

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Published since 1915

Research Articles:

Constructing Narratives: Organizational and Individual Stories
About Intercollegiate Debate
GLENDA TREADAWAY and BILL HILL

Select Sweepstakes of the Cross-Examination Debate
Association: A First Year Analysis
MICHAEL H. BAUER

Pedagogical Essay:

Cloning Ourselves to Death: A Plea for Real Audiences/Real
Forensics
KENNETH HADA

Editor's Notes



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

National Council

JOEL HEFLING, PRESIDENT

*Communication Studies & Theatre, South Dakota State University,
P.O. Box 2218, Brookings, SD 57007-1197 605-688-4390*

SCOTT JENSEN, PRESIDENT ELECT

*Communication, History, Politics & Law, Webster University,
470 E. Lockwood, St. Louis, MO 63119 314-968-7439*

ROBERT LITTLEFIELD, SECRETARY TREASURER

*Box 5075, University Station, North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105-5075 701-231-7783*

BILL HILL, Jr, PAST PRESIDENT

*Communication Studies, University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223 704-547-4217*

MICHAEL BARTANEN, EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC

*Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447 253-535-7764*

GLENDA TREADAWAY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Communication, Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608 704-262-2222*

BOB DERRYBERRY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Communication, Southwest Baptist University
Bolivar, MO 65613 417-326-1697*

SUSAN MILLSAP, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Speech Communication, Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-1753*

TAMMY FRISBY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*PO Box 3744, Concordia College
Moorhead, MN 56562 218-299-5638*

TERRY HINNENKAMP, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*1210 10th Street N
Fargo, ND 58102 701-235-9657*

R. DAVID RAY, HISTORIAN

*PO Box 2882, University of Arkansas-Monticello
Monticello, AR 71655 870-460-1078*

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

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

Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Research Articles:

- 1 Constructing Narratives: Organizational and Individual Stories About Intercollegiate Debate
GLENDA J. TREADAWAY and BILL HILL
- 25 Select Sweepstakes of the Cross-Examination Debate Association: A First Year Analysis
MICHAEL H. BAUER

Essay:

- 33 Cloning Ourselves to Death: A Plea for Real Audiences/Real Forensics
KENNETH HADA

Editor's Notes

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. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts employing any appropriate methodology and is particularly interested in historical-critical studies in forensics and forensics education. Manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students and previously unpublished scholars will also receive serious consideration.

The journal reflects the values of its supporting organization. *Pi Kappa Delta* is committed to promoting "*the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.*" The journal seeks to promote serious scholarly discussion of issues connected to making competitive and non-competitive debate and individual events a powerful tool for teaching students the skills necessary for becoming articulate citizens. The journal seeks essays reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual events forms, including, but not limited to: NDT, CEDA, NEDA, Parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas debate; and NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events.

Reviews of books and other educational materials will be published periodically. Potential reviewers are invited to contact the editor regarding the choice of materials for review.

All works must be original and not under review by other publishers. Authors should submit three print copies conforming to APA (4th ed.) guidelines plus a PC-compatible disk version. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references; book and educational material reviews should be between 4-5 double-spaced pages. Submitted manuscripts will not be returned. The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address and telephone number. The second page should include an abstract of 75-100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor: Michael Bartanen, Department of Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447. 253-535-7764. BARTANMD@PLU.EDU. Authors will have an editorial decision within three months.

Review Editors

Sandra Alspach, Ferris State University
David Frank, University of Oregon
Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College
Jaime Meyer, University of Mary
C. Thomas Preston, Missouri-St. Louis
Margaret Greynolds, Georgetown College, Review Editor

Donna Beran, University of Dayton
Jeff Gentry, Southwestern Oklahoma
Glenn Kuper, University of Puget Sound
Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College
Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times yearly, Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$30.00 for one year, \$60.00 for two years and \$75.00 for three years. Second class postage paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: please send all changes of address requests to: PKD, 125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Constructing Narratives: Organizational and Individual Stories About Intercollegiate Debate

GLEND A J. TREADAWAY AND BILL HILL

Organizations have identities and how participants in an organization construct their identity provides insight into the nature and values of the organization. This paper will use the Cross-Examination Debate Association as a case study by using Fisher's theories of narrative to help illuminate the organization's narratives and resulting beliefs and behaviors. The study identifies macro-narratives existing in CEDA; analyzes the narrative probability and narrative fidelity of the macro-narratives; and analyzes the implications of this research.

Academic debate is in the midst of an identity crisis. Over the past decade, the debate community has witnessed the emergence of at least three new debate organizations, rapid growth of alternative models and forms of debate, and equally rapid disaffection of members from one organization followed closely by their affiliation with another. It is only a slight exaggeration to say that organizational evolution and re-alignment during this time have been staggering.

There have always been differences in perspective—values, priorities, and practices—within the debate community. However, those differences have widened to the point that even the term “debate community” means something vastly different now than a decade ago. Today there is no debate community, at least in the holistic sense that all organizations subscribe to commonly shared principles, practices, and purposes. Rather, it would be much more accurate to describe academic debate as a collection of different organizations linked more by the generic description of what they do—debate—than by the values, procedures and pedagogical approaches that they share. As a result, the organization to which one subscribes now more than ever operationally defines “debate,” one’s identity as a “debater,” and a program’s identity as a “debate team.”¹

Because the organization has become the key unit of analysis in describing the nature of debate, understanding organizational identities is important. Each debate organization has an identity, and it

GLEND A TREADAWAY is Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Forensics, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC. Ph.D. Ohio University. BILL HILL is Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication Studies, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, Charlotte, NC. Ph.D. Florida State University. A version of this paper was presented at the Southern States Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, Texas, 1998.

communicates that identity through its organizational narrative. The narrative or story that the organization tells reveals the educational, ethical, and competitive values it espouses, the procedures and practices it endorses, and the behaviors it expects from its members. Those elements become part and parcel of the organization's identity because they illuminate the self-image of the organization, define its basic nature and describe the image it attempts to project to others.

The Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) is an important case study in organizational identity. Among current debate organizations, CEDA is the only one to have been both the "alternative" to the presumed ills of a major existing organization (NDT), and the major organization for which an "alternative" (NEDA) was established. Thus, it is the only organization to have been on both sides of the evolutionary cycle of debate organizations. It has also experienced the major effects of organizational change including significant fluctuations in membership, and major changes in the nature of debate that it promotes. Finally, because of its age, one would suspect CEDA's narrative to contain the completeness and development necessary to constitute a good narrative case study. For each of these reasons, understanding more about the identity of CEDA—what it means to say "I'm a CEDA debater," or we have a CEDA debate program—" is important.

In this paper we will construct the macro-narrative of the Cross Examination Debate Association. The macro-narrative portrays the organization's "official" story, and is usually derived from its public communication, or what Bormann & Bormann (1996) call the formal structure. Bormann and Bormann describe the formal structure in the following way.

Organizations usually have a formal structure. Members simply do not have enough contact with all the other people in a large organization to form impressions about them. Certainly they do not work together enough to develop a role structure. Formal positions take the place of roles and tell people what the organization expects of them and what they can expect from the organization. (249)

The macro-narrative is embedded in formal communication such as policy statements, aspiration statements, constitutional provisions, and bylaws. This narrative is likely to be stable over time and broadly constructed to reveal the core values and codes of conduct publicly endorsed by the organization. Organizational values contribute to the macro-narrative because they clarify the fundamental principles of the organization, help define the public image of the organization, help link individual members with the organization, and establish a

¹ In today's world statements such as "I am a CEDA debater," or "We have an NPDA program" are necessary to accurately describe what "debate" means. Simple statements such as "I'm in the activity," or "My school has an active debate team," actually reveal little about the nature of the individual or program.

foundation from which expectations about behaviors might be derived. Behaviors advocated or proscribed by the organization contribute to the macro-narrative because they help shape the public image of the organization, and identify presumed norms for the conduct of members.

Not only must one understand the macro-narrative to have a meaningful understanding of the organization, the organization should use the macro-narrative as an impetus for intra-organizational dialogue. The components of the macro-narrative—organizational goals, core values, behavioral expectations, and procedural guidelines—create a vision of the organization's "ideal" identity. Ultimately that ideal vision must be tested within the context of the realities of the day-to-day activities of the organization and its members. No matter whether conflicts or convergence emerge, the macro-narrative is critical to understanding the organization and its evolution. In addition the macro-narrative also provides the parameter within which the organization can identify and prioritize issues critical to the organization.² Through this study, we hope to accomplish two objectives. First, we will describe the macro-narrative of the Cross Examination Debate Association. Second, we will analyze the macro-narrative according to Fisher's concepts of narrative probability and narrative fidelity. Accomplishing these objectives will illuminate the organizational identity that The Cross Examination Debate Association projects in its macro-narrative, and clarify the role that organizational identity has in shaping and guiding activities within the organization. In addition, by testing the narrative fidelity of the macro-narrative, we will provide information that CEDA can use to promote intra-organizational dialogue about its values and practices. Overall, the information gleaned from this analysis can be useful to the organization as it continues to evolve.

METHODOLOGY

The macro-narrative will be constructed by applying the major components of Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm (1978, 1984, 1985, 1987, 1989) to the formal structure of CEDA. For the purpose of this study, the macro-narrative of the Cross Examination Debate Association will be constructed by identifying the values and behaviors advocated by the organization and expressed in the 1996 (December) CEDA Constitution and Bylaws. This document was selected because it is the most comprehensive and recent official organizational statement of values and behaviors. Thus, data derived from this document potentially offers the most accurate reflection of the organization's formal public structure.

²For example, members might use the macro-narrative to identify and prioritize organizational goals, define and hierarchically arrange core organizational values, and measure actual behavioral norms and procedural guidelines with the ideals prescribed by the organization.

After constructing the macro-narrative, we will analyze that macro-narrative according to Fisher's concept of narrative probability. Narrative probability refers to judgments about the structure of a story, particularly whether or not the story is coherent.³ A narrative is said to have narrative probability if it portrays relevant events in a consistent manner, provides complete and relevant detail while accounting for aberrations or opposing explanations, and attributes motives and actions to the characters involved which are consistent with their previously known motives and actions. These tests are formally termed argumentative, structural and characterological coherence.

After assessing the narrative probability of the macro-narrative, we will analyze its narrative fidelity. While narrative probability is concerned with the structure of the story, narrative fidelity is concerned with the plausibility or truth qualities of a story. In order to assess narrative fidelity, one would look at the individual elements of the story in order to determine whether or not they are "accurate assertions about social reality..." (1987: 105). When a story has narrative fidelity, it is said to "ring true" (1984: 8) to those who assess it. Stories with narrative fidelity are judged to be both believable and plausible accounts.

In order to apply the test of narrative fidelity to the macro-narrative, we will test key components of the macro-narrative by analyzing the relationship between those components and the communicative and behavioral actions of members of the organization. The communicative and behavioral actions of members constitute the social reality of the organization, thus they are the bases that one would use to assess the accuracy of the macro-narrative.

For the purpose of this study, examples of communicative and behavioral actions were drawn from a transcript of the final round of a national tournament, videotapes of randomly selected debate rounds at a regular season regional tournament, and observations of individual communicative and behavioral actions at a national tournament.⁴ Thus, examples were drawn from a fairly broad cross section of organizational activity including: (1) both formal (in-round) and informal (out-of-round) individual communication and interaction; (2) written, video, and personal observations of individual communication and interaction; (3) individual communication and interaction at both the national and regional levels; and, (4) individual communication drawn over a five-year period of time including the most recent history of the organization.

Drawing examples from a broad cross-section of organizational activity over an extended period of time enhances the reliability and

³ Fisher uses the expression "hangs together" (1985, 349-350) to illustrate coherence.

⁴ The transcript used came from the 1993 CEDA National Tournament Finals. Videotapes of debates were collected at the 1995 Vanderbilt tournament. Personal observations were recorded from the 1998 CEDA National Tournament.

validity of our data set, however communicative and behavioral actions are inherently individualistic and caution must always be used in making generalizations about them. Similarly, the examples that we use illustrate what we believe to be fairly typical communicative and behavioral actions, but we do not claim that they are necessarily representative in the traditional quantitative sense. They are appropriate for this study, however, because they constitute meaningful tests of the macro-narrative. Examples of communicative and behavioral actions—even of the most isolated and unrepresentative sort—can constitute a significant test when they directly conflict or coincide with the central “facts”—the values and behavioral expectations—of the macro-narrative. Such examples can be significant because they constitute a compelling voice; a voice with sufficient rhetorical force to raise questions that must be answered, to advocate revisions that must be considered, or to garner conviction that the fundamental elements of the macro-narrative are substantially correct. Thus, our primary criterion in selecting examples of communicative and behavioral actions was to select those with sufficient force to constitute a significant test of the narrative fidelity of the macro-narrative. Employing this criterion makes sense both because it makes the analysis of narrative fidelity more rigorous and because it isolates the rhetorical and behavioral impulses which should be the subject of intra-organizational dialogue.

CONSTRUCTING THE MACRO-NARRATIVE

In this section we will construct the macro-narrative of the Cross Examination Debate Association. First, we will identify the values stated and implied in formal organizational communication. Second we will identify behaviors defined by the organization as appropriate.

Values

The Cross Examination Debate Association makes straightforward statements in its formal communication about the values it embraces as an organization. CEDA defines the relative importance of competition and education, and clearly preferences the value of education above that of competition. For example, in Bylaw XIV, Section IA, the organization states that “Sacrificing one’s academic progress for competitive success, or extending one’s college career to excessive length in order to go on debating are behaviors contrary to the goals of this organization.” This is a clear statement that the organization views debate as an activity secondary in importance to one’s formal academic curriculum and progress toward graduation. Thus from an organizational standpoint, one’s ultimate purpose should be to attain a quality education. Competition can be used as a tool to promote attainment of more important educational goals, but it should not be viewed as the ultimate value in and of itself. Nor should students ever sacrifice educational goals simply to fulfill their competitive urges.

Second, CEDA values an educational form of debate. CEDA views

debate as an important educational tool that offers students a uniquely beneficial way to develop important skills such as analysis, communication, research, organization, and critical thinking (Bylaw XIV, Section 1). These skills are believed by many to be vital to personal success, growth and ultimately democratic governance. Although the macro-narrative does not specify how these skills are developed through debate, it is clear that CEDA prefers a form of debate which is presumed to correlate to the development of such intrinsically important skills. According to the macro-narrative, that form of debate is one which strikes a balance among analysis, delivery and evidence (Article II, Section 1). CEDA apparently desires to sponsor debates which strike that balance because it believes that participating in such debates is conducive to the attainment of important educational objectives. Thus, the educational core of CEDA's instructional mission is directly linked to the concepts of balance and universal goals (e.g. delivery, research, analysis) rather than excess and idiosyncratic or peripheral concerns. It is clear from this philosophy that CEDA attempts to use debate to foster skills that will have broad application in the social and professional lives of students.

Third, CEDA values ethically responsible conduct and is committed to maintaining high ethical standards. CEDA affirms the values of honesty and fairness as cornerstones of ethical and educationally sound debate when they declare that "It is the duty of each debater to participate honestly and fairly" (Bylaw XIV, Section IB). Presumably, these general values can be used by debaters to assess the ethical appropriateness of a broad range of competitive behaviors. Another example of CEDA's commitment to high ethical standards can be found in Bylaw XIV, Section IC and Bylaw XVII which addresses ethical guidelines for research. According to those sections, CEDA clearly views plagiarism, distortion and fabrication of evidence as unethical and strongly discourages such practices. To enforce adherence to rigorous ethical standards, CEDA establishes adjudication and appeals procedures to formally regulate behaviors which are inconsistent with basic guidelines of ethical research. Thus, the clear message in the macro-narrative is that CEDA members should adhere to high ethical standards, and that those who do not will be penalized.

Fourth, CEDA values equality among participants. CEDA acknowledges the role and contribution of all members in the organization, and of all participants in the debate activity. For example, in the macro-narrative CEDA places a high value on student involvement and input, and affirms that value by constitutionally mandating that each region within CEDA have a student representative (Article IV, Section 11A). Not only are students included within the formal governing structure of the organization, they are encouraged to be active participants in the governance process by voicing their concerns and opinions to the Executive Council (Article IV, Section 11, B1). Adding student representation to the Topic Committee, arguably one of the most important committees in the organization, also illustrates CEDA's effort to promote and encourage student involvement (Article

IV, Section 11, B3). Overall, the macro-narrative clearly communicates the notion that CEDA wants students to have a prominent role in the governance, operation and activities of the organization.

Coaches and judges are also accorded important roles. CEDA presumes that coaches have a natural leadership role in the organization and that they should encourage students to follow organizational guidelines and to emphasize the importance of learning over competition (Bylaw XIV, Section 2). Similarly, judges contribute to educational growth and development by helping regulate the form and quality of debate, and by acting with integrity in a competent, fair, and courteous manner (Bylaw XIV, Section 3).

The attention paid to the roles of students, coaches and judges is significant. In one sense, it illustrates that the Cross Examination Debate Association views each of these characters as an important role player in both the operation and day-to-day debate activities of the organization. Moreover, by encouraging coaches to emphasize education and learning above the importance of competitive success, CEDA acknowledges that coaches are first and foremost educators, a role that is consistent with the value CEDA places on education. At the same time, if coaches and judges are first and foremost educators, debaters must first and foremost be students. Thus, in the macro-narrative, the coach is an EDUCATOR/ coach, the judge is an EDUCATOR/ judge, and the debater is a STUDENT/debater. Finally, it is clear within these particular role definitions of the macro-narrative that CEDA does not preference the importance of the role of any one of these characters, nor does it convey ownership of the activity or the organization to any single group of them. Rather, CEDA clearly communicates the message that coaches, judges, and students alike must fulfill their roles in education and governance if the organization is to function as intended. By so doing, CEDA endorses the value of equality among all involved in the organization.

Finally, CEDA values public recognition for its members. CEDA proposes in the formal narrative to "recognize (through awards) outstanding debate teams, students and educators" (Article II, Section 2). Recognition is important because it symbolizes individual accomplishment; those recognized are rewarded for their success, and are identified as individuals who have succeeded. Moreover, CEDA can use public recognition as a vehicle to promote both the debate activity and the organization. Publicly recognizing individual successes not only promotes the individuals who attained special honors, it simultaneously serves as evidence of the prominence and importance of debate and the work that CEDA is doing to promote the activity. Thus, the process of recognizing achievement is important at the individual, peer, institution, and organizational levels.

Behaviors

How the characters act and the actions and motives ascribed to them is a central part of the narrative. The macro-narrative defines

appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for its members as well as for the organization. From the organizational standpoint, the primary responsibility that CEDA has is to work actively to promote growth and development of intercollegiate debate. CEDA values debate as an intercollegiate activity, and views promoting debate as a central responsibility of the organization. For example, within the macro-narrative CEDA speaks to its role “to promote competitive practices which ensure growth and survival of intercollegiate debate” (Article II, Section 1). Presumably, CEDA would judge its success both on the service it provides to its members, as well as the results of its efforts to promote growth and development of intercollegiate debate.

One of the most important behaviors CEDA charges students with is to respect and promote the educational goals of the organization. According to the CEDA, debaters should behave in a manner consistent with the organization’s educational goals and values, and should bear their responsibility to further the educational aims of the debate activity. In Bylaw XIV, Section I, for example, CEDA states that debaters should “recognize their responsibility to preserve and promote the educational benefits of intercollegiate debate.” CEDA reinforces the linkage between debate form and educational value by encouraging students who participate in CEDA-sponsored debates to strive to “develop their abilities to analyze, research, organize, evaluate and communicate ideas and to experience personal growth” (Bylaw XIV, Section 1).

Charging debaters with the responsibility to “preserve and promote” educational outcomes clearly illustrates the centrality of education in the day-to-day activities of the organization, and it underscores the notion that students bear personal responsibility in promoting their own educational growth and development. Thus according to the macro-narrative, students are expected to be both actively involved in learning and they are expected to act in ways conducive to attaining the major educational goals most closely associated with the form of debate that CEDA endorses.

In addition, CEDA charges its members with the responsibility for promoting effective oral expression. Specific communication behaviors are noted in many places throughout the macro-narrative of the organization. For instance, Bylaw XIV, Section IB notes that “...debate is an oral, interactive process. It is the debater’s duty to aspire to the objective of effective oral expression of ideas.” CEDA further affirms the centrality of effective oral expression in debate and debate education when it suggests that debaters should communicate ideas in an effective manner, understand that communication in debate is a two-way interactive process, and acknowledge that the audience plays a key role in that process. Those are fundamental principles one would expect to find in any basic communication class, and by incorporating them CEDA effectively forges the notion that debate should be an extension of the classroom.

Through its proclamation that participation in CEDA debates pro-

mote effective oral expression, CEDA also effectively links the debate activity with the academic communication discipline. That linkage is important because it enables debate programs to benefit from the administrative structure of established academic departments, because it identifies a body of pedagogical approaches that educators can draw from to develop educationally meaningful debate training, and because it establishes an institutionally-recognized locus of legitimacy for intercollegiate debate.

Another major behavioral expectation in the macro-narrative focuses on research. It is clear that CEDA recognizes that research is an integral component of debate, and the macro-narrative delineates guidelines for the conduct of research. According to the macro-narrative, it is the debater's responsibility to create the arguments they use, and to gather the research used to support those arguments. In Bylaw XIV, Section IC students are encouraged to rely on their own research efforts to obtain information for debates, and to formulate their own argumentative perspective for their debates. This same section also suggests that relying on materials or evidence not obtained through one's own research is a behavior counter to the educational goals of CEDA. By focusing the responsibility for research and generating arguments squarely on the debaters shoulders, CEDA reinforces the view that debate should be an extension of the classroom where students rather than teachers are responsible for completing their own work, and where students are expected to be actively rather than passively involved in their own learning.

Not only should debaters be responsible for doing their own research, they should follow prescribed guidelines for using information in a debate round. CEDA does not prescribe overly specific guidelines for introducing information into a debate round, but it does endorse the general guideline that "debaters should clearly identify and qualify, during their speeches, the source of all of the evidence they use" (Bylaw XVI, Section IC). Although not explicitly stated in the macro-narrative, the rationale for such a guideline could reside in any of the following: clear and complete identification of sources and explanation of evidence promotes ethical responsibility and accountability for the accuracy and use of evidence in a debate round; clear and complete identification of sources and explanation of evidence facilitates effective communication by enhancing the clarity of the message; and/or clear and complete identification of sources and explanation of evidence enhances decision-making by enabling receivers to more accurately and completely evaluate the substantive merits of an advocate's claim(s). Overall, the organization encourages debaters to research and report evidence accurately, fairly and completely with the prior knowledge that violations of the specified codes of ethical behavior could result in penalties.

A fourth set of behavioral expectations focuses on tournament procedures. Tournament guidelines are provided as a model to illustrate how a CEDA tournament should operate, including what should be in

the tournament invitation, how rounds should be paired, and how judging assignments should be made (Bylaw XVI). Guidelines are also established to encourage tournament administrators to provide complete and accurate information including division definitions, power matching, fees, and schedules in their tournament invitations (Bylaw XVI, Section 4A). The macro-narrative does not specify which tournament pairing procedures should be used, but it does provide specific direction that judge assignments should be random (Bylaw XIV, Section 4B and 4C). Although CEDA does not specify many of the tournament procedures which are to be used, it does establish in the macro-narrative criteria that should be used to assess individually-constructed tournament procedures. Those criteria are embedded in the expectation that all tournaments should be constructed and run in a manner which promotes equal opportunity for all to succeed (Bylaw XIV, Section 4), and that the procedures used in any tournament (e.g. pairing) should be fair. Equal opportunity and fairness are important criteria to guide tournament behaviors both because they are intrinsically important individual values and because they are closely connected to the educational process. That is to say, they are values generally recognized across our society to be important and they are values one would expect to be fundamental to any worthwhile educational experience. Imposing these values as criteria to assess tournament-related behavior therefore reinforces both CEDA's commitment to dignified treatment of individuals, and to its view that the debate activity is an extension of the classroom experience.

Another set of behavioral expectations relates to abiding by the rules and regulations of the organization. Although assumed or implied throughout the macro-narrative, CEDA specifically charges debaters and coaches with the responsibility to be aware of and follow all eligibility standards and division eligibility requirements established by the organization. This expectation is based upon the rationale that "Competitive fairness is best maintained for all students when eligibility standards and division definitions are respected by all participants" (Bylaw XIV, Section 1A). Respecting eligibility requirements protects the integrity of the activity by ensuring that CEDA competition is fair and equitable, and thus educationally sound. Moreover, by using those values to describe appropriate conduct in competition, CEDA reinforces the notion that competition is a vehicle for promoting educational outcomes, and that as such it should be guided by the major principles and values intrinsic to education.

Just as CEDA identifies appropriate types of behaviors for its members, it also identifies behaviors which are considered to be inappropriate. One notable example deals with demeaning or dehumanizing behavior. In the macro-narrative CEDA clearly takes the position that demeaning or dehumanizing behavior, no matter from what source or for what purpose, is contrary to the purposes of the organization, the activity, and the educational experience. For example, CEDA states that "Behaviors which belittle, degrade, demean or otherwise dehumanize others are not in the best interest of the activity because they

interfere with the goals of education and personal growth" (Bylaw XIV, Section IB). These same behaviors are mentioned again in CEDA's Statement on Sexual Discrimination (Bylaw XV), where CEDA not only discourages discriminating or dehumanizing behaviors, it outlines adjudication procedures to respond to violations. It is quite clear that the macro-narrative of the Cross Examination Debate Association formally and officially discourages any communication, behavior, or practice which could emotionally or psychologically harm another person. This position is consistent with the importance CEDA places on fairness and equal treatment, and it illustrates one additional way that CEDA attempts to encourage maintenance of an environment that promotes respect for the individual and is conducive to educational growth and development.

In summary, the macro-narrative creates a positive public image of the Cross Examination Debate Association. The organization affirms the value of the activity they promote, and the importance of their role in helping students attain educational and personal goals. Members are encouraged to keep the importance of competition in perspective and to not allow it to overshadow broad educational goals. Members are accorded significant roles in the organization and all members share ownership of the activity and the rights and responsibilities incumbent with that ownership. The coach-debater relationship is fundamental to the activity, but ultimately the student-teacher relationship is paramount. Promoting the development and practice of effective communication is a fundamental component of CEDA's educational agenda and all are encouraged to maintain high ethical standards and practice ethically responsible communication. Finally, all members of CEDA are encouraged to demonstrate respect for others and interact with others in ways that encourage positive human relationships.

ASSESSING NARRATIVE PROBABILITY

Narrative probability will be assessed by applying three tests to the macro-narrative: argumentative, structural and characterological coherence. Argumentative coherence deals with the internal consistency of a narrative. In order to have argumentative coherence, the major elements of a story must be consistent with each other. The test of structural coherence deals with the completeness of the narrative. A narrative which contains all necessary major themes and details would be judged to be structurally coherent. Characterological coherence is the final test of narrative probability. This test deals with the nature of the actors associated with the narrative. According to Fisher, a story has characterological coherence when the actors are depicted acting in ways consistent with their known behaviors.

The macro-narrative has argumentative coherence in the way that it portrays its major mission. One of CEDA's major goals is to promote development of the debate activity, and the macro-narrative continually reinforces that theme. The importance of that goal never waivers

in the macro-narrative, and the actions that CEDA endorses (e.g. educationally-responsible debate, public recognition) in the macro-narrative appear to be consistent with achievement of the goal.

The argumentative coherence of the macro-narrative is also enhanced by the way it consistently portrays education as a major organizational goal. Throughout the macro-narrative CEDA consistently alludes to the intrinsic importance of education, and portrays itself as an organization that attempts to promote educationally-responsible debate. CEDA advances an educational agenda that appears to be based on a sound philosophy—balance among universal skills—and it draws from that agenda to formulate many components of the macro-narrative. Moreover, CEDA clearly and consistently emphasizes that competitive ends are less important than educational growth and development, and it portrays debate competition more as a tool to facilitate attainment of educational goals than as a value in and of itself. The macro-narrative is also argumentatively coherent because it promotes a structurally consistent view of characters. In many respects, the view of characters represented in the macro-narrative is a product of the depth and consistency with which the theme of education permeates the narrative. For example, CEDA consistently identifies and encourages members to engage in those behaviors one would likely associate with an educationally responsible organization. Similarly in formulating recommendations regarding appropriate tournament behaviors, CEDA advocates those consistent with an educationally driven agenda, and discourages behaviors which appear to be competitively-driven and antithetical to educational goals. As a general rule, CEDA also encourages members to adhere to ethical guidelines that are conducive to promoting a positive educational climate. As a result, members of the organization are encouraged to engage in those actions which promote respect for individual dignity and attainment of educational goals, and to refrain from those which undermine those objectives.

The macro-narrative is also argumentatively coherent in its portrayal of characters vis-a-vis each other. Coaches, students, and judges, are imbued with equal status in the governance of the organization, and they appear to be given relatively equal ownership of the organization. Moreover, all characters are designated to have relatively equal responsibility in promoting attainment of organizational objectives. CEDA does not assume that any specific group of characters should bear ultimate responsibility for the organization's success; rather each is regarded to be an important player, and all characters are encouraged to take an active role in promoting educational growth and development. In addition, the character's respective roles are defined in consistent and compatible ways. For example, the coach is viewed as a multi-dimensional actor who fulfills a major role, TEACHER, and a subsidiary role, coach. Consistent with that role definition, the student is assigned a major role, STUDENT, and a subsidiary role, debater. Even judges are thought to fulfill both a major role, EDUCATOR, and a subsidiary role, decision-maker. The role def-