropriate critical judgements of competitors who may misrepresent, distort or fabricate

evidence. If judges/coaches allow or ignore unethical practices, conclusions drawn by participants may be erroneous as to the ethical behavior which is acceptable. The individual actions of judges/coaches have a direct effect on others. Whether as judge or coach, or in both capacities, these individuals function as role-models to peers and to students and have an inherent responsibility to act professionally at all times.

As judges and coaches we cannot deny the impact of our present actions on the future organization of Pi Kappa Delta. The success of a forensic program is usually due to the success of the coach. We have all known of chapters and programs that ceased to exist after a position has been vacated. Abandoned Pi Kappa Delta chapters have placed some administrators in positions where budgets are tight to direct funds to another area which has resulted, ultimately, in a dead forensic program. To assure that this situation rarely exists, we must prepare future coaches and judges. We must create a desire in our students either to join our ranks or to take our places. We can do this by sharing the benefits afforded one another from our interforensic cooperation, by assisting our students in realizing the importance of self-worth and by being of service in the ethics of education.

As we examine ethics and ethical behaviors as the responsibilities of educators in forensic programs, it becomes clear that the answer to how we must accomplish the goals related to values and ethics is by direct teaching. Just as Emerson described eloquence as "the art of speaking what you mean and are," forensics may be described as the laboratory for teaching the ethics of communicating what you mean and for teaching the ethical behavior of what you are. Regardless of the range of forensic activities and competition, individual coaches must emphasize an overriding communication ethic which binds educators and students in a bond of mutual respect and support. Our mission for the future of Pi Kappa Delta should be to develop good members and encourage companionship among chapters locally, regionally and nationally. We should continue to cooperate and communicate as we define and redefine ethical obligations for each individual competitor and for forensic competition. We must create the energy and commitment needed for devoting more time to promoting educational ethics. If we do this, we will also meet the increasing need for interforensic organizational cooperation. Our goal should be to foster what Aristotle considered so many years ago, the good life of the individual and the state, or the good life of the individual and Pi Kappa Delta, by assisting students to develop the capacity for critical self-observation and analysis of motive and actions so that they strive for the highest quality of work and achievement of which they are capable. In order to accomplish this, students must be provided opportunities to compete responsibly and effectively in an intellectual environment. It is through activities such as these that young people will develop positive character traits such as self-confidence and respect for dissenting opinions, and this will directly prepare them for "life after forensics." The forensic vision and the coach's vision should be a vision by which a forensic student might wish to be known later in life, such as that proclaimed by Cicero: "By their dignity, by their actions and by their Character of life." Let us then reenergize ourselves with a commitment to address, not only the subject matter of communication but the ethical issues and concerns as well. Let us purposefully commit ourselves to the goal of increasing interforensic

organizational cooperation. If we do this, then we of Pi Kappa Delta will have provided an opportunity for young people to learn and to experience personal growth, and we will be fulfilling some of the very ideas and ethics which led us to teaching and coaching in the first place.

REFERENCES

Bartanen, M.D. (January, 1988). "The Case for Regulation of Forensic Transfers." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 73, 1-6.

Jensen, J.V. (October, 1985). "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication." *Communication Education*, 34, 324-30.

Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson. IV. Boston, 1909-14, 342.

Littlefield, R.S. (Fall, 1986). "The Use of the Undergraduate Student in Tournament Management: Some Ethical Consdierations." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 72, 2-6.

Lucas, S.E. (1986). *The Art of Public Speaking*. New York: Random House.

Ross, W.D. (1927). *Aristotle*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Second National Developmental Conference on Forensics. *A Rational for Forensic Education*. 1974.

Second National Developmental Conference on Forensics. *The Ethics of Forensics*. 1974.

Stewart, D.J. (Spring, 1986). "A Standard of Ethics for Argument." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. 71, 53-60.

Thonssen, L.; Baird, A.C.; and Braden, W.W. (1970). *Speech Criticism*. New York: The Ronald Press.

Watson, J.S. (1970). Trans. *Cicero, Marcus Tullius*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

ETHNIC AND CROSS-CULTURAL CHALLENGES IN THE ROLE OF HONORARY IN THE FORENSICS COMMUNITY

L. Crowder Churchill
Rocky Mountain College
Billings, Montana

This article looks at the emerging new majority throughout the United States and addresses some of the cross-cultural issues that Pi Kappa Delta will need to resolve if the members of PKD want to live up to the honor of "honorary" - a sense of doing what is right and proper with integrity. Are we developing primarily Euro-American white students for tomorrow's leadership while sacrificing our emerging ethnic majority students? Is what we teach about the status quo, in fact, "in actual existence"? How PKD meets these ethnic and cultural challenges will determine its visibility in academia, the political and corporate worlds.

An important and too infrequently discussed trend in our country is our rising racial (herinafter called ethnic) population.[1] This article looks at the emerging new majority throughout the United States and some of the intra-cultural issues that Pi Kappa Delta needs to address if we want to continue our rich legacy of being progressive pioneers within the forensic community.[2]

I quote Edith Folb, Professor at San Francisco State University:

> Sitaram and Cogdell (1976) have identified intra-cultural communication as 'the type of communication that takes place between members of the same dominant culture, but with slightly differing values' (p. 28). They go on to explain that there are groups ('subcultures') within the dominant culture who hold a minimal number of values that differ from the mainstream, as well as from other subgroups. These differences are not sufficient to identify them as separate cultures, but diverse enough to set them apart from each other and the culture at large. 'Communication between members of such subcultures is intracultural communication.'[3]

Edith has written a brilliant article, "Who's Got the Room at the Top? Issues of Dominance and Nondominance in Intracultural Communication." In addressing hierarchy, power, dominance and nondominance, she asks: "Whose social order is maintained? Whose beliefs and values are deemed appropriate? Whose norms, mores, and folkways are invoked?"

Her response is as follows:

> In most societies, as we know them, there is a hierarchy of status and power. By its very nature, hierarchy implies an ordering process, a sense of the evaluative marketing of those being ordered. . . .

Whatever the basis for determining the hierarchy, the fact of its existence in a society assures the evolution and continued presence of a power elite - those at the top of the social hierarchy who accrue and possess what the society deems valuable or vital. And, in turn, the presence of a power elite ensures an asymmetrical relationship among the members of the society. In fact, power is often defined as the ability to get others to do what you want and the resources to force them to do your bidding if they resist - the asymmetrical relationship in its extreme form.

But the perpetuation of the power elite through force is not the most effective or efficient way of ensuring one's position at the top of the hierarchy. It is considerably more effective to institute, encourage, and/or perpetuate those aspects of culture - knowledge, experiences, beliefs, values, patterns of social organization, artifacts - that subtly and manifestly reinforce and ensure the continuation of the power elite and its asymmetrical relationship within the society. Though we may dismiss Nazism as a malignant ideology, we should attend to the fact that Hitler well understood the maintenance of the power elite through the manipulation and control of culture - culture as propaganda.

Though I would not imply that all power elites maintain themselves in such an overtly manipulative way, I would at least suggest that the powerful in many societies - our own included - go to great lengths to maintain their positions of power and what those positions bring them. And to that end, they support, reinforce, and, indeed, create those particular cultural precepts and artifacts that are likely to guarantee their continued power. To the extent that the culture reflects implicitly or expressly the needs and desires of of the power elite to sustain itself, it becomes a vehicle for propaganda. Thus, cultural precepts and artifacts that govern such matters as social organization and behavior, values, beliefs, and the like can often be seen as rules and institutions that sustain the few at the expense of the many.[4]

Further, Folb tells us that a "dominant culture significantly reflects the precepts and artifacts of those who dominate culture and is not necessarily, or even usually, a reference to numbers, but to power."

"Nondominant groups," Folb tells us, are:

> . . .those constellations of people who have not historically or traditionally had continued access to or influence upon or within the dominant culture's (that is, those who dominate culture) social, political, legal, economic, and/or religious structures and institutions. Nondominant groups

> include people of color, women, gays, the physically challenged, and the aged, to name some of the most prominent. . . .Within the United States, those most likely to hold and control positions of real - not token - power and those who have the greatest potential ease of access to power and high status are still generally white, male, able-bodied, heterosexual, and youthful in appearance if not in age. . . .
>
> As Porter and Samovar (1979) remind us 'We (in the United States) have generally viewed racial minorities as less than equal; they have been viewed as second class members of society - not quite as good as the white majority - and treated as such. . . . Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Indians, and Orientals are still subject to prejudics and discrimination and treated in many respects as colonized subjects.'[5]

I have chosen to elaborate on these definitions so we can have common, academically acceptable frame of reference.

Most of you will remember one or more of your ethnic students who were outstanding in debate. Perhaps Thurgood Marshall was in your class. Or, you remember someone who excelled in drama, prose, or impromptu in individual events. Most of us have an ethnic success story to tell, but this paper is meant to focus on the ethnic majority, not the few superstars that can be our comfortable tokens to reminisce about.

One of the important issues we need to consider is our accepted and pervasive use of the Western-European traditions of debate. Because, it is from this tradition that we teach what the status quo is, and I ask, is our version in actual existence? The status quo is presumed to have widespread acceptance, or it would not continue to exist.[6] The status quo is presumed to be "in actual existence."[7] is what we teach really the greatest good for the greatest number or is it the greatest good for the Caucasian population, a population that has become accustomed to being in the majority and defining what is the greatest good for the Caucasian population, and forcing it on other ethnic populations? Are the propositions that we have used down through the years in our forensic tournaments consistently reflecting Caucasian concerns, to the exclusion of ethnic concerns?

Again, I quote from Edith Folb:

> Perhaps nowhere is a dominant culture's (those who dominate culture) etnnocentrism more apparent than in the missionary-like work carried on by its members - whether it be to "civilize" the natives (that is, to impose the conquerors' cultural baggage on them), to 'educate them in the ways of the white man,' or to 'Americanize' them. Indeed, the very term American is a geopolitical label as we use it. It presumes that those who inhabit the United States are the center of the Western hemisphere, indeed its

only residents. Identifying ourselves as 'Americans' and our geopolitical entity as "American,' in light of the peoples who live to the north and south of our borders speaks to both our economic dominance in this hemisphere and our ethnocentrism.

Identifying the United States in geopolitical terms is to identify it as a conqueror and controller of other peoples, and suggests both the probability of nondominant groups of people within that territory as well as a polarized, even hostile relationship between these groups and those who dominate culture. What Rich and Ogawa (1982) have pointed out in their model of interracial communication is applicable to most nondominant peoples: 'As long as a power relationship exists between cultures where one has subdued and dominated the other . . . hostility, tension and strain are introduced into the communicative situation.' Not only were the Indian nations and parts of Mexico conquered and brought under the colonial rule of the United States, but in its industrial expansionism, the United States physically enslaved black Africans to work on the farms and plantations of the South. It also economically enslaved large numbers of East European immigrants, Chinese, Irish, Hispanics (and more recently, Southeast Asians) in its factories, on its railroads, in its mines and fields through low wages and long work hours. It coopted the cottage industries of the home and brought women and children into the factories under abysmal conditions and the lowest of wages.

Indeed, many of the nondominant peoples in this country today are the very same ones whom the powerful have historically colonized, enslaved, disenfranchised, dispossessed, discounted, and relegated to poverty and low cast and class status.[8]

It is this geopolitical ethnocentric bias that I will be taking into consideration in my proposal for increasing our ethnic students in forensics, while also advocating that we need to educate ourselves, along with our Caucasian students, about the positive benefits of incorporating non-Western European traditions of debate into our forensic system.

As Carl Becker says:

There are tremendous barriers . . . to the acceptance of argumentation and debate as methods for the consideration of new proposals . . . in East Asia. . . .

Many Westerners may be convinced of the importance of logic, and of its superiority to emotive intuition. Yet we need to be careful not to discard those areas of human life and communication in which intuition may be extremely

valuable, in our efforts to quantify and mathematize. We may agree with Habermas that an ideal speech situation requires equality of participants, freedom from social coercion, suspension of privilege, and free expression of feeling (rather than self-censorship) cf. Burleson and Kline. But we should realize that this is at best a very Western ideal, both impractical and even theoretically inconceivable to traditionally educated Chinese and Japanese.

We desire to understand our powerful East Asian neighbors, to do so, we propose to communicate. It is true that they may have many ideas to learn from our forms and modes of argumentation and debate. At the same time, we should not forget the long and relatively peaceful histories they have experienced, entirely without the benefit of our methods of discussion and rhetoric. Before imposing our own models of communication upon them in another gross display of insensitivity and cultural imperialism, let us remind ourselves that our own presuppositions about ideal communications are also culture-bound. In mutual respect, while we make our communication methods and studies available to those in the Far East, let us seek to understand their own respective cultural contexts.[9]

We are at a unique period of time, a time that most of us are not prepared for. For too long, we have been thinking of the nondominant ethnic populations as minorities, and now we are going to have to re-educate ourselves because the major ethnic populations are collectively becoming the majority.

If we do not develop our own awareness, and our student's awareness of our geopolitical ethnocentricity, will we unwittingly be developing our historically Euro-American Caucasian forensic students to become the leaders of tomorrow at the expense of our emerging ethnic majority - thus creating our own apartheid?

Out of 50 states plus the District of Columbia, 36 states are listed as having PKD chapters in the 1989 PKD Directory.[10] Of these chapters, how many of our forensic teams have significant ethnic population involved? How many of us coaches work to develop the Indian, Asian, Hispanic or black talent available to use on our campuses? How many of us teach our Euro-Caucasian students about their fellow students' cultures from the aforementioned group? How many of us really know much about these cultures ourselves?

In 1983, 42 percent of the United States' population was ethnic.[11] The ethnic groups listed were: 1) black; 2) Hispanic; 3) American Indian, Aleut or Eskimo; 4) Asian; and 5) other, which included Iranian and all other people not fitting into one of the four primary nonwhite ethnic groups.

I was surprised to learn that there are only three states in our country that have less than a 10 percent ethnic population: Maine, 6.2 percent; Vermont, 7.85 percent; and New Hampshire, 8.64 percent.[12]

There is evidence to suggest that the figures I am using to represent our ethnic population is considerably low because the figures I am using were compiled in 1985; more recent and isolated accounts reveal a much higher ethnic percentage.

I will use California as an example because I think it is distinctive and noteworthy.[13] In 1966, California's Caucasian educational enrollments K-12 totalled 75 percent; in 1985, 53 percent; in 1988, 49 percent; and by the year 2000, California's Caucasian enrollment is projected to 43 percent.

In other words, demographic data show that 23 years ago only 25 percent of California's population was ethnic; 6 years ago, 47 percent; and today, 51 percent. Within 17 years, California's ethnic population has risen by 25 percent.

If you look at Table 1 in the Appendix, you will see that California has the third highest Hispanic, second highest Asian, and eighth highest "other" ethnic population.[14] Further, you will see that of the states having PKD chapters, California becomes the state with the highest Hispanic and Asian populations. It also has twelve Pi Kappa Delta chapters. What a wonderful opportunity for PKD to reach out and teach "functional leadership skills for life through debate and individual events to these specific populations.[15] (See Table 2 in the Appendix.)

Some of you will argue that you do not have very many ethnic students on campus. That is true, proportionately we do not have the number of ethnic students at the college level as we do Caucasian students. This is a critical problem that we should address through our recruiting practices. Unfortunately, the scope of this paper does not permit me to focus on recruiting. But, while we acknowledge the need to recruit more ethnic students to participate on our teams, we also need to look at the number of chapters we have in each state and at the states without PKD chapters.

Unfortunately, in the two places with the highest ethnic populations (Hawaii, 83.29 percent and the District of Columbia, 79.76 percent), there are no Pi Kappa Delta chapters. What a wonderful contribution the debate team from Howard University, and others, would make to our PKD tournaments, likewise, with the University of Hawaii.

In looking at all the states that appear to not have PKD chapters, we are missing a significant number of potential ethnic members. In Table 3 of the Appendix, you will see that New Mexico has a 53 percent ethnic population and only 2 PKD chapters; New York show a 43 percent ethnic population with only 6 chapters; Texas, 42 percent with 18 chapters; Mississippi, 40 percent and only 1 chapter; New Jersey, 38 percent with 3 chapters; and both North Carolina and Florida with 37 percent ethnic population and only 4 and 3 chapters, respectively.[16]

Of these 10 states with the highest ethnic populations, 8 states have a total of 49 Pi Kappa Delta chapters which comprises 21 percent of all our PKDs. This means that almost one-fourth of our chapters already have an opportunity to take a leadership role in training tomorrow's ethnic leaders on their forensic team.

Let me share some of my experiences in trying to integrate my ethnic students into our forensic program.

In Montana, where I teach, our state is ranked as being the sixth highest American Indian populated state in the nation, and our school has less than a one percent American Indian student population on campus. On the other hand, Montana is also one of the ten states with the lowest black and Asian populations.[17] Ironically, I have two black, two Hispanic, three Asian (two Japanese and one Chinese), and one Samoan students who are trying to participate in the forensic program.

All of these students say they came to Montana because they didn't want to be in an urban environment, and they wanted the wide open spaces where they thought they would be safe. All of these students are disappointed in the system. Many have changed from debating to doing individual events because they felt too intimidated by their fellow-Caucasian students.

At this point, it may be helpful to share some of the insights I have gleaned from teaching my ESL classes. In retrospect, I can see that I have been too quick to put down the educational system in our country because I have been disappointed in the lack of exposure to literature and history our students have when they get to college. It was my expectation that foreign students, particularly Asian students, would have a far superior grounding in these subjects. Much to my surprise, my foreign students are generally as unknowledgeable about the history and literature of their cultures as are the students from our culture. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that at the undergraduate level we generally do not get the foreign students who are the academic achievers in their own system.

In my ESL class, we are looking at what constitutes images and realities in each of our cultures, and trying to analyze whether artists, authors and musicians present us with their images, a culture-bound reality, or a universal reality. In doing this, we have been looking at primarily writers from their respective cultures.

Our first barrier was the inaccessibility of literati from their cultures, and second, was access to literature that had been translated into English.

If we are not at least attempting to expose our students and ourselves to the literary greats of other cultures, can we ethnically say that we are contributing to our student's conscious awareness of a culturally-diverse nation, and ultimately, a sense of belonging to a global world?

How many of us expose our individual events students to the Asian literature of Mishima Yukio?[18] Mishima made his name in 1948 with the publication of "Confessions of a Mask," in which a lonely youth comes to recognize his forbidden sexuality and his need to wear a mask before the world to conceal it. How many of us ever heard of the famous Latin American poet, Derek Walcott, from Santa Lucia? Most of my ESL students will be performing in the April forensic tournament we are hosting. And further, because of the fun we are

having in ESL with literature from other cultures, as well as our culture, I am requiring the students in my Oral Interpretation class to experiment with literature from other cultures. Most of the students from this class are also in individual events on our forensic team.

I would like to share a couple of sad experiences that my Asian students have had. First, my Chinese girl placed fourth at a tournament in dramatic interpretation and came and told me that a Caucasian judge had asked her what she was doing trying to participate in a language that she did not even understand. What better way to learn the language than dare to perform? Second, one of my Japanese girls, who is working very hard at practicing the English language and becoming more expressive with her nonverbal behavior says that she is caught in a catch-twenty-two: her fellow-Japanese students reject her because she is "trying to be too American," (the Japanese mode is to stay in the clan) and her American fellow-students reject her because she is "not American" - in other words, not Caucasian - but trying to be.

In my argumentation class, two of my black students asked if we could have a separate class so they "could learn the material without being verbally assaulted by the whites." This led me to interviewing all of my ethnic students who, I discovered, also felt intimidated by the verbal aggressiveness of Caucasian students.

It has taken me a whole semester to realize that I have to create special classes for my ethnic students who want to participate in forensics, especially debate. Even though it is rewarding, it also has its challenges.

Problems across-the-cultures include: 1) lack of basic knowledge about debate; 2) lack of basic "general" knowledge and more specifically, knowledge about political science and the American Constitution; and 3) the most potent barrier seems to stem from the fact that four primary nonwhite ethnic groups - blacks, Indians, Asians and Hispanics - all come from culturally different attitudinal and communication stances than their Euro-Caucasian counterparts. For example, much like the Asians, the focus of argumentation in the African culture and subsequently our black culture, is on "complimentary dualism" - where both sides are heard and both sides win. Would this not be a positive and exciting new way to judge debate?

A common communication stance that is different from ours is that in the Hispanic, Asian and Native American cultures, silence is revered. And blacks, though vocal on their own turf, are generally silent because they feel overwhelmed in the white culture. Caucasians are taught from infancy to be verbal, and verbally articulate in stardard English using masculine logic - that to succeed, they MUST be verbal!

As educators who purport the noble ideals of democracy and the freedom for the pursuit of happiness, I wonder just how noble or honorable we are being as forensic coaches and speech professors, or as an honorary forensic fraternity, when we allow only our verbally aggressive Euro-Caucasian students to be our debaters. It is because they bring home the trophies and trophies supercede an equal educational experience for ALL our students? May Dillard, president of

Stanford's Black Student Union, charged recently, "There's something wrong with the best and brightest. There is an appalling ignorance among many students about other cultures, and that leads to trouble."[19] I would agree with Mary.

"The overwhelming majority of Caucasian college students graduate from all-white high schools and live in comparable neighborhoods. Similarly, very few black students experience more than token racial integration before coming to college."[20]

It is this kind of fear and isolation leading to bigotry and injustice that Martin Luther King, Jr. fought during a career of preaching and protest.[20a] Dr. King's legacy, however, works to obliterate hostility and fear with love and understanding. It rejects separateness and preaches a coming together for society. It provides a solid basis on which to rout racism.[21]

As mentioned earlier, the nonargumentative East Asians have had a long and relatively peaceful history.[22] Likewise, President Bush has talked about a kinder, gentler America, and I believe most Caucasians could learn a lot about being kinder and gentler from their counterparts of color - black, Indian, Hispanic and Asian.

Some of you are probably saying this is not fair, and I am saying to you that if we do not want to contribute to an aparthied attitude, we have to change our forensic requirements, especially our debating requirements. That is, if we want to help our ethnic students learn debating and have more solid opportunity to move into leadership roles. Political leadership in our country requires a fundamental knowledge of how to debate.

Pi Kappa Delta could accomplish several things by creating a category called Explorations Debate Division I and II. Division I would have very specific guidelines about the "basic," minimal knowledge that could be displayed in a tournament. A tournament could be two schools who choose to work together, or against each other as is the case in debate. Division I would be primarily for ethnic students and presumably other first-generation college students who have not been exposed to forensics. We could have the ethnic populations debate each other for up to one year in this category. After they have experienced tournament debating this way for a year, they could move into the Explorations Debate Division II for another year. In Division II, Caucasian students who want to learn the debating styles from other cultures, or who genuinely want to help students from other cultures learn the Western-European style of debate, could be allowed to participate in this division. Would not our Caucasian students have a great learning experience if they were judged by a panel of multi-cultural judges where the objective was not winning or losing the debate? After two years, ethnic students could then be required to enter novice debate and thrown into the den of wolves, as it were, to hold their own during their third and fourth years of debate.

Members of ethnic groups might be saying that this idea is partronizing, that it is a two-tiered concept; that is not my intention. What I am saying is that to be politically successful in this country requires Western-European

debate skills. And I cannot think of another solution that allows all students exposure to learning all forms of debate.

How Pi Kappa Delta meets these ethnic and cultural challenges will determine its visibility in academia, the corporate and political worlds.

In conclusion, I would like to review some articles of the Pi Kappa Delta Constitution. In Article I, it says that Pi Kappa Delta signifies "the Art of persuasion, beautiful and just." In Article II, it says, "It shall be the purpose of this fraternity to stimulate progress in and to further the interests of intercollegiate speech activities and communication in an effort to provide functional leadership training for life, to foster beneficial competition in intercollegiate speech and communication activities, and at the same time encourages a spirit of fellowship, brotherly cooperation, and incentive to achievement." And, finally, in Article XII, it states that, "Pi Kappa Delta is organized exclusively for educational purposes."[23]

I submit that unless we forge ahead with great speed and attempt to incorporate our ethnic, soon-to-be majority, and unless we teach ourselves and our students about these cultures, we will not be fulfilling the Articles of our Pi Kappa Delta Constitution, or the Constitution of the United States of America. Pi Kappa Delta has always served as a forum for new ideas and has made a name for itself in trying innovative ideas. I hope this is an idea you will embrace.

I would like to end by proposing a resolution. "Resolved: That Pi Kappa Delta will earn greater visibility in the academic community, corporate and political worlds by providing functional leadership in the art of persuasion to a wider membership base that specifically includes our increasing ethnic population in the United States. Specifically, Pi Kappa Delta will open new divisions within tournaments for pre-novice ethnic students to participate in for two years before being required to participate as a standard novice in forensic tournaments."

By focusing more attention on our ethnic stude we will be opening more doors of opportunity for interforensic organizational cooperation. I have enough pre-novice-standing ethnic students who would love to debate with other students at the same level from MSU in Bozeman or Car ll College in Helena, Montana, that I believe this proposal is workable. These students really want to participate in forensic tournaments, and the current system does not offer them something meaningful.

A new intra-cultural committee could be established and operate under the umbrella of the Forensics Assistance Program. As part of educating new judges about forensics in general, we could also require some basic knowledge about intra-cultural forensics to receive national certification for judges.

APPENDIX

Table 1.[24]

Highest in descending order, and corresponding number of PKDs in state:

	Black	PKDs	Hispanic	PKDs	Am. Ind.	PKDs	Asian	PKDs	Other	PKDs
1.	DC	0	SC	0	AK	0	HI	0	HI	0
2.	MS	1	DC	0	OK	9	CA	12	NY	6
3.	SC	0	CA	12	NM	2	WA	8	NJ	3
4.	LA	6	NY	6	AZ	0	NY	6	RI	0
5.	GA	3	NC	4	SD	6	OR	5	MA	1
6.	AL	3	FL	3	MT	2	VA	3	CT	0
7.	MD	2	HI	0	AK	8	AZ	0	PA	15
8.	NC	4	NV	0	NV	0	MA	1	CA	12
9.	VA	3	NJ	3	ND	3	MD	2	FL	7
10.	AK	8	IL	12	MO	16	NJ	3	NV	0
		30		40		46		40		40

Lowest in ascending order, and corresponding number of PKDs in state:

	Black	PKDs	Hispanic	PKDs	Am. Ind.	PKDs	Asian*	PKDs	Other	PKDs
1.	NH	0	ME	0	CT	0	VT	0	MS	1
2.	ND	5	AL	3	PA	15	NH	0	TN	8
3.	SD	13	NH	0	NJ	3	MN	4	KY	5
4.	ID	3	AK	8	MI	5	ND	13	SC	0
5.	MT	2	SD	13	HI	0	MT	2	NC	4
6.	VT	0	ND	5	NY	6	UT	0	AK	8
7.	ME	0	VT	0	RI	0	SD	6	AL	3
8.	WY	0	WV	3	DC	0	WY	0	GA	3
9.	UT	0	TN	8	WI	11	ME	0	LA	6
10.	MN	4	KA	9	KA	9	ID	3	VT	0
		27		48		49		28		38

*all listed in the Asian group had less than 1% Asian population in the 10 states.

APPENDIX

Table 2.[25]

All states not listed in the 1989 PKD Directory and their ethnic population:

Maine	3.2%	Connecticut	22.64%
Vermont	7.85%	Delaware	27.37%
New Hampshire	8.64%	Nevada	30.31%
Utah	14.87%	Alaska	34.22%
Wyoming	19.06%	South Carolina	34.9%
Arizona	20.26%	Dist. of Col.	79.76%
Rhode Island	22.64%	Hawaii	83.29%

Table 3.[26]

In descending order, the 8 highest ethnic populated states with PKDs:

State	Percent	Number of PKDs
New Mexico	52.9	2
California	47.29	12
New York	42.53	6
Texas	41.91	18
Mississippi	40.28	1
New Jersey	38.20	3
North Carolina	37.26	4
Florida	37.02	3

NOTES

[1] The word "ethnic" is used in this paper to avoid pejorative interpretation of the terms minorities, people of color, nonwhites, racial, etc.

[2] This article and my interest in the subject is the direct result of the inspiring administrators and professors I worked under during my tenure at West Virginia State College: Dr. Thomas Cole, then President; Dr. Ancela Bickley, then Academic Vice President; Dr. James Russell, Acting President for a year; Dr. Virginia Edwards, Chair of my department; and Dr. Ida Kramer, History Professor. But, my specific interest in the ethnic demographic shift arose from a speech I heard at West Virginia State College on October 29, 1966, by L. Eudora Pettigrew, President of The State University of New York at Old Westbury.

I owe special thanks to Jimi Cantrell, Professor at Carroll College, Helena, MT; Larry Dawkins, Professor, Mt. Hood Community College, Mt. Hood, OR; Dr. James Russell, Acting President, Southern West Virginia Community College; Dr. Virginia Edwards, Professor-emeritus, West Virginia State College; and Dr. John Bilorusky, Director, Western Institute of Social Research, San Francisco, CA, for my revisions.

[3] Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter, *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 5th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1988), pp. 121-122. Edith A. Folb, "Who's Got the Room at the Top? Issues of Dominance and Nondominance in Intracultural Communication." This original essay appeared in print for the first time in the third edition. All rights reserved. Permission to reprint must be obtained from the publisher and the author. Professor Folb teaches at San Francisco State University.

[4] Ibid., p. 123.

[5] Ibid., pp. 125-126.

[6] Jon M. Ericson and James J. Murphy with Raymond Bud Zeuschner, *The Debater's Guide*, (Carbondale, IL: South Illinois University Press, 1987).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Edith A. Folb, op. cite., pp. 128.

[9] Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter, *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 5th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1988), pp. 251-252. Carl B. Becker, "Reasons for the Lack of Argumentation and Debate in the Far East," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10 (1986), pp. 75-92. Reprinted by permission of the publisher. Carl B. Becker is Assistant Professor of Asian Curriculum Research and Development at the University of Hawaii.

cf. B. Burleson and S. Kline, "Habermas' Theory of Communication: A Critical Explanation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65 (1979), pp. 412-428.

[10] Pi Kappa Delta 1989 Directory.

[11] James Paul Allen and Eugene James Turner, *We The People - An Atlas of America's Ethnic Directory*, (New York: Macmillan, 1988).

[12] Ibid.

[13] Cheryl Sullivan, "The U.S. - A State at Risk," *The Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 3, 1989.

[14] Allen and Turner, op. cite.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] M. Yukio (1925-1970 - real name Hiraoka Kimitake). He was a Japanese author who wrote novels, short stories, plays and essays.

[19] Curtis J. Sitomer, "Editorial," *The Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 1989, p. 13.

[20] Ibid.

Thomas Kochman, *Black and White Styles In Conflict In Communication*, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

[21] Curtis J. Sitomer, op. cite.

[22] Samovar and Porter, op. cite.

[23] Pi Kappa Delta 1989 Directory.

[24] Allen and Turner, op cite.

[25] Allen and Turner, op cite.

[26] Allen and Turner, op. cite.

FORENSIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

William A. Yaremchuk
Monmouth College
West Long Branch, New Jersey

After a review of the 1984 National Conference on Forensics, the author identified two major areas of concern for Inter-Organizational Cooperation: 1) assistance for new or declining forensics programs and 2) the quality of judging. It is recommended that a Forensics Assistance Program (FAP) be established to provide information and support for new and ailing forensics programs. Moreover, a National Certification for Judges (NCJ) program for strengthening forensics judging is advocated. The conclusion is drawn that Pi Kappa Delta can provide the initial impetus towards the establishment of a forensics assistance program and national judge certification.

The National Developmental Conference on Forensics which convened in Evanston, Illinois, September 12-15, 1984, examined in depth the topic of Inter-Organizational Cooperations.[1] Its focus was on 1) the variety of organizations, 2) a potential forensics merger, and 3) areas of cooperation interest.[2]

The 1984 Conference adopted a resolution establishing a national council of forensics organizations. Several of council's proposed actions included: 1) The preparation of an annual calendar, a code of ethics, a results booklet, and a directory; 2) coordination of SCA convention programs and development of a national forum for forensics; and 3) an assistance program for forensic directors.[3]

Of the major proposed tasks of a national forensic council, two major considerations remain largely unaddressed: 1) Training for new directors of forensics, and assistance to new, small, or struggling programs; and 2) Judge training and certification.

First, greater emphasis needs to be provided by the established forensic organizations to assist new directors of forensics. The new director, unless inheriting an established program, will face numerous obstacles in the operations of a program, the recruitment of students, and the coaching of student performers. The new director may as well not perceive how to best develop support or funding for the program.

The new director may have some experience in selected aspects of forensic activity, but not in all aspects. For example, a new director with extensive experience in debate may now be directing an individual events program. Or a person with a strong public address background may be faced with coaching oral interpretative or theatre-oriented events. This new director may need some initial assistance to succeed in the early stages of one's career in coaching.

The new director also might be required to administer a program which includes a debate tournament, a drama competition, a poetry contest, a speak-up series, or a Model United Nations. The diversity of these related forensic

activities may result in inadequate understanding, experience, or skills in the management of these special events.

A national or regionally established Forensics Assistance Program (FAP) would serve to provide the necessary contacts and general information required for the new director. Moreover, the FAP would schedule workshops for skills development in tournament management, special events (drama competition, Model United Nations, and others), fundraising, recruitment, and coaching student performance.

Smaller program or programs struggling with reduced budgets, declining student interest, or wavering administrative support also would find the FAP of value. Suggestions for dealing with these types of problems could be provided by the FAP system. Forensic programs which have declined may profit from activities sponsored by the FAP. The FAP itself or any other interested party might assist with the re-institution or resurgence of a faltering program. Overall, a focal point of information and support, such as FAP activities, may significantly advance forensic education by assisting the new director's programs as well as any established or declining program.

A second major concern of this report deals with judge training and certification. Greater cooperation is necessary in the area of judging debate and individual events contests. The single greatest complaint of students deals with the quality of judging. The FAP would sponsor judging workshops to assist the new, as well as, the established coaches with the interpretation and understanding of judging criteria, rules clarification, consistency of judgment, and methods of reporting results.

Moreover, the FAP could take the first step towards a National Certification for Judges (NCJ). The common complaint of always having "bad judges" would be alleviated in large measure with a national certification program. Each person seeking to act as a forensic judge would file an application for judging certification with the FAP. The application would include 1) credentials, 2) past forensic experiences, 3) special training in speech, theatre, or debate events. Each major forensic activity, such as NDT debate, LD debate, extemporaneous speaking, Model United Nations, poetry, dramatic pairs, etc., would be listed. An individual would seek certification in one or all of the following five areas: 1) debate, 2) oral interpretation, 3) theatre-oriented, 4) public address, and 5) special events (student congress, Model United Nations).

The FAP would schedule judging training workshops to provide the necessary background and observation for judge certification. These workshops could be scheduled as a part of a national convention program, preceding regularly scheduled tournaments, or as a special summer workshop program. During early September, several topic seminars and training programs could be established without interference with the traditional forensic season, which commences in September. After participation in various selected workshops or seminars, an individual would become certified to judge those events in future forensic contests. The FAP would not only assist with the presentation of workshops, but would also coordinate the certification process. Over a two year period, the

FAP would develop all the aspects of a national certification program for forensic judges (NCJ). Within an additional two year period, the actual training and certification would be initiated. For example, if the FAP with its NCJ concept was approved this year, its activities would be fully operational by 1991 and could begin the certification program. By 1993, all aspects of the FAP/NCJ would be established.

In order to assist new directors of forensics, to stimulate the small or declining programs, and to assure quality judging, the various forensic organizations need to unite in these common efforts. Inter-Organizational Cooperation is called for to meet these needs. The Council on Forensics, as proposed in 1984, ought to initiate a general forum to explore the feasibility of a forensic assistance program, such as FAP, and the implementation of a national certification for judging (NCJ). As a first step, a convention program should be scheduled to discuss and debate the merits of both programs, especially the subject of judging certification. Moreover, a summer workshop or seminar should be sponsored as a first effort for clarifying judging responsibilities, and developing effective evaluative skills.

If the major forensic organizations are unable or unwilling to cooperate in these endeavors, then Pi Kappa Delta should undertake such a program. Pi Kappa Delta could establish a FAP to assist its provinces and member organizations in each of the provinces. Moreover, PKD could establish a special committee for assessing the feasibility and workability of a certification program for judging. In addition, with or without national certification, PKD could sponsor judging seminars or workshops as part of its national convention program or as a special summer program.

Much has been accomplished by those working to create greater Inter-Oranizational Cooperation. However, two major areas, assistance to new/ailing programs and quality judging, need concerted attention. The 1984 convention served to initiate major cooperative change. Let the 1989 PKD National Convention stimulate continued progress in these two endeavors.

NOTES

[1] See *American Forensics In Perspective*, edited by Donn Parson. (Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association), p. 3 and pp. 49-52.

[2] *Chapter VI Inter-Organizational Cooperation*, p. 49.

[3] See p. 51 of report for listing of the nine specific actions recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Offered by the Working Group on Organizational Structure and Processes

1. Article X should be revised to allow for more expedient consideration of proposed constitutional changes.

2. A mail ballot election should be conducted for all PKD leadership positions.

3. The size of the National Council should be increased.

4. Student participation on the National Council should be expanded and limited to the host province.

5. The national secretary-treasurer should have ex-officio status on the National Council and be non-voting.

6. Non-enforceable sections of the Constitution should be deleted.

7. A limit below which the treasury may not fall without the declaration of an emergency should be set.

8. Standards for accepting and rejecting members by local chapters should be revised.

9. Pledging, as a concept in PKD, should be reviewed.

10. The language used in the initiation ceremony at the chapter level should be revised.

11. A student task force to identify tasks and roles for students to perform in PKD governance should be created.

12. The possibility of having two or more National Council members from the same province should be reviewed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Offered by the Working Group on Competitive and Noncompetitive Out ets

1. PKD should showcase winners from each group of A, B, and C events at the national banquet as entertainment. These could be rotated so that over a period of conventions, all events could be used.

2. PKD should institute a public forum debate match within each province (on an off topic) to recognize the final four debate teams in each province.

3 PKD should encourage extemporaneous Lincoln-Douglas debate at tournaments throughout the year.

4. PKD should encourage an educator-oriented ballot-critique. Judges should be recognized for writing the best ballots at both province and national tournaments, as well as at invitationals.

5. PKD should schedule a training meeting for coaches and judges over contest rules and ballot writing prior to the beginning of the tournament events at the province and national tournaments.

6. PKD should establish consistency between debate and individual events concerning elimination rounds and awards.

7. PKD should schedule a program (panel) designed to exchanged and develop an interest in non-competitive speech activities at the next national developmental conference of PKD.

8. PKD should propose to SCA (or hold in conjunction with SCA) enrichment of speech activities and forensic education.

9. PKD should encourage institutionals to develop a speech education curriculum and/or the activities of state professional associations of speech involved in curriculum development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Offered by the Working Group on Forensic Pedagogy and Research

1. PKD should send a resolution to the Association of Communication Administrators encouraging communication administrators to offer directing forensics in their curricula.

2. PKD should develop a directory of member schools offering courses and/or programs in forensic education on the undergraduate and/or graduate level.

3. PKD should request SCA to include the designator "forensics" (or a form of it) in its graduate school directory.

4. PKD should establish a national steering committee to develop a judge training program aimed at helping the inexperienced judge function more effectively as an educator critic.

5. Experimentation with the criteria-referenced ballot be continued.

6. All ballots used at PKD tournaments should carry the words: "Reason for Decision."

7. PKD should disseminate a standard ballot to facilitate the establishment of a data base for future forensic research.

8. PKD should encourage students and coaches to embrace research as a dimension of the forensic experience.

9. PKD should urge the Council of Forensic Organizations to publish a guide to resources for forensic research.

10. PKD disseminate guidelines for conducting research at its national tournament.

11. PKD should investigate the possibility of holding a summer research seminar for forensic educators.

12. PKD should sponsor poster programs at SCA and PKD conventions for the dissemination of forensic research and teaching methodology.

13. PKD should present and record at least one oral history interview at each national convention.

14. The editor of *The Forensic* should be encouraged to include a "Research Notes" column on a regular basis.

15. PKD should present a biennial research award for the best forensic research published by one or more of its members since the preceding convention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Offered by the Working Group on Interforensic Organizational Cooperation

1. PKD should be committed to the goal of increasing interforensic organizational cooperation within its own member schools and within the larger forensic community.

2. All forensic programs of Pi Kappa Delta should make a recommitment to education and the highest level of ethical standards as primary objectives.

3. One of the programs sponsored by PKD at the SCA convention should deal with one aspect of directing a forensic program. At the next PKD national convention and tournament, a coaching clinic should be sponsored (just as the Developmental Conference was sponsored).

4. PKD should encourage the national Council of Forensic Organizations to take a stronger role in promoting and coordinating forensic education in the nation.

5. The Council of Forensic Organizations should organize, compile, and publish a listing of all forensic organizations stating their philosophies, goals, and a description of their activities.

6. PKD should investigate the impact of intercultural changes in and upon the forensic community.

DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

Presenters and Respondents

Kris Bartanen
Department of Comm. & Theatre Arts
University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, WA 98416
(206) 756-3463

Marty Birkholt
Department of Speech Comm. & Threatre
Moorhead State University
Moorhead, MN 56560
(218) 236-2126

Vicki Bradford
Department of Comm. Arts
Regis College
Denver, CO 80221
(303) 458-4969

Don Brownlee
Dept. of Speech Communication
CA State Univ.-Northridge
Northridge, CA 91330
(818) 885-2853

Laura Churchill
Department of Speech
Rocky Mountain College
Billings, MT 59102
(406) 657-1082

Margaret Greynolds
Department of Comm. Arts
Georgetown College
Georgetown, KY 40326
(501) 863-8161

Colan T. Hanson
Department of MCSCTA
North Dakota State University
Box 5462
Fargo, ND 58105
(701) 237-7789

Joel Hefling
Department of Speech
SD State University
Brookings, SD 57007
(605) 688-6131

Pam Joraanstad
Department of MCSCTA
North Dakota State University
Box 5462
Fargo, ND 58105
(701) 237-8221

Carolyn Keefe
Department of Speech Comm. & Theatre
West Chester University
West Chester, PA 19383
(215) 436-2450

Gina Lane
Department of Communication
William Jewell College
Liberty, MO 64068
(816) 781-3806 x439

Cindy Larson-Casselton
Department of SCTA
Concordia College
Moorhead, MN 56560
(218) 293-3333

Susan Miskelly
Department of Speech Communication
Bridgewater State College
Bridgewater, MA 02324
(617) 697-1200 x2134

Larry Norton
1010 North Heading Ct.
Peoria, IL 61604

James Norwig
Department of Speech
Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, LA 71272
(318) 257-4766

Robert Ridley
Speech Department
Southwest State University
Marshall, MN 56258
(507) 537-7103

Sally Roden
Department of Speech and Theatre
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR 72032
(501) 450-3160

Anthony Schroeder
Department of Comm. Arts & Science
Eastern NM State University
Portales, NM 88130
(505) 562-2415

Harry Strine, III
Department of Comm. Studies
Bloomsburg University
Bloomsburg, PA 17815
(717) 389-4576

Don Swanson
Department of Speech Comm.
Willamette University
Salem, OR 97301
(503) 370-6244

Penny Swisher-Kievet
3804 South Crane
Independence MO 64055
(816) 373-2651

Rita Whillock
Department of Comm. Arts
University of Al-Huntsville
Huntsville, AL 35899
(205) 895-6645

Kelly Jo Wright
Department of Comm. Arts & Sciences
Station #3
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130
(505) 562-2415

Bill Yaremchuk
Department of Speech, Comm., & Threatre
Monmouth College
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
(201) 571-4430

Registered Participant Observers

Kathy Atchison *
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Carol Alexander
Arkansas Tech University
Russellville, Arkansas

Kirk Baruth
Sterling College
Sterling, Kansas

Jamie Bonor-Bridges *
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Jeri Butler
Austin Peay University
Clarksville, Tennessee

Sam Cox
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri

Bob Derryberry
Southwest Baptist University
Bolivar, Missouri

Dawn DeVeaux
Austin Peay University
Clarksville, Tennessee

Ken Goering
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado

Fran Hassenchal
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

Fay Hawks
Arkansas Tech University
Russellville, Arkansas

Hal Holloway
California University of Pennsylvania
California, Pennsylvania

Ted Huffman *
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Andrea Lester
Austin Peay University
Clarksville, Tennessee

Robert Littlefield
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Beverly McArter *
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

V. Joliece McClendon
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado

James McPhee
Bridgewater State University
Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Kristi Paulson *
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Ann Price
Arkansas Tech University
Russellville, Arkansas

Rebecca Ramsey
Sterling College
Sterling, Kansas

David Ray
University of Arkansas
Monticello, Arkansas

Bill Scheffield
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

Dierdre Silva
Bridgewater State University
Bridgewater, Massachusetts

V. Leisa Smith
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Wes Wilkerson
Arkansas Tech University
Russellville, Arkansas

Aaron Williams
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado

Andrea Yates *
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

* Non-luncheon Registered Participants