THE FUTURE ROLE OF PI KAPPA DELTA
OUR CHALLENGE FOR THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND

Don R. Swanson

Manuscript of keynote address at the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference, Delivered March, 1989, St. Louis, Missouri.

A Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament is a time to celebrate. We do that well with our rituals and spirit of fellowship. But in 1989 we cannot afford to be complacent. We must not only celebrate, we must examine and feel challenged. In particular we must examine to see whether we live up to our stated goals. The National Council is to be commended for recognizing the need for examination and establishing this developmental conference. We should be extremely grateful to Robert Littlefield who deserves our thanks for his energy and commitment to developing a quality conference.

I have been reflecting as I prepared to speak to you. I have thought about why I love forensics, why I chose this profession, and why I have continued as a forensic educator for a quarter of a century. And the more I reflected the more I considered questions and answers that seemed commonplace, but aren't expressed as often as they ought to be. So I will express them generally as the crises I see forensics facing, the opportunity Pi Kappa Delta has to be instrumental in shaping the future, and the challenges of forensic leadership.

Pi Kappa Delta faces a future full of challenge because educational activity of forensics faces significant challenges. In general, I view two major crisis. The crisis of elitism and the crisis of ethics.

THE CRISIS OF ELITISM

A problem exists when forensics develops participation barriers that significantly limit the ability of quality students to participate. We have various operational definitions and disagreements regarding how selective we can and should be. To illustrate consider national tournament restrictions: The American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament (NIET) was established to be a highly selective national tournament. For a hundred and seventeen years the Interstate Oratorical Association National Contest has included only the top two orators from each state. The National Forensic Association (NFA) National Tournament qualification procedure allows for a broad range of participation. The National Debate Tournament, that was traditionally highly selective, has become less selective over the years. The Cross Examination Debate Association is under pressure to establish selective qualification standards for participation. The arguments for and against tournament inclusion or exclusion are familiar to us. But simply discussing the

qualification procedures for tournaments does not adequately address the crisis of elitism. Routine operational behavior of the activity and the degree of entry level barrier into a forensic program provide a better definition of the level of elitism that is present. I don't presume to be able to clearly define the level of elitism that is present in all of the various facets of forensics, but I believe that a problem results when we allow it to become too elite. To illustrate I turn to the familiar historical example of policy debate.

Witness the crisis that our activity NDT debate found itself in by becoming more elite. The entry level barriers, esoteric presentation style, selective judging pools, and excessive research demands, all combined to enhance the elite nature of the activity. As high school team debate increasingly adopts the same features, they are experiencing a resultant drop in participation. NFL President Frank Sferra related to me recently that high school team debate has experienced an 8% decrease in participation during each of the last three years. Many of you probably read an article in the October 10, 1988, issue of The New Republic entitled "The Decline of Debate: Pull It Across Your Flow." Michael McCough, a former debater, examines high school policy debate. His discoveries and discontent with the evolution of debate, are not a surprise to speech educators, and provide an explanation for the decline of debate. Listen to the tone of his description: ". . . form comes to dominate content . . . the power of the flow pad is what moves . . . the real debate takes place on the notepad, not at the podium . . . Quantity of arguments, however comes at the expense of quality . . . the absurdity of the argument won't be held against you. In the surreal world of abstraction that is debate, one argument is as good as another—provided that it is supported by a 'quote card' from an expert . . ." McCough characterizes speakers using "robotic effect," and "drill instructor mode," and an incomprehensive speed that ". . . sounds like the motormouth in the Federal Express commercials." The article goes on to point out what I consider to be the root of the problem, the incestuous elitism of debate. "The 'debate community' is so inbred that many judges . . . are ex-debaters, and thus votaries of the flow sheet." When it is suggested that "lay" judges be used, ". . . the prevailing feeling is that they should not. The resistance to "lay" judges points up a dirty secret about debate: a lot of its attraction is based on snob appeal." And as debaters often say: ". . . it has nothing to do with the real world."

I have quoted McCough's article at length because his observations shatter the illusions of many parents and educational administrators who support debate. They support debate because they believe that it is ". . . an oasis of liberal learning in the intellectual desert." But as debate evolves what is it really? Where is it going? Is CEDA debate capable of remaining true to its roots and maintaining an audience orientation and an application of sound rhetorical principles? Many observers say that question is already moot. Can the NDT

survive? Can the American Debate Association revive policy debate? Will the move to Lincoln-Douglas debate in high schools preserve opportunities for students to debate with an audience orientation? Because I have focused on debate to illustrate, please don't think that individual events are immune to elitism. Should public speaking competition appeal to the public? Does a judge have to know the locus of the dividing line between oral interpretation and acting? Is the public qualified to judge forensic events? What have we accomplished if we have trained students only to appeal to a "qualified" forensic critic? What have we done when we take the act of public communication and make it essentially a private act? In short, what if we are creating an elite group of people whose key skill is to talk "forensics" to each other? For many forensic educators answers to these questions raise ethical issues.

THE CRISIS OF ETHICS

I'm concerned about the state of current practice in debate. As a coach I've witnessed an evolution of debate practice that is reflected well in McCough's comments. Questions regarding debate practice are questions of ethics to me. I recognize, as Carolyn Keefe does in her textbook chapter "Debate Ethics and Morality, " that ". . . individuals directly concerned with the activity of debate do not agree about the domain of ethics." One of my favorite professors, William S. Howell, has written that:

> "Ethical considerations in human events surface only when they are consciously classified as significant issues. Most of the time, people carry on their day-by-day activities with never a thought about the moral rightness or wrongness of what they are doing. Occasionally, however, doubts about the morality of their own actions or the activites of others do become a matter of concern."

We all know that there are many who love debate and forensics who have serious doubts and concerns about its contemporary state. We should worry. There are a lot of speech communication educators, some of them administrators, who have serious doubts about the morality of many contemporary debate practices. What if we are alienating the key people whose support we most need?

Isn't it a professor's responsibility to profess what he or she has studied and contemplated? Do we as professors profess the standards and principles of sound and competent rhetoric? Have we been true to the traditions and intent of forensic education? Do we, as rhetoricians, advocate effectively for what we believe? I believe in "good" rhetoric which I define in the following manner: Good rhetoric is not incomplete rhetoric. Contrary to what some debate practitioners would espouse, complex rhetoric is not necessarily better rhetoric.

Even information theorists indicate the information overload does not constitute good rhetoric. Good rhetoric adapts to the audience, a dictum which doesn't imply that the rhetorician selects only a highly selective subset of the audience to appeal to. The good rhetorician is capable of following the Ciceronian model and explaining in a manner that the ordinary listener can understand. The good rhetorician works to accomplish excellence in all of the canons of rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery.

Do I assume too much when I assume a rhetorical perspective for forensics practice? Hasn't the traditional rationale for forensic education been that it teaches the principles of rhetoric and serves as a laboratory for rhetorical skill development? Isn't it an ethical stance to insist that our forensic activities reflect the teaching of all of the canons of rhetoric? Isn't it also an ethical stance to expect, as Carolyn Keefe does in her discussion of "Debate Ethics and Morality," that debate should "develop an appreciation of systematic change as a basis for democratic action . . ." and ". . . foster concern for interpersonal relationships in the debate community?" It is an ethical question when we ask: Does the content of our forensics teaching prepare students to deal with the reality of how rhetoric applied in the "real world?" But how is rhetoric applied in the real world? Don't worry, be happy! This theme represents the most successful song lyric and Presidential campaign theme of this current academic year. Don't worry, be happy! It has appeal, and behavioral impact, but is it ethical rhetoric? The ethical expectation of accurate representation is something we all learned a long time ago. We learned that "saying something, doesn't make it so." For example, isn't there a tinge of demagogery to Presidential candidate Bush saying, "I want to be nown as the education President," and then in his first month in office proposing further cuts in the federal education budget? For example, are we demagogues when we extol the goal achievement of our forensic programs? Are we ethical when we justify forensics as a laboratory in rhetoric to those who support our program? Wouldn't it be unethical for me to assert that we face no significant challenges as forensic educators, or to say that because Pi Kappa Delta is strong and healthy in 1989, it will remain so in the future? Of course it would be, we all know Pi Kappa Delta faces challenges, but we are uniquely equipped to deal with the challenges.

PI KAPPA DELTA'S CHALLENGE

Pi Kappa Delta is unique because of the types of institutions and forensic programs that affiliate with Pi Kappa Delta. We are unique because we cherish and nourish our history and culture. We are unique because we strive to accomplish a balance between the various purposes we serve. We are unique because we don't just manage tournaments, we seek to lead our members to a quality forensic experience. The constitution of Pi Kappa Delta states:

> It shall be the purpose of this fraternity to stimulate progress in and to further the interests of intercollegiate speech activities and communication in an effort to provide functional leadership training for life, to foster beneficial competition in intercollegiate speech and communication activities, and at the same time encourage a spirit of fellowship, brotherly cooperation, and incentive to achievement.

A concise statement of our mission then is: To provide functional leadership training, foster beneficial competition, encourage fellowship, and provide recognition for achievement. How does that differ from other forensic organizations? All would certainly express their reason for existence as to provide, encourage and regulate intercollegiate competition. Perhaps our mission is not drastically different. But I think our emphasis is unique. We state that we stimulate speech activites "in an effort to provide a functional leadership training." It is stated first and provides an overarching reason for doing what we do.

Pi Kappa Delta colleges and universities are special and perhaps even unique. Stereotypes are often unrealistic, but I'll stereotype anyway. I speculate that by comparison to non-Pi Kappa Delta Schools, Pi Kappa Delta schools are more likely to have a forensic program that enjoys strong support from an academic department of speech communication; more likely to be funded through stable academic funding rather than student government controlled funding, more likely to be a school with a strong commitment to liberal arts education; and more likely to enjoy significant moral support from the campus community. Now if these features of my stereotype are accurate, there is a causal connection to be drawn. Pi Kappa Delta schools are affilliated with this honorary because of its rich tradition and its goals. What does this broad stereotype indicate? It indicates that Pi Kappa Delta schools have features that empower them to take a leadership role in maintaining quality in the intercollegiate forensic experience.

I will extend my line of thought, because of its basic mission, its history and its people, Pi Kappa Delta is in a position to lead the forensic community. Perhaps I can best explain this proposition by an analogical application to the field of study of managerial leadership.

The general concepts of leadership are fairly simple. In their 1987 book The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations, Santa Clara University Professors James Kouzes and Barry Posner's research has caused them to discover five basic behavioral commitments in the cases of "best leadership." They not only consider a variety of major leadership studies, but worked with the American Management Association in a comprehensive study of 1500 managers. I've borrowed the Kouzes/Posner labels, because I think they represent concepts we all recognize and they fit the challenge of forensic

leadership that Pi Kappa Delta faces in the future. The commitments are "challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart." My guess is that just listening to these labels, you have a feel for how they fit the leadership of Pi Kappa Delta. I'm fortunate to be able to speak to you today and assert some ways in which I believe these commitments are fulfilled by Pi Kappa Delta and to open a discussion of how Pi Kappa Delta might fulfill forensic leadership commitments in the future. I'm also fortunate that I am free to generalize, since I precede the real work of the developmental conference where carefully developed ideas will be deliberated.

We are all familiar with leadership bromides. Their value is to stir our concern and in this Conference today we are concerned and our shared concern is finding methods that might enable us to bring leadership concepts to fruition through our actions. How do we deal with the five behavioral commitments?

1. CHALLENGING THE PROCESS

To challenge the process really means to search for innovation that will improve the activity. Pi Kappa Delta has always taken the lead in studying the rationale for and then trying new approaches to forensic competition. In 1987 Pi Kappa Delta President Gary Horn wrote: "Not only have we been willing and able to change to meet the needs of members but on many fronts we have been the first to make new and innovative moves." His reference is to that historical legacy of innovation that we are all proud of. As Gary pointed out, we took the lead in advancing CEDA debate to our national tournament, and we worked to diversify the scope of individual event opportunities. We work to nourish our members after they graduate by supporting alumni chapters. We are having this developmental conference today. We are actively pursuing innovation. James McGregor Burns in his seminal volume on leadership could well have been referring to Pi Kappa Delta when he said: "The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people's enduring needs." Our innovations tend to endure because they are based on our commitment to our goals.

Our challenge is to continue innovation. Change simply to have change has not been a Pi Kappa Delta goal, the goal has been to discover the innovations that improve our pedagogy and practice. How can we now challenge the process of forensic education and competition? Many of us have ideas, and we shall hear many of those stimulating ideas for change this afternoon in our developmental conference.

2. INSPIRING A SHARED VISION

The simple fact that we are engaged in this developmental conference today, indicates our desire to share our vision of forensics education. Many fraternal

colleagues have preceded us and shared their vision with us.

The more I learn about organizational culture, the more I realize why we need "the Order of the Beards," and the Hall of Fame. The history, tradition, rites, rituals, and anecdotes about past Pi Kappa Delta heroes are to be cherished. They are to be cherished because they provide us not only with a sense of where we have been, but they provide the real sense of "we" as a community, dedicated to common goals, moving forward to meet our timeless aspirations.

Our challenge is not only to challenge the process and work to improve forensic practive, but also to share that vision with others which means we must enable others to act.

3. ENABLING OTHERS TO ACT

The theory of organizational leadership embodies the tenet that successful leadership will come from building a coalition of supporters and collaborators. For forensic programs to be successful they need the support of a number of constituencies. Rather than discuss all of those groups, I will focus on the most important support group we can have. It is the group that provides our most significant resource and raw material.

I believe that we frequently fail in our meager efforts to gain the support and collaboration of our secondary school forensic colleagues. They view us with suspicion and frequently feel that our only interest in them is to grab their tournament fees and recruit their outstanding competitors. Some send their students to summer forensic workshops conducted on a college or university campus. Too frequently, they have a highly negative reaction to much of what their students learned. And they blame the entire forensic community for the kind of training their students receive in these workshops.

There are deficiencies in many secondary school forensic programs that reflect on the forensic community at large. There is a disturbing trend in too many school districts to employ a non-teacher as the forensic coach. This hired gun usually lacks training in rhetoric or argumentation, and focuses the program's energy on filling the trophy case. By the way, have you ever asked high school forensic coaches about their academic background in the field of speech communication? I challenge you to survey coaches at the next high school tournament you sponsor. In the survey ask if they have taken courses in public speaking, argumentation, oral interpretation, rhetorical theory, or the pedagogy of directing speech activities. When we realize their educational deficiencies, we begin to understand why the students that come to our programs from theirs lack an understanding of the principles that underline forensic practice.

The secondary forensic educators, who are serious about providing quality forensic instruction, face an enormous task. They must face the question of why their forensic program is different from the various competing activities that teach public speaking skills? Such programs include the 4H, FBLA, FFA, Optimist, VFW, American Legion contests, model legislative assemblies and model UN. Secondary school forensic programs should be different because they are grounded on a solid base of forensic and rhetorical theory. Many teachers would like to feel comfortable turning to us as a resource. Many of these

educators simply want to know that we share common concerns and educational goals for our students.

Our challenge is not only to strengthen all of our members to be better forensic competitors, coaches and critics, but to work with all members of the forensic community to strengthen the activity. We enable others when we teach them what we know and believe. We must examine Pi Kappa Delta's past educational efforts and develop methods to reinstitute, refine and extend those efforts. You will hear some excellent ideas addressing this challenge this afternoon.

4. MODELING THE WAY

Contemporary forensic practice is largely a result of modeling behavior. Students model the behavior of other competitiors and of their judges. We serve as powerful models in many of our coaching techniques. But perhaps our most significant impact derives from how we model rhetorical criticism as a forensic judge.

All of us who are members of the Order of Instruction and who serve as judges in our national tournament, bear a responsibility. We are forensic educators placed in a critic-judge position in order to foster the personal growth of the student competitors. If I am serious about my designation as a member of the Order of Instruction, the implications are: I cannot function as tabla rasa judge. If I am to fulfill my moral responsibility as a Member of the Order of Instruction I must function as an interventionist educator. There are some things I cannot leave outside the door as I enter a competitive round of speaking. I cannot leave outside, or refuse to apply, my knowledge of the self evident truths of the world, or my knowledge and experience with rhetoric, argumentation and communication theory. I challenge you, as you judge in this and other tournaments, to remember your pledge as a member of the Order of Instruction. If you remember the pledge you will not just play judge, you will instruct! I know, some might point out that we interventionists are a minority. So what? We have the solid basis of forensic tradition and rhetorical theory to back us up. Contemporary gamesmanship practices that do not reflect the theory of our academic discipline are ripe for criticism. We members of the Order of Instruction are the critics. If we have a commitment to the goals of our honorary, we will model the appropriate judge behavior. Remember the Pi Kappa Delta motto: "The art of persuasion beautiful and just." Our motto is not "The science of winning a ballot, expeditious and strategic.

5. ENCOURAGING THE HEART

Our motto not only indicates our aspirations for our rhetorical endeavors, but also sets a socio-emotional tone.

Perhaps it is difficult in the heat of competition to consider the true emotional nature of relationships in the forensic community. Yet any of us who reflect on our own competitive experience realize it is the relationships that endure long after the pot metal tarnishes and the plastic flakes away from the trophies we collected. Ask any Pi Kappa Delta national officer why they are willing to put forth enormous effort on behalf of the organization and they will respond that they love the activity and want to give something back to the activity which has given them so much. Ask any Pi Kappa Delta competitor what they remember

most about a national convention and tournament and they will respond with stories about the comraderie of their team and the new friends they made. As members we share a fraternal love for each of our colleagues in the fraternity. That love takes the form of an active celebration of each other's accomplishments, an active recognition of excellence, active help and support to enable all to improve their communication skills, and active fellowship that builds the comraderie of Pi Kappa Deltans. That is a cultural feature of our honorary. In the corporate world, organizations would envy and strive to accomplish what Pi Kappa Delta has accomplished. Deal and Kennedy in Corporate Cultures identify the key features of a strong culture in an organization as the "shared values," the "heroes," and the "rites and rituals." Organizations wishing to build a stronger culture are encouraged to engage their members in the definition and repeated expression of their core values. They are taught that those values are hollow unless they are operationalized in their organizational behavior. The values are constantly reassessed in light of the ongoing life of the organization. It is important to note that the stories need to be retold of those who were instrumental in developing the organization and its core values, i.e., the heroes should be celebrated. And organizations wishing to have a "strong culture" are taught to institutionalize their "rites and rituals." The positive recognition and reinforcement that rites and rituals bring to a culture creates a climate of mutual support that enhances both individual and organizational growth.

What would an organization culture scholar discover in doing a cultural assessment of Pi Kappa Delta? Our initiation ritual reinforces our shared values. Our rituals have not changed significantly since our founders put them into words almost 80 years ago. The rhetorical standards we value continue to be refined and enhanced by research, but the basic rhetorical standards are stable. The members of the Pi Kappa Delta Hall of Fame are our heroes and their inspiration lives on in our anecdotes, our records, and the excellent volume of history that has been compiled by our historian, Larry Norton. Our challenge is to maintain our core values, keep our history alive and celebrate the accomplishments of our members.

What changes does the next century hold for Pi Kappa Delta and forensics? Where is our "place?" I refer to our "place" in the manner that Joshua Meyrowitz defines it. In 1984 his book No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior, won the Speech Communication Association Golden Anniversary Book Award. He says that "social roles (i.e. social 'place') can be understood only in terms of social situations," and we should strive to understand how the "ways we transmit and receive social information" are changing. The obvious question is, how will society's rhetorical practices change, and how should foresic education confront those changes?

We, as communication scholars and practitioners living in an information age, may confront challenges and pressures on forensic education that we are unable to envision today. Enrollment trends indicate more students desire to study

communication. Roger Ailes, communication consultant and debate coach for Presidents Reagan and Bush, preaches that "You are the message," and thus aspiring politicians see value in refining their speaking skills. The relationship of communication skill to personal success is a topic of frequent discussion by persons in all fields of endeavor. Thus we know that there will be a demand for education and activity designed to increase oral communication skills.

In No Sense of Place Meyrowitz envisions computers "democratizing information access." A friend who is a management scholar recently related similar thoughts, and I think a paraphrase of his comments illustrates how change may affect our concerns. In the past, information has always been power. But, with the increasing universality of computers in management, all organizational leaders will have access to the information they need to decide and support their decisions. Power will increasingly be held by those who can communicate the information. Those individuals who stand out above the crowd, who truly become successful leaders, will be those who have developed the outstanding oral communication skills to be able to persuade others to act on the shared information.

Pause for a moment and think of the opportunities Pi Kappa Delta will have in the future. I am not a futurist, and I tend to be amazed by the pace of change in our society. So I am not going to attempt to play futurist, but I can wonder, I can express hope and I can raise questions.

I wonder - what will our concerns be at the Pi Kappa Delta Convention in 2001? I wonder - will our mission and our tournament procedures be the same? It will be intriguing to look back over the 12 years since this developmental conference and discuss the innovations that have occurred. I hope that in 2001 we take stock and see that Pi Kappa Delta has asserted a leadership role and is a successful advocate for forensics with groups like the ACA, Association of Communication Administrators. I hope we find Pi Kappa Delta showing the way for programs to maintain forensics as a co-curricular activity. In 2001 I hope that we find Pi Kappa Delta has a significant relationship with secondary school forensics and that our members take pride in providing forensic education services to secondary schools. And I hope as the fine secondary school programs view the Pi Kappa Delta model they strive to maintain a strong relationship to the curriculum rather than functioning as just another club or extra-curricular activity. In 2001 I hope we experience enormous pressure for more alumni chapters. I hope that we find our alumni are not only eager judges of our competition, but that our old alums are welcomed as judges by our student competitors. But most of all, I hope at our convention in 2001 we are all still finding enlightenment, the thrills of competition, and the warmth of the support of our Pi Kappa Delta brothers and sisters.

But the future may well be framed by some of the general questions and challenges I have raised today. When you consider your perspective, my

questions may or may not be on target for you, but my quess is that some of them stir a reaction. What if we abandon the mission of providing functional leadership training? What if we fail to innovate and challenge the process? What if we fail to share our vision of forensics? What if we fail to work to strengthen all elements of the forensic community? What if we fail to intervene with our values and knowledge when we function as critic/judges? What if we fail to maintain the unique culture of Pi Kappa Delta? What if we create an elite group of people whose key skill is to talk "forensics" to each other? What if we alienate the very people whose support we most need?

If we don't take up the challenge and answer the nagging questions about our activity, we can't expect those outside of the forensic community to listen, respect or support forensics. What if we fail to address the challenge?

References

Burns, J.M., Leadership, New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A., Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Coporate Life. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Howell, W.S., The Empathic Communicator. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1982.

Keefe, C., Harte, T.B. & Norton, L.E., Introduction to Debate, New York: MacMillan, 1982.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z., The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

McCough, M., Pull It Across Your Flow. The New Republic, 1988, October 10, 1988, pp. 17-19.

Meyrowitz, J., No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior. New York: Oxford, 1985.

Parson, D.W., American Forensics in Perspective. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Assoc., 1984.

Moving the Pi Kappa Delta Archives to William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri has brought about several leadership changes in the organization. Jack Starr, who had served as Historian for four years felt he would be unable to continue in that role due to the distance and time required to assist in the establishment of the permanent archives in the WJC Library. Professor Starr's resignation was effective on June 1, 1989. The Council is appreciative of Professor Starr's service and continued support to bring about significant changes on behalf of our order.

On April 21 Penny Kievet was appointed to fill the six year unexpired term as Pi Kappa Delta Historian beginning June 1, 1989. Penny's willingness to serve, her knowledge of Pi Kappa Delta, her successful leadership roles in PKD, and her association with William Jewell College made her the ideal candidate for the position of Historian. Please give to Penny all of your support as she works to preserve our history and establish the permanent archives of Pi Kappa Delta.

R. David Ray, Immediate Past President

PKD 1989 DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

The 1989 Developmental Conference on the Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta in the Forensic Community was the kick-off activity for the 1989 Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament. The four working groups were: Organizational Structure and Processes, Competitive and Noncompetitive Outlets, Forensic Pedagogy and Research, and Interforensic Organizational Cooperation.

Don Brownlee, Anthony Schroeder, Carolyn Keefe, and Sally Roden chaired the respective working groups. In addition, Robert Ridley, James Norwig, Susan Miskelly, Pamela Joraanstad, Rita Whillock, Margaret Greynolds, Kristine Bartanen, Colan Hanson, Vicky Bradford, L. Crowder Churchill, and William Yaremchuk presented papers for consideration. Respondents included Gina Lane, Joel Hefling, Harry Strine III, Marty Birkholt, Don Swanson, Larry Norton, Cindy Larson-Casselton, and Penny Swisher Kievet.

Don Swanson delivered the keynote address which is included in this issue of The Forensic. In addition, abstracts of the papers presented are printed here.

The following recommendations/resolutions were submitted by the working groups. The proceedings will be prepared for publication and final distribution will take place following our summer council meeting in June. These items are presented for the information of the membership, and serve as touchstones for discussion by the National Council at its summer meeting.

Abstracts of Papers Presented and Recommendations Offered by the Working Group on Organizational Structure and Processes.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES

"Ethical Principle in the Forensic Organization"
Don Brownlee, Working Group Chair
CSU Northridge
Northridge, California

This paper explores the ethical principles that should ground the structure of any educational organization. Comparisons are made to the organizational documents of other academic organizations.

Presenters:
"Organizational Structure and Process:
Are Changes Needed to Carry Pi Kappa Delta into the Future?"

Robert A. Ridley
Southwest State University
Marshall, Minnesota

The paper will review three articles of the PKD Constitution: Article III relating to leadership, expenditures and correspondence; Article IV relating to admission and retention of members and chapters; and Article X relating to amendments. Following a review of the articles, the paper will recommend specific changes, from which the work group will draft resolutions to be presented to the National Convention for ratification at a business meeting.

"A Proposed to Change the Procedures for Gaining Membership in Pi Kappa Delta"

James E. Norwig
Louisiana Technical University
Ruston, Louisiana

It is argued that a rationale exists to 1) modify the membership rituals, 2) abolish and discourage pledge periods, and 3) change those provisions of the constitution which make membership dependent on an affirmative vote of members of the local chapter. Specific suggestions for such changes are advanced.

"A Proposal to Increase Student Participation Within the Ranks of Pi Kappa Delta"

Susan Miskelly
Bridgewater State College
Bridgewater, Massachusetts

This paper addresses the need to increase the students' role within the organizational processes of Pi Kappa Delta. Suggestions for broadening the levels of student involvement are offered.

1. Article X should be revised to allow for more expedient consideration of proposed constitutional changes.
2. A mail ballot election should be conducted for all PKD leadership positions.
3. The size of the National Council should be increased.
4. Student participation on the National Council should be expanded and not limited to the host province.
5. The national secretary-treasurer should have ex-officio status on the National Council and be non-voting.
6. Non-enforceable sections of the Constitution should be deleted.
7. A limit below which the treasury may not fall without the declaration of an emergency should be set.
8. Standards for accepting and rejecting members by local chapters should be

revised.

9. Pledging, as a concept in PKD, should be reviewed.
10. The language used in the initiation ceremony at the chapter level should be revised.
11. A student task force to identify tasks and roles for students to perform in PKD governance should be created.
12. The possibility of having two or more National Council members from the same province should be reviewed.

Abstracts of Papers Presented and Recommendations Offered by the Working Group on Competitive and Noncompetitive Outlets

COMPETITIVE AND NONCOMPETITIVE OUTLETS

"A Review of Competitive and NonCompetitive Forensics"

Anthony B. Schroeder, Working Group Chair
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

This paper reviews of how tournament competition started from a variety of both competitive and noncompetitive influences. Some historical trends and approaches that have influenced the nature of the activity and the events are presented.

Presenters:

"A Discussion of Awards at the National Tournament:
Do We Need to Change?"

Pamela S. Joraanstad
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

This paper poses discussion questions regarding the determination of awards for contestants at the National Pi Kappa Delta Tournament. The history of awards for speech and debate at the National Tournament over the last 75 years is examined. Possible avenues for change are explored.

"Expanding the Audience-Centered Nature of Debate:
As Analysis of Non-Competitive Outlets"

Rita Kirk Whillock
University of Alabama-Huntsville
Huntsville, Alabama

This paper investigates options for expanding debate opportunities beyond the competitive arena. The argument is advanced that by doing so, we can increase

the presence of the organization as well as the prestige of the activity among the public at large.

"PKA - Opportunities for Campus and Community Enhancement"

Margaret Greynolds
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Since 1922, Kentucky Alpha Chapter of PKA has worked to support and enhance communication development for its members through structured campus and community involvement in an expanded speaker's forum/program. This program will review the conception and expansion of such a program; its benefits to participants in promoting communication excellence, as well as its long range function to promote networking for future professional contact for employment and/or references.

1. PKD should showcase winners from each group of A, B, and C events at the national banquet as entertainment. These could be rotated so that over a period of conventions, all events could be used.
2. PKD should institute a public forum debate match within each province (on and off topic) to recognize the final four debate teams in each province.
3. PKD should encourage extemporaneous Lincoln-Douglas debate at tournaments throughout the year.
4. PKD should encourage an educator-oriented ballot-critique. Judges should be recognized for writing the best ballots at both province and national tournaments, as well as at invitationals.
5. PKD should schedule a training meeting for coaches and judges over contest rules and ballot writing prior to the beginning of the tournament events at the province and national tournaments.
6. PKD should establish consistency between debate and individual events concerning elimination rounds and awards.
7. PKD should schedule a program (panel) designed to exchange and develop an interest in non-competitive speech activites at the next national developmental conference of PKD.
8. PKD should propose to SCA (or hold in conjunction with SCA) that efforts be made to generate grant applications for the enrichment of speech activities and forensic education.
9. PKD should encourage institutionals to develop a speech education curriculum and/or support the activities of state professional associations of speech involved in curriculum development.

Abstracts of Papers Presented and Recommendations Offered by the Working Group on Forensic Pedagogy and Research.