



Open Parliamentary Debate

Back Row: Lorely Leonard, Patrick Oldenberg, Jr., Amber Slayton, Scott Hathaway
Front Row: Joshua Compton, Rachael Peachee

Open Parliamentary Debate

Quarterfinals

Southwest Baptist (Compton & Peachee) defeated
Pacific Lutheran (McDonald & Ober) on a 2-1 decision

Southwest Baptist (Slayton & Hathaway) over
Southwest Baptist (Breshears & Boyer) by coach's decision

Texas-Tyler (Dickson & Martin) defeated
Louisiana Tech (Moore & Free) on a 3-0 decision

Cameron (Leonard & Oldenberg) defeated
Western Washington (Kunze & Hamsik) on a 3-0 decision

Semifinals

SW Baptist (SH) defeated Texas Tyler (DM) on a 3-0 decision
Cameron (LO) defeated SW Baptist (CP) on a 2-1 decision

Finals

SW Baptist (SH) debated Cameron (LO).

Open Parliamentary Debate (Speaker Awards)

1. Boyer (SW Baptist)
2. Leonard (Cameron)
3. Ober (Pac Lutheran)
4. Moore (La. Tech)
5. Martin (Tex-Tyler)



Novice CEDA

Deborah Pederson, Virginia Milstead

Novice CEDA Debate

Semifinals

Arkansas State (HP) defeated Appalachian State (VG) (3-0)

Abilene Christian (MP) defeated Tennessee Tech (HP) (2-1)

Finals

Abilene Christian (MP) defeated Arkansas State (HP) (2-1)

Novice CEDA Debate (Speaker Awards)

1. Holder (Ark. St.)
2. Pellham (Ark. St)
3. Milstead (Abilene Christian)
4. Gibbs (Appalachian St.)
5. Yeager (Southeast Missouri)



Junior CEDA

Philip DuBarry, Laurie Ishak, Kristina Campos, Charles Walts

JV CEDA Debate

Quarterfinals

- Middle Tennessee (ID) defeated Cameron (WP) (3-0)
- Eastern New Mexico (EW) defeated Gustavus Adolphus (EF) (3-0)
- Pacific Lutheran (SP) defeated Lewis & Clark (HA) (2-1)
- Abilene Christian (CW) defeated McNeese/NDSU (MC) (3-0)

Semi-finals

- Abilene Christian (CW) defeated Pacific Lutheran (SP) (2-1)
- Middle Tennessee (ID) defeated Eastern New Mexico (EW) (3-0)

Finals

- Abilene Christian (CW) defeated Middle Tennessee (ID) (2-1)

JV CEDA Debate (Speaker Awards)

1. Campos (Abilene Christian)
2. Walts (Abilene Christian)
3. Ishak (MTSU)
4. Wilkerson (ENMU)
5. Paillette (Pac Lutheran)



Open CEDA

Sean Tiffée, M.J. Barrois, Matt Barreto, Scott Fuqua

Open CEDA Debate

Quarterfinals

Gustavus Adolphus (WW) defeated Lewis & Clark (SE) (2-1)

Eastern New Mexico (BF) defeated McNeese (TJ) (3-0)

Southwest Texas (BT) defeated McNeese (PW) (3-0)

Abilene Christian (WH) defeated Northeast Louisiana (AB) (2-1)

Semi-finals

Gustavus Adolphus (WW) defeated Southwest Texas (BT) (3-0)

Eastern New Mexico (BF) defeated Abilene Christian (WH) (3-0)

Finals

Eastern New Mexico (BF) defeated Gustavus Adolphus (WW) (2-1)

Open CEDA Debate (Speaker Awards)

1. Tiffée (Southwest Texas)
2. Fuqua (ENMU)
3. Alexander (NE Louisiana)
4. Barreto (ENMU)
5. Western (Gustavus Adolphus)

1997 PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL CONVENTION AND TOURNAMENT EVALUATION RESULTS

by Thomas M. Huebner
William Carey College

Background:

The 1997 Pi Kappa Delta national tournament and convention were held on the campus of Northern Kentucky University in Covington, Kentucky. In previous years, efforts had been made to conduct evaluation of the tournament and convention, however, rates of return were so small that data was either not reported or not representative. PKD president Bill Hill from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte appointed the committee of Thomas M. Huebner, Jr. (chair) from William Carey College, Glenda Treadway and Nina Jo Moore from Appalachian State University, and Kevin Dean from West Chester State University and charged them with the responsibilities of developing an instrument to provide adequate evaluation of the event as well as making the data available for the PKD executive council during the summer 1997 meeting. The evaluation instrument was developed in accordance with questionnaires utilized at other national tournaments (PKD and others) as well as with a consideration for issues of concern that had been expressed at previous PKD meetings and in other venues. The survey was distributed at the final business meeting of the convention and collected at the conclusion of that meeting. Members of the committee were given the opportunity to speak about the evaluation process at previous business meetings. Two-hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed and 209 were returned (N=209). The first section of this evaluation provides information regarding those who participated at the convention and tournament. Section two includes the mean scores and standard deviations of the responses to each of the questions in the test instrument, while sections three and four provide additional analysis of those responses. Section five examines free-response comments included on the questionnaire. In addition, this document includes a copy of the survey instrument, a table of variance and mean scores, and a complete list of free responses collected from the evaluation form.

The participants:

The actual number of respondents will be listed first with the percentage of the total number of respondents in parentheses.

Provinces. The first question asked for respondents to note which province they represented (N=209)

Lower Mississippi	39	(18.7)
Southeast	20	(9.6)
Missouri	16	(7.7)
Lakes	21	(10.0)
Northern Lights	61	(29.2)
Great West	17	(8.1)
Colonies	30	(14.4)
Plains	5	(2.4)

Position. The survey asked respondents to indicate their primary role at the tournament and convention (N=209).

Director of Forensics	36	(17.2)
Assistant Director of Forensics	24	(11.5)
Competitor	139	(66.5)
Hired judge	6	(29.0)
Other (primarily family, friends)	4	(1.9)

Events. The questionnaire asked individuals to indicate in which events they participated (N=207).

Debate only	96	(45.9)
Individual Events only	11	(5.3)
Both	100	(47.8)

Tournaments. This item asked individuals to indicate how many Pi Kappa Delta national tournaments and conventions they had attended (N=209).

1-3	174	(83.3)
4-6	25	(12.0)
7-10	7	(3.3)
11+	3	(1.4)

Nationals. The respondents were asked to indicate how many other national tournaments they attend each year. Seven others were listed, including American Forensic Association (AFA), National Forensic Association (NFA), Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), National Debate Tournament (NDT), National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), and Delta Sigma Rho/Tau Kappa Alpha (DSR/TKA). Space was given to indicate tournaments which were not included in the survey. The following tournaments were listed: Interstate Oratorical Association (IOA), and the International Forensic Association (IFA). No respondent listed that they attended DSR/TKA, however there were 29 combinations of support ranging from those who attended no other tournament to one school that attended six other national tournaments. The most frequent combinations included:

NFA, PKD	30	(14.4)
NFA, AFA, PKD	24	(11.5)
CEDA, PKD	24	(11.5)

Sex. Respondents were asked to indicate their biological sex on the questionnaire (N=208).

Female	77	(36.8)
Male	131	(62.7)

Race. The instrument asked for participants to indicate their ethnic background (N=206).

African-American	8	(3.8)
American Indian	2	(1.0)
Asian-American	5	(2.4)
Caucasian	183	(87.6)
Hispanic-American	1	(.5)
Other	7	(3.3)

Answers to Questions:

The following information provides the mean scores and standard deviations to each of the questions in the survey instrument. The

questionnaire consisted of 25 questions and utilized a Likert-type procedure that asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement. For purposes of interpretation, each level of agreement corresponds to a number (Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neutral=3, Agree=4, and Strongly Agree=5). It is noteworthy that all questions had ranges of 4.0 with minimums of 1.0 and maximums of 5.0. Mean scores will be listed first and standard deviations will be included in parentheses.

1. I received my invitation well enough in advance. 4.0485 (.9766)
2. The invitation adequately covered tournament information. 3.9662 (.8668)
3. The hotel accommodations are satisfactory. 4.2476 (.8621)
4. Hotel registration was relatively trouble-free. 3.8927 (1.0564)
5. Tournament registration went smoothly. 3.9707 (.9441)
6. The tournament sweepstakes formula is equitable. 3.4902 (.9851)
7. I believe the PKD national tournament should focus more on competition and less on convention. 2.7233 (1.4129)
8. I believe PKD should discontinue elimination rounds in debate. 2.4078 (1.567)
9. I believe PKD should add elimination rounds in individual events. 2.6538 (1.4860)
10. I believe that the fraternal aspects of PKD are more important than competition. 3.6377 (1.1738)
11. I attend province meetings. 4.269 (.9225)
12. I attend PKD business meetings. 4.2584 (.8772)
13. Non-competition related meetings (e.g. business and province) are important. 3.8900 (.9519)
14. PKD is too expensive. 3.1990 (1.0884)
15. The PKD experience is worth the expense. 4.0481 (.8031)
16. The tournament staff is courteous. 4.4211 (.6685)
17. The tournament operated efficiently. 4.2212 (.7350)
18. The tournament needed a shuttle service. 3.6442 (1.1371)
19. Adequate time was allotted for debate rounds. 3.5545 (1.0316)
20. Adequate time was allotted for individual events rounds. 4.1154 (1.0431)
21. Flight restrictions (i.e. students can only enter one event in flight A, and two events in B and C) are satisfactory. 3.1739 (1.3178)
22. The individual events showcases are worthwhile. 3.8107 (1.0675)
23. The graduate school fair should be continued. 4.0146 (.9447)
24. This tournament is outstanding compared to previous PKD tournaments I've attended. 3.3367 (.8301)

25. This tournament is outstanding compared to other national tournaments I've attended. 3.2915 (.9350)

Comparison of Mean Scores:¹

T-test:

An independent subjects T-test, with equal variances assumed and two-tailed significance, was conducted on the variable of sex in an effort to compare the mean scores of the males with the females. This yielded no significant differences in mean scores in general and only a significant difference in mean scores on the item related to province meeting attendance ($t=2.462$; 206 df, $p=.015$). Males attended province meetings less often ($m=4.1450$) than did females ($m=4.4675$), although it is clear that both male and female scores fall within the range of agreement on the questionnaire. Overall, it is safe to assume that men and women evaluated the tournament and convention similarly.

Analysis of Variance:

The rest of the variables (provinces, events, positions, previous PKD tournaments, and race) were subjected to a series of ANOVAs to determine any differences in mean scores on each individual question. The data reveal intuitively consistent results--although the distribution of the data prevented reliable results from being obtained on the race variable. For ease of understanding, the results only are included in this section. For specific reports of the analyses of variance, including post-hoc comparison of individual mean scores, please see the ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE at the end of this document. Finally, please remember that even though there are some significant differences in mean scores, the data-without question indicate an overall positive perception of the 1997 PKD national tournament and convention.

Provinces: As would be expected, the province data produced the largest number of significant differences in the mean scores.

1. The province of the Plains was less satisfied with the invitation than the province of the Southeast.
2. Although there was a difference in how the provinces felt about the hotel accommodations, it is not clear which provinces felt more strongly.
3. Respondents in the Lower Mississippi were more satisfied with the hotel registration process than were those in the Northern Lights.
4. Those in the Southeast believed the registration process went more smoothly than did those in the Lakes, the Northern Lights, and the Great West.
5. The respondents from the Lower Mississippi were more likely to believe that the tournament should focus more on competition.
6. Respondents from the Lower Mississippi believed more strongly that we need elimination rounds in debate than did the provinces of the Southeast, the Lakes, the Northern Lights, and the Colonies. The province of the Missouri believed more strongly that we need elimination rounds than did the provinces of the Lakes and the Colonies. Also, the province of the Great West believed more strongly than did the province of the Lakes and the Colonies.

7. Those in the Lower Mississippi believed more strongly that elimination rounds should be added to individual events than did those in the Colonies and the Northern Lights.
8. Those in the Lower Mississippi believed that competition is more important than the fraternal aspects of PKD than did those in the Southeast, the Lakes, and the Colonies.
9. Individuals in the Lower Mississippi, the Northern Lights, and the Great West were more likely to attend province meetings than those in the Lakes.
10. Those in the Southeast believed more strongly that the tournament/convention experience was worth the expense than did those in the Lower Mississippi.
11. Those in the Lower Mississippi and the Southeast believed the tournament to be more efficient than did those from the Northern Lights.
12. The results indicate that those in the Lower Mississippi were more satisfied with the amount of time allotted for debate events than those in the Northern Lights, that those in the Southeast were more satisfied than were those in the Lakes and the Northern Lights, that those in the Missouri were more satisfied than were those in the Lakes and the Northern Lights, and that those in the Great West were more satisfied than were those in the Lakes, the Northern Lights, and the Colonies.
13. Respondents in the Southeast and the Lakes believed the showcases to be more worthwhile than those from the Lower Mississippi and the Missouri.
14. Those in the Southeast believed this tournament to be more outstanding compared to other PKD national tournaments than did all other provinces.
15. Those in the Southeast believed this tournament to be more outstanding, as compared to other national tournaments, than did those in the Northern Lights and the Colonies.

Events: As indicated previously, respondents were given the opportunity to indicate if they participated in debate only, individual events only, or both debate and individual events. Analyses of variance yielded some interesting, though mostly predictable, results.

1. Those who participated in debate only and both debate and individual events had a stronger belief that the invitation adequately covered tournament information than did those who participated in individual events only.
2. Respondents who participated in both debate and individual events believed hotel registration went more smoothly than did those who were in debate only.
3. As might be expected, those involved in individual events only were more likely to believe that elimination rounds should be discontinued in debate than those who do debate or both debate and individual events.
4. Debaters were stronger supporters of fraternity as compared to those who participated in both individual events and debate.

5. Individuals who participated in both debate and individual events were more likely to attend province meetings than those who did either individual events or debate.
6. Likewise, those who participated in both debate and individual events were more likely to attend business meetings than were those who were just in debate or individual events.
7. There is a difference between the provinces as it related to the cost of the tournament, though it is not clear how the specific provinces felt.
8. Debaters did not believe enough time was given for rounds as compared to those who participated in both debate and individual events.
9. Both individual events competitors and those who participated in both debate and individual events were less satisfied with the time allotments for individual events than were those who participated in debate only. Also, individual events only competitors were less satisfied with IE time allotments than those who participated in both.
10. Those who participated in both debate and individual events were more likely to support the continuity of the graduate school fair than those who did either debate or individual events.

Position: Respondents were given the opportunity to note whether they were a director of forensics, an assistant director of forensics, a hired judge, or a competitor, or other. The following is a summary of results. Note: The validity of many of these items must be questioned because, for example, many of the competitors might not have had access to information that would have enabled them to answer particular questions from an educated position.

1. Directors of forensics believed the tournament invitation adequately covered the appropriate information than did competitors.
2. Directors of forensics believed the tournament registration process went more smoothly than did competitors.
3. Directors of forensics thought non-competition related meetings were more important than did competitors.
4. Directors of forensics believed the tournament staff to be more courteous than did competitors.
5. Directors of forensics were more likely to believe that the tournament operated efficiently than were competitors.
6. Hired judges gave this PKD experience a more favorable rating as compared to previous PKD tournaments and conventions than did directors of forensics and competitors. Likewise, assistant directors of forensics rated this tournament experience more positively than did competitors.
7. Both hired judges and directors of forensics believed this tournament experience to be more positive as compared to other national tournaments than did competitors.

Number of Previous Pi Kappa Delta tournaments: The questionnaire asked for respondents to indicate how many PKD national tournament and