

ment¹² proved reliable for this problem. Barnlund found that group decisions, reached through cooperative deliberation, are significantly superior to decisions made by individual members working alone and to majority rule.

Procedure

The subjects used in this investigation were 149 students participating in contests in debate and individual events at the 1963 National Pi Kappa Delta convention-tournament on the campus of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois. Testing was done on a voluntary basis. The subjects were not given any previous instructions prior to the experimental sessions. When students arrived at the designated testing room, they were handed either Form "A" or Form "B" of the **Logical Reasoning Test**, instructed to answer the questions and allowed to leave upon completion of the test.

The tests were administered on three consecutive days in an effort to acquire a sampling of the population. Of the 500 delegates attending the convention 149 voluntarily became experimental subjects. Of these subjects 95 were participants in debate, 49 were participants in individual events, and 5 participated in both individual events and debate. Ninety-two of the contestants were men and 57 were women. These individuals represented 71 colleges and universities from 22 states.

Instrument

The measuring instrument selected for this experiment was Form "A" and Form "B" of E. E. Bradley's **Logical Reasoning Test**.¹³ These tests, used extensively in studies by Tame¹⁴ and Barnlund,¹⁵ incorporate the use of the syllogism in 35 multiple-choice test items.

Statistical analyses made to check the content validity of the tests demonstrate high reliability and validity coefficients. The problems on each of the two forms include the 19 valid

moods of the syllogism along with the 11 most common fallacies. The reliability coefficient is .93 for Form "A" and .90 for Form "B." The mean for Form "A" is 16.4, that of Form "B" is 16.75. The standard deviations of Forms "A" and "B" are 6.6 and 6.4. Intercorrelation of the two forms, using the Pearson Formula, yields an "r" of .88. Continued use of the test, with similar populations, indicates that there has been no significant change in norms from 1950 to 1964.

Treatment of the Data

The test scores and the contest records became the data for this study.

The test scores were first divided into two groups: those from Form "A" and those from Form "B." Subdivisions were made into other individual groupings as men, women, debate contestants, individual events contestants, etc. The arithmetic mean for each group was compared with that of the other groups and that of the normative sample. The basic tool for statistical analysis was the "t" test.

Results

In light of the questions posed the following results were found:

1. Are debaters superior to a normative group in logical reasoning ability?

TABLE I

In the comparison of debaters' test scores with those of an established mean, the former proved significantly higher in logical reasoning than the "normative group." Using the "t" test of significance debaters tested by Form "A" and Form "B" were examined. In all cases the debaters rated higher than the normative sample. Debaters studied separately on Forms "A" and "B" rejected a null hypothesis as shown in Table 2. Table I shows the debater higher in the arithmetic means and in every other statistical calculation.

¹²Bradley, *op. cit.*

¹³Bradley, *Ibid.*

¹⁴Tame, *op. cit.*

¹⁵Barnlund, *op. cit.*

Table II

2. What correlation may be found between achievement in tests and ratings in individual contests?

For the purpose of analysis of relationships between ability as shown by tests and ability as shown by contest ratings, the scores of individual events participants were divided into four groups on the basis of their test and contest ratings. These groups are reported in Tables 3 and 4.

Method of Grouping. Of the raw scores gathered from the tests on logical reasoning a scale was designed to divide the scores into percentile groups. Both Forms "A" and "B" were combined for these data. The maximum score on both forms for the participant in individual events was 33; the minimum score was 9. The range was 24. This range of distribution produced the percentile groupings shown in Table 3.

Within each of the four groups, subdivisions were made on the basis of contest ratings. The participants in individual events ranking in the upper ten per cent were rated "Superior"; those in the next 20 per cent were rated "Excellent"; those in the next 30 per cent were rated "Good." Those contestants ranking below the above standards were designated with "No Rating."

TABLE III

In a general analysis of the patterns of distribution, as depicted in Table 3, the students who were rated highest in the contest situation scored in the upper percentiles of the logical reasoning test. In the second percentile the subjects ranked in equal division within the ratings of "Superior" and "Good." Similar to Group I, Groups III and IV show a significant decline on both the test scores and contest ratings.

A comparative analysis was made into the relationship of performance as shown by contest ratings and ability in logical reasoning. The arithmetic means of each percentile group were statistic-

ally compared to the mean of the normative group by the use of the "t" test for significance. The "t" values and comparisons are included in Table 4.

In all these comparisons, therefore, there was a pattern of progressive ascendancy as to members within the respective groups scoring in the percentiles of the tests and contests. The correlation between test scores and contest ratings proved significant at the one per cent level of confidence in all instances except that group termed "No Rating" which proved significant between 20 and 30 per cent.

TABLE IV

3. What differences in logical reasoning ability are found between men and women?

The "t" test was also used in the analysis of logical reasoning ability for men and women. A comparative analysis was made for the following relations: 1. the mean scores for men and women on Form "A," 2. the mean scores for men and women on Form "B," and 3. the mean scores for men and women on both Forms "A" and "B." The arithmetic means indicated that men rated slightly higher than women in logical reasoning ability. On the other hand, the statistical analysis showed that, at the one per cent level, there was no difference between the means calculated. The data for this analysis is found in Tables 1, 2, and 5.

TABLE V

Summary

The subjects for this analysis were 149 delegates from 71 colleges and universities and 22 states attending the intercollegiate contests at the National Pi Kappa Delta Convention of 1963. The test scores and contest records of these subjects, with statistical computations, became the data for comparison and analysis.

The data collected and analyzed in this study suggested the following conclusions:

1. The results of this study reinforce the findings made by Brembeck,¹⁶ Howell,¹⁷ and Tame¹⁸ that those students participating in debate do possess more ability in problem solving than those of a normative group. All comparisons of the debaters' arithmetic means with those means established for the **Logical Reasoning Test** support this proposition.

2. Comparisons of test scores and contest ratings of the individual events participants indicate that those students scoring high on the logical reasoning test were ranked high in contest activities as shown by Table 3. Those students ranking high or low on the **Logical Reasoning Test** ranked similarly in the contest situation. Statistical analysis revealed that the arithmetic means for each group is far greater than that of the normative group as shown in Table 4.

3. The statistical analysis shows no significant difference in logical reasoning ability between men and women.

Discussion

This study opens some areas for further investigation. One of the questions is, does debate really improve the ability of the student who participates or does it merely attract those who have this ability? It is true that ability in logical reasoning is closely related to

general intelligence and that persons who excel in debate are no doubt those of superior ability initially.

The findings of this study would indicate that the difference between the ability of the debater and the "normative group" on which the means of the test were established is great enough that there is probably a dual force at work. That is, the persons who are attracted to debate do have superior ability but there is also reason to believe that this ability is improved through participation in the activity. Just as the physical ability of the individual is improved through proper and regular exercise, so can mental ability be improved through exercise, and debate is an excellent form of exercise for this purpose.

Probably the most important finding of the study was the high positive correlation between excellence in speaking and scores on the test. This would further reinforce the argument that ability in logical reasoning is a counterpart of effective communication in the speaking situation. This portion of the study needs to be expanded as the sampling was too small for generalization, but the indication of direction leads to some interesting speculations.

That men are not superior to women in this area will come as no surprise to anyone. Since this test was constructed in 1949, no significant differences between the scores of men and women have been found in over 2000 cases examined.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL POPULATIONS

Population	n	ΣX	\bar{X}	ΣX^2	\bar{X}^2	$\Sigma \bar{X}^2$	sd
Form "A."	70	1626	23.00	39532	529.00	1762.35	5.02
Form "B"	74	1586	21.40	36329	457.96	2337.16	5.62
Debaters	95	2161	22.74	51644	543.62	2486.94	5.12
Debaters (A&B)	95	2161	22.74	51644	543.62	2486.94	5.12
Indiv. Ev. (A&B)	49	1051	21.45	24171	493.28	1628.12	5.76
Men (A&B)	92	2075	22.55	49547	538.55	2746.73	5.46
Women (A&B)	57	1245	21.84	28717	503.81	1523.58	5.18
Estab. mean							
Form "A"	1000	16400	16.40	—	—	43516.40	6.60
Estab. mean							
Form "B"	1000	16750	16.75	—	—	40919.00	6.40

¹⁶Brembeck, op. cit.

¹⁷Howell, op. cit.

¹⁸Tame, op. cit.

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL COMPARISONS WITH TEST NORM
 (Comparisons of test scores with
 the established mean*)

Test	"t" value from sample	"t" value from table (.01)	Null Hypothesis rej. or ret.
Debaters (A)	+7.168	2.57	rej.
Individual Contestants (A)	+4.683	2.57	rej.
Debaters (B)	+5.656	2.57	rej.
Individual Contestants (B)	+2.944	2.57	rej.
Debaters and Indiv. Con. (A)	+8.468	2.57	rej.
Debaters and Indiv. Con. (B)	+6.122	2.57	rej.
Men (A)	+7.339	2.57	rej.
Women (A)	+4.769	2.57	rej.
Men (B)	+4.840	2.57	rej.
Women (B)	+3.714	2.57	rej.
Men and Women (A)	+8.536	2.57	rej.
Men and Women (B)	+5.877	2.57	rej.

*Established means for Forms "A" and "B" are 16.4 and 16.75.

TABLE 3
COMPARISON OF CONTEST RATINGS WITH TEST SCORES

Range		Contest Ratings				Frequency
		Superior	Excellent	Good	No Rating*	
Group I: 10%	30-33	5	3	2	0	10
Group II: 20%	27-29	6	6	6	1	19
Group III: 30%	21-26	1	10	9	7	27
Group IV: 40%	9-20	0	2	8	22	32
Total		12	21	25	30	88

*Those delegates rating lower than "Superior," "Excellent," and "Good."

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED AND ESTABLISHED
MEAN USING THE "t" TEST

Contest Rating	n	Calculated Mean	Established Mean	"t" value from sample	Significance
Superior	12	28.9	16.6	6.556	$p < .01$
Excellent	21	25.6	16.6	6.277	$p < .01$
Good	25	22.4	16.6	4.429	$p < .01$
No Rating	30	18.0	16.6	1.179	$.2 < p < .3$

TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS

Test	"t" value from sample	"t" value from table (.01)	Null hypothesis rejected or retained
Men and Women (A)	+1.0123	2.57	ret.
Men and Women (B)	+0.1505	2.57	ret.
Men and Women (A&B)	+0.7817	2.57	ret.

Pi Kappa Delta President Honored



Left to right: Mrs. Frances Billeaud, Instructor of Speech and Chairman of the Arrangements Committee; Mrs. Roy D. Murphy; Roy D. Murphy, National President of Pi Kappa Delta; Peter E. Mayeux, U. S. L. speech major; Elizabeth O. Robertson, President of the U. S. L. Chapter of Sigma Alpha Eta; and Charles L. Dupin, President of the Louisiana Gamma Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta.

The Louisiana Gamma Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta held its Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Speech Takes a Holiday Banquet in honor of Professor Roy D. Murphy who sponsored the first Speech Takes a Holiday Banquet at the University of Southwestern Louisiana in the spring of 1940.

Professor Murphy is National President of Pi Kappa Delta, Immediate Past-

President of the Southern Speech Association, and a Past-President of the Louisiana Speech Association.

The alumni, students, and faculty of the Department of Speech presented a beautiful gold wrist watch to Professor Murphy and the local chapter of Pi Kappa Delta presented to him a set of golf cuff links and a tie clasp as tokens of appreciation. Mrs. Murphy was also presented a charm bracelet.

The local chapter of Sigma Alpha Eta informed Professor Murphy that he had been elected to Honorary Membership in the organization by the local chapter upon the approval of the National Executive Council. Sigma Alpha Eta is a national honorary speech and hearing therapy fraternity.

Dr. Waldo W. Braden, Chairman of the Department of Speech at L. S. U., Past-President of the Speech Association of America, and a member of Pi Kappa Delta, was the featured speaker of the evening. His address was entitled, "Breaking the Thought Barriers."

Some one hundred seventy alumni, students, and speech faculty members were present for the anniversary banquet.

On the Other Hand—

EDNA C. SORBER

The following article is in response to Mr. Fouts's article in the May **Forensic**

At the risk of showing a tendency to resist change, I cannot help pointing out that the "straw men" set up by Mr. Fouts, have more substance than he might have realized.

Particularly does his definition of "originality" seem unusual, set up as he has it as an opposite to "borrowing". It would seem that a specific definition of each term would serve to show similarities rather than differences between these items. As originality is used in reference to the words of the debater, orator, or extemp speaker, it usually deals with the use made of the information included. The speaker is expected, not to lose contact with reality, but to utilize the evidence he has collected to support reasons for or against the idea with which he is dealing. Originality lies in his use of the material, **not** in his invention of the material. Quantity of quoted material might be measured, but such measurements seem irrelevant since the term "originality" deals ordinarily with use of quoted material, not amount. If the interp speaker has a duty to take the ideas of the author, and re-think them himself, use the author's ideas to support arguments with which the author may or may not have been familiar, treat the author's material as factual evidence for defending or defeating an idea, then there would seem to be similarity between the activities. If, however, the interp speaker has a duty to convey the thoughts, and feelings, of the author by means of the use of the author's own turns of phrase, then the similarity needs to be sought on other grounds than "borrowing" versus "originality".

According to some definitions of persuasion, all communicative activity can be thus classified. Mr. Fouts assumes that oratory, extemp, and discussion are less persuasive than debate. His

definition of "stimulate" as to "stir the emotions" is at variance with other definitions of this term, especially that used by Robert Oliver in his **Psychology of Persuasive Speech**. Oliver includes speeches to stimulate as persuasive speeches, but uses the term in a didactic way that would bring gray hairs to a literature enthusiast.

Further study of Oliver, Brembeck and Howell, or Minnick, will show that persuasive speaking is not effective if it is merely a depiction of examples of anything. Persuasion results from relating examples and ideas to the needs of the **specific audience** — a procedure impossible if the absent author is to be allowed to keep his own wording of his ideas. Moreover, since most people have no more intention of murdering their fathers than they do of following the current trend to put "beans in their ears", a reading of **Oedipus** must have more reason for being than a "persuasive activity".

Finally, the inclusion of interp in contests devoted largely to persuasive original speaking does not seem to indicate "recognition" on the one hand, and "exclusion" on the other. It sometimes seems to be little more than including a change of pace activity in a tournament. When interp turns out to be a popular event, it does an excellent job of violating what many interp teachers consider to be the purpose of reading aloud. To say that interp should not be a recognized activity of Pi Kappa Delta is not to say that it is not valuable, not useful, not acceptable as a discipline. Football, glee clubs, home economics classes, painting, have all received "acceptance and inclusion in the curricula of colleges and universities all over the country." This does not warrant their consideration as branches of activity for Pi Kappa Delta.

Extemp Speaking

LEON CAMP

Since the first extemp contest held at the 1924 Peoria convention¹, Pi Kappa Deltans have argued the merits of the extempore speaking event. In 1946, the Province of the Pacific under the leadership of Edward S. Betz surveyed the student participants at the Province Tournament. The students believed the extemp topics to be too narrow, bemoaned the supposed emphasis on using "facts" rather than "creative analysis," and conjectured that the event suffered from a lack of "clear objectives."² In 1950, a disenchanted Pi Kappa Delta coach, B. W. Hope, voiced his criticism of extemp speaking in the May 1950 *Forensic*. As a judge, he said, extemp is "unrealistic, uninteresting, and unfair." The one-hour preparation on "unequal" topics ("some topics are interesting, some are not") is not like "real life." He suggests that students may not be interested in current events, and that the collegiate minded audience should deal more with "subject" area questions instead of the usual adherence to politics, international relations and history. Also, continued Mr. Hope, why not try using a **statement** rather than a question for the extemp topic?³

Writing in the December 1952 issue of the *Southern Speech Journal*, another Pi Kappa Delta coach, the eminent Harvey Cromwell, lamented that one of his students had received a first, second, and eighth (last place) in the **same extemp round**. Bewildered by the three ballots, Dr. Cromwell believed this to be a clarion call for experimental research on judging-ballots.⁴

At the last PKD national convention in Carbondale, students participating in the extemp contest may remember the questioning session with the judges at the end of their individual speeches. This writer has vivid memories of one of the rounds he judged. There were three judges in the room and several participants. After a student speech on problems of integration and segregation, one of the judges (a non-speech instructor and not a forensic coach) asked the girl, "Tell me, which side do you think **God** is on in this dispute?" The student turned pale, the audience gasped and the other "speech" judge looked at me as if he wanted to run from the room. The participant, however, regained her composure and answered she didn't know but she felt that the Bible had quite a bit to say about the brotherhood of man.

I remain convinced that my ballot was marked for the contestant on the basis of the brave answer to the other judge's ridiculous question. But for the **judge**—the way out of all the difficulties and problems of extemp speaking is relatively painless. All we have to do is mark the ballot. For the student, however, an equally easy solution seems to be non-existent. The purpose then, of this short article, is to provide some suggestions (not rules) for students who are novice extemp speakers.

While the evidence cited thus far seems to indicate that extemp speaking is unrealistic or unfair (as one author points out), evidence exists to support the other side of the coin. For example, the Betz article referred to earlier, admits (in addition to the student gripes) that the extemp event is the "best contest in the system." Furthermore, in direct contradiction to the Hope article, the student survey indicates that the event "comes closest to presenting a life

¹See the *Debater's Magazine*, 3, 1947, p. 84.

²Edward S. Betz, "Evaluation of the Inter-Collegiate Forensic Program," *Debater's Magazine*, 2, 1946, p. 148, as reprinted from the *Forensic*.

³B. W. Hope, "Draw Three," *Speech Activities*, 6, 1950, 125-6, as reprinted from the *Forensic*.

⁴Harvey Cromwell, "Decisions in Extemporaneous Speaking Contests," *Southern Speech Journal*, 18, 1952, p. 116.

situation." And, even though the lamentation of Dr. Cromwell seems especially loud at times, few coaches (and few students) wish the removal of extemp as a contest event.

II

Perhaps one way for the student to avoid some difficulties in extemp is to remember that the event is not a debate. In a sense, it is an exercise in persuasion. **You** are trying to persuade the judge that **you** are doing the best possible job of all the contestants. While there is a similarity between this oral act and debate (e.g., ballots) there seem to be more dissimilarities than likenesses. In debating, preset forms of organization can be utilized to a high degree. Evidence is adopted and used regardless of the audience present. Strategy and plans can be drawn up as if the participants are in a game.

In extemp, however, rules and regulations pertaining to the event seem to be non-existent — partially because of the tacit recognition of extemp as a form of public speaking rather than an act of argumentation. The only list of "rules" this writer is aware of are those provided in the January 1926 issue of *The Forensic*⁵:

1. It (the extemp speech) must engage the subject directly.
2. The speech must show that the speaker has a knowledge of his subject.
3. The speech must show progress.
4. There must be variety in development.
5. It must reach a definite conclusion.

While the above admonitions seem to be as valid now as in 1926, perhaps some other suggestions are needed. The novice extemp speaker should, of course, adapt his communication to the needs of his audience (if he has one). In other words, talk **with** us—not **to** us. This ad-

vice is easier given than followed, but the avoidance of debate jargon will help achieve some semblance of a public speech. Artificial and ambiguous words such as contention, inherent evils, needs and plan immediately place a certain "stamp" upon a contestant. The use of short sentences, personal pronouns and active voice verbs will help liven your language.

Contrary to popular misconception, judges are also human and they appreciate being "led" verbally to the problems in your speech. When you move from one thought context to another then bridge the gap with a transition. Don't assume the judge automatically knows all about the financial problems of the UN or the reapportionment issue in Tennessee.

In addition to a vivid style and language free from obvious error, speakers may wish to develop some system of organization. Adopting a highly structured system, however, may hinder the participant more than help him. Students might find it easier to adapt to audience reactions with a simple introduction, main point, conclusion method.

Another distinctly usable item in the extemp speech is the illustration. While some authors contend that a good quotation is an excellent device at the beginning of the speech⁶, this writer suggests that a short, pertinent illustration might be as effective. Once, for example, while discussing the idea that men must own property to vote, Benjamin Franklin is reported as saying:

To require property of voters leads us to this dilemma: I own a jackass, I can vote. The jackass dies, I cannot vote. Therefore, the vote represents not me but the jackass.

Regardless of the rating you receive in the next contest, remember that the process of developing into an effective speaker takes time and hard work. Our **immediate** goal may be to win, but our **ultimate** objective is to be an articulate communicator.

⁵Forensic, January 1926, p. 105, as reprinted in Debater's magazine, 3, 1947, p. 85.

⁶Arthur N. Kruger, "The Extempore Speaking Contest," The Speech Teacher, 5, 1956, p. 216.

Speech and the Honors Program

(A speech delivered to the Southern Speech Association, April, 1963)

HARVEY CROMWELL

My subject, "Speech and the Honors Student," implies the obligation of reviewing the situation in which education for the Honor student finds itself and then indicating the place of speech in that program. In order to clarify my stand on Speech and the Honors Student, I would like to look briefly at some of the changes that have taken place in our way of life during the past fifty years.

I think most of you will admit that the past half - century has been truly momentous. In fact, it is doubtful if the world has ever witnessed a period of near equal length in which there has been such an upheaval in our way of living, in the very nature of society.

In my time, transportation has literally moved from the horse and buggy speed of four to six miles an hour to satellite speed of nearly 18,000 miles an hour. In the field of communication, fifty years ago, telephones were just being introduced and the player piano was accompanying Americans' first experience with the silent movie. Then came radio, talking movies, and television.

In the past fifty years, we have seen medicine move from a fumbling that was almost primitive in its methods to miracle drugs and skillful surgery. We have moved from steam to nuclear energy, from the artisan's skill to the automatic machine. Equally striking have been the social and economic upheavals that have come from a major depression, two world wars, the Korean War, and the cold war that is before us today. We have seen the New Freedom of Wilson, the New Deal of Roosevelt and have experienced the New Frontier of Kennedy. Today, we face the impact of resulting social problems such as increasing delinquency, crime, divorce, mental illness, unemployment, alcoholism, materialism, statism. The social and economic problems that have exploded among us have caused many

people to question the effectiveness of our system of education, especially from the standpoint of whether it has changed sufficiently to provide adequate preparation for meeting the demands produced by our new knowledge.

American education has changed. It has actually moved from the proverbial "Little Red School House" into institutions representing investments that run into millions of dollars. While American education has done a pretty good job of providing quality education for the many, it has, on the whole, been remiss in discovering and promoting quality education for the superior minded, talented, or motivated student. Too many of these students have been lost along the way. Too few of them have been properly motivated and directed toward the fulfillment of their potentials or desires. In fact, it took Sputnik I to make Americans look critically at their system of education and to give acceleration to a movement begun in the early 1950's that was designed to meet the needs of the superior student. As a result, today there are more than 300 Honor Programs in operation in our colleges and universities and according to a recent report of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, an additional 500 institutions have committees studying and planning for future Honor Programs. We have had one of those programs at Mississippi State College for Women for the past two years. And even though I think we are moving toward an improved educational status, I must confess that we still have a long way to go before we have a program that will adequately develop the students in our college in the areas of critical thinking, problem solving, special talents, and a real understanding of human concerns and relationships.

Now, just what does all this talk of changes and Honors Programs have to do with speech? My immediate answer

is that it has a great deal to do with speech because whether it has been intentional or unintentional most of our students fit into the classification of being either superior minded, gifted, or motivated. It is no news to you that this is especially true of our students who participate in intercollegiate debate and forensic activities and in dramatic and radio - television productions. It is no news to you that few of our majors are dropped from school because of failing grades. I submit to you that we demand far more from our students than a mere textbook knowledge and that students who are not interested in an enriched education are quick to learn that the extra out-of-class hours required of speech students do not provide a gilded path to an easy diploma. I submit that we in speech have had an honors program for the superior student for many years and the results achieved by our students in later life prove I am not just bloating our own egos. Let's look at some facts.

Two weeks ago, Pi Kappa Delta held its Golden Anniversary Convention. As a part of our celebration, we extended Distinguished Alumni Awards to fifty men and women who had made outstanding contributions through their professional careers for a freer, more worthwhile society. The selecting of those fifty from the hundreds of names submitted was no easy task and the eleven committee members who made the final choice were very much aware that the list, at best, was only representative. The list selected included U.S. Senators and Representatives, members of the diplomatic service, College and University Professors and Presidents, five past - presidents of the Speech Association of America, television and movie personalities, Supreme Court Justices, Governors, ministers and missionaries, and high level business executives. All of these men and women were college and university debaters and forensic speakers. All of them expressed a debt to their experiences in speech activities. And let me hasten to add that Pi Kappa Delta has no monopoly on such distinguished alumni. The rolls

of Tau Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Rho Pi, Alpha Psi Omega — all will provide alumni of similar stature. Two days ago I received a copy of the results of a survey conducted by **Freedom and Union**. The opening paragraph of that report is of significance to us. It began as follows:

Would you be President, Senator, Congressman, Governor? Then young man or woman, go out for the debate team in your high school or college. That sums up the evidence and advice thus far revealed in a survey that **Freedom and Union** is conducting among prominent leaders in political and other fields . . .

The report then pointed out that 156 of 249 political leaders included in the survey had participated in high school or college debate and that over fifty per cent of those who had no student training in debate stated that they regretted that they did not go out for the debate team when they were in school. If you need further proof, check the **Who's Who** publications. You will find them filled with the names of men and women who chose to enrich their undergraduate curricula by participating in speech activities.

I have made it no secret that I like speech activities and I'll speak to their values on the least invitation. I've seen the results and so have you. And I contend that through our speech activities we have provided an honors type program for the superior student who has wanted something out of his college life and who was willing to pay the time and effort required to obtain his goal.

During the past half - century debate has stimulated thousands of speakers to attack significant social, economic, and political problems. Support for farm prices, membership in a world court and an association of nations, minimum wages and maximum hour laws, increase in the powers of the President, the use of an International police force — these are all examples of issues originally debated by our students and later resolved in the affirmative. And as Dr. Edward Betz, Dean of the University of the Pacific, expressed it, "It is entirely possible that the consideration