

STRENGTH

The strength of this organization is based solely on the individuals who come together in chapters, the chapters which convene in Provinces, and the Provinces which unite at Nationals. PKD, is an excellent organization. Because of individual involvement, we can demonstrate our talents and abilities on programs at SCA. We can work as a team in meetings of business, and above all, we can enjoy the challenge of our profession and the friendship of our colleagues.

I wish for everyone a great second half of the 1993-94 academic year. Make PKD plans to see each other at a Province. Stress fraternity. Share the strength of Pi Kappa Delta.

REQUEST FOR NATIONAL TOURNAMENT HOST

Pi Kappa Delta is actively soliciting bids to host the 1997 convention and tournament. Any chapter interested in hosting the 1997 convention and tournament should inform the Site Selection Committee of their interest immediately. Formal bids **must be submitted by April 30, 1994.**

Being local host for the national convention and tournament is hard work, but it is also very rewarding. As the local host, you would **perform a major service for PKD.** Without a dedicated local host, our national convention and tournament simply could not happen. You would also **perform a major service for your local community.** A PKD national convention and tournament generates significant financial activity for local hotels, travel, restaurants, tourism, and vendors. You would **bring significant recognition to your local PKD chapter.** As local hosts, your PKD Chapter will be profiled in The Forensic. Hosting a national PKD convention and tournament will be a truly unique and rewarding educational experience for your students. You would also **bring significant recognition to your institution.** PKD'ers from all over the nation will come to know and remember your institution. In turn, your campus administrators will better understand PKD's commitment to forensics education, competition, and fraternity. You will also be eligible for induction into the new and select **President's Order For Distinguished Service.** In addition, you chapter will also receive a number of tangible tokens of appreciation including: (1) your chapter's annual dues will be waived for 2 years; (2) all tournament entry fees for your students will be waived; and (3) your chapter will receive up to 5 banquet tickets (above those for tournament participants from your chapter to distribute as you choose).

Although there are any specific criteria which proposed sites must meet, critical ones you should consider before deciding to submit a bid include the following: a minimum of 75 contest rooms and suitable rooms for tournament tabulation on campus; hotel facilities to accommodate a 650-1000 person convention; appropriate meeting space including a general meeting area

which can seat up to 700 and a minimum of 10 individual meeting rooms 4 of which must be able to seat 100 people; and appropriate banquet space to accommodate a sit-down meal for up to 900.

If you have any interest in submitting a bid to host the 1997 convention and tournament, or would simply like to obtain more information about bid requirements or the selection process, please contact:

Bill Hill

Chair, Site Selection Committee

Communication Studies/English

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Charlotte, NC 28223

Phone: (704) 547-4217

Fax: (704) 547-3218

PKD AWARDS PI KAPPA DELTA HONORS THREE MEMBERS AT SCA CONVENTION IN MIAMI BEACH

Three members of Pi Kappa Delta were honored at the SCA Convention held in November at the Fountainbleau Hotel Miami Beach, Florida. Michael Bartanen, Tom Preston, and Harold Widvey won the Pi Kappa Delta Awards presented annually to active coaches and members of the fraternity.

Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran University, received the E.R. Nichols Award for Outstanding Contributions for the Furtherance of the Forensics Discipline. This award is given to an individual who has made significant contributions to improving intercollegiate forensics in the United States. Dr. Bartanen was credited with his work to develop the Guild of Forensic Educators whose purpose is to improve the educational underpinnings of forensic activities. Also, he was credited with years of service as Executive Secretary to CEDA and for his services on PKD's National Council.

Tom Preston, University of Missouri-St. Louis, was named the L.E. Norton Outstanding Scholar. This award is given to an individual who had made an outstanding scholarly contribution to PKD through a book or article. Dr. Preston's recent scholarship in *Argument and Advocacy*, *The National Forensic Journal*, and *The Forensic* of PKD, were cited as justifications for his selection this year.

Harold Widvey, Professor Emeritus from South Dakota State University, received the John Shields Award for Outstanding Contributions to Pi Kappa Delta. This award is given to an individual who has made significant service contributions to the fraternity. Dr. Widvey's eight years of service as Secretary-Treasurer of PKD, as well as his years of leadership to the fraternity and many other offices, provided testimony to his dedication and loyalty to PKD.

All three individuals were in attendance at the awards presentation held Friday evening immediately prior to a reception for PKD members and forensic colleagues. Past President Robert Littlefield announced the recipients and Sally Roden, President of Pi Kappa Delta, presented plaques to the winners.

All members of Pi Kappa Delta may submit nominations for the 1994 award to Robert Littlefield, Box 5075, Fargo, N.D. 58105-5075. Deadline for receiving nominations is May 1, 1994. Announcement of the 1994 awards will be made at the SCA Convention to be held in New Orleans, LA, November, 1994. Current members of the PKD National Council are ineligible for these awards.

REFLECTIONS ON THE STATUS OF THE FORENSIC BY THE 1991- 1993 EDITOR

Don R. Swanson

My 1991-93 term as Editor has been a very rewarding experience and I wish to thank the National Council for their support and assistance. I now have a new understanding of international communications, printing, mailing and academic deadlines, and a heightened appreciation of the busy schedules of forensic educators who work to fit in their forensic scholarship. Thank you to all who submitted your work for our consideration. A very special thank you is due to the 91-93 Editorial Board who were tough, and thorough referees of the material we considered. Their feedback helped authors to revise and strengthen their writing. Those editors were: Cynthia Carver, Assistant Editor, Concordia College, Vicky Bradford, Regis University, Don Brownlee, California State University - Northridge, C.T. Hanson, Moorhead State University, Steve Hunt, Lewis and Clark College, Carolyn Keefe, West Chester University, Willis Watt, Ft. Hays State University, and Glenda Treadaway, University of North Carolina - Charlotte. The Pierce Company of Fargo, North Dakota is due special recognition for consistently giving careful and timely assistance on a publishing project that is really a minor project in their daily scope of printing. But because I reside 9,000 miles away from the printer, my tenure as editor has been enabled by the exceptional help of Cynthia Carver and Robert Littlefield who served as essential proofreaders and liaisons to the print shop.

While I was Editor I was the custodian of a file box that holds an invaluable and fascinating array of history of Pi Kappa Delta. This box contains the Editor's archival copies of past issues of *The Forensic*, the official journal of the national forensic honorary. It is fascinating to pursue the thoughts of past forensic educators. Since 1915 the writers have stated hopes,

dreams and fears for the activity of forensics. Their thoughts provide an intimate glimpse into the development of forensic activity and indicate an important purpose for the journal. *The Forensic* chronicles both the contemporary status and the history of Pi Kappa Delta and its membership. But Forensic scholars can also probe the history of forensic pedagogy by reading the thoughts of the early forensic educators as they struggled to define, redefine and promote the activities that Pi Kappa Delta celebrates. Many Pi Kappa Delta affiliated institutions have library subscriptions. Many members are not aware that *The Forensic* is also available on 16mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 105 microfiche through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. The Summer, 1990, issue provided a special tool for researchers when it published an index to *The Forensic*, 1915-1990. To get a flavor of the nature of early articles in *The Forensic*, refer to the article in the Summer 1993 Annual edition by Pi Kappa Delta Hall of Fame member E.R. Nichols. Writing in 1922 he provides an intriguing view of the early days of intercollegiate forensics and the role it played in both campus life and public policy discussion in the nation at large.

The Forensic consistently aspires to promote quality research and to be an outlet for forensic scholarship that explores new theoretical insights and applies established theory and practice to unique applications. I am proud that we were able to proceed with our goal to publish a 1993 "summer annual" issue that was devoted solely to scholarly articles. Another important goal of the 1991-93 editorial board was indicated in this "Editorial Board Philosophy" printed in the Winter, 1992 issue of *The Forensic*.

The examination of our forensic pedagogy and practice is essential to maintain the health of forensics. New ideas, insights, reactions, pedagogical innovations or time proven methods should be explicated in a forum that is accessible to forensic professionals and competitors. *The Forensic* intends to provide that forum and to broaden the universe of forensic discourse. (p. 12)

Your new editor, Steve Hunt, made that mission more specific when he stated his goals in the Fall, 1993 issue:

I want *The Forensic* to become an even better scholarly and fraternal journal for PKD. I want to see more submissions of scholarly research in argument, persuasion, rhetoric, and forensics. I would like to see the "coaches and students corner" become an active place for dialogue on forensics issues in debate and individual events. I want recent books, video programs, and computer items to be critically reviewed in our journal. At the same time, *The Forensic* must continue to contain fraternal news from the National Council and from provinces and chapters.

Perhaps you haven't read the official description of publication requirements that appears at the end of the table of contents of each issue. If you look you'll discover some basic demographic features of the journal. *The Forensic* of Pi Kappa Delta is (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times a

yearly, Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer by the Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of the membership dues. For alumni and non-members the subscription rate is \$20 for one year and \$50.00 for three years. Approximately twenty-one hundred copies of each journal are printed by the Pierce Company, Fargo, North Dakota, 58102. Copies are mailed second class to each chapter, including enough copies for all active members. Copies are also mailed to alumni members and to subscribing libraries. The mailing list of subscribers is maintained by the Secretary/Treasurer and all address changes and subscription orders are made directly to his office. And by the way the National Council would like to have feedback indicating when you get your issues. Second class mail can be unpredictable. There has also been considerable National Council discussion of how many copies should be published and distributed to each Chapter. Since *The Forensic* constitutes one of the major expenses of the organization, and the per-copy cost is rather high, the council would like to know if you are receiving the appropriate number of copies.

Steve Hunt and the review editors welcome all submissions and will determine the appropriate section placement of the article in the journal. It is the goal of the editors to assist authors to get their articles into print. The initial rejection rate for submissions during 1991-93 was about 85%, but many articles were revised, resubmitted and published, so our ultimate rejection rate has not been prohibitive. Authors have a high success rate in submitting to *The Forensic* because virtually all articles are returned to authors with specific constructive suggestions. One of my outstanding experiences as Editor was receiving a letter from a graduate student, who had submitted an article, who stated that the revision suggestions he received comprised more substantial help with his writing than any help he had received from the graduate faculty at his institution. As seems to be the rule with other forensic journals, *The Forensic* is experiencing a dearth of submissions. More submissions are desired. The board encourages forensic educators to submit conference papers as well as articles written specifically for *The Forensic*. Coaches' commentary is also strongly encouraged. The Editor is especially interested in ideas for thematic sets of articles. There is no lack of significant concerns and possible research issues, as recent developmental conferences clearly indicate. But there is a shortage of submitted research on the issues. *The Forensic* is an accessible and user friendly outlet for forensic scholarship and strongly encourages submissions by educators, graduate and undergraduate students. As your Editor Steve Hunt has recently indicated: "Only if we all contribute in the spirit of PKD can *The Forensic* become the journal we all want it to be."

E. SAM COX, Ph.D.

**ASSOC. PROF. & DIR. OF FORENSICS
CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

I view forensics as an educationally accountable activity. It is an extension of the classroom, a laboratory for communication education. For example, to me debate is reasoned communication with reason being the adjective that clarifies the kind of communication being experienced. Competition is the carrot but improvement in students' communication skills is number one! I sincerely appreciate and support all forms, kinds, formats, and aspects of forensics, I am willing to listen to all ideas and try to improve on my own role as an educator. Education to me is a life-long quest in which my students and I jointly participate. I see forensics as a significant dimension to a liberal arts education – how to think and how to adapt to various audiences rather than what to think. Our work is to equip students for life! I will continue to strive to insure that forensics is accessible to everyone. We must hold up high standards but all must be welcomed to try!

SUSAN MILLSAP

GOVERNOR, PROVINCE OF THE LAKES

I began my association with forensics and Pi Kappa Delta in 1978 when I joined the Speech Team at then West Chester State College under the direction of Carolyn Keefe. Forensics directed me toward graduate school at the University of Tennessee where I was the Forensics graduate assistant under Dr. Dorothy Sorensen and Dr. Russell T. Church. From UT I taught and coached debate and I.E. at Clemson University for one year before moving to Miami, Florida where I coached debate for three years at the University of Miami.

For the past seven years I have been coaching debate at Otterbein College in Westerville, Ohio. For the last three years I have been Director of Forensics. I am a strong believer in the educational value of forensics and believe that Pi Kappa Delta enhances these values. Forensics and Pi Kappa Delta taught me the value of research and quality argument as well as the enjoyment of good literature and an appreciation for the spoken word. Forensics directed me towards my career and gave me the self confidence to succeed. As a coach and teacher I have seen these same benefits work for other students. That is the reason that I continue to support forensics and Pi Kappa Delta.

As governor of the Province of the Lakes I would like to see the continued growth of the province through the initiation of more chapters as well as greater participation from current chapters. The Lakes is becoming a very



active province again and I hope to be able to maintain that momentum. One of the elements that has helped to revitalize the province has been the bi-provincial tournament. This year we will once again join the province of the Colonies for a bi-provincial tournament on March 4-5 at Youngstown State University in Youngstown, Ohio.

Newly Elected:

Student Lt. Governor: Stacy Adams, Ohio Northern University
Lieutenant Governor: Dr. Christina Reynolds, Otterbein College
(team begins March, 1994)

STONES' INDUCTION AS HONORARY PKD MEMBER

On October 7, 1993 Harold A. Stones was initiated as Honorary Member of Pi Kappa Delta – Kansas Nu Chapter. Mr. Stones was honored for his dedication to the activity and his outstanding achievement as a former debate coach. Mr. Stones openly admits that his “debate years” kindled friendships that have lasted his lifetime. Harold attributed much of his success to the skills he acquired from debate. Mr. Stones was a very successful debate coach from 1958 to 1960 at Fort Hayes State University. Currently, Harold is Executive Vice President for the Kansas Bankers Association and on the Board of Directors for the FHSU Alumni Association. Mr. Stones is also a gracious supporter of FHSU debate. Among those in attendance were several of Harold's former debaters, [pictured in order left to right] Dr. Willis M. Watt (former Director of Forensics, FHSU); Mark D. Nuss (Director of Forensics, FHSU); Harold A. Stones; Jason Hibbs (FHSU debater), Chris Crawford (Plains Province Governor).



LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE: PREPARING FOR VALUE ARGUMENTATION

Reviewed by Don R. Swanson
University of Guam

Michael Bartanen and David Frank's *Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Preparing for Value Argumentation* is a long overdue addition to the National Textbook Company's array of texts for high school forensics. Over the last decade high school students' participation in Lincoln-Douglas debate has grown dramatically and eclipsed participation in team debate, but there has been a lack of quality comprehensive instructional texts available. This book should begin to fill that void. It is also applicable to the various intercollegiate forms of Lincoln-Douglas debate.

I approached the book wondering how it would deal with some myths about LD debate that have been oft repeated over the last two decades. Lincoln-Douglas debate is not simply "dueling persuasion" that "doesn't require evidence," nor has experience demonstrated that "debating value propositions is easier than debating policy propositions." Bartanen and Frank have dispelled these notions by writing a book that is comprehensive in coverage of necessary concepts and practices, while maintaining a tight concise style that should make this a quick read for sincerely interested students.

The initial chapter presents the benefits of debate without overclaiming the significance of the activity. Most readers will be intrigued by the opening sentence: "Debate training will not make you better looking, physically stronger, or even instantly financially wealthy." Page two indicates that "Debate is one of those activities that no one ever really learns completely." The somewhat breezy introduction to debate in Chapter 1 provides a realistic look at what it takes to learn to debate and to work to be a successful interscholastic debater. Instead of providing a long brainstorming list of all of the supposed benefits of debate Bartanen and Frank focus on four and develop each of them. "Developing public speaking skills, learning to argue more effectively, and improving research and study skills are standard fare. It is uncommon for authors to develop the ethos benefit with such emphasis. As they discuss "growing as an ethical competitor and person" they employ a tone that reveals the strength of their belief in the value of debate training. One short paragraph on page six would make a fine poster caption for debate coaches to hang on their walls:

An ethical perspective requires debaters to treat judges and opponents with respect and dignity. Such a perspective requires debaters to treat evidence with scholarly rigor and to follow the rules of debate. Because debate is an educational activity, you should learn and follow the highest possible ethical principles.

Chapter 1 also provides a history of debate that is pithy and gives credit to the discipline of rhetoric and the practice of public policy argument as key developmental forces in creating the contemporary educational exercise of

competitive debate. Bartanen and Frank depart from previous Lincoln-Douglas debate text authors in an important respect. They do not presume that the reader understands or has a knowledge of policy debate theory and practice. Such a presumption has flawed other textual discussions of LD debate. Today the vast majority of LD debaters and LD debate coaches lack experience with policy debate. This text clearly speaks to this sort of audience.

Chapter two considers "values and stock issues." The stock issues are fairly standard and should provide a pragmatic foundational structure for the novice debater. However the reader may wish for more discussion and illustration of the "value hierarchy" and may be led to wonder why the authors tease with their underdeveloped discussion of "Bartanen and Frank's stock issues" that are audience oriented. Why mention this slightly divergent approach when it is not applied in Chapter 4 on developing the affirmative side of the debate? Perhaps the real value of raising this is to encourage reference to Bartanen and Frank's 1990 book on *Debating Values*, and to remind us that the authors have a strong affinity for audience centered debate.

This chapter refers to the sample case, contained in the transcript of a final round NFL debate included as an appendix, to illustrate how the stock issues function in an actual debate. Hopefully the student reader will take the suggestion on page 15 seriously and read the sample case before proceeding through the text because this debate transcript serves as an effective example throughout the text. But I had questions that I think many other debate coaches who read this transcript will have: what year was this the final NFL debate and is it available on videotape as an additional instructional tool? There is no reference that answers either of these questions.

As the debater learns about resolutorial analysis in chapter 2, the authors employ Barbara Warnick's concept of "argument fields." It is laudatory that they raise this step in analysis since so many debaters wish to ignore frames of reference and leap immediately into the development of micro-argumentation. However it would be advantageous to expand the discussion of how the selection of an argument field can assist in analysis and the selection of criteria for judgment.

Those who have acquiesced to the myth that LD debate does not use substantial evidence, should be referred to the twenty-four page long Chapter 3 that deals with finding and presenting proof. The chapter includes effective, albeit standard advice on where to find evidence and how to format it. Students are advised to construct argument briefs which is more in line with current practice than the card format discussed in other debate texts. But it would be helpful if the sample brief on page 58 (figure 3.5) was more completely developed in order to make it provide a pragmatic model for the novice debater to follow.

Chapter 4, "debating the affirmative," deals with complex tasks in a very concise manner. High school students should find the treatment of basic concepts very readable. Strong points in the chapter are the emphasis on definition of terms and the suggestions for how to find general methods for "applying criteria to the subject area of the resolution." Discussion of the nature of signposting and extending the affirmative case lend a pragmatic tone to the chapter. But I think the authors omitted an important suggestion in their discussion of where to find criteria. On page 71 they refer to

philosophy texts and theories as sources of basic criteria. These suggestions are vague and difficult for most students to follow. Some examples of general sources would benefit the reader. For example, in my LD debate workshops we read and discuss the Bill of Rights since most NFL debate topics have related to one or more of the core values of democratic society.

Chapter 5 moves to a consideration of "debating the negative." It begins with an injunction to accomplish two negative goals. The first goal, and it is significant that it is listed first, deals with the negative debater being a persuader. The explanatory paragraph strikes an important tone:

The first general responsibility of the negative speaker is to present eloquent, persuasive, and ethical arguments against the resolution and the affirmative case. One of the major reasons behind the use of Lincoln-Douglas debate in high schools is the desire to emphasize eloquence and persuasiveness. Debate is more than simply gathering proof for arguments; it depends heavily on presenting your arguments as articulately as possible.

The second goal states the rather standard admonition to "demonstrate why the affirmative has failed to uphold the burden of proof" and to argue against the resolution and case structure. The remainder of the chapter is organized around the "outline of negative speaker duties" presented in a figure on page 88. This figure is a powerful reinforcement of the textual discussion of what the negative constructive can do to refute the affirmative and the resolution. If negative debaters hold a vision of this figure in their mind as they debate, judges should hear more clash in negatives' response to the affirmative. The negative options are clear in this chapter. The advantages and disadvantages of two general strategies, "prepared negative strategy" (PNS) and "flex negative strategy" (FN), are discussed in enough detail that new debaters should grasp the nature of their options and realize that the negative can be creative and adaptive.

Chapter 6 discusses the practices a student will need to understand and employ at the debate tournament and in the debate round. It is an exceptional description of things that debaters need to know to reduce their uncertainty about what a tournament is and how to conduct their cross-examination, listening behavior and flow sheet notetaking. Compared to other debate texts, this chapter is unique, and I predict that many students will read it first.

"Having the strongest arguments in the world will not do any good unless you have the skills to present them persuasively to the listener." This opening sentence in Chapter 7 on "Delivery, Style and Audience Adaptation" lays the rationale for understanding the "difference between conversational delivery and debate delivery" and the "characteristics of good delivery." The discussion places emphasis on improving delivery. The concepts of "word economy" and "signposting" are explained in terms that both debaters and educators should understand. Adaptation in the debate round is treated by describing various judging paradigms and suggesting how to employ the verbal and nonverbal feedback a judge provides. The audience oriented perspective pervades this treatment of delivery that, by debate text comparisons, is comprehensive.

The capstone chapter of the text considers "Competition and the Ethics of Debate." The astute debate educator will realize the paramount significance of

this chapter and walk students through it in class. The discussion points out that debate is not only a scholarly activity, but a humane activity as well. It seems appropriate that the final six pages of this last chapter examine the nature of feedback and criticism. This leaves the reader with the impression that the authors desire, i.e., that learning to react effectively to criticism is perhaps the most valuable lesson gained from debate experience.

There are a variety of features which make the text accessible to students. The language level is appropriate for high school students, yet not so simplistic that college students will feel that it talks down to them. The table of contents is quite complete, as is the index, which enables the student to use this text as a convenient and continuous reference. The list of figures that follows the table of contents provides rapid access to key summaries, however it lacks a listing of page numbers and requires that the reader scan a section of the book to find the figure. The book lacks a standard feature that debate educators have come to expect; it would benefit from a list of references or a bibliography.

There is a teacher's manual for the text that is a valuable asset to the inexperienced forensic educator. It goes beyond the scope of the usual manual by providing three distinct units of assistance. The first section provides philosophical background. It is clearly written with such a debate director in mind and with the admonition that forensics is a community activity that aims to develop articulate citizens. The second section provides an outline of classroom activities and lesson plans. The third section on student assessment includes possible test questions that will focus the student on key concepts and practices. I was disappointed however by the brief two paragraphs devoted to "debate ballots and assessment." The new forensic educator needs more guidance in how to effectively employ judges' feedback and how to teach students to respond to critical evaluation of their debating. But this minor flaw does not detract from the conclusion that this is an exceptionally useful teacher's manual.

As I read *Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Preparing for Value Argumentation*, I was impressed with the numerous insights that the authors discussed that aren't mentioned in other debate texts but are the real stuff that debate coaching is made of. It's a text that can bring some clarity to the confusion over how LD debate should be conducted and it may well become a standard reference for high school LD debate.

AMERICAN FORENSICS ASSOCIATION - NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL EVENTS TOURNAMENT FINAL ROUND TAPES OF PUBLIC SPEAKING EVENTS

Reviewed by Larry Schnoor, Concordia College

For the past several years, the AFA-NIET has videotaped the final rounds of the public speaking events. The taping has been done for several reasons, foremost being to provide examples of the finest public speaking by college students that could be used for instructional purposes in the classroom or for helping in the development of forensics competitors. Everyone in the final round of a public speaking event is taped, but before the tapes are made available to the public, performances are removed for those competitors that request removal. The tapes provide excellent examples of actual speech performances as opposed to those tapes that are in an artificial studio or classroom environment. This allows the observer to witness speeches as they were actually presented to an audience, see and hear the audience reactions, and to be aware of the situation in which the speeches were presented. The quality of the 1993 tapes from the final rounds at Rice University, Houston, Texas is excellent.

Each tape presents the speeches as they were presented in the rooms at Rice University. The sound and visual quality are very good with the exception of the tape for informative speaking. In that round, the camera and microphone were in the rear of a very large auditorium style room and this adversely affected the quality of the sound and visual performance of the speakers. It is still a good tape and provides excellent examples of how the speakers incorporated and handled visual aids in their presentations. All the other events were taped in rooms with excellent lighting and clear acoustics. Viewers of the tapes will be able to see how the speakers made use of movement, gestures, facial expression, and vocal delivery. Viewers will also be able to witness the preparation time for impromptu speaking, hearing the time signals as they are called out by one of the judges. This would be helpful for a new forensic student interested in impromptu speaking to be able to witness just how this process works. In the extemporaneous speaking round, viewers will be able to see one of the judges giving time signals with his hand, again providing the new extemp speaker with an example of how the process works. The after dinner tape allows the viewer to hear the audience reaction and how it may have influenced the individual speakers as well as the judges of the round.

The tapes of the final rounds in persuasion and informative contain four speakers each. In both the events, two speakers elected not to have their final round performances remain on the tape. All of the other events, Impromptu, After Dinner Speaking, Extemporaneous Speaking, and Communication Analysis provide six examples of effective speaking by college students.

These tapes will adapt well to the classroom setting if the instructor wishes to have students analyze (1) the introductions and/or conclusions

employed by the speakers in a particular event. (2) the degree and types of supporting materials incorporated in a presentation. (3) the various patterns of organization, and (4) the different delivery styles of the individual speakers. A major strength of all the tapes is that the speakers represent what was considered to be the best at the 1993 AFA-NIET and come from varying parts of the nation. The tapes are missing any commentary from the judges who heard the rounds. It might be worth considering the addition of critiques from the individuals who heard the speeches but this would require some careful planning. However, the absence of the critiques does allow for the classroom instructor or forensic coach to develop methods of analysis and evaluation of their own choosing.

Copies of the final round tapes may be obtained by contacting Larry Schnoor, SCTA Department, Concordia College, Moorhead, MN. 56562.

Tapes are \$20 per tape (one tape per event) + \$3.50 shipping and handling charge.

BOOK REVIEW/VIDEO AND SOFTWARE CRITIQUES NEEDED FOR THE FORENSIC

The editor is seeking book reviews and video and software critiques for the Spring and Summer issues of *The Forensic*. Reviews or critiques for the Spring issue are due to the editor by March 15, 1994 and for the Summer issue by May 15, 1994 in camera ready condition with both a hard copy and a 3 1/2 inch disk with the review in Microsoft Word or Word Perfect Mac or DOS. See reviews from the Fall, 1993 or Winter, 1994 issues of *The Forensic* for models. When you have picked something to review, please get in touch with Steve Hunt so we may avoid too many people doing one book, video, or program.

Suggestions for review include but are not limited to the following (informal citation style used for convenience):

Douglas N. Walton *Plausible Argument in Everyday Conversation* 1992 St University of New York Press

Douglas N. Walton *The Place of Emotion in Argument* Penn St University Press 1992

David Vancil *Rhetoric and Argumentation* Allyn 1992

John Reinard *Foundations of Argument: Effective Communication for Critical Thinking* 1991 Brown and Benchmark

Championship Debates and Speeches 1991 SCA / also 1992 edition

Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the 7th SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation ed. Donn W. Parson 1991 SCA

Van Eemeren, and R. Grootendorst *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragmadiialectical Perspective* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum 1992

- Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse U of Alabama Press 1993
- Robert Pinto and John Anthony Blair Reasoning: A Practical Guide 1993
- SERIES by Carol Winkler, William Newman, David Birdsell eds. from William C. Brown 1993
- Lines of Argument: Core Volume
- Lines of Argument for Value Debate
- Lines of Argument for Policy Debate
- Ed David Thomas and Stephen Wood CEDA 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings Kendall Hunt 1993
- Michael D. Bartanen Teaching and Directing Forensics Gorsuch Scarisbrick 1994 (is out now)
- CEDA Yearbook 1992 / also 1993 edition
- Michael Pfau and Roxanne Parrott Persuasive Communication Campaigns Allyn and Bacon 1993
- Rich Edwards of Baylor debate management program****
- Gary Larson of Wheaton debate management program***
- Michael Bartanen and David Frank Nonpolicy Debate Gorsuch Scarisbrick 1994
- J. Michael Sproule Speechmaking: An Introduction to Rhetorical Competence 1991 Brown Benchmark
- Austin J. Freeley Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making Wadsworth 1993 8th edition**
- David Thomas and J. Hart Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching 4th ed National Textbook 1992
- Eds. Frans H. van Eemeren Rob Grootendorst J. Anthony Blair Charles A Willard Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Argumentation U of Amsterdam 1990
- Richard Rieke and Randall Stutman Communication in Legal Advocacy
- Seth Hawkins Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results 1992
- Seth Hawkins Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results 1993
- Robert V. Friedenberg ed Rhetorical Studies of National Presidential Debates 1960-1992 2nd ed Praeger 1993
- William Benoit, Dale Hample, Pam Benoit , eds. Readings in Argumentation NY: Foris Pub. 1992
- Ronald Matlon Opening Statements and Closing Arguments Stuart Allen 1992
- 2nd National Conference on Individual Events when it is finally out.
- Theresa Enos and Stuart Brown Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, 1994

David Berube Tuna Snider and Kristan Pray Nonpolicy Debating: University Press of America, 1993.

C.T. Hanson et al The Practice of Public Speaking: A Practical Guide For Beginning Speakers 2nd ed Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co., 1991.

Raymond Zeuschner Communicating Today Allyn 1992

Rudolph Verderber Essentials of Informative Speaking: Theory and Contexts Wadsworth 1991

____ Essentials of Persuasive Speaking: Theory and Contexts Wadsworth 1991

Charles Mudd and Malcolm Sillars Public Speaking: Content and Communication 6th ed Waveland 1991

Donald Klopff and Ron Cambra Personal and Public Speaking 4th ed Morton Publishing 1993

D. Leith and G. Myerson Rhetoric, Reason, and Argument—The Power of Address: Explorations in Rhetoric

Brian MacArthur editor The Penguin Book of Twentieth-Century Speeches

Ed Inch, editor Proceedings of PKD Third Development Conference when it is published

REQUESTS FOR THEME ISSUES

The editor requests scholarly papers, editorial opinions in the form of coaches' and students' corner remarks perhaps even in pro and con debates, and book reviews, software and video critiques on two themes for future issues of *The Forensic*.

I. Hosting and Managing Forensic Tournaments Materials due by May 15, 1994.

Topics might include but are not limited to : computer software programs in running debate or individual events, scheduling problems and solutions, graciousness, health, and religious issues in running tournaments, reviews of management programs, articles, or books about managing, hosting tournaments, ethical issues in running forensics tournaments, comparisons of one day versus two day versus three day schedules, options for running simultaneous events and justifications for conflict patterns, analyses or criticisms of NFA, NIET, NDT, CEDA or other nationals as model tournaments, methods for assigning judges and pros and cons for same, benefits of having forensics workshops at tournaments, priorities and justifications for priorities in scheduling debates or individual events, arguments for the most educational rules, time allowances, event descriptions, etc. at tournaments, arguments as to what are the best kind of ballots to use, etc. etc.

II Outcomes Assessment of the Values of Forensics Participation Materials due May 15, 1995

Topics might include but are not limited to: what is outcomes assessment research, what methods can/should be utilized in outcomes assessment research, what are the values of forensics participation in general and from each activity within forensics: public speaking classes, rhetoric classes, debate class, competitive debate, extemporaneous speaking, impromptu speaking, persuasion/oratory, informative or expository speaking, after dinner or speaking to entertain, rhetorical criticism or communication analysis, oral interpretation, etc. etc. , how can the values of forensics participation be defined and operationalized, and most of all empirical research in outcomes assessment. This call is made a year in advance so that interested parties can do some actual outcomes assessment during a semester or year of forensic activity. Quantitative research will be preferred but qualitative research will also be considered.

EDITOR'S NOTE ABOUT PUBLISHING IN THE FORENSIC

From time to time it is necessary to remind our authors and contributors about the publishing process in *The Forensic*. Basically, here is how it works.

You write a scholarly article, or an opinion piece or pedagogical piece, or a book, video, or software review. You utilize *The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers 3rd* or *The Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association 3rd* for style and you carefully check your spelling, grammar, footnotes, and bibliographic entries. You show your paper to respected peers for their criticism and you revise it until you are satisfied.

You then send three hard paper copies and one 3 1/2 inch disk, preferably utilizing Microsoft Word MacIntosh or DOS or Word Perfect MacIntosh or DOS, to the editor. The editor looks over your paper and sends it out for review to three associate editors for their critique and constructive criticism. This usually takes about a month to a month and a half. Then the editor sends back your paper with the critiques of the associate editors and his own. Once in a very great while, about once in ten times, the paper will be published with few or no changes. Nine out of ten times the editor will either ask for significant revisions, or, more rarely, reject the paper outright.

The request for revision should not be taken personally. The great majority of papers have to be reformulated and revised. The purpose of this process is to make your voice as an author clearer and more authoritative through having improved your original work. The editors really do try to give you constructive criticism, reinforcing good ideas and apt expression even while pointing out weaknesses and specifying possible improvements. Even rejection should not be taken personally. It merely means that the particular paper is not appropriate at this stage for *The Forensic*.

As an author , you are asked to revise your paper and get it back to the editor, again with a disk and three hard copies, this time supposedly camera ready. The editor appreciates quick revisions but realizes that some revisions may take some months. Your revised paper, if revised appropriately, may be published or may come back for even more revisions. Publishing takes persistence and the ability to take criticism to meet the needs of the journal. A paper submitted at one deadline may not get in until one or even two issues down the line.

It takes about a month to edit *The Forensic* and get it printed sometimes a little more. This means the following schedule applies:

March 15 deadline for submissions for Spring issue comes out April 15 - May 1

May 15 deadline for submissions for Summer issue comes out June 15 to July 1

Oct. 15 deadline for submissions for Fall issue comes out Nov. 5 to Nov. 15

Dec. 15 deadline for submissions for Winter issue comes out Jan. 15 to Feb 1

Like most journals, *The Forensic* really does not have enough good submissions. Some authors don't carefully think out and meticulously draft and redraft their papers before submitting them. Some authors, for mysterious reasons, give up when asked to revise their papers. We really do need good materials and we really are seeking improved materials when we ask you to revise. It takes time and persistence, but you can really publish (we want you to publish) if you just try to and keep trying.

Steve Hunt, Editor