

FRATERNALLY SPEAKING

by
Bill Hill
President

To all of my brothers and sisters in Pi Kappa Delta I want to affirm that I am deeply honored to have been selected to be your President. I assure you that I understand the importance of this position, and that I am completely prepared to commit my time, energy, and effort to work for the best interest of our organization.

Since I joined the National Council 6 years ago, I have had the opportunity to work with an outstanding group of Past and Current Presidents. David Ray, Terry Cole, Robert Littlefield, and Sally Roden have in my judgment provided tireless and wise leadership for our organization. Each has brought to the Council their deep-seated commitment to PKD. Each has demonstrated unique and important leadership traits and been a model for their fellow Council members to emulate. I am better prepared today to assume the office of President simply from having had the opportunity to work with them and learn from them. They deserve our utmost gratitude and appreciation.

As we journey into the next two years in the life of PKD, we do so with a National Council prepared to move PKD forward and to do so in a manner consistent with our shared principles and ideals. The Council members you have elected have made a commitment to the organization and to you—a commitment they will individually and collectively honor as they discharge the important duties of their respective offices.

Joel Hefling, your President-elect, will be responsible for all aspects of our site selection process for the 1999 Convention and Tournament. His is a critical job and he will work hard to ensure that we have an outstanding site for that special Convention. **Glenda Treadaway** will be your 1997 Tournament Director. She will organize and administer an educationally and competitively rewarding tournament—one that will be efficiently and fairly managed, and culminate in a positive experience for every participant. **Scott Jensen** will work to promote Professional Development within our organization. He will oversee a number of special functions associated with our convention, and will coordinate our important internal and external public relations efforts. **Jeff Hobbs** will be your Province Coordinator. Jeff will establish the vital link between the national council and the provinces, oversee our charter and standards process, and work to integrate as fully as possible every member of PKD into the activity and governance of our organization. Our new student representatives, **Lisa Waschnok** of Northern Kentucky University and **Rudy Dunlap** of Appalachian State University, will work actively to ensure that student perspectives are always considered in the collective action of the council.

Our returning Council members, **Sally Roden** (Past-President and 1996-97 SCA program planner), **Robert Littlefield**, (national secretary-treasurer), **Steve Hunt**, (editor, THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta) and **David Ray** (Historian) will continue to fulfill in a positive and productive manner the duties associated with their respective offices. In addition, they will, through their collective experiences, provide continuity, wise guidance, and seasoned judgment as they discharge the duties of the National Council.

I am bringing to your Council the charge to address in as thorough and rational a manner as possible three issues critical to the long-term health and development of our organization and the role of PKD in the forensics community. First, we will thoroughly assess the long-term financial prospects for PKD. We have evolved into an organization whose financial existence is increasingly dependent upon the revenue generated at our convention and tournament. The degree of our dependence increases when we fall short in recruiting new members. For the current biennium, we are approximately 1/3 below our customary level of new memberships for our organization, thus further increasing our financial dependence on the convention and tournament. We cannot move blindly into the future. We need to make thoughtful decisions about our financial future and the financial structure of our organization. We must and we will be prepared to make hard decisions, and we must make decisions about both our revenue and expenditures. I have asked Robert Littlefield to lead our efforts by chairing a working committee to explore this issue.

Second, we must assess the essential roles and responsibilities of the various leadership levels within PKD. One theme that has consistently emerged since the time I have been on the National Council is that we need to find ways to get our province leadership more actively and meaningfully involved in the governance and development of their respective provinces as well as the national organization. PKD cannot move into the millennium as a healthy and vital organization based solely on the leadership of the National Council. We must integrate the Governors into the on-going life and activity of the organization and we can wait no longer to do so. To that end, I am prepared to submit to a special working committee chaired by Jeff Hobbs proposals to implement immediately the following actions.

1. To establish a permanent body to be called the Governors Assembly. This body would be composed of the Province Governors and Lieutenant Governors and be designed both as a forum for discussion and information sharing, and as a fixed structure to relay information and suggestions and concerns to the National Council. This body would meet annually in conjunction with SCA, would meet in conjunction with our national convention, and would regularly submit reports to the national council.

2. To revise the current process for new charter applications so that the Province Governor is the primary contact and initiator of that process. And, further, to streamline the process to make application for membership more efficient and less imposing.

In addition to these actions I will appoint each Governor to one of our standing national committees, and instruct the Province Coordinator to send to the Governors, Lieutenant Governors and Student Lieutenant Governors newsletters three times per year which apprise them of the activities of the National Council. I have also instructed the Province Coordinator to establish and maintain on-going contact with the Governors, Lieutenant Governors and Student Lieutenant Governors. Ultimately, it is my hope that taking these actions will make a significant contribution to the collective decision-making of our total organization and help to invigorate the activities of our various provinces.

Third, we need to explore the role of PKD among the various organizations which comprise the forensics community. The forensics community is becoming increasingly fragmented. Unfortunately our community is neither so large nor powerful that it can absorb on-going fragmentation and expect to conduct business as usual. PKD can and should play a significant role in helping to unite and fortify our community. We have a unique opportunity to forge a bond among the diverse interests within our community and to promote the values of the forensic experience. At the same time, however, there can be no doubt that we must remain fully and faithfully committed to those principles of honorable forensics practices and justifiable educational ends which underlie our shared purposes and values. We cannot simply be an umbrella flapping aimlessly in the wind. We must take the high road, we must act out of principle, and we must find new ways to be a leader among organizations within our community. I have asked Scott Jensen to chair our working committee on this issue.

PKD is an outstanding organization. It has meant so much to the professional and social lives of its members and it has had some significant, positive effect on every person sitting in this room. Two values to which we subscribe are the importance of the educational mission of our activity, and the importance of the fraternal mission of our organization. I would like to focus on both of those values as I close this column on a personal note. I want to extend a personal and very sincere expression of thanks to Dr. Terry Cole, a past-president of this organization and my forensics coach. Terry was without question the best undergraduate instructor I had. Reflecting back upon Terry as a coach, it has been clear to me for years that he was the model of what a forensic educator could be. Terry has had a profound and lasting effect on my approach to forensic education and it is primarily because of him that I am a member of PKD today. I respect his judgment, appreciate his commitment to education, and cherish his friendship. To him, a very public Thank You.

To each of you a commitment that your 1995-97 National Council will be hard working, publicly accountable for our actions, and always cognizant of the best interests of PKD.

THE SMART TOURNAMENT ADMINISTRATOR (SOFTWARE REVIEW)

Reviewed by

T. C. Winebrenner

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

In recent years, intercollegiate debate tournaments have come to resemble test sites for the technology which drives the information highway. Armed with powerful notebook computers, portable printers, and cellular phone connections, students spend spare moments surfing the Internet and probing Lexis-Nexis for up-to-the-moment information which might prove to be the

difference between winning and losing the next round. In such an environment, it is paradoxical that tab room administration seems to be locked in the age of pencils, calculators and 4x6 note cards. While it is true that some tournaments do take advantage of personal computing technology, it mostly is limited to crunching data with generic spreadsheet or database software. Over the years, a number of custom software applications have been made available to tournament directors, but many directors seem reluctant to relinquish control to computer software. The mythology of the debate community includes an extensive oral history of matching errors and computer glitches holding-up tournaments for hours until hard-copy data could be generated and manual tabulating was able to get the tournament back on track. However, a few select custom tournament administration programs are now revising that history. Perhaps the most powerful of those programs is Gary Larson's *Smart Tournament Administrator*.

Commonly known as "the CEDA Nationals program," this is the software which has handled tabulations for the CEDA National tournament since 1988. While early incarnations of STA were prone to operator error or programming bugs which required desperate phone calls to the software designer, version 6.03, which Larson currently is distributing, evidences none of the design problems which once made the package "user unfriendly." In fact, STA's combination of speed, flexibility and ease of use makes it an indispensable tournament resource.

STA is a full-featured DOS based tournament administration package which automates all tournament data entry, matching, assignment, calculations and print functions. The software requires an IBM compatible computer equipped with 4 megabytes of available hard disk space and a high-density 3.5 inch floppy disk drive. While the documentation advises a minimum 386-class platform, the program will run on older XT or 286-class equipment. The issue merely is one of speed. For testing purposes, I constructed a mock 40 team tournament. Loaded on a 286 operating at 16 mhz, STA paged through the two configuration screens, power-matched and assigned rooms and judges for a sixth round in 27 seconds, and matched and assigned rooms and judges for an octofinal round in 47 seconds. Loaded on a 486 operating at 66 mhz, the same functions were completed in 7 seconds and 25 seconds, respectively. Unless you are running a particularly large tournament, computing platform would not seem to be a major concern. The quality of the printer attached to the platform is far more important. The printer must be capable of both 12 and 17 characters per inch, and both 6 and 8 lines per inch, which excludes "no frills" dot matrix printers. However, the program includes drivers for 85 different printers, including the Epson LQ, IBM Proprinter and HP LaserJet and DeskJet. Most mid-range printers emulate one of these standards. As with almost any computer application, print speed is the major bottleneck. If equipment resources are limited, it might make more sense to splurge on a high-end printer than on a powerful personal computer.

The structure of the program is intuitive, taking you through six main menus and a series of sub-menus, fixed-choice responses and data entry boxes. The options involve commonplace choices with which any experienced tournament director would be familiar. For the most part, operating the program is as easy as moving the high-light bar and hitting <enter>.

One of the more compelling arguments for using tournament administration software is that it redistributes the time which must be allocated to tabulations. While computer driven tournaments require a good deal of pre-tournament data entry (schools, teams, judges, rooms, constraints, etc.), this substitutes for the time which ordinarily would be spent in the midst of the tournament matching rounds and computing results. A primary concern with any tournament software should be the amount of time which must be devoted to pre-tournament and mid-tournament data entry. Data entry time, of course, depends upon the size and complexity of the tournament. I was able to configure the software defaults in 8 minutes, and enter 40 teams and 30 judges from 15 schools in 22 minutes. The 30 minute set-up time did not include strikes or team/judge constraints, and reflects the data entry skills of someone experienced with the software. Inexperienced operators probably could expect to spend double or triple that amount of time. In addition, it took approximately 8 minutes to record and blind verify the results of the 20 debates in each round. Even allowing for an inexperienced operator and delinquent ballots, STA makes it possible to structure a tournament without lag power-matched rounds.

The distinctive feature of STA is its tremendous flexibility. Nowhere is this more evident than in the way the software handles preliminary round matching and judge assignment. Each round may be matched using one of five strategies — random, high-high, high-low within win/loss brackets, high-low within quartiles, and power protect. The basic strategy is then subject to as many as 7 pairing constraints, from the ubiquitous own school, previous match and team conflict constraints, to less common limits such as regional constraints and a previous match with the opponent's school. One particularly useful constraint for power-matched rounds limits computer backtracking by searching for possible matches only within a team's win/loss bracket. Judge assignment is subject to as many as 11 constraints, running the gamut from own school, previous round, judge conflicts and strikes to a team already having been judged by someone from a particular school or region, or already having been judged by a hired judge. There also are two configurations of mutual preference judging for tournaments which use that system of judge assignment. It is up to the tournament director to decide which constraints to use, and to establish their relative priority. Power-users also can choose between various strategies for sorting teams prior to establishing win/loss brackets, as well as a number of ways of sorting judges prior to assignment. The safest play is to stick with the constraints and strategies you would use for manual matching and judge assignment, a choice STA encourages by defaulting to common constraints and procedures. While the tournament set-up routine cycles you through the strategy and constraints options for each round, allowing you to make your choices as part of the pre-tournament configuration, the protocol for matching each round reprises those screens so you can confirm or alter the procedure.

The software is at its best when employing fully automatic matching, where the program engages in the pairing strategy and abides by the constraints without operator intervention. This is the feature which produces pairings in a matter of seconds. Other options include automatic team matching combined with semi-automatic judge assignment (the software matches the teams and produces a list of judges, with conflicts annotated, from

which the operator makes an assignment), semi-automatic teams combined with semi-automatic judges (the software produces annotated lists from which the operator chooses both teams and judges), and fully manual matching (the software merely records operator choices). The latter option is useful for extremely small tournaments where there are very few permutations of an acceptable schematic. Since the software can backtrack only within a particular round, it cannot alter Round 5 in order to produce a Round 6 which fits the constraints. In this setting, a schematic for the entire tournament must be constructed in advance and pairings manually recorded. This allows you to take advantage of other software functions such as results tabulations and print jobs. The final matching option is for pairing elimination rounds. You choose the number of teams to advance, and using a top-bottom matching logic STA will pair the round, including adding an appropriate number of byes should you choose to pair a partial elimination round, and giving you the option to break brackets. The software then assigns three judges and a room to each elimination debate.

Flexibility notwithstanding, I find the most useful STA feature to be the way it tabulates results. Using a ballot code the program prints on every ballot or ballot label, STA calls up a results screen for that particular debate. You then record the decision (affirmative, negative, double-bye, or double-forfeit) and the speaker points for each of the debaters (0-30 or bye). Experienced operators will take advantage of a set-up option for pre-set speaker positions. By setting the option to NO during pre-tournament data entry, you are not slowed by continual prompts for unknown speaker position information. However, by subsequently changing the setting to YES, the prompt will interrupt the results screen the first time a team is on a side, and then will request speaker points in the same order as they appear on the ballot. It takes less time to confirm that the speakers did not switch positions than it does to avoid a recording error on an out-of-order screen. Recording the results of a round is as simple as entering "1001" (ballot code), "A" (decision), "28 27 26 27" (speaker points). What makes the way STA tabulates results unique is its blind verification option. Each ballot is recorded twice, each time on an empty results screen. If the second entry does not exactly match the first entry, the software beeps and flashes an appropriate warning, and requires the operator to select the initial or revised data. Since the module accepts intermingled divisions and initial and verification data, ballots can be recorded and double-checked as they are received. This means that results tabulation normally is completed within seconds of receiving the last ballot.

STA includes 14 different print options, including code lists, strike sheets, pairings and ballot labels. Tournament participants will appreciate the informative tabulation sheets. Tab sheets can be printed out immediately after the results of the final preliminary round have been entered, which means that there is no excuse for ballot packets absent tabulation information. The print-outs include round-by-round notations for side, opponent, judge, decision, and points for each speaker. Two of the most important print options are team cards and judge cards. The most frightening prospect facing any computerized tournament is technological malfunction, be it as serious as a disk crash or as frustrating as a power outage. As a safety precaution, as soon as a round has been paired, printed and distributed, print team and judge cards (they will include all up-to-date pairings and results). If there is a crash,

you are ready to switch to manual administration without having to reconstruct data.

The major problem with STA is that it relies on a relatively obscure commercial integrated applications package, Smartware II, as host software. Unfortunately, the company which developed Smartware II has sold its rights to a Canadian firm which does not intend to continue servicing the product. This means that the host software simply is not available on the commercial market. However, Larson is able to provide a bare bones run-time version of the Smartware II spreadsheet module to anyone interested in beta testing STA. Even though the STA files are freeware, beta testers cannot distribute copies of the host spreadsheet. That means that an operational version of STA is available only through its developer. The good news is that Larson is under contract to test APWARE, a new programming language which will allow code to be compiled for use on DOS, Windows, Macintosh and UNIX platforms. His test project will involve converting STA to APWARE code.

As with most custom software, the quality of the documentation lags far behind program mechanics. Some features are undocumented. For instance, when designating a floppy drive for backing-up files, STA requires an uppercase alpha response. Mistakenly entering "a" rather than "A" evokes a warning beep and a pause for an acceptable response. On the other hand, the software makes the same assumption when identifying the teams involved when breaking brackets in an elimination round. In this case, however, mistakenly entering "b" rather than "B" for each team produces neither warning nor pause; the command simply is ignored. The less than vigilant operator might assume that the change had been made, only to be embarrassed by a posting with an intraschool match. Neither situation is documented. The team sort criteria allows operators to choose between POINTS and POINTS(x), and between OPP-RECORD and OPP-RECORD(x), but the manual fails to explain the subscript. On the other hand, the manual includes an excellent section on adding and/or deleting single or multiple teams in the midst of the tournament. This is especially important since the software cannot compensate unassisted for multiple teams added to or dropped from the same side of the bracket. Fortunately, the repair procedure is straightforward, and the explanation is clear.

There are other niggling problems. The menus are navigated by <space> and <backspace> rather than with the arrow keys, but this is a limitation of the Smartware II host rather than a design flaw. One change in version 6.03 which disappointed me is the removal of one of the judge constraints which had been included in previous versions. "Team met judge on side" was useful in very small tournaments where it is impossible for teams to have a different judge for each round. Assigning this as the lowest priority constraint allowed, if necessary, a judge to hear a team a second time but on the opposite side. While Larson has endeavored to streamline the software by eliminating exotic constraints, it would seem as if this is a more useful constraint than "team met judge's region."

All in all, Smart Tournament Administrator is an outstanding contribution to the debate community. The software is reliable, easy to use, and flexible enough to deal with literally every tournament situation. If you have an IBM compatible computer platform available, this custom tournament administration software package will take the pain out of

tournament tabulations work. Tournament directors interested in receiving a beta test version should contact Gary Larson directly. He can be reached via the Internet at g-larson@rachel.wheaton.edu, or in care of Communications Department, Wheaton College, Wheaton IL 60187.

TAB ROOM ON THE MAC: AN INSTRUCTIONAL CRITIQUE

Rodger Biles
Glen Strickland
Emporia State University

The most significant event in intercollegiate debate during the 1990's has been the increased reliance on the computer. The popularity of online databases such as Lexis-Nexis and Dialog has reached an all-time high among collegiate debaters. The impact of computers in the area of tournament management has also been substantial. Before 1990, most tournaments were managed on a system using individual team cards. Today, most tournaments are managed on one or more of the numerous computer tabulation programs. One of the most popular of these programs is the *Tab Room On The Mac* program developed by Dr. Richard Edwards of Baylor University.

In an unpublished paper delivered at the 1994 Speech Communication Association Convention, one tournament manager indicated that he had been using the Edwards program for several years ranging from system 6 through system 7 up to the current 300 version. "I have relied almost exclusively on this program for administering debate tournaments due to several factors. These factors include: our debate program operates mostly Macintosh platforms, other similar programs have been unavailable to me for proprietary reasons, and because the performance of the TRM has been fairly good." (Snider, 1994)

The objective of this paper is to examine the *Tab Room On The Mac* program. This analysis of the tabulation program developed by Dr. Rich Edwards of Baylor University will consist of three major elements: getting ready (preparation and the instruction manual), input of data, and operation.

For the tournament director who has a lot of experience using cards, or some other analog form, for recording data and pairing the tournament, turning the functioning over to a computer can be a harrowing experience. Many directors begin by using the computer as a "back-up" for the data which is first written on cards. This may be the best way to begin for one unsure about using a computer but becomes unnecessary and duplicative. One should begin the use of the Edwards program with a positive frame of mind and by reading the Instruction Manual. A positive frame of mind is important because (a) some of the data input is tedious and can cause tournament directors to change their mind, and (b) any mistake or "glitch" is likely to cause doubt about continuing with the TRM program. Most mistakes are related to "gigo" or garbage in/garbage out. The Edwards' program, as with all

databases, is very unforgiving of mistakes. When one occurs, the director should find the input mistake rather than blame the program. Mistakes can be quickly repaired usually with minor inconvenience to the director or the functioning of the tournament, if one knows where to look for the answers. That location is the Instruction Manual.

On disk four of the current edition, or disk six of earlier ones, is a file identified as Instruction Manual. Double clicking this icon will open the word processing files on the hard drive and open the manual. It is possible to read page by page through the manual on the screen but this is time consuming and cumbersome. It is better to command the file to print and then wait for about twenty minutes. Using a Classic II and Stylewriter II printer it takes about eighteen minutes to print the complete text of the manual. It is a large document of fifty pages and it suggests that you put the manual into a notebook for easy reference. The manual is extremely user-friendly and even those without much computer knowledge should be able to follow the directions.

The manual begins by telling one the hardware requirements to run the program. Directors must make sure the Macintosh being using meets the memory requirements before beginning or it will be difficult, if not impossible, to input the data and operate the tournament. If borrowing the Macintosh computer from someone, inform them of the required size and memory. That owner should know the specifications to determine if their equipment is sufficient. One can gain some added memory by clicking on the Apple key and dragging the mouse to the control panels folder. Open this and turn off any extensions which will not be needed during the tournament. Some systems have a file called extension manager. This makes it easy to simply turn off unused applications.

Otherwise, it may be necessary to physically remove some programs from the hard drive and save them on a floppy disk. One should especially think to turn off a screen saver if one is loaded on the drive. Some of these use a lot of memory, and they can cause a special panic when they come on. Once the screen saver image has started, when one moves the mouse and returns to work all or part of the TRM screens will remain blank. In actuality the screens are there and ready to use they don't "pop" back up after the screen has been on. Should this happen simply click the mouse on the menu icon and the master menu screen will reappear.

The manual also provides a list of error numbers. In the event of a problem in the functioning of the program an error message will appear on the screen. In the back of the manual one can consult the list of error number to discover what type of error has occurred. For the most common errors the steps to follow in solving them are listed.

Finally, Dr. Edwards lists his phone numbers in the manual and he can be called to help work through the problems. While one should not call him for every question, which can usually be answered by consulting the manual, these writers have found Dr. Edwards to be very kind and willing to give help over the phone when a major problem arises. His commitment to making debate tournaments easier to run is demonstrated by his providing the program free of charge and offering tremendous support.

Inputting the data is the most tedious aspect of the operation of the TRM. This is one part of the program which takes more time than it would take to write out

lists and cards. Think of the time it takes to input the data as a tradeoff for the speed with which the program does the operation of the tournament. This is also one area where having more than one set of eyes is extremely important in checking the data. A mistake made here will be very costly. For example, an error in the school code number assigned to a team can result in having that team being assigned to meet a team from the same school or be judged by a coach from their own school. This is initially frustrating because the school name may appear in all three entries' names, but the school number will not show. For example Emporia State University may be listed as school 601 in the program but a team that gets mistakenly identified from school 602 is not from Emporia regardless of how the name appears on the screen. As soon as one set of lists, school numbers, teams, judges, or rooms is finished a director should print a copy of that list to have a paper reference to use when inputting the other data. Extra minutes spent double checking here can save several minutes and avoid panic later. Inputting of a large tournament can be time-consuming. Two recent tournament experiences with multiple divisions and over fifty teams took about two and a half hours to input. Changes can be made at any point in the tournament either by altering the team entry file or by altering the team cards. The alter team card menu item and this allows one to change opponents, sides, results, judges or rooms for a given team by simply changing the appropriate numbers. This seems to be the fastest way to make a change of the tournament data.

Operating the program is extremely easy. The menu item operate should be selected then simply follow the directions or answer the questions that appear on the screen. If one is unsure of what specific item or question means the complete explanation of each item is mentioned in the manual. The tournament is given multiple options about pairing and assigning judges and one should be able to conduct the tournament following any philosophy or approach. One should always use the print round schedule for the tab room function before printing the schedule for the tournament. This item allows the director to see the pairings with all of the appropriate item numbers. This makes changes much easier and quicker to make by simply entering the alter team cards menu item.

Criticisms of the TRM

Having used the program on many occasions these writers' criticisms of the program are few.

First: there is no method to look at a round's pairing on screen. On many occasions it would be simpler to look at the round on the screen and make changes then. Many will simply print the results without a check and not discover the mistake until pairings have been released. This is partially the director's fault but the ability to preview the round on the screen would be useful.

Second: if a room is deleted or altered after a round has been stored to the hard drive, the program simply refuses to assign the round. Once a round has been stored, if the room is to be changed one must alter the team cards and input a new room. The computer will not automatically assign an available room to a round that has been altered this way. This creates some slow down and the need to repeat the printing process.

Third: There is no way for the computer to make sure judges who have a commitment to judge are used before hired judges. If one is using the automatic judge placement function, the computer will assign judges available regardless of commitment. The only way to assure that hired judges are placed

After obligated judges is to do a manual judge assignment. The manual assignment is one complaint many coaches and directors have about analog methods because of the possibility for manipulation by tabroom staff. Whether that manipulation is real or not, the perception is one to be avoided. Using the computer to assign judges eliminates most of those fears. Enabling the computer to assign obligated judges first would eliminate this problem without bankrupting the tournament's funds.

Fourth: The TRM dislikes small tournaments. It is difficult to use the computer to assign six rounds of a tournament with fewer than twenty teams. The newest edition of the program has a function to preset rounds for tournaments of sixteen or less but this does not always work. A recent tournament experience found the tabulation staff pairing late rounds by hand because the computer was unable to do so. Smaller tournaments should be paired on card and then input manually into the computer. It saves time.

The TRM is a powerful and excellent program for administering a debate tournament. It is a public domain freeware and may be obtained from Richard Edwards, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798.

Works Consulted

Edwards, Rich. *Instruction Manual: The Tab Room On The Mac*. 300 Team Version Computer software. 1994.

Nieder, Alfred. "Making Powerful Tools More Convivial: Debate Tournament Team Pairing Practices and the TRM Program." Unpublished paper delivered at the Speech Communication Association Convention, November 1994, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1994.

THE NEW DIALECTIC

van Eemeren, Frans H., Rob Grootendorst, Sally Jackson, and Scott Jacobs. Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1993.

Reviewed By
Brian R. McGee
The Ohio State University

Robin Rowland and David Zarefsky have complained recently that communication professionals active in coaching academic debate rarely connect the practice-oriented scholarship of academic debate with more general research on argumentation and rhetoric. Specifically, debate coaches have been criticized for focusing on the narrow agenda of improving debate pedagogy. According to Rowland and Zarefsky, the solution to this problem is for those scholars associated with debate to apply their expertise in argument invention and analysis to other argumentative contexts, a task that requires familiarity with recent innovations in argumentation theory if such research is to be relevant.

Debate coaches who have not kept pace with the latest developments in argumentation theory would be well advised to read van Eemeren, Grootendorst, Jackson and Jacobs's *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*. This book represents a unique collaborative effort involving the two Dutch scholars responsible for the pragma-dialectical "Amsterdam approach" to argumentation theory and two leading American proponents of the study of conversational argument. While those who want an in-depth treatment of the work of these scholars would be best served by reading their separately authored essays and monographs (e.g., van Eemeren and Grootendorst's 1992 *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies*; Jacobs and Jackson's essay on conversational argument in Dervin *et al.*, *Rethinking Communication*, vol. 2), this latest book provides unique insights into the ideas shared by four highly regarded students of argumentation.

The most basic premise of van Eemeren *et al.* is that the separation of descriptive and normative research hampers the development of argumentation theory and the initiation of comprehensive research projects in argumentation. For the authors, descriptive, empirical research is a prerequisite for providing informed advice about optimal argumentative practice, while description "depends at some level on normative assumptions, if only to differentiate between relevant and irrelevant phenomena" (175). Given this interdependence of descriptive and normative approaches for the study of argumentation, van Eemeren *et al.* advocate in chapter one a comprehensive approach to argumentation research that is grounded in speech act theory. This approach includes a preference for the study of argument as dialectical procedure for solving problems.

In subsequent chapters, the authors carefully explain how researchers might reconstruct the arguments made in everyday conversation in order to study those arguments more effectively, a process that they label "normative reconstruction." Given the initial commitments of the authors, chapter two posits an ideal model for using argument to resolve disputes, which includes confrontation, opening, argumentation, and concluding discussion stages. Chapters three through seven then explain how one might proceed with normative reconstruction. By giving discussants "the benefit of a doubt" in assuming that they are participating in argument as a means for solving problems, the authors are able to reconstruct arguments from such disparate examples as letters to the editor of a college newspaper, the proselytizing efforts of Mormon missionaries, and third-party dispute mediation sessions as used in some child custody cases. The adeptness with which the authors are able to extricate arguments from the messiness of everyday talk is one of the strengths of the book. By proceeding with this painstaking reconstructive process, van Eemeren *et al.* are able to illustrate the ways in which examples of conversational argument meet or fail to meet the conditions of an ideal pragma-dialectical critical discussion.

Chapter eight completes this book with a discussion of the ideal model's relevance for the comprehensive study of argumentation, including implications for research methods and the practical application of research findings to everyday discourse. Further, concerning notions of reasonableness and their ideal model, van Eemeren *et al.* contend that reasonableness is "located in the self-correcting capacities of a discussion procedure" (171), rather than describing reasonableness as a precondition for substantive dialogue or a psychological attribute of interlocutors.

While this work deserves our careful attention, I have three concerns after reviewing *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*. First, notwithstanding the insistence of van Eemeren *et al.* that all four of them contributed equally to the work—note the alphabetical listing of the authors—some chapters seem clearly to belong to only one or two of them. For example, chapter one is almost exclusively a summary of arguments made elsewhere by van Eemeren and Grootendorst, beginning with their 1983 *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions*, while chapter seven of van Eemeren *et al.* appears to be derived from Scott Jacobs's 1982 dissertation. As a result, the work does not always seem to speak with a single voice; one sometimes has a sense that the book consists of a series of much-revised essays, rather than interconnected chapters building to a single thesis.

Second, those like David A. Frank who worry that the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation studies devalues rhetoric will not be comforted by this newest volume. Elsewhere, van Eemeren has called the pragma-dialectical approach the "new dialectic" to distinguish it from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's new rhetoric, and van Eemeren and Grootendorst long have denied rhetoric the critical, reflective role that they assign to dialectic. While devoting only a few sentences to this subject, *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse* suggests no retreat from their previous position that rhetoric requires a relativistic perspective on argument analysis. Despite Geoffrey D. Klinger's recent claim that van Eemeren and Grootendorst have no desire to marginalize or denigrate rhetoric, rhetoricians can be forgiven if they conclude that philosophy is treated more favorably than rhetoric by these authors, at least where the contributions of van Eemeren and Grootendorst to this latest monograph are concerned.

Third, the basis on which the ideal model of argumentative discourse is founded is not entirely clear. The use of normative reconstruction to compare conversational argument with the ideal model is a central objective of this book, yet the authors devote only a few paragraphs to justifying the ideal model. While van Eemeren *et al.* refer the reader to the earlier work of van Eemeren and Grootendorst for further explanation, one is left wondering why this ideal model is superior to other possible ideal models of argumentation (e.g., a model grounded in the narrative theory of Walter Fisher).

Overall, van Eemeren, Grootendorst, Jackson and Jacobs should be commended for their unique contribution to argumentation studies. Individually, these scholars are responsible for some of the greatest innovations in argumentation studies in recent years; together, they have produced a volume that promises much for the international and interdisciplinary study of argumentation. Concerning academic debate, van Eemeren and Grootendorst's pragma-dialectical theory has even inspired an experiment in intercollegiate academic debate in their native country, which appears to be loosely modeled on the U.S. experience with debating policy propositions (see van Eemeren and Grootendorst's 1994 edited collection, *Studies in Pragma-Dialectics*, Ch. 20).

In the U.S., pragma-dialectics might provide a new theoretical framework from which to evaluate the contemporary practice of academic debate. Contrary to the assumption made by many critics of academic debate, there is a great deal of cooperative problem-solving going on in debate rounds, especially between varsity debaters in cross-examination periods. Familiarity

with the cooperative, pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation might facilitate additional cooperative interaction among competitors. Further, if those academics familiar with intercollegiate debate make use of debate as a laboratory for the testing of pragma-dialectical precepts, pragma-dialectics could provide one way to reconnect debate with contemporary argumentation theory. Finally, pragma-dialectics might provide a perspective that would allow the experience of debate coaches with argument analysis to be applied usefully to other argumentative contexts.

BOOK REVIEW/VIDEO AND SOFTWARE CRITIQUES NEEDED FOR *THE FORENSIC*

The editor is seeking book reviews and video and software critiques for *The Forensic*. Reviews should be submitted with a camera ready hard copy and a 3 1/2 inch disk with the review in Microsoft Word or Word Perfect Mac or DOS in Modern Language Association Style, 3rd edition.

See reviews from previous issues of *The Forensic* for models. Reviews can be of anything relevant to rhetoric, public address, and forensics including any of the following subject areas: rhetoric, public address, argumentation, debate, forensics, public speaking, reasoning, values, tournaments or tournament management, forensics competition, rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism, public speaking, persuasion, expository speaking, oral interpretation, parliamentary debate, forensics pedagogy, etc.

Suggestions for review include but are not limited to the following:

Michael Bartanen and David Frank *Nonpolicy Debate* Gorsuch Scarisbrick 1994.

William Benoit, Dale Hample, and Pam Benoit, eds. *Readings in Argumentation*. N.Y.: Foris Publishers, 1992.

David Berube *Nonpolicy Debating*. University Press of America, 1993.

Edwin Black. *Rhetorical Questions: Studies of Public Discourse*. University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Stephen Brydon and Michael Scott. *Between One and Many: The Art and Science of Public Speaking*. Mayfield Publishing, 1994.

Stephen Bygrave. *Kenneth Burke: Rhetoric and Ideology* N.Y.: Routledge 1993.

Carolyn Calloway Thomas and John Lucaites *Martin Luther King and His Sermonic Power of Public Discourse*. University of Alabama Press, 1993.

- CEA Yearbook 1991, 1992, 1993 editions
- Championship Debate and Speeches SCA 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 editions
- Martha Cooper and William Nothstine *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Modern Age* Alistair Press, 1992.
- Theresa Enos and Stuart Brown. *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1994.
- Robert V. Friedenberg, ed. *Rhetorical Studies of National Presidential Debates 1960-1992*. 2nd ed. Praeger, 1993.
- Dirk Gibson. *The Role of Communication in the Practice of Law*. University Press of America, 1991.
- C.T. Hanson et al. *The Practice of Public Speaking: A Practical Guide for Beginning Speakers*. 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co., 1992.
- Seth Hawkins Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results 1992 or 1993
- Susan Hellweg, Michael Pfau, and Steven Brydon. *Televised Presidential Debates: Advocacy in Contemporary America*. Praeger, 1992.
- Ed Inch, ed. Proceedings of PKD Third Development Conference.
- George Kennedy. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Donald Klopff and Ron Cambra. *Personal and Public Speaking*. 4th ed. Morton Publishing, 1993.
- DLeith and G. Myerson. *Rhetoric, Reason, and Argument: The Power of Public Address Explorations in Rhetoric*
- L.H. LaRue. *Constitutional Law as Fiction: Narrative in The Rhetoric of Authority*. Pennsylvania St. University Press
- Mieczyslaw Maneli. *Perelman's New Rhetoric As Philosophy and Methodology for the Next Century*. Kluwer Academic, 1993.
- Ron Matlon. *Opening Statements and Closing Arguments*. Stuart Allen, 1992.
- Brian MacArthur, ed. *The Penguin Book of Twentieth -Century Speeches*.
- Raymie McKerrow, ed. *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge: Proceedings of the 8th SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. SCA, 1993.
- Martin Medhurst, ed. *Landmark Essays on American Public Address*. Hermagoras Press, 1995.
- Michel Meyer. *Rhetoric, Language, and Reason*. Pennsylvania St. University Press, 1994.
- Charles Mudd and Malcolm Sillars. *Public Speaking: Content and Communication*. 6th ed. Waveland, 1991.
- Donn Parson, ed. *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the 7th SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. SCA, 1991.

- Michael Pfau and Roxanne Parrott. *Persuasive Communication Campaigns*. Allyn and Bacon, 1993.
- Robert Pinto and John Anthony Blair. al *Reasoning: A Practical Guide*, 1993.
- John Reinard. *Foundations of Argument: Effective Communication for Critical Thinking*. Brown and Benchmark, 1991.
- Edward Schiappa, ed. *Warranting Assent: Case Studies in Argument Evaluation*. SUNY Press, 1995.
- Sharon Shavitt and Tom Brock. *Persuasion* Allyn and Bacon, 1994.
- J. Michael Sproule. *Speechmaking: An Introduction to Rhetorical Competence*. Brown and Benchmark, 1991.
- David Thomas and Stephen Wood, eds. *CEDA 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Kendall Hunt, 1993.
- David Thomas and J. Hart, eds. *Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice and Teaching*. 4th ed. National Textbook, 1992.
- Marlene Vallin. *Mark Twain: Protagonist for the Popular Culture*. Greenwood, 1992 (#18 in Great American Orators Series)
- David Vancil. *Rhetoric and Argumentation*. Allyn, 1992.
- Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst. *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragmadiialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992.
- ____ + J. Anthony Blair, and Charles A. Willard. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Argumentation*. University of Amsterdam, 1990.
- Ralph Verderber. *Essentials of Informative Speaking: Theory and Contexts*. Wadsworth, 1991.
- Douglas N. Walton. *Plausible Argument in Everyday Conversation*. SUNY Press, 1992.
- ____ *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. Pennsylvania St. University Press, 1992.
- David Zarefsky, ed. *Rhetorical Movement: Essays in Honor of Leland M Griffin*. Northwestern University Press, 1993.
- Raymond Zeuschner. *Communicating Today*. Allyn, 1992.

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(Copy and forward to your librarian)

Name _____

Department _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please enter a subscription to **The Forensic** at the subscriber rate of \$20 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription will begin with the current issue.

One year ☐ \$20 Two years ☐ \$40 Three years ☐ \$50

On subscriptions outside the U.S. add \$12 per year for foreign postage.

Prices effective through December 31, 1995

Make check payable to **The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta**

Order from your subscription agent or directly from:

Robert Littlefield

National Secretary-Treasurer PKD

Box 5075 University Station

North Dakota State University

Fargo, ND 58105-5075

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through Secretary-Treasurer Littlefield's Office include:

The History of Pi Kappa Delta by Larry Norton

_____ copies @ \$10/each \$ _____

The Proceedings of the 1989 PKD Developmental Conference

ed. by Dr. Robert S. Littlefield

_____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____

The Proceedings of the 1995 PKD Developmental Conference

ed. by Scott Jensen

_____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____

Past issues of *The Forensic* (specify year/issue)

_____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____