

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Published since 1915

THEMED ISSUE

PI KAPPA DELTA IN THE NEW MILLENIUM: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Looking Forward, Looking Back: The Lessons of the Past to Create our Future

NINA-JO MOORE, EDITOR

Forensics in the New Millenium: The Need for Traditional Research in Forensics

JACK R. ROGERS

Preserving History: Why and How to Write a History of Your Forensics Program

CLAY W. REDDING AND JEFFREY DALE HOBBS

The Educational Value of Forensics*

WILLIAM YAREMCHUK, DON BROWNLEE, MARTY BEASLEY, AND LAWRENCE WOODARD

**Originally published in The Forensic, Series 64, No. 2, January 1979*



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

National Council

GLEND A TREADAWAY, PRESIDENT

Department of Communication, Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608 828-262-2222

SUSAN MILLSAP, PRESIDENT-ELECT

Department of Speech Communication, Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-3386

BILL HILL, SECRETARY-TREASURER

Office of Academic Affairs, University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223 704-687-2090

SCOTT JENSEN, IMMEDIATE PAST-PRESIDENT

School of Communication, Webster University
St. Louis, MO 63119 314-968-7439

NINA-JO MOORE, EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC

Department of Communication, Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608 828-262-2171

SANDRA ALSPACH, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Department of Humanities, Ferris State University
Big Rapids, MI 49307 231-591-2779

SUZANNE AMUNDSON, NATIONAL COUNCIL

910 10th Ave., North
St. Cloud, MN 56303 320-253-8110

THOMAS BARTL, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Department of Communication, Oklahoma University
Norman, OK 73026 405-325-3111

STEPHAN COLLINS STEPGNY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Department of Communication, Morgan State University
4246 Suitland Road - #203 Suitland, MD 20746

SCOTTY KEHOE, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Department of Humanities, Ferris State University
P O Box 159 Stanwood, MI 49346-0159

R. DAVID RAY, HISTORIAN

P.O. Box 2882, University of Arkansas-Monticello
Monticello, AR 71655 501-460-1079

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

Joyce Krueger
124 Watson St., P.O. Box 38
Ripon, WI 54971

nflpikappa@centurytel.net
Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

THEMED ISSUE

PI KAPPA DELTA IN THE NEW MILLENIUM: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

- 1 Looking Forward, Looking Back: The Lessons of the Past to Create our Future
NINA-JO MOORE, EDITOR
- 3 Forensics in the New Millenium: The Need for Traditional Research in Forensics
JACK R. ROGERS
- 25 Preserving History: Why and How to Write a History of Your Forensics Program
CLAY W. REDDING AND JEFFREY DALE HOBBS
- 37 The Educational Value of Forensics*
WILLIAM YAREMCHUK, DON BROWNLEE, MARTY BEASLEY, AND LAWRENCE WOODARD
**Originally published in The Forensic, Series 64, No. 2, January 1979*

The *Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research and administration in competitive and non-competitive debate. In keeping with the vision of the present administration of Pi Kappa Delta, the Editor and Editorial Board seeks articles that are especially about ways to increase diversity in forensics. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts of this nature of top priority. Manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students and previously unpublished scholars will also receive serious consideration.

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

Reviews of books, activities, and other educational materials will be published periodically (as submitted), and those submissions are also sought. Potential authors should contact the Editor regarding the choice of materials for review.

All works must be original and not under review by other publishers. Authors should submit **3 print copies AND a PC-Compatible disk version** (for editing purposes). Submissions should conform to **APA guidelines** (5th edition). Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references; books reviews and educational materials should be 4-5 double-spaced pages. Submitted manuscripts will not be returned. The title page should include the title, author(s), correspondence address, e-mail address, and telephone numbers. The second page should include an abstract of 75-100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page (with no reference to author), with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed and double spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

SEND MANUSCRIPTS TO: Nina-Jo Moore, Department of Communication, Appalachian State University, Box 32039, Boone, NC 28608-2039, 828-262-2171. Do not fax or e-mail submissions, although feel free to contact the Editor by those modes of communication: moorenj@appstate.edu; 828-262-2543. Authors should have an editorial decision within 3 months.

Review Editors

Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran Univ.
Doug Binsfield, Southwest State Univ.
Terry Cole, Appalachian State Univ.
Steve Hunt, Lewis and Clark College

Scott Jensen, Webster University
Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College
Don Swanson, Monmouth University
Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State Univ.

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN:0015-735X) is now published twice yearly, Winter and Summer, by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$20.00 for 1 year, \$40.00 for 2 years, and \$60.00 for 3 years. Second class postage is paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: Please send all address change requests to: PKD, 125 Watson St., P. O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. **THE FORENSIC** is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Looking Forward, Looking Back: The Lessons of the Past to Create our Future

EDITOR'S NOTE

Historically Speaking...

In today's world of forensics, it is often important to "return to our roots," to remember who we are, how we got to where we are today, and to look and see if we are remaining true to our educational goals. This edition of *THE FORENSIC* takes the reader on a historical journey.

We begin the journey by Jack Rogers discussing an age-old topic of dialogue in the area of debate practices from a contemporary position. Adding to this editor's belief that diversity is important, this discussion incorporates what people from outside of the culture of the United States think about our approach to debate. The old argument of "Is debate educational anymore, with all of its 'research games,' its 'gaming strategies,' and the style of delivery used by debaters?" is brought to light. Interestingly, Rogers discusses how academic institutions place research burdens on faculty, and draws some interesting analogies between what we require of our students and what we demand of ourselves as productive scholars of our academic field.

The journey next takes us to Clay Redding and Jeffrey Hobbs' discussion of the importance of knowing your program's history, both to directors of forensics as well as to participants. Redding and Hobbs then give a practical guide to developing your program's history. The article is an excellent guide for both students and faculty to formulate your chapter's history, and to put together an excellent entry into this year's Pi Kappa Delta Convention and Tournament Chapter History event.

Finally, in keeping with where we come from and where we are going, an article of historical merit is included. "The Educational Value of Forensics" was originally published in *THE FORENSIC* in January of 1979, Series 64, Issue Number 2. Although we do not often hear what coaches' philosophies of making this activity more educational are, this article gives four well-known former coaches' viewpoints on this valuable topic. Many programs today are running the risk of becoming extinct due to budget constraints, especially at state institutions this year (it has been reported that more than thirty-five state university systems are suffering severe budget shortfalls this year). William Yaremchuk, Don Brownlee, Marty Beasley, and Lawrence Woodard share some ideas on how to make your programs

more justifiable when your administrations begin to think that one way to conserve funds for your institution is to trim your resources. The ideas presented to Pi Kappa Delta more than twenty-three years ago are still viable today.

I invite you to take a historical journey, then, and see if there are some new pieces of information to make your program a better one.

Nina-Jo Moore, Editor



Forensics in the New Millenium: The Need for Traditional Research in Forensics

JACK E. ROGERS, PH.D.

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract: *This manuscript examines the need for traditional research within the forensic community both from the student and coaches' perspectives. Research skills are absolutely critical in the "real world" both for our students and our forensics peers. As the new millennium dawns, the role of information and the ability to find, organize and control its dissemination will increasingly correlate with success and survivability. However, we should not allow our students to lose sight of the need to develop their ability to successfully adapt their persuasive messages to a variety of audiences and communicate them in an effective manner. Students are best equipped through broad-based, foundational educational experiences that are sharpened through the process of "specialization." Both areas are critical for higher-level thinking and the expression of ideas. This manuscript concludes that there is a need for research-intensive educational experiences for students and that forensic professional need to intensify their commitment to rigorous programs of research and publication.*

The Debate

Shigeru Matsumoto, representing the Research Institute for Educational Development, Tokai University and President of the Japan Debate Association, stepped to the podium. His was one of four papers in a panel on the state of competitive forensics in Japan, delivered at the International Debate Education Association's (IDEA) 2000 Convention held in Budapest. As he delivered his remarks, he observed that the forensics community within both the secondary and higher education systems in Japan has witnessed a general decline in the number of students willing to participate in traditional policy debate. During this same time period, the number of students eager to pursue a non-evidentiary parliamentary format has surged. He argued that this trend could be traced to a general attitude that he summarized as being; "Students are lazy. They do not want to have to do research." A chorus of mumbles immediately arose from the audience. "Superficial debate! No work," remarked Kirill Belogoubets, the University Debate Program Coordinator in Nizhny Novgorod, Russia as he translated the remark to his Romanian colleague Viorel Murariu.

*JACK E. ROGERS is an Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Forensics at Central Missouri State University in Warrensburg, MO. Rogers has served as a DOF for the past 20 years at Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA and The University of Texas at Tyler, TX, was a forensics competitor as an undergraduate at McNeese State University, and has served as the Founding Editor of *The Southern Journal of Forensics* and *The International Journal of Forensics*.

Naoto Usui, representing Aikoku Gakuen University, Japan, another presenter on the panel, countered Professor Matsumoto's observation by arguing that "(T)here is a misunderstanding that the parliamentary style of debate does not require research . . . perhaps, this may be true in a more traditional sense . . . however, students must research a broad range of topics to be knowledgeable about society and world issues." Usui's comment was immediately met with enthusiastic cheers of "Here! Here!" by Alastair Endresby, a representative from the English Speaking Union, London, England. Several members of the audience echoed Endresby's fervent convictions.

Thus, the resolution was set, the sides drawn, the debate had begun with enthusiasm. Each side of the aisle spent the next several minutes trying to outline the relative research burdens of their preferred format of debate, why this approach was pedagogically superior, pragmatically necessary, or more relevant to "real world," post debate experiences, and how their format's evidence burdens better supported the educational and critical thinking goals of forensics in a broader context. No conclusions were reached. No converts were forthcoming.

It seems somewhat ironic that approximately 9,000 miles from the United States' intercollegiate competitive debate circuit U.S. program directors were listening to a debate that they had heard dozens of times in every possible venue. From socializing at the National Communication Association (NCA) convention, to argumentation and development conferences, in textbooks and professional journals, in heated "discussions" at tournaments that offer multiple formats, in Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) and National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) business meetings, at Pi Kappa Delta's bi-annual national convention and tournament, and over the numerous list serves, the topic has been discussed relentlessly. Again, though the various sides and their representatives may have reached conclusions, few, if any, conversions of positions on this controversial subject were made. At the conclusion of the panel discussion, Natalia Oturgasheva, a professor with the Siberian Academy for Public Administration in Novosibirsk, Russia remarked, "It seems there are few differences that divide your colleagues [United States] but the amount of research you use." Program directors from both formats assured her that it was not quite that simple.

The next panel was an assortment of presentations on the pedagogy of teaching debate. Everything was proceeding according to plan until Jeff Jarman, from Wichita State University, presented his paper on the use of evidence as a "critical tool in teaching debate concepts, argumentation theory and critical thinking skills to novice debaters." The research debate re-ignited. Both sides seized the opportunity to reestablish the claims argued earlier. Is extensive research necessary to teach argumentation and critical thinking? What role does a more spontaneous style of argumentation play in the development of social influence? Neither side seemed to be gaining ground.

Seated in the chambers, Zbigniew Pelczynski, Director of Poland's School for Young Social and Political Leaders quietly asked, "Is there no balance between these perspectives that would enable students to do well in both styles?" David Berube, of the University of South Carolina, in his role as respondent even went so far as to ask "What is research/evidence? How do we define it? Is it only secondary or do we consider primary sources?" He concluded this line of questioning with his summary that there is an over-dependence on secondary sources in debate. The panel discussion spilled over the limits of time and out into the hall where the post-Japanese panel debate was extended further with a philosophical discussion on what traditional definitions of research were and how they might be expanded in light of Pelczynski's and Berube's comments.

Much later, in an impromptu "discussion" held in the pub of the Central European University, over the merits of research and its value to the "forensics as education" view, the focus of the participants in the argument widened. Wellness issues, with regard to the frantic pace at which we Americans pursue competition, were addressed. In particular, one Moldovian colleague, Sergei Lysenko, coordinator of the National League of Preuniversity Debate, was very interested to know how we, as teaching professors, could find the time to continue to pursue our programs of research and publication given our rigorous coaching schedules. He was incredulous to learn of this author's experiences as Editor of both the *Southern Journal of Forensics* and the *International Journal of Forensics*. Overall submissions of quality research monographs reflective of forensic scholarship have decreased significantly and continue to decline. Steve Hunt, Michael Bartanen, and Nina-Jo Moore have discussed similar editorial experiences with *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. Former editors of *Argument & Advocacy: The CEDA Yearbook* have conversed about an overall decrease in submissions, although the paucity of articles has not been as chronic as other publications. "Perhaps," Lysenko theorized, as he returned to the research debate, "the students lack respect for the research process and the rigors it demands, because their mentors do not seem to respect it as well?" A quick explanation of the enormous commitment in terms of time and resources that coaching demands was offered. It was also pointed out that the number of credible, professional forensics journals is relatively small. He was not dissuaded. "Perhaps," Lysenko concluded, "it is not possible to be both a good professor and a good coach." "Maybe," Belogoubets added, "you should be putting into practice what you are demanding of students."

In the process of sorting through these experiences and the very detailed notes on both of the panels and the discussions with the representatives from the international forensics community, two clear themes began to emerge: first, what is the proper perspective and role of research in undergraduate debate; and second, what is the proper perspective and role of research in our professional lives as members of the academic community? A plethora of supporting ideas and questions emerged from the mapping exercise. Are the two perspectives

linked? Are we poor role models for our students? Are we demanding more of our students than we are requiring of ourselves? Given the rigorous tournament schedule, are our expectations too high for our students and ourselves? How do observers from outside of the forensics community view the research perspective and its impact on what we are about? Is it possible to achieve the balance that Pelczynski advanced?

The Student Extension

Which format of competitive debate, together with its respective research burdens and argumentation styles, provides our students with the most realistic educational experiences; that will, in turn, translate into "real world" post graduation competencies? Is a research-intensive format, that tends to focus on the analysis of a highly specialized knowledge base, superior to a less intensive format that requires the successful competitor to demonstrate a less in-depth knowledge of a much wider, more generalized information base? *Depth* versus *Breadth*; which better serves our students? Any possible answer to this deliberation is further muddled by the style of argumentation/presentation typified by each respective format. *Content* versus *Form*; which better serves our students?

These questions, and the resulting debate surrounding them, are certainly not new. Anyone with even limited experience in intercollegiate, competitive forensics has some understanding of the "countermovements" which have shaped and divided the forensics community over the past two-and-a-half decades. Indeed, the debate over exactly what constitutes research, its centrality to various formats of debate, and how research should and should not be used have been the focus of numerous scholarly articles and presentations at the Alta Conferences for the past two decades (see Epstein, 1996; Parson, 1984; Goodnight, 1984). Ultimately, the debate over what research is and how it should be used has done more to shape the evolution of schisms within the forensics community than any other single issue. In this article the intent is not to argue how our differing philosophies over research and delivery divide our community, but rather, how we as a community must come together to support a unified philosophy or forensics education or risk extinction.

After the First National Developmental Conference on Forensics, Jack Howe (Director of Debate at California State University - Long Beach) helped to establish the Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA) as an alternative to the National Debate Tournament (NDT). Howe's primary justification was to reduce the burden of research evident in NDT and refocus that energy towards analysis and more cogent delivery. George Ziegelmueeller (1990) explains that Howe "objected to what he saw as an excessive emphasis on research and speed of delivery among policy debaters and proposed to create an alternative form of debate emphasizing analysis, and slower, more persuasive delivery" (27). William Bennett (1972) advances this con-

ceptualization in his work when he argues that debate coaches and teachers neglect debate as "a speech development activity. . . A debater, like any speaker, must learn to reach his audience. Debate education serves best when it has an orientation toward communication" (286-87).

Edward Panetta (1990) represents the other side of this debate. He argued that evidence intensive, policy debate reflects the cultural trend from "generalization" to "specialization." Panetta commented "the best debater is no longer the 'most generally intelligent' student but rather 'the specialist.' Today, the best debaters are the students who focus their energies on the specific topic . . . inherent in this emphasis is the stress placed on the research skills of the students" (71-72). Panetta concluded "competitive debate aims to nurture the leaders of society who have better research skills and can understand the complex issues of society" (in Makino, 2000, 116). More than a decade later, this position continues to be articulated.

Of course, Howe's "modest proposal" struggled through the first few years. Eventually, CEDA gained popularity and increased in size so much that NDT was all but extinguished. CEDA and NDT eventually "merged," to some extent, in 1997-98 largely due to CEDA's gradual "morph" away from Howe's vision. Now, an observer in the final round of the NDT or CEDA Nationals would observe little, if any, significant differences between the two formats. Ziegelmuller observes "theoretical issues similar to those that plagued NDT debate ten or more years ago are often the focus of current CEDA contests . . . CEDA had even developed much of the same kind of elitism for which NDT has often been criticized" (1990, 27). To borrow from history, these "developments" have caused some to observe that CEDA has "met the enemy and they are us!"

Competitive forensics had come full circle. The "rhetorical sensitivity" model, advanced by the visionary Jack Howe, had been tried and it had ultimately failed. Adapting persuasive arguments to a more generalized audience context, and thus building a broader understanding and impact for the message, the underpinning assumption of the rhetorical model, seemed doomed to failure. Was it the end of the debate? No, for as soon as CEDA began to introduce rule and policy changes that engendered a more research-intensive style (e.g. the shift from value to policy resolutions and one resolution per academic year rather than one per semester) the move to create alternative competitive formats was launched. The NPDA then entered the forensic venue with its complete abandonment of traditional research and an extensive, rhetorically-based delivery model. Within a very few short seasons, the move to NPDA was in full swing. Tournaments offering NPDA were overwhelmed with entries. NPDA had become so popular that last year's National Finals Tournament was forced to adopt a system of "qualifying" based upon the order of entry and then to a number of slots per program to accommodate the resources of the tournament host. This year's NPDA National Tournament was