

- Burgeon, J. & Montgomery, C. (1976). "Dimensions of Credibility for the Ideal Debater". *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 12. 171-177.
- renshaw, C. (1993). Dominant form and marginalized voices: Argumentation about feminism(s). *CEDA Yearbook*. 14, 72-79.
- Freidley, S. & Manchester, B. (1985). "An Analysis of Male/Female Participation at Select National Championships". *National Forensic Journal*. 3, 1-12.
- Griffin, J. & Raider, H. (1992). "Women in High School Debate". In D. Thomas and J. Hart (Eds). *Advanced Debate-Readings in Theory, Practice, & Teaching*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Hayes, M. & McAdoo, J. (1972). "Debate Performance: Differences Between Male and Female Rankings". *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 8, 127-131.
- Hill, S. (1973). "A Study of the Effect of Non-Ability Variables on the Outcome of Intercollegiate Debates". Ph.D. dissertation. Gainesville: University of Florida.
- Jarzabek, M. (1996, March). The double standard in CEDA: A feminist perspective on gender stereotyping in intercollegiate debate. Paper presented at the Southern States Communication Association convention, Memphis, TN.
- Johnson, A. & Bruschke, J. (1993). A research agenda for study of women in debate: A framework and preliminary analysis. In R.E. McKerrow (Ed.) *Argument and the post modern challenge: Proceedings of the 8th ARA/SCA Conference on Argumentation*. Anondale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No Contest: The Case Against Competition*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Logue, B. (1987). "CEDA: Male/Female Participation Levels: A Research Report". *CEDA Yearbook*. 7, 22-26.
- Martin, S. (1988). "An Analysis of the Participation of Women in Competitive Debate". Honor's Thesis. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College.
- Plutchik, R. (1968). *Foundations of Experimental Research*. New York: Harper & Rowe.
- Rosen, N., Dean, L. & Willis, F. (1978). "The Outcome of Debate in Relation to Gender, Side, and Position." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 15, 17-21.
- Rothwell, J. (1992). *In Mixed Company-Small Group Communication*. Fort Worth: Harcourt, Brace, Johanovich.
- Shelton, K. (1983). "Variables that Effect Success in Debate". Master's Thesis, Charleston, IL: Eastern Illinois University.
- Shelton, K. & Shelton, M. (1993). "Boys and Girls at Play-The Effect of Gender Upon Success in Debate". *The Forensic Educator*. 7, 22-25.

- Spiker, B., Daniels, T. & Bernabe, L. (1982). "The Quantitative Quandary in Forensics: The Use and Abuse of Statistical Evidence". *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 14, 87-96.
- Stepp, P., Simerly, G., & Logue, B. (1994). Sexual harassment in CEDA debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy—The Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 31, 36-40.
- Szwapa, C. (1994). Sexual harassment and gender discrimination in NDT debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy—The Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 31, 41-44.
- Vasilus, J. & DeStephen, D. (1979). "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Debate Tournament Success and Rate, Evidence, and Jargon". *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 15, 197-204.

A RESPONSE TO SHELTON

by Jon Bruschke and Ann Johnson

Responding to criticism about your work is somewhat similar to being the Unknown Soldier—on the one hand, it is something of an honor, but on the other, it is an honor that all things being equal you would rather not have. In the case of the Unknown Soldier, of course, you would rather not be dead and you would probably prefer that others knew who you were. In the case of Mike Shelton's commentary on our gender work, it is (as always) a compliment to draw the attention of fellow scholars although it would have been much more pleasant had the review been a little more laudatory. Nonetheless, we thank Professor Shelton for engaging in our call to "extend the discussion and debate" and we thank the editor for this chance to continue the dialogue. In this essay we will pursue four tasks: offer our major reaction to Shelton's criticisms, respond to what we take to be Shelton's most poignant rebuke, discuss some of the finer points of the exchange, and finally identify those issues we leave to the readers to resolve.

First, our major reaction to Shelton. We can't help but notice that our central conclusion is largely unassailed. We discovered that very subtle differences existed which were most important in very specific situations (female-female teams with female judges on the negative), at large NDT tournaments, and which appeared after controlling for prior performance at those tournaments. We take this to be accurate whether or not we reviewed the literature exhaustively and whether or not we justified the inclusion of those controls (the proof, we believe, is in the fact that every control we mentioned did have a statistically significant relationship on our dependent variables). Our primary conclusion is that gender bias "relationships are complex, depend on a variety of factors, and may not reveal themselves in any single collection of eight rounds. That does not make them any less real" (p. 169). We stand by that conclusion and consider it unchallenged. If Shelton were able to point to a study that employed similar controls, measured a similar dependent variable, and came to a contrary

conclusion serious reconsideration of our work would be in order. We do not see such a study in Shelton's review. In fact, in Shelton's extensive review of post-1970s research there is no study he identifies that both (a) studied speaker points, and (b) controlled for prior success at the tournament.

Second, our congratulations to Shelton. He researched more thoroughly than we did. While our review was generally limited to published and indexed literature, Shelton was able to uncover a series of master's theses, convention papers, and papers from less-well circulated publications that we, quite bluntly, missed. And bully for him. It is a useful contribution to the discussion to know that female participation is higher in CEDA than NDT, and it also seems to be at this point almost a settled issue that female-female teams do not have substantially lower win loss records than teams of other gender compositions. For the reasons cited above, we do not believe that the additional literature in any sense disproves the findings we obtained, but "Still, it's a terrible thing to be outdated" (p. 321), as Charles Willard (1989) once quipped. We encourage students of the issue to pore over the additional studies Shelton cites for additional insights into the issue.

A bored reader could stop now and be assured that the main thrust of what we have to say has been said. However, for those readers still enraptured by the discussion and, as congresspersons are fond of saying and reporters are fond of hearing, "for the record" we advance the following points. Shelton chides us for failing to comprehensively review the non-debate literature and cites a smattering of research of his own to show that women are just as competitive as men. We react three ways. First, the claim is irrelevant. Whether or not women are as willing to compete as men is not our claim, in fact, we hope that women are as likely to compete or debate likely doesn't have much to offer for them. Our concern was whether audiences (judges) discriminate in providing rewards. For example, Eagly, Makhigani, and Klonsky's (1992) meta analysis discovered that women are just as capable of performing traditional leadership styles as men are but they are derogated for doing so. We wonder if something similar could be happening in debates. Second, we find it ironic that Shelton would fault our review for being incomplete and then cite only two sources of his own. Simply listing the varieties of feminism could be a multi-volume work; it seems that neither we nor Shelton are prepared to undertake such a task. Perhaps the topic is best considered, as one reviewer hand-wrote in the copy of Shelton's article we received, a "framing" issue. Third, and this is the important point, had we decided to comprehensively review all the literature on gender bias we believe that the cataclysmically overwhelming bulk of it would contend that gender bias exists. And that conclusion, by the way, is much more consonant with our conclusion than Shelton's.

In addition, we are taken aback (if we do not take offense) at Shelton's insinuation that we knew of some literature and intentionally ignored it: "Bruschke and Johnson ignore all of the evidence on the subject produced since 1978... Why would all post-1978 data be ignored by these researchers? ... Is it more difficult to explain away the findings of other research?" Come now, Professor Shelton, we will gladly concede your literature review is impressive. But suggesting nefarious and dishonest motives on our part is uncalled for and, frankly, insulting. We do not presume personal motives behind your review of our work; please do not challenge our professional reputations because you found some difficult-to-obtain documents that we did not.

The last point we wish to deal with specifically is Shelton's unusual attention on our conclusion that "participants ... be self-reflective" (p. 171), dismissing it as "hyperbolic." *Hyperbolic*? We asked the debate community to take a moment and

think about gender issues and that should be labeled hyperbolic? What must Shelton think of critical calls to overthrow paradigms? ("Murderous anarchists" seems mild.) It's not like we were suggesting that males be removed from the judging pool. Actually, we felt guilty as we wrote the conclusion because it was such a lame, watered-down suggestion for dealing with what we take to be an enormously important issue. There may indeed be many criticisms of that particular conclusion, but that it tends to hyperbole is not one of them. Can anyone even think of a less forceful suggestion to conclude applied research?

Finally, there are several issues we will simply leave to readers to judge for themselves. We dismissed the published studies of the 1970s because they dealt with high school students and speaker ranks; if it is true that the information gathered on speaker ranks in 1978 so conclusively proved that debate was free of gender bias that further research was unnecessary then so be it, but we are confident that most readers will conclude otherwise. We suggested a number of controls prior research did not incorporate and Shelton faulted us for not dealing with each study specifically; we again encourage readers (and Shelton) to find a study that did include all of our controls and came to a contrary conclusion. Shelton faulted us for not defining what a "large" NDT tournament was; we trusted at the time (and still do) that within the debate community there is sufficient understanding of the term to allow readers to fairly evaluate the findings. Shelton found our theorizing about causes to be unrelated to the data; we will let readers judge whether our thoughts provoked useful ideas. In the end, we will be satisfied if the paper forms part of the mosaic of rhetoric that surrounds the issue of gender and debate.

In conclusion, and after having re-read our original paper now three years after having written it, Shelton is perhaps correct that we could have been more careful and dwelt more vigilantly on the limitations of our study. But gender is a topic that sparks ideas and theories and our sin may very well have been that we were caught up in the enthusiasm of intriguing findings, perhaps to the exclusion of extended reflections about the possible limitations of those findings. In that sense, Shelton's paper may be a useful correction and scholars will contemplate (and, we hope, replicate) our study with the academic caution that all social science rightly ought to inspire. For now, we believe that when proper controls are included gender differences in speaker points do emerge, the literature Shelton reviewed should be incorporated into future work, and we invite other scholars to join us on our quest. And braving the dangers of hyperbole, we are still hopeful that those in the debate community will reflect on issues of gender.

References

- Bruschke, J. & Johnson, A. (1994). An analysis of differences in success rates of male and female debaters. *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 30, 162-173.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhigani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3-22.
- Willard, C. A. (1989). Reply to McGee, Warnick, and Wenzel. In B. E. Gronberg (Ed.), *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 317-323). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2ND 1990 NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

Conference Coordinated by Larry Schnoor and Vicki Karns

from the notes of Bonnie Clark
St. Petersburg Junior College

*Only passed recommendations are noted

Hierarchy

1. To create a committee to investigate the creation of a national forensic office to act as a non-policy, co-ordinated body for forensic organizations. This committee will be charged with determining the duties of this office including internal and external public relations, enactment, and potential methods of funding.
2. That the AFA-NIET be encouraged to modify its at-large qualification method to allow students to qualify by obtaining a cumulative of "9" rankings over 3 tournaments regardless of the size of the events 10 schools 6 people in the even minimum at the tournament.
3. To encourage the development and tournament sponsorship of experimental and creative events.
4. To minimize and eliminate the verbal emphasis on national tournament qualification information at tournament announcements.
5. That tournaments whose purpose is to manipulate competition to increase qualification for the national tournament in IE are unethical.
6. To encourage the AFA to divest itself of the national tournaments (NDT/NIET) in order to become the umbrella organization of the forensic community.
7. To encourage the AFA to explore means to make Argument and Advocacy: JAF more responsive to the needs and interests of the entire forensics community.
8. That on or before June 1, 1991 each forensic organization endorse the AFA as the umbrella organization of the forensic community if the AFA divests itself of the NDT and NIET.
9. That the AFA and/or CFO assume the functions of the SCA Forensic Division.
10. That the SCA Forensic Division chair no longer be an officer of CFO.

Duality

1. To endorse the role of competition in enhancing education.
2. To encourage program directors to seek a variety of forums for students and those forums should serve a variety of students experience levels.

3. That forensic coaches have the duty to articulate to students their program's philosophy, goals, rules, and expectations.
4. That tournament directors present both event rules and educational outcomes as event descriptions in tournament invitations.
5. That individual tournament directors engage in experimentation that fosters educational outcomes in rounds of competition. Such experimentation includes but is not limited to, question-answer periods, diversity in performance venue, oral critiques, and decision rationales.
6. That academic departments of Speech Communication institute courses and/or workshops in forensic pedagogy for future forensic educators at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
7. That a national office be established to promote and publicize forensic activity.
8. That this body recognizes the critical need to publicize and promote the educational benefits of forensics within the Speech Communication profession and to the larger public.

Training Practices

1. We move that a formal mentoring program, tied to a parent organization, be established to service the developmental needs of new and existing coaches.
2. We move that formal training programs for judges should include among their elements:
 - a. explanation of rules
 - b. principles of events
 - c. criteria for writing constructive ballots
 - d. judging etiquette
 - e. sample ballots
3. We move that tournament directors should provide substantive guidelines for performances and evaluation in each event at their tournaments. National tournament organizations are especially encouraged to do so.
4. We move that tournament directors should assume responsibility for monitoring the professional performance of their hired judges.
5. We move that individual events ballots should include specific sections for explanation of the rationale behind the judges decision.
6. We move in conformance with the principles of Resolution 48 of the Second Development Conference on Forensics (Evanston), Tournament directors should consider allowing time for additional oral critiques following conclusion of a round.
7. We move that workshops be encouraged to examine the norms, skills and legitimacy of forensic scholarship.
8. We move to have professional forensic organizations sponsor programs on insuring the long term financial stability of forensics.

9. We move that college forensic programs, in cooperation with high school organizations, should encourage their students to participate in formal judge training procedures to include judging high school contests.

New Programs

1. That the 1990-91 CFO directory identify forensic educators willing to serve as mentors to new directors.
 2. That a workshop to provide training for Directors of Forensics in all areas of program administration be held at Regis College on June 16-22, 1991
 3. That additional tournament directors develop apprentice programs designed to provide experience in tournament administration.
 4. That tournament directors should recognize novice competitors through special divisions and/or awards at invitational tournaments.
 5. That tournament directors provide opportunities for social interaction between students and forensics educators.
 6. That national tournaments offer a special "Newcomer Award" for schools competing at the tournament for the first time.
 7. That forensics journals focus special issues on basic Program operation including program administration, selecting tournaments, gaining publicity, and/or methods of recruitment and retention especially for at risk students.
 8. That Directors of Forensics seek information from employers regarding their legal responsibilities and liabilities when traveling with students on forensics trips.
 9. That a video recruitment tape be planned and preliminary production begun by a committee of forensic educators prior to the 1990 CS annual Convention.
- That monetary support be sought for the production of the recruitment video tape from collegiate forensic organizations.
- That the PBS studios at Bradley University be used for the production of the recruitment video tape.

Public Speaking

1. To support the creation of a contestant's guidebook on ethical practices for both interpretive and original speaking events. The guidebook should include, but not be limited to, issues of plagiarism, proper source citation, author integrity, and literary integrity, as well as all codes of ethics currently published by all national forensics organizations. We propose that the guidebook include definitions, rationales for ethical models, and illustrative material.
2. That forensics organizations be responsible for distributing their codes of ethics to all competitors prior to their respective national tournaments.
3. With increasing use of personal interviews for gathering information, we recommend that both coaches and students consider the implications of using these valid sources, and that interviews used as resource material be electronically recorded and made available upon request.

4. Tournament directors inform and encourage judges to realize that there are multiple organizational patterns (e.g. problem/solution) in public address events.
5. Originality as a criterion be more clearly defined to original work and subject treatment and the use of unique and unusual topics.
6. To encourage forensics directors, coaches, and students to select materials and events which maximize the educational experience of the contestants by demanding mastery of a v variety of skills unique to each event.
7. Directors of forensics tournaments should provide opportunities for thoughtful criticism of student performance.
8. Tournament directors who adopt experimental rules or procedures should take steps to evaluate these efforts formally and report the results of those evaluations to the forensic community through appropriate channels.

Oral Interpretation

1. We encourage all national tournament committees to employ descriptive rationale for each of the national events.
2. We urge that the national organizations draft ethics statements in support of the literary integrity considering such issues including, but not limited to: writing in characters, altering plot lines, rewriting lines or parts of a story, and/or altering tenses/sexes.
3. We encourage national organizations to require that students and/or coaches are able to produce uncut, contiguous sections of the original source performed.
4. We encourage coaches to teach and work with students on the process of cutting literature.
5. We encourage coaches and students to emphasize the educational process of literary criticism.
6. We urge students and coaches to engage in a high level of literary analysis in their choices of literature, introductions, transitions, and audience adaptation.
7. We encourage tournament directors who write invitations to consider recommendations generated at the National Developmental Conferences of 1984, 1988, and 1990.
8. We support a justified, quality performance that grows out of the literature and makes the literature come alive. We support consideration of the following, including but not limited to, for example: manuscript-optional, use of visual aids, the interweaving of literature, creative movement, etc.
9. We recommend national organizations request justification for rank and rate ideally in the form of Reason for Decisions on ballots.
10. We recommend instructors and students seek out other disciplinary sources for wider literary choices.
11. We strongly encourage tournament directors to train hired judges for tournaments as far in advance as is feasible.

PRESIDENT'S CORNER

by
Bill Hill

Greetings from your National Council. Plans are moving steadily forward for our 1997 Convention and Tournament. We expect to have all plans finalized at the completion of our Summer Council meeting. We will incorporate some significant changes including new ceremonial events, a more streamlined schedule, and new election procedures. Each of these changes will, I believe, enhance the value and pleasure Pi Kappa Delta members get from attending our National Convention and Tournament.

At the Summer Council meeting we will also address more broadly defined issues related to forensics. Last Summer members of the National Council formed working groups and one of the groups focused on inter-organizational issues facing Pi Kappa Delta and the forensics community. I established this working group to generate thoughts and ideas about the current state and future of forensics, and the role(s) Pi Kappa Delta could play in promoting forensics and forensics programs. The working group generated a number of important and timely ideas, many of which were ultimately linked to some aspect of cooperation, clarity of purpose and/or unity of purpose among the various forensics organizations.

This Summer we will broaden our discussion by including viewpoints from another organization. **Dr. Allan Loudon**, President of the American Forensics Association, will meet with our National Council to discuss general ways to enhance cooperation and unity of purpose among forensics organizations. We will also try to identify specific ways to broaden our forum to include representatives of other forensics organizations, and to develop the framework of an agenda for such discussions.

As we move closer to our 1997 convention, please keep in mind the ongoing efforts PKD members need to make to help our organization function smoothly and productively. **Steve Hunt** (Lewis and Clark College), editor of The Forensic, needs submissions and book reviews which can be reviewed for our publication. **Brenda D. Marshall** (Linfield College), chair of the Nominations Committee needs your input regarding candidates for National Council. Finally, if you are aware of any school in your area which might be interested in joining Pi Kappa Delta or a current Pi Kappa Delta school which needs assistance from the National Office, please take the initiative to contact them and to notify **Jeff Hobbs** (Abilene Christian). Cultivating new chapters and retaining existing chapters are critical to Pi Kappa Delta's future and all members of our fraternity must work in that effort.

KENTUCKY ETA CHAPTER: READY AND WILLING AS THE 1997 NATIONAL TOURNAMENT AND CONVENTION HOST

By Scott Jensen
Public Relations Committee Chair

The Kentucky Eta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at Northern Kentucky University is rolling out the "bluegrass carpet" as it prepares to host the 1997 Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament and Convention. The commitment and enthusiasm that characterizes this chapter will be the tools that Professor Durell "Butch" Hamm, along with his students and department, use in organizing what they know will be a successful event.

The Northern Kentucky University forensics team is hosting this year's national event despite its PKD chapter being less than 10 years old. According to Hamm, the program was founded in 1980. After two coaches, Hamm assumed director responsibilities. He took the team to the 1989 national tournament and convention in St. Louis where the Kentucky Eta chapter was initiated. The chapter has also attended national events in Tacoma, Washington (1993) and Shreveport, Louisiana (1995).

Hamm considers the Shreveport tournament and convention to be a particularly special event in his team's brief history. It was there that the team earned an excellent award in individual events sweepstakes after being named the 1997 host.

The NKU forensics team is sponsored by the university's department of communication. The team's membership, however, reaches all corners of campus life.

Hamm commented, "The students who participate on the team are university wide majors. I have always maintained the philosophy that the team was there for anyone who wanted to improve their speaking skills while learning to manage criticism."

The team receives strong support from NKU's administration. Hamm explained, "Both our Dean, Dr Thom Isherwood, and our department Chair, Dr. Steven Weiss are very supportive of our program. They both have agreed to support our convention in every way possible." Hamm added, "Dr. Weiss is a former debate coach who realizes the important value forensics plays on the lives of young folks."

The NKU forensics program emphasizes skills that students can use after their graduation. Hamm described his focus as a forensics educator in the following manner:

"As coach, I believe one of the best if not the best skill a student learns is how to deal with criticism. When they graduate they may not get the opportunity to interp poetry before an audience, but they will receive criticism, both positive and negative and I truly believe this is a life skill that is taught through forensics."

Hamm's students are a testament to the program's success in attaining its goal. Incoming team captain, Gina Holt, boasted that "forensics has given me an opportunity to express myself and get rewarded for it. It teaches me to understand and accept criticism in a positive way."

As the Kentucky Eta chapter turns its attention toward preparations for the 1997 nationals, Hamm and his staff are optimistic that all will be perfect when March 1997 rolls around. "Those who have been to our I.E. tournament know that we have a compact-unique campus that offers good ole Southern hospitality in a modern campus atmosphere," said Hamm. He added, "We are in a large metropolitan area that offers everything from riverboat casinos and cruises, to horse racing and shopping."

As a program whose students participate on a voluntary basis, the Northern Kentucky University forensics program is characterized by dedication. Lisa Washnock, outgoing NKU forensics team captain and Pi Kappa Delta National Council member summed up the Kentucky Eta chapter's sentiment:

"I am ecstatic that NKU has the honor and privilege of hosting a convention/tournament that will have a strong impact on those who attend, as previous conventions have had on me."

ANALYZING PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES: TWO METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

by

Susan Hellweg, Michael Pfau & Steven Brydon,
Televised Presidential Debates, (New York, NY: Preager, 1992)

Edward Hinck

Enacting the Presidency, (New York, NY: Preager, 1993)

reviewed by Phillip Voight

Director of Forensics, Gustavus Adolphus College

Televised Presidential Debates and *Enacting the Presidency* present communication educators with two different methodological approaches to understanding the enduring influence of American presidential debates. Although each approach has merit, combining the two texts in a single course would provide students with an opportunity to witness the implications of methodological considerations on a single common topic of study.

Enacting the Presidency is organized chronologically, and would serve as an excellent starting point for a course on presidential debates. In the first chapter, Hinck outlines the relationship between presidential debating style and leadership. "Debates are important events in presidential campaigns," he argues, "because they constitute unique opportunities for audiences to observe each candidate's ability to respond to symbolic challenges" (Hinck 1993, 3).

Hinck is a rhetorical critic, and his approach emphasizes the ways in which the concept of leadership is symbolically structured and conveyed to