

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Deep

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
V. 99 OTTAWA, KANS. #1

Introduction

JOSH COMPTON, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

What Debate Means to Us: An Interpretive Analysis of Debate and Identity

DARREL FARMER, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT LINCOLN

A Sign of the Times: Jimmy Carter's National Energy Policy Speech and Syntagmatic Confusion

CARL M. CATES, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN J. MIKOLAJCIK, WALTERS STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MICHAEL H. EAVES, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM V. FAUX, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Re-balancing Inherency: *Can, Will, and Should*

RYAN K. CLARK, BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY

Book Review: Hart, R. P., Childers, J. P., & Lind, C. J. (2013). *Political tone: How leaders talk and why*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

REVIEWED BY BRIAN T. KAYLOR, JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

National Council

JEFFREY A. STOPPENHAGEN, PRESIDENT

*The Greater Nampa Area High Schools
Nampa, ID 83687*

208-440-1794

DAVID BAILEY, PRESIDENT-ELECT

*Bob R. Derryberry School of Comm. Arts, Southwest Baptist University
Bolivar, MO 65613*

417-328-1697

PHILLIP VOIGHT, SECRETARY-TREASURER

*Department of Communication Studies, Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, MN 56082*

507-933-7369

GINA JENSEN, PAST PRESIDENT

*School of Communication, Webster University
St. Louis, MO 63119*

314-968-7164

JOSH COMPTON, EDITOR OF *THE FORENSIC*

*Institute for Writing and Rhetoric, Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755*

603-626-9842

SUSAN MILLSAP, HISTORIAN

*Department of Communication, Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081*

614-823-3386

RYAN LOUIS, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Division of Communication Studies, Ottawa University
Ottawa, KS 66067*

785-248-2526

TOMEKA ROBINSON, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Department of Communication & Media Studies, Marietta College
Marietta, OH 45750*

740-346-4546

JENNIFER TALBERT, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Theatre and Communication, William Carey University
Hattiesburg, MS 39401*

601-318-6775

AUSTIN W. ALLEN, NATIONAL COUNCIL - STUDENT

*c/o Department of Communication Studies, University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS*

601-266-4271

RYAN CARRIGAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL - STUDENT

*c/o School of Communication Studies, Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701*

740-593-9962

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

Lisa Vossekuil
125 Watson St., P.O. Box 38
Ripon, WI 54971

pkdnationaloffice@gmail.com
Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478

Visit us at: www.pikappadelta.com

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

1 **Introduction**

JOSH COMPTON, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

3 **What Debate Means to Us: An Interpretive Analysis of Debate and Identity**

DARREL FARMER, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT LINCOLN

21 **A Sign of the Times: Jimmy Carter's National Energy Policy Speech and Syntagmatic Confusion**

CARL M. CATES, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN J. MIKOLAJCIK, WALTERS STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MICHAEL H. EAVES, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM V. FAUX, VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

31 **Re-balancing Inherency: *Can*, *Will*, and *Should***

RYAN K. CLARK, BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEW

41 **Hart, R. P., Childers, J. P., & Lind, C. J. (2013). *Political tone: How leaders talk and why*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.**

Reviewed by BRIAN T. KAYLOR, JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

The *Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research and administration in competitive and non-competitive speech and debate activities. *The Forensic* welcomes submissions from forensic coaches, communication/rhetoric scholars, and students (undergraduate and graduate).

The Editor and Editorial Board invite scholarly discussion of making competitive individual events and debate powerful tools for teaching essential citizenship practices, including clear and ethical communication. Topics of particular interest to the Editor and Editorial Board include, but are not limited to: ways to increase diversity in forensics, speech/argumentation pedagogy, and transfer as it relates to forensics (e.g., transfer among individual events, debate, and interpretation; transfer between competition and the classroom, and vice versa; transfer between forensics and careers).

The journal seeks submissions reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual event forms, including, but not limited to: NDT, CEDA, NEDA, NPDA, IPDA, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, as well as NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events. The journal also welcomes explorations of non-competitive speech and debate activities, including classroom projects, interdisciplinary efforts, and civic programs. *The Forensic* may also publish reviews of books, activities, and other educational materials. Potential authors should contact the Editor regarding the choice of material for review.

All submitted works must be original, unpublished, and not under review by other publishers. Any research involving human subjects must have the approval of the author's institutional review board. Submissions should conform to APA guidelines (latest edition). E-mail submissions to the editor in Word format with no specialized internal formatting. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references. The title page should include the title, author(s), correspondence address, e-mail address and telephone number of the author(s). The second page should include an abstract of between 75 and 100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with no reference to the author, and with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed and double-spaced on the pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

SEND MANUSCRIPTS TO: Josh Compton, josh.compton@dartmouth.edu. **Do not fax submissions.** Authors should have an editorial decision within three months.

REVIEW EDITORS

David C. Bailey, Southwest Baptist Univ.
Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran Univ.
Heather J. Carmack – James Madison Univ.
Mark S. Hickman - West Chester Univ.
Ed Hinck – Central Michigan Univ.
Jeffrey Hobbs - Phuket Rajabhat Univ.
Todd T. Holm – Marine Corps Univ.
Gina Jensen – Webster Univ.
Brian Kaylor - James Madison Univ.

Nina-Jo Moore - Appalachian State Univ.
David Nelson - Valdosta State University
Jack E. Rogers - Univ. of Central Missouri
Don R. Swanson - Monmouth Univ.
Crystal Lane Swift - Mt. San Antonio College
& California State Univ., Northridge
Scott Thomson - Ithaca College
Phillip A. Voight - Gustavus Adolphus College
Kelly Jo Wright – Univ. of Wisconsin,
Eau Claire

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN:0015-735X) is published twice yearly, Winter and Summer, by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$20.00 for 1 year, \$40.00 for 2 years, and \$60.00 for 3 years. Second class postage is paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: Please send all change requests to: PKD, 125 Watson St., P. O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. **THE FORENSIC** is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Call for Submissions to a Special Issue of *The Forensic*: Forensics and Law

Speech and debate prepares students for various careers (and many of us would argue, any career). But the connection between speech and debate and the study and practice of law seems especially strong.

In this special issue of *The Forensic*, we will explore how forensics prepares—or does not prepare—students for the study and practice of law, and in what ways.

Possibilities include, *but are not limited to*:

Personal reflections by current lawyers about their forensic experiences

Historical essays about connections between forensics and the law

Theoretical considerations of forensic and legal practices

What learning theory tells us about how forensics prepares students for careers in law

Biographies of famous lawyers with forensic experience

Submissions will be accepted through October 15th, 2014. Please use "SPECIAL ISSUE: LAW" in the subject line of your email submission.

All submitted works must be original, unpublished, and not under review by other publishers. Any research involving human subjects must have the approval of the author's institutional review board. Submissions should conform to APA guidelines (latest edition). E-mail submissions to the editor in Word format with no specialized internal formatting. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references. The title page should include the title, author(s), correspondence address, e-mail address and telephone number of the author(s). The second page should include an abstract of between 75 and 100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with no reference to the author, and with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed and double-spaced on the pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

SEND MANUSCRIPTS TO: Josh Compton, josh.compton@dartmouth.edu. Do not fax submissions. Authors should have an editorial decision within three months.

Missing

Introduction

For the past six years, I have been a part of the Institute for Writing and Rhetoric at Dartmouth College. I teach several speech courses (including Public Speaking, Speechwriting, and Persuasion) and I am actively involved in faculty development, leading workshops and discussions about public speaking, argumentation, and learning. And nearly every day, I'm having conversations with my colleagues and students about speaking and writing—about what is similar, about what is different, and, when the conversations might be at their best, about how we can learn more about writing through speaking and how we can learn more about speaking through writing.

I'm struck by how often I recall my days of forensic competition and coaching when I think about speaking and writing. On one level, the connection is obvious: Forensic students (and their coaches) write and speak *a lot*.

But other dimensions of speaking and writing in forensics go beyond a count of minutes speaking or writing. Consider how writing drafts of speeches often leads to discoveries, to new ideas and arguments. Consider how talking through a draft in a practice session, or over coffee with a coach or friend, leads to changes to the written draft. Competitors are writing and speaking, and they are also writing *for* speaking, and speaking *for* writing.

And so are their coaches. Coaches talk through ideas with their students; they shift among the canons of rhetoric in their talk, often without linear order. A comment about organization blends seamlessly into a discussion about delivery; a concern expressed about a balance of artistic proofs leads to a discussion about language and style. Such talk is followed or accompanied by writing—as coaches jot down reminders during their students' speeches, as students write marginal notes on their manuscripts, draw arrows to show a possible reorganization, or use a big question mark as a reminder that *something* was wrong with a particular part, even if that *something* was, at least at the moment, unclear.

Or, consider the ballot. Judges write to record their evaluation of the speech, but also, to make sense of their own reaction to the speech.

And then there is *The Forensic*. I see *The Forensic* as a space to continue our conversations about speaking and writing and more. This is a forum for thoughtful explorations of what it means to communicate, to argue, to speak, to engage in dialogue, to reason.

Seldom will we know precisely how conversations became notes, became research, became revisions, became articles in *The Forensic*.

Neither will we know how often conversations and research and notes and revisions returned during the process that led to these articles. But we can conclude, with a good deal of confidence, I think, that the articles we read in *The Forensic* are reflections of both speaking and writing, and of writing for speaking, and of speaking for writing. I can hardly wait to see where our conversations go next.

Nina Jo Moore, the previous editor, has been a kind and patient colleague during the editor transition process, and I want to take this opportunity to thank her again, here. Let me also note, as a specific example, that two of the articles in this issue were received under Nina Jo's tenure, and she oversaw the peer review process. (Editing mistakes, however, are mine.)

I very much look forward to reading your work.

Josh Compton
Editor, *The Forensic*



What Debate Means to Us: An Interpretive Analysis of Debate and Identity

DARREL FARMER, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT LINCOLN

Abstract: Debate programs are disappearing across the nation due to budget cuts when colleges see them as expendable. Current scholarship explains the skills derived from debate as an activity, but this paper helps to fill the gap in the research by offering debaters' voices on what they gained. By mining interviews utilizing interpretive analysis, this paper extracts core concepts about how debate shapes the individual's identity and offers a collection of self-reported benefits for participating in debate. The paper has implications for how programs can justify their existence as well as the powerful, transformative effects that debate can have on individual identity formation.

The connection between debate and critical thinking skills is well documented and promoted as a reason to engage in the activity. Students who have taken part in debate have shown greater propensities to succeed in business, law, and public service (National Forensic League, 2007). The reason that students engaged in academic debate do better is not just because of the critical thinking skills they gain, but also how they internalize those skills into a worldview (Gentry, 2000; Derryberry, 2005). While students may learn the skills of critical thinking, research aptitude, and argument-building while engaging in the activity of debate, the propensity to move those lessons beyond their years competing seems internally motivated (Rowland & Fritch, 1989). Rowland and Fritch explained, "the practice of debate also can inform our understanding of argumentation practice and theory" (p. 463) and be used in forums outside of debate.

While debate certainly provides life skills, the question remains as to how competitors internalize the lessons learned from debate? Is debate simply a collection of skills generated out of necessity in order to compete? Or, are there life lessons, personal attributes, or behaviors that one gains from the activity beyond the components of the debater toolkit?

DARREL FARMER (Ph.D. Candidate, University of Nebraska Lincoln) is a Graduate Teaching Assistant in Communication Studies and the Director of Debate at The University of Nebraska Lincoln (Lincoln, NE). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention in Cleveland, OH, 2012, where it received Top Paper from the Argumentation and Forensics Division. The author would like to thank Dr. Dawn Braithwaite for her guidance in the seminar that helped foster this paper. Please refer all questions and comments to the author at dfarmer@huskers.unl.edu

In order to understand the answers to these questions, it is essential to understand the connections between debate and identity. After speaking to a group of present and former debaters, I have heard them explain how being a debater shaped their self-esteem and the way they envisioned themselves. Debaters reported an increased awareness of personal agency, higher esteem through empowerment, and superior coping skills taken from their years spent in the activity. In order to begin answering some of our questions, we need to look at identity and empowerment.

Identity

Individual identity is created and maintained through the use of communication (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934; Meltzer, 1967). Mead's theory of symbolic interaction argues that the mind and self are created through social interaction. Represented in the field of identity theory is the assumption that identity is not just reflected in communication, but constituted through communication (Augoustinos et al., 2006; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Brubaker & Cooper, 2000; Edwards, 2009). Bergen (2010) explained that "human beings develop a sense of self (identity) by taking the perspective of others gained through social interaction. The main unit of analysis from the symbolic interactionist perspective is the social act, that is, the interactional process of communication" (p. 37).

Identity and language develop by mirroring the behavior of, learning, and taking the role of others in your social network (Mead, 1934; Meltzer, 1967; Wood 1994, 2000). The role of debate in identity formation can be explained in how debate teams and debate leagues become cultures and social networks (Derryberry, 2005; Swift, 2008b). Taken to its conclusion within Mead's framework, debaters become part of the larger social network that is comprised of their team, the debate league, and their governing body. They learn patterns of behavior in relationship to group norms.

Debate creates a communicative framework in which the presentation of information and production of thought is shaped through interaction. Community norms and expectations champion certain skills and behaviors over others through the external motivation of competitive success. This shapes the way that people see themselves and refines their communicative behaviors to fit the expectations of the debate community within which they exist. This helps explain the close connection between the abilities taught in debate and their transition to a debater's sense of self. Erving Goffman (1959) argued a similar point by saying that individuals' identities are validated through the eyes of others. As debaters become more engaged in the activity, their identity is reinforced by the social network surrounding them on their team and at tournaments.

Identity formation is a product of our competing cultural experience (Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993). Debate constantly puts one's cultural experience in contrast with others because of the fluid nature

of the activity. Switch-side debating forces students engaged in the activity to be able to advocate from all sides of the proposition, which seeks to make them better informed advocates (English et al., 2007; Munksgaard & Pfister, 2003). Thus debate helps form one's identity by constantly putting one's viewpoints at risk. One way in which this benefits debaters is through personal empowerment. Debate-trained advocacy skills affect the ways in which a student can argue for, think about, and conceptualize complex ideas.

Empowerment

Administrative champions of debate have argued for years that debate empowers students (La Ban, 1980; Smith & Popovich, 1980). Students learn cognitive templates and tools that they need to critically evaluate the world around them through the activity. It also offers them methods to give voice to their beliefs. This knowledge helps debaters break down barriers of intimidation that surround questions of policy-making that can debilitate the common voting public.

Dauber (1989) explained that academic debate is a valuable tool for empowering participants because it "proves to students that they ought not be intimidated by the rhetoric of expertise surrounding questions of policy" (p. 206). This helps students of debate to answer the call of Goodnight (1982) to try to rescue deliberative discourse from the clutches of the technical sphere. Debaters learn how to overcome fears surrounding technical jargon, how to test the logic of proposed claims, and they learn the courage to speak up and have their voice heard. These are the tools needed to test claims of technical expertise. Debate helps to keep alive the dream of an invigorated deliberative democracy because the advocacy training empowers students to take action and get involved.

The empowerment offered through debate has many pedagogic and lifelong functions. Some of the pedagogic functions of this empowerment are the increased aptitude to create an argument for in-class essays and papers. Switch side debating cultivates habits of mind that provide a cognitive framework for debaters to synthesize diverse materials into interwoven arguments (Harrigan, 2008; Mitchell, 2010). Debaters typically do better in the classroom and have an easier time grappling with complex ideas. Winkler (2010) reports that after engaging in academic debate, "students showed significant gains in reading rate, accuracy, fluency, and comprehension" (p. 569). By accelerating the reading and comprehension skills needed in the college classroom, they give a debater a superior sense of themselves as orators. This gives them confidence and helps them feel empowered in the classroom.

In addition to the pedagogic function, the empowerment offered through debate also extends beyond the classroom. Researchers have found that empowerment through debate allows the expansion of critical voices (Wiese & Varda, 2005). Debate helps offer those stu-

dents who would have otherwise been marginalized the voice required to call their treatment into question. Warner and Bruschke (2001) explained that debate allows students to become “critics of knowledge” and “agents of change” (p. 19). They illustrated how debate has helped teach inner city students how to argue on their own behalf for better policies in their surrounding communities and within their schools. These examples show how the vocabulary, critical thinking skills, and advocacy skills learned in debate create a method for supporting oneself that work in public, as well as academic forums.

Identity Transformation Across Contexts

Scholars argue that individuals have many identities based around different contexts (Eisenberg, 2001; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). People can see themselves as mothers, firefighters, or union members all at the same time and each of those separate identities affects the way that the person positions themselves based on a given situation. The question is: does empowerment gained from debate translate to an improved self-concept in other contexts of a debater’s life? If this empowerment and the identity formation associated with debate can translate across social contexts, then it may affect the way an individual sees themselves overall. Does being empowered by debate actually make a debater into a more active citizen or better student? Does it become central to your understanding of yourself or is it simply a small piece to a larger puzzle?

RQ #1: How is empowerment communicated by debaters?

RQ #2: Are empowerment and identity applicable across contexts?

RQ #3: How does improved self-concept affect debaters’ lives beyond debate?

Applications

In addition to the ideas of identity and empowerment, debate has long been related to critical thinking skills and civic engagement (Cox & Jensen, 1989; Dimock & Dimock, 2009; Gentry, 2000; La Ban, 1980; Rowland & Fritch, 1989). Students engaging in political discourse and argumentation build skills that translate to the real world as the foundations upon which engaged advocates and citizens are built. Argumentative discourse and on-the-fly challenges to their positions build critical thinking and evaluation skills that help students liberate themselves from traditionally oppressive power structures (Wiese & Varda, 2005; Winkler, 2010). Debate provides a forum and context in which traditional power structures can be called into question and, ideally, emancipates participants. In order to better understand the ways in which debate can affect one’s life beyond identity formation, it is essential to consider civic engagement and critical thinking skills.

Civic Engagement

The mutually reifying relationship between argumentation theory

and democratic practice is well established by scholars (Blair, 2006; Rehg, 2002; van Eemeren, 2002; Williams & Young, 2006). Zompetti and Williams (2007) noted “effective and sustained civic engagement by citizens requires not simply motivation on the part of citizens but also skills and, specifically, skills in argumentation” (p. 819). Argumentation allows its students a basic understanding of the structure of arguments and how to test claims made by politicians. Analytical and critical advocacy skills provide the “how to” in the puzzle of civic engagement. Van Eemeren (2002) explains that argument plays a crucial part in the uncertainty management inherent in democracy.

The question of which specific analytical skills translate to democracy has been set forth by many scholars. Effective advocacy (verbal), critical analysis (cognitive), and effective response are all analytical skills needed by a competent citizen that can be learned through debate (Williams, 2006; Williams & Young, 2006; Zompetti, 2006). These same skills can be considered to be prerequisites to effective citizens within a democracy (Dewey, 1954).

Educators and debate coaches are constantly looking for ways to connect civic engagement and argumentation skills (Mitchell, 1998, 2000; Rowland, 1989; Williams & Young, 2006; Zompetti, 2006). The connection between debate and civic engagement is in large part why such an expensive activity is funded by universities and colleges (Smith & Popovich, 1980). Without any longitudinal study done of debaters’ civic engagement over time and no particular tool to measure civic engagement’s correlation to a particular activity or phenomenon, a feasible answer to the question of did debate affect your personal civic engagement could be one best understood in conversation. The correlation in people’s feelings may not translate to a number on a scale as well as it does in the narrative of their experience. This leads to the next research question:

RQ #4: How, if at all, does participating in debate influence a person’s civic engagement?

Critical thinking

Critical thinking is defined as “reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1987). Studies show that the critical thinking skills taught in debate extend beyond the classroom (Bellon, 2000; Ehninger, 1970; Ehninger & Brockriede, 1963; Howell, 1943; Huseman & Goodman, 1976; Whalen, 1991). The benefits of this critical thinking translate to business, law, and daily decision-making. The specific skills that it seems to benefit the most are the ability to make arguments, the ability to recognize weak arguments, and a decrease in verbal aggression during arguments (Sanders & Wiseman, 1994).

The critical thinking learned from debate does not just teach about argumentation, but it also teaches participants methods for decision-