

THE

Forensic

OF PI KAPPA DELTA

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, KANS.

Y 73, 74

4, 1

SERIES 73, NO. 4

OCTOBER, 1988

SERIES 74, NO. 1

A MESSAGE FROM ALUMNI NEWS EDITOR

John M. Burt

Permit me two personal remarks: one is to thank all who have expressed concern about my health following quadruple by-pass heart surgery. Things seem under control following a relapse when I tried to do too much too soon.

Two, I want to thank those who provided back issues of *The Forensic*; am still in need of two: Series 67, #2 and #4.

Now to the main point: Alumni Chapter news seems to be a very rare commodity. I have received nothing. What are the alumni Chapters doing to assist and promote PKD?

I recall from years past that one Alumni Chapter established a fund to pay for PKD pins for all new members of the active chapter. Is it still in operation?

Another school used alumni members to serve as judges at tournaments where the school could send a debate team without the cost of paying for a judge to travel or for the hiring of a judge at the host school. The alumni provided members as a service to their chapter. This, of course, requires that the alumni records be up-to-date.

You may have noticed two PKD Alumni have provided articles recently as to how forensic training still assists them in their chosen profession. One was a lawyer and one a university professor. I would like to receive the name and address of PKD alumni in other fields of endeavor . . . law enforcement; public relations; broadcasting; farming; small business; and many others. I will make the arrangements for them to express their views, but I need your assistance for the names and addresses, and occupations.

The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 73, NO. 4

OCTOBER, 1988

SERIES 74, NO. 1

Penny Swisher Kievet, Editor

3804 S. Crane

Independence, MO 64055

John M. Burt, Alumni Editor

REVIEW EDITORS

Don Brownlee, California State University - Northridge

Kris Bartanen, University of Puget Sound

Mike Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran University

Jeanine Congalton, California State University - Fresno

C.T. Hanson, North Dakota State University

Fran Hassencahl, Old Dominion University

Bill Hill Jr., University of North Carolina - Charlotte

Edward Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

Gary Larson, Wheaton College

Anthony Schroeder, Eastern New Mexico State University

Leanne Wolff, Heidelberg College

CONTENTS

The Role of Policy Implications in CEDA Debate	
by Greg R. Miller	1
Achievement and Recognition: Reaching Goals	
by Dr. Bob Derryberry	10
Students Beliefs About Good and Bad Judges	
by Dr. C.T. Hanson	13
President's Award	22
Summer Council Meeting	23
President's Page	26
KD Developmental Conference	28
Chapter News	30

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 due. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$12.50 for one year and \$30.00 for three years. Second Class Postage paid at Independence, MO. Postmaster: send address changes to Penny Swisher Kievet, Editor, The Forensic 3804 S. Crane, Independence, Mo 64055.

Printed by Copy-Rite Printing, Independence, Missouri 64055

PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL HONORARY FORENSIC FRATERNITY NATIONAL OFFICERS

R. David Ray, **President**, University of Arkansas - Monticello,
Monticello, Arkansas 71655

Terry Cole, **President-Elect**, Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Harold Widvey, **Secretary/Treasurer**, South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota 57007

Robert Littlefield, **Province Coordinator**, North Dakota State University,
Fargo, North Dakota 58105

Michael Bartanen, **Tournament Director**, Pacific Lutheran University.
Tacoma, Washington 98447

Bob Derryberry, **Constitutional Revision**, Southwest Baptist University,
Bolivar, Missouri 65613

John Bernier, **Student Member**, University of Missouri - St. Louis,
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Linda Hummel, **Student Member**, Central College,
Pella, Iowa 50219

Gary Horn, **Past President**, Ferris State College,
Big Rapids, Michigan 49307

Jack Starr, **Historian**, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse,
LaCrosse, Wisconsin 54601

PROVINCE GOVERNORS

Lower Mississippi, Joe Cardot, Abilene Christian University

Northwest, Edward Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

Plains, Dick Finton, Southwestern College

Southeast, Margaret Greynolds, Georgetown College

Colonies, Harry Strine, Bloomsburg University

Lakes, Deb Boyce, Defiance College

Missouri, Gina Lane, William Jewell College

Northern Lights, Joel Hefling, South Dakota State University

Pacific, Don Brownlee, California State University - Northridge

THE ROLE OF POLICY IMPLICATIONS IN CEDA DEBATE: AN ARGUMENT FOR THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VALUES AND ACTIONS

By
Greg R. Miller

Greg R. Miller is currently a doctoral candidate and graduate teaching student at the University of Southern California.

Because of the difficulty in debating values, a number of critics have complained about the nature of value/CEDA debate. The lack of firm decision rules, difficulty in weighing qualitative issues, and the lack of a theoretical understanding of values, have made CEDA a difficult activity to debate and judge. Several writers have attempted to rectify some of these criticisms, arguing that debating values encourages an examination of policy/action. This essay agrees, but extends this analysis contending that policy implications should be demanded in CEDA. That is, a discussion of values absent policy implications is "debate in a vacuum," resulting in boring and irrelevant argumentation. The real problem this paper isolates is the judge who rejects policy considerations. Therefore, this paper examines: (1) The interrelationship between values and policy, both theoretically and practically; (2) The problems with debating "pure" values; (3) The rationale for the inclusion of policy implications; (4) Criticisms of policy implications; and (5) Conclusions and summary.

An interesting observation regarding CEDA debate is that CEDA was never intended to be exclusively value oriented. The fundamental rationale for CEDA was not to emphasize values but communication.¹ In an effort to differentiate the activity from policy debate, CEDA seems to have adopted the position of debating value propositions.

INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VALUE AND POLICY

Theory

Because CEDA debate has tried to be value oriented, we must examine values theoretically. One should begin with a definition of value:

an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.²

This definition illustrates the interrelationship between the end-state/action and values. Moreover, Rowland argued that values are statements **guiding** human conduct.³ Hollihan further suggested that values influence the available modes, means and ends of action.⁴ And philosopher Nicholas Rescher claimed:

To adopt a value is to espouse principles of policy in the expenditure of resources, and the mode of value evaluation with which we are now concerned is predicated on the somewhat hard-headed standpoint of the question of whether, how, and to what extent such expenditures are worthwhile.⁵

All of these viewpoints describe the role of **action** within the value structure. Indeed, definitionally the role of policy implications are included in discussions of policy, hence the inclusion of implications.

Additionally, Walter Fisher suggested that humans as rhetorical beings are as much valuing as they are reasoning animals.⁶ Fisher further contended that values determine the persuasive **FORCE** of reasons, and that values constitute the ultimate ground of action. Fisher assumed that value judgments are inevitable, irrational, consensus about them will never be fully realized, and there is no hierarchy of values in which to resolve conflicts.⁷ The avenue for understanding values thus becomes an examination of the action it encourages.⁸ Warnick also analyzed value propositions, maintaining that value propositions suggest that a particular action is good, beneficial, admirable.⁹ Additionally, the method to determine if a value is beneficial is to look at the action the value promotes.¹⁰ It is difficult to analyze values without looking at the policies, actions or behaviors promoted.

One cannot examine the role of policy implications in CEDA without a conceptual understanding of values. Values are important because they affect our actions, behaviors and policies. Because of the necessity of examining the actions/policies resulting from changing values, debating values without examining policy implications is inappropriate. The difficulty of debating values without an end-state perspective is manifested when critics penalize teams for looking at the effects of values. Because policy implications are integral to a discussion of values, we cannot separate policy and value from CEDA Debate.

Practice

A number of practical reasons justify the position of not debating value propositions apart from policy considerations. Because of the interrelationship between values and policies, debaters should not attempt to argue values exclusively. The inability to discuss values without looking at the corresponding policies make "pure" value debate impossible.¹¹

It is also important to note that the reverse is also true. In order to advocate a change, policy debaters must look at the values behind their proposals. Matlon,¹² Brownlee,¹³ and Bartanen¹⁴ all suggested that policy debate requires

the understanding of the values behind the particular action.

Indeed, an understanding of the relationship between policy and value in debate, demonstrates the impossibility of separating values from policies. Because policy and values are entwined one cannot study one without looking at the other.¹⁵ Vasilius argued that values are manifested in policy formation, influence, and implementation. Each is meaningless without the other.¹⁶ Hample concluded that to study values is to study their role in policy:

To study values in discourse is to study their function. It may not be necessary to identify a value in order to describe its operation in a particular instance. Rarely, if ever, do values themselves appear in argument; instead, they influence the audience by the consistent evaluation of various objects.¹⁷

Pragmatically, the difference between value and policy debate is that CEDA is implicit about policy considerations, while NDT is explicit about policy ramifications.¹⁸ However, this difference does not justify CEDA rejecting policy implications. In some instances policy debate can emphasize values, e.g. goals criteria case. Ambiguity occurs, however, when policy or value debate tries to exist without discussing the values, or policy implications, embedded in the decision. For example, analyzing actions, without the philosophical underpinnings underlying the action, might not tell the judge what is the most desirable policy. The reverse is also true. Analyzing values without their corresponding effect might lead the judge to vote for an undesirable value. Because of the interrelationship of values and policy, rational debate cannot take place without consideration of the other.¹⁹

PROBLEMS WITH DEBATING "PURE" VALUES

There are a number of problems with arguing values exclusive of their policy implications. Initially, the theoretical basis of value debate is centered on policy. Many scholars have argued that no theoretical base exists to teach students in debating values.²⁰ While publications have tried to correct the problem,²¹ this research is similar to building a foundation after the house is built. Because research has evolved after practice, disagreement exists on deciding value controversies. To explain how judges have resolved value conflicts, Vasilius argued that value debate has pilfered from policy debate theory.²² By starting from a policy foundation, value debate cannot help but look at the policy effects of a given value.

A second problem is with the paradigms utilized by value debate critics. While a number of articles have been published that attempt to offer solutions to policy exemplars²³, these solutions, while theoretically attractive, are devoid of significant use. Empirical research found that tabula rasa was the most

popular paradigm in value debate.²⁴ Moreover, recent examination of the CEDA National Judging Booklet reveals that most judges are still *tabula rasa* resorting to a cost/benefit approach (consistent with the policy-making model).

Additionally, difficulty arises in comparing qualitative value significance with quantitative policy significance.²⁵ In a CEDA round, how does one weigh the value of justice against the risk of species destruction of nuclear holocaust? The lack of any clear standard in this area confuses the debate process.

Another problem with debating values exclusive of their effect is the absence of clear stock issues.²⁶ In policy debate, general agreement exists on the stock issues: ill, blame, cure, and cost. A number of different interpretations exist on what is necessary to debate values. Verch and Logue spent considerable effort discussing the various ways to resolve value debate, concluding that a large number of interpretations exist on the stock issues.²⁷ For example, Thomas suggested that CEDA has three stock issues: 1) the explication of values implicit in the resolution, 2) what criteria should be used for value evaluation, and 3) the ability of the interested community to influence the situation.²⁸ Furthermore, Kelley argued that the debate ballot determines the stock issues.²⁹ These are just two examples of the numerous ways to view value debate. With the large amount of discrepancy regarding value decision-making, value debate should use a more policy oriented approach to decision-making.

Some theorists have provided solutions to overcome the problem of stock issues. One suggestion was to base judge's decisions on decision rules provided by debaters. Flaningam argued that decision rules are vital in value debate.³⁰ However, debaters are generally not creating decision rules in value rounds.³¹ Without an agreement on stock issues or the decision rules in CEDA, making a decision in a value debate round is extremely difficult.³² One possible solution is to examine the policy implication in value debate. By analyzing the various policies embedded in the value question, the stock issues of ill, blame, cure, and cost can be used to understand the debate.

RATIONALE FOR POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There are a number of rationales for the incorporation of policy implications in CEDA debate. Initially, by analyzing policy implications in CEDA, rendering decisions over competing values would be more objective. Values are not consistent across a wide range of people.³³ Additionally, in current CEDA practice, the lack of consensus on value decisions makes criteria extremely important in resolving value disputes. Some have argued that criteria create consistency in deciding value controversies, assessing when the value of the resolution is met or justified.³⁴ However, the use of criteria do

not make decisions any easier, in and of themselves. For example, under the resolution that we should provide military support to nondemocratic nations, an affirmative may argue for a criterion of national security. This criterion is useful for limiting the focus of the debate, but not for establishing decision rules to examine values exclusive of their effects. For example, a negative could argue that the effect of the value, military support, could lead to greater national security problems in the future. The resolution of this value dispute should require the critic to examine the effects, the policy implications, of adhering to the "value" of national security. Indeed, when we exclude the discussion of policies in value debate we limit negative approaches and may confuse the discussion of values.

Second, past CEDA resolutions have contained implicit policy ramifications. For example, the topic: "Resolved: that the method of conducting presidential elections in the United States is detrimental to democracy," implied that if the method of conducting presidential elections is detrimental, then what change was needed to promote democracy? Similarly the topic "That the United States is justified in providing military support to nondemocratic governments," required the affirmative to defend the United States policy in supplying arms to some country. In the past few years, the resolutions in value debate seemingly require, or at least strongly promote, the consideration of policy implications.³⁵

The obvious response to the above argumentation is that recent CEDA resolutions were not intended to debate values exclusive of policy implications, thereby reducing the previously mentioned problems of value debate. This response is correct if a consensus exists on the nature of the resolution. Problems occur when critics and debaters attempt to take policy oriented topics and force an exclusive consideration of values. This was noticeable under the resolution: Resolved that American Judicial System has overemphasized freedom of press. Affirmatives argued that the resolution was a statement of fact, thereby the implications of reducing freedom of press could not be assessed. It is my argument that all resolutions consist of numerous implicit value statements, hence the avoidance of discussing those implications does not adequately test the resolution. In support of the aforementioned view Rowland argued:

If the rationale for value debate rests on a consideration of values apart from policies then the experiment of CEDA with value debate must be considered a failure. Here, I in no way deny the worth of CEDA as a form of debate, but only note that it has not succeeded in divorcing values from their policy implications . . . while the topics have been phrased in evaluative terms, they have clearly implied a policy change.³⁶

Supporting Rowland's view, Thomas suggested that value resolutions have a value statement on the resolitional subject.³⁷ For example, the Presidential election topic assumed that democracy is good. The intrinsic worth of democracy, however, served as justification for changing the current method of electing Presidents. Thus, value statements do not eliminate the need to look at policy considerations.³⁸

A third rationale for the inclusion of policy implications is that they result in better decisions. For example, Rowland argued that values are not clarified in value debate but clarified from a consideration of policy.³⁹ Rowland's position leads one to conclude that a value that cannot meet an end goal is empty and not worthy of consideration.⁴⁰ By analyzing the end result of values, e.g. in a policy round, the relative merits of conflicting values can be better understood. This justifies the inclusion of policy considerations in CEDA debate. Moreover, we must be able to analyze the end goal of various values.

A final reason to debate policy implications is the difficulty in teaching students about value debate. Gaske argued that the lack of concrete stock issues makes value debate more difficult to teach beginners, concluding that policy debate is a more effective avenue to teach students.⁴¹ Because of the clarity in stock issues and pragmatic approach of policy debate, novices have an easier time beginning at a policy level. By opening up value debate to policy considerations we create a situation that is easier to teach novice debaters, and describes more accurately the relationship between values and action.

CRITICISMS

By debating the policy implications of value questions we do open up the possibility of abuse. The request to quantify value objections can inevitably lead to the "grain fed beef disadvantage."⁴² Another problem is the value debater who finds recycled evidence that enables him/her to bond any value to old "mass destruction disadvantages."⁴³ Before one rejects my position because of this possibility, we must examine the current practice in CEDA. Recent second negative positions have emphasized value objections based on mass destruction. It is my position that this is not necessarily undesirable. If we look at values we need to be aware of the destructive implications that could result from adherence to the value system. For example, the value of national security is not justified if it leads Reagan to become more militaristic, leading to a greater risk of nuclear holocaust. Indeed, it would be naive to assume that negatives are arguing true "value objections." It shouldn't take a new CEDA critic more than one or two rounds to realize that value objections are simply disadvantages with another name.

Even though values and policies are inextricably linked, some scholars have argued that values get lost in NDT debate.⁴⁴ To some extent, the role of mass destruction disadvantages, and the "never say die" generic counterplans has turned NDT debate into a contest of counting the number of bodies, rather than looking at the philosophical foundation behind various policies. However, values are still implicit in any consideration of policy.

The relative absence of value consideration in NDT debate gives credence to the position that CEDA should look at policy implications. Bartanen argued that NDT strategies in CEDA have the potential to stagnate value debate.⁴⁵ By looking at the policy implications we do not restrict the discussion of values, we merely have a more realistic way to assess value desirability.

CONCLUSION

It seems that the underlying response to excluding policy from value debate is an attempt to keep CEDA "pure" from NDT practices. However, by examining values as pre-policy, debaters can look at the actions inherent in values, while still addressing value considerations. This allows us to look at the values and the policies embedded in various resolutions.⁴⁶ Analyzing values, without their corresponding effect, stagnates the substantive issues in competitive debate. Debaters and judges must look at values within the policy realm.⁴⁷ Indeed, policy and value relationships, different value interpretations, resolutions, lack of theory, and no clear evaluative criteria provides a clear demonstration for the inclusion of policy implications.

REFERENCES

- ¹Jack Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," ED. Don Brownlee, *Contributions on the Philosophy and practice of CEDA*, (1981) 1.
- ²Milton Rokeach, *Human Values*, (New York: Free Press, 1973) 5.
- ³Robert Rowland, "The Philosophical Presuppositions of Value Debate," *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation*, Eds. David Zarefsky, Malcolm C. Sillars, and Jack Rhodes. (Annendale, VA; SCA, 1983) 832.
- ⁴Thomas Hollihan, "An Analysis of Value Argumentation in Contemporary Debate," *Debate Issues* (1980) 8.
- ⁵Nicholas Rescher, *Introduction of Value Theory*, (Englewood Cliffs, NH: Prentice-Hall, 1969) 134.
- ⁶Walter R. Fisher, *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*, (Columbia, SC: University of Southern Carolina, 1987) 105.
- ⁷Fisher, *Human*, 105.
- ⁸Hollihan, 8.
- ⁹Barbara Warnick, "Arguing Value Propositions," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 18 (1981) 110.
- ¹⁰Walter R. Fisher, "Debating Value Propositions: A Game for Dialecticians," Ed. G. Ziegemeueller, & J. Rhodes, *Dimensions of Argument*, (1981) 1023.

- ¹¹Carl D. Flaningam, "Value-Centered Argument and the Development of Decision Rules," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 19 (1982) 108.
- ¹²Ronald J. Matlon, "Debating Propositions of Value," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 14 (1978) 195.
- ¹³Don Brownlee, "The Stock Issues of Valuation," *Debate Issues*, 17 (1983) 14.
- ¹⁴Michael D. Bartanen, "The Role of Values in Policy Controversies," Ed. Don Brownlee, *CEDA Yearbook* (1983) 19.
- ¹⁵Gregory W. Young, & Paul C. Gaske, "On Prima Facie Value Argumentation: The Policy Implications Affirmative, Ed. Don Brownlee, *CEDA Yearbook* (1984) 29.
- ¹⁶Jan Vasilus, "Presumption, Presumption, Wherefore Art Thou Presumption?," Ed. Don Brownlee, *Perspectives on Non-Policy Argument* (1980) 35.
- ¹⁷Dale Hample, "Testing a Model of Value Argument and Evidence," *Communication Monographs*, 44 (1977) 106-7.
- ¹⁸Rowland, 825.
- ¹⁹Rowland, 822.
- ²⁰Brownlee, Stock, 13.
- ²¹Joseph W. Wenzel, "Toward a Rationale for Value-Centered Argument," *Journal of the American Forensics Association*, 13 (1977) 150-8; Ray W. Karras, & James Veitch, "A Proposed Theory of Value Debate," *Debate Issues*, 14 (1981) 1-6.
- ²²Vasilus, 40.
- ²³See for example, Greg R. Miller, "Debate Critic as an Ideologue: The Application of Ideology to Debate," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, San Diego, 1988; Rick Rodrick, "An Alternative Paradigm for Judging CEDA Debate," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City, 1987; Jeanine Dipaolo Congalton, "Paradigms Found? Paradigms Lost? Critical Perspectives and CEDA Debate," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City, 1987; Vincent Meldrum, "Contemporary Paradigms in CEDA Debate," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City, 1987; William Cue, "Musings of A CEDA Judge," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City, 1987.
- ²⁴Paul C. Gaske, John M. Theobald, & Drew B. Kugler, "Judging Attitudes and Paradigmatic Preferences in CEDA Debate: A Cumulative and Construct Validity Investigation, *CEDA Yearbook*, (1985) 57-61.
- ²⁵Rowland, 823.
- ²⁶Rowland, 828.
- ²⁷Stephen L. Verch, & Brenda J. Logue, "Increasing Value Clash: A Propositional and Structural Approach," Ed. Don Brownlee, *CEDA Yearbook*, (1982) 25-8.
- ²⁸Thomas, 527-8.
- ²⁹Beverly Merrill Kelley, "An Alternative to NDT Debate," Ed. Don Brownlee, *Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA*, (1981) 11-2.
- ³⁰Flaningam, 114.
- ³¹Jones, 11.
- ³²Flaningam, 109.
- ³³Joseph W. Wenzel & Dale Hample, "Categories and Dimensions of Value Propositions: Exploratory Studies," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11 (1975) 128.
- ³⁴Warnick, 117.
- ³⁵Rowland, 829.
- ³⁶Rowland, 829.
- ³⁷David A. Thomas, & Maridell Fryar, "Value Resolutions, Presumption, and Stock Issues," Eds. George Ziegelmuller, & Jack Rhodes, *Dimensions of Argument*, (1981) 513.
- ³⁸Rowland, 829.
- ³⁹Rowland, 823.

"Rowland, 823.

"Paul C. Gaske, "Implications of the National Developmental Conference in Forensics," Paper presented to the panel on topic selection, Ed. Donn Parson, *American Forensics in Perspective*, (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1984) 58.

"Hollihan, 8.

"Hollihan, 8.

"Rowland, 823.

"Bartanen, 21.

"Rowland, 829.

"M. Anway Jones, & Stephen W. Crawford, "Justification of Values in Terms of Action: A Rationale for a Modified Policy-Making Paradigm in Value Debate," Ed. Don Brownlee, *CEDA Yearbook*, (1984) 11.

THE FORENSIC CHANGES ISSUE DATES

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta will include only three issues in each of its yearly series effective with the next series. A transitional action has been approved by the National Council. The summer edition of Series 73 Number 4 and the fall edition of Series 74 Number 1 will be combined under one cover. Beginning with series 74 and until further notice, each yearly series will include three issues. Fall, Winter, and Spring.

The action was taken to avoid an increase in the subscription rates and membership fees.

ACHIEVEMENT AND RECOGNITION: REACHING GOALS THROUGH FRATERNITY

By

Dr. Bob Derryberry

Dr. Bob Derryberry is Director of Speech Communication/Forensics at Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, Missouri.

When students become involved in the "world of forensic activity," they often enter from a number of diverse avenues. Some speakers begin their university studies with the firm goal of participating in collegiate forensics; others discover competitive speech activities through an introduction to public speaking or by taking courses in disciplines such as oral interpretation or argumentation and debate. Some campus programs may encourage becoming a part of a forensics team via workshops or tryouts for opportunities to represent one's school in competition. Despite the diversity of routes chosen in discovering forensics, you, along with hundreds of other Pi Kappa Delta members, have soon discovered the importance of recognizing and recording achievements within our fraternity.

Our society is reward oriented. Many businesses and professional organizations give recognition and financial incentives for work that is done well. We recognize bravery and rank in military service, we denote high academic achievement with appropriate honor designations, and we give numerous awards representing achievements in amateur and professional athletics. In short, achievements and records of goals reached are important to all of us. Likewise, accomplishments and service in the arena of speech communication and performance also deserve appropriate recognition.

Pi Kappa Delta is an honorary fraternity promoting the "art of persuasion, beautiful and just" in many dimensions: It undergirds sound forensic instruction, active participation, and healthy competition. Additionally, and very importantly, Pi Kappa Delta can contribute to the personal growth and realization of achievement for each member. Unfortunately, however, some of our best vehicles for promoting and recognizing forensic achievements are not fully utilized and opportunities for personal growth and fraternal recognition are neglected.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT MEMBERSHIP

At times individuals, including prospective members, misunderstand how one becomes a part of Pi Kappa Delta. Some members and prospects want the membership requirements to say something that the organization's constitution does not say. Occasionally prospects with strong potential are frightened away from membership by impressive records of members who are well-known for

their attainments in debate or in individual events. While giving full recognition for the forensic achievements of our membership and prospects, we should also emphasize that our fraternity is one that invites growth through participation, achievement, scholarship, and systematic study. Very importantly, the founders of our fraternity knew that members needed to become a part of a "fraternity" in order to grow and develop skills and talents. Thus, they devised five degrees of membership: Fraternity, Proficiency, Honor, Special Distinction, and Highest Distinction.

EARNING MEMBERSHIP

Membership in Pi Kappa Delta at the first level or degree is designed to encourage entry into the fraternity as early in the collegiate experience as possible and to inspire further achievement and growth. Emphasis is given to making progress and receiving deserved recognition in an atmosphere of fraternity. Thus, our constitution sets forth minimum standards for the first degree:

For the Order of Individual Speaking the candidate shall have represented his college in six rounds at recognized intercollegiate contests; or shall be certified by his chapter sponsor as having presented six non-classroom speeches of significance and merit, or a combination of six contest rounds and non-classroom speeches.

For the Order of Debate the candidate shall have participated in eight decision debates, or in twelve non-decision debates. (Article IV, 405.11-12.

REWARDING OUTSIDE SPEAKING: AN IMPORTANT OPTION

The founders of Pi Kappa Delta certainly knew that many students would benefit from fraternity affiliation and fellowship. They also realized that some students would not be able to travel off campus to participate in "typical" contest-tournament events. In short, they understood very well the problems of finances for travel, employment obligations, and personal hardships. To meet needs of students, the fraternal order established the option of preparing and presenting six non-classroom speeches as a valid means of earning entry level membership. Such speeches have proven to be extremely helpful to student speakers, the sponsoring fraternity, and local communities. Since university organizations, service clubs and churches constantly need programs, developing speeches or presentations can meet the needs of specific audiences while enabling the prospective member to accumulate events counting toward membership.

Added features of the outside speaking option is that the local chapter can

experience providing encouragement for developing speakers. Further, students who may not be able to assume or qualify for heavy travel schedules may still profit from fraternity membership and the development that it offers. These members can become a vital part of a local fraternity-team effort.

The outside speaking option also serves ambitious students as they are able to set goals and keep them in accord with their own schedules. Indeed, only the lack of energy and openness of prospects, coaches, and local chapters can limit the opportunities of enthusiastic students seeking to earn membership in Phi Kappa Delta.

ADDED DEGREES

For students to receive the recognition that they earn and deserve, it is important that they complete their applications for advanced degrees as set forth in the constitution. Each degree stipulates the number of rounds, speeches, and years of experience required. Fraternity membership can mean so much more to the individual if he or she has advanced as far as possible during the years of active membership. With the many options available for advancement, consider setting a chapter goal of recognizing all members who attain advanced degrees during their college speaking careers.

SETTING GOALS

As you make your plans and help to set goals for your chapter during the coming academic year, consider promoting all of the options for earning membership in PKD. Encourage the entry of individuals who are serious about membership growth and yet may experience limited schedule opportunities for earning membership through contest rounds. Remember that these recruits may develop into some of your stronger members and even some of your best competitors. Of course, while different membership options can add support for your local chapter, our national order becomes stronger with the growth of each chapter.

Further, encourage your chapter to utilize the fraternity's degree structure to recognize those who set goals and achieve in individual speaking and debate. Yes, the accomplishments and service rendered by our members in speech performance deserve appropriate recognition. Remember also that forms for degree advancement can be obtained from your chapter sponsor or from our national secretary.

STUDENT'S BELIEFS ABOUT GOOD AND BAD JUDGES

By

Dr. C.T. Hanson

Dr. Hanson is Professor of Speech Communication at North Dakota State University. This paper was presented at the Speech Communication Association's National Convention, November 5, 1987 in Boston, Massachusetts.

The forensic tournament has been characterized and endorsed as a communication laboratory (Second National Conference on Forensics [2NCF], 1984). Consequently, the learning laboratory needs people fulfilling the role of experimenters, as well as the role of educational evaluator. While much advice has been given to students experimenting with the various communication events, little feedback has been solicited from the students regarding their reactions to the contest experience. To strengthen the overall educational experience for the student, critic-evaluators may need feedback on how their respective comments are being received by the contestants. Perhaps it is presumptuous for critic-judges to assume that their ballots are contributing to the educational growth of the contestant.

Background

Criticism of the comments by contest judges can be heard in hallways, vans, student parties, coaches' gatherings, to name just a few places. Frequently, both contestant and coach are upset by the judges' comments. The issue of effective judging has also been discussed in academic circles. The 2nd NCF devoted a major portion of its chapter on individual events to the issue of judging. Conference participants dealing with the issue of judging in individual events suggested that "maximum educational objectives are achieved when expert judges and standards are utilized" (2NCF, 1984, p. 89). Hanson was quoted as saying: "The use of lay judges unskilled in critical evaluation of students engaged in the mastery of the art and craft of oral communication is a genuine disservice to the student's educational growth" (p. 89). Clearly, some strong feelings surround the task of critically evaluating a round of contest speaking.

Advice to would-be-judges has surfaced in a number of forensic related publications. Klopff notes that "The best judges, again, are trained individuals whose special knowledge of an event qualifies them as experts, as critic-judges. Only these persons are competent to evaluate the educational processes in forensics and to render an educationally valuable opinion" (1982, p. 271). Klopff goes on to note, however, that the input from trained observers will probably be very limited: "Individual events judges, for the most part, perform three duties in casting their decisions: assign a rank, give a quality rating, and occasionally write evaluation comments for each speaker or

reader. Generally speaking, they do little else in the way of critique. Lack of time usually prevents their preparing extensive written or oral evaluations" (1982, p. 284).

In specific advice for the oral interpretation judge, Littlefield (1987) has suggested that a good interpretation judge be familiar with the rules; be accepting of different interpretations; be able to communicate with the contestant nonverbally; and be well read.

Advice to the individual events judge from Swanson and Zeuschner (1983) encourage the judge to write comments on the ballot; make at least one positive comment; focus criticism on the behavioral acts of the contestant not the person; offer observations on the ballot not inferences; focus on exploring alternatives, not offering absolutes; use the ballot to help the contestant, not ventilate frustrations; and finally, rate and rank each of the contestants.

From a slightly different vantage point, Goodnight and Zarefsky (1980) urge tournament directors to give careful thought to how judges are assigned to contest events. They also suggest that judges may be assigned using one of three different methods: a pre-set schematic for judge assignments; assign judges on a random basis - observing norms like not judging one's own students or judging the same student in the same event more than one in the preliminary rounds; or assigning judges in a discretionary manner, where the tournament director makes a series of individual judgments as to what judge is best suited for a particular round (1980, p. 59).

While concern has been expressed regarding the quality of the judging taking place in contest situations, and advice has been afforded to would be tournament judges and tournament managers, little research has been done to find out what the contestants actually expect from the judge in the contest situation.

Statement of Purpose and Rationale

Two research questions were employed to obtain insights into what contestants perceived to be qualities associated with good and bad judges. An additional two research questions were employed to assess the contestant's motivation to comply with the suggestions of a good judge and those of a bad judge. The specific purpose of this research was to add an additional voice, the contestants' voice, to the dialogue on the matter of judging in the contest situation. The rationale for including the voice of the contestants in the dialogue on judging was to add a measure of clarity as to what are the actual student expectations of the judges in the contest setting; and to obtain some insight as to whether students are willing to comply with the suggestions offered by critic-evaluators in the contest rounds.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects in this study were students competing at the AFA-NIET's District Four Qualifying Tournament. Two hundred forty-one subjects received a copy of the survey as part of their registration materials for the contest. One hundred twelve students returned the survey, which equaled a 46 percent return rate. Once the materials were distributed, there were no unobtrusive opportunities to use a follow-up mechanism to increase the total return response rate. The returned surveys constituted the data base for this study. All of the surveys returned identified traits associated with a good judge and traits associated with a bad judge (the number of traits in each of the two categories ranged from one to five). Additionally, all of the returned surveys answered the questions dealing with the motivation to comply with the suggestions from both good judges and bad judges.

Instrument

The means used to collect the data was a survey instrument of two parts. The first portion of the instrument used questions with an open-response format. Students were first asked to list the traits they associated with a "good" judge; and then, using a second question, contestants were asked to list the traits they associated with a "bad" judge. The second portion of the instrument used questions with a closed-response format. Using a semantic differential with the bipolar adjectives of motivated and unmotivated, students were asked to indicate how motivated they would be to comply with the suggestions made by a judge whom they regarded to be a "good" judge. In a second question with an identical format, students were asked how motivated they would be to comply with the suggestions made by a judge whom they regarded to be a "bad" judge.

The design of the research instrument reflects the approach that Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) recommend for the identification of a set of modal salient beliefs from a given population group.

Once the responses were collected, a frequency count was used to identify the modal salient beliefs of the population group regarding traits associated with a good judge; traits associated with a bad judge; motivation to comply with the suggestions of the person regarded as a good judge; and motivation to comply with suggestions of the person regarded as a bad judge. The process of conducting a frequency count of responses is somewhat analogous to conducting a content analysis. The responses from each of the individuals were grouped together with similar responses from other survey participants to