

delivery rather than evidence and strategy. I was told I was not wanted too often to disbelieve it." Another respondent offers the conclusion: "Females and students of color are chilled by the environment of verbal hostility and obscene language." We know the solutions to the incivility problem: We need to implement tournament speech doctrines and teach students strategies for countering verbal aggression. We need to bring audience back into the tournament round, and particularly the debate round, by diversifying judging tools and empowering ourselves and others to function as *educator-critics*. We need to re-center the forensic activity in argumentation rather than display-effect. We need to do more work, like this conference, which models dialogue across difference.

One of the traditional strengths of Pi Kappa Delta has been a willingness to incorporate innovation, as Larry Norton's *The History of Pi Kappa Delta, 1913-1987* documents wonderfully. To bring the competitive tournament into better congruence with the challenges of this moment in history, we should consider both incremental and systemic changes. First, we have the opportunity to bring a much more diverse array of individual events into the tournament framework. Someone could, for example, sponsor an event entitled "Dissent" which would invite students to advocate a position in direct response to an opposing artifact. The event could be extemporaneous or prepared, and designed to emphasize strategies for civil disagreement. Others might sponsor thematic interpretation events, perhaps choosing for a single tournament or a semester to focus on literature from various cultural voices which explores the theme of self and other. Another innovation might revamp persuasion at a given tournament to emphasize audience adaptation; senior division students might, in each panel, conduct a group interview of their judge in Round I. In Round II, scheduled at a time to allow reasonable preparation, students would present their prepared speeches to that same judge, having incorporated whatever adaptations they chose. The ballot might be modified to include some indication of whether the speech succeeded in changing the judge's belief or attitude in any way. Such an innovation would emphasize communication as dialogic, rather than monologic (Hiley, 1996, p. 13); it would emphasize persuasion as not simply beautiful display, but as just consideration of the other.

All of these ideas are incremental changes, to which your response might be: (1) That's a lot of work for students. (2) There's not room in a tournament for more events. (3) Students won't enter something they're only going to do one time. Granted, modifying event rules at some tournaments does demand more from some students. This might be a healthy change. At present, our activity is bound by a one-size, fits-all approach. Events are defined by boundary setting rules (10 minutes, memorized, etc.) rather than by objectives we hope will be accomplished at novice, junior, and senior levels of competition. Perhaps we would want to do some systemic thinking about the vertical integration of forensic education: The basic definition and corresponding objectives might be a good starting point for novices. Could we articulate more advanced objectives and boundaries for juniors? Might we offer more experimental and "stretching" events for seniors? (Considering the possibility that one could begin as an orator as a high school freshman, what is the rationale for essentially the same event eight years later as a college senior?)

There is room for innovation in tournaments if we consider change by substitution rather than change by accretion. More local tournaments could

break out of the comprehensive menu model, the model which "requires" offering all AFA/NFA events plus two or three forms of debate every weekend. Regional or province committees could work as consortia to plan a menu of offerings for a term or a year that would meet objectives desired at the local level. For example, choosing a scientific theme for a limited preparation event category, and inviting a guest scientist to address the tournament audience at a seminar, might be valued above hosting impromptu on a given weekend. Such a specialty offering, if publicized in advance, might also serve as an opportunity for each college forensics program in the region to do outreach to its own science departments (who often want their students to develop stronger communication skills) by inviting student scientists to prepare for and compete in that weekend's event. Another tournament might sponsor a discussion event centered around male and female leadership styles and incorporate viewing of Laura Liswood's film, *Women World Leaders*, as a kick-off or present copies of her book as awards. (Liswood, head of the Women's Leadership Project in Washington, D.C., is the only person to have interviewed the fifteen living national women presidents and prime ministers. Her film, presented at the International Women's Conference in Beijing, is now in distribution to educational institutions.) Such an event would address issues of pluralism and also might be an outreach opportunity to bring more women students to a forensic tournament. Special preparation events such as these might be attractive to students who cannot travel every weekend due to work or family commitments—students who otherwise might be discouraged about having to compete against those who've been doing their speeches at tournaments week after week. Perhaps many of our students who have been nurtured by the present "nationals bound" system are disinclined to enter one-time-only events (although I've always found that those who do have a great experience), but the key may be that a *different* set of students would be interested in such opportunities if they were encouraged. In short, we might choose to substitute one additional opportunity for "a leg" in order to try to accomplish goals of access, outreach, and diversity.

We can also continue to make a place for innovations in forms and formats for debate that strengthen its role in developing citizen-orators. In particular, we need to maintain (or reassert) the importance of the exigence of the resolution in academic debate. Parliamentary debate drifts to the sophistic rather than the rhetorical when resolutions have no exigence (e.g., "This House believes it is better in the dark."). NDT and CEDA drift to a strange form of dialectical ritual when the resolution vanishes. We might also envision occasional debate formats in which debaters must engage in cooperative problem-solving and present their consensual conclusions for evaluation.

Even if reformed incrementally or systemically, is the vehicle of the competitive tournament sufficient for accomplishment of the mission of forensic education? Pi Kappa Delta has strongly answered "no" to that question. Consider the distinctive elements of the organization and the national tournament-convention: Membership includes the orders of forensic communication, alumni and instruction. Community service is included as a criterion for advancement in degrees. Outstanding chapter awards at the Province and National level are based on a combination of competitive excellence, high membership activity, and achievement of noteworthy campus and community projects.

As this organization works to discern its distinctive place in the midst of the broader forensic community, however, where tournament success speaks

so forcefully, we might consider how the voice of Pi Kappa Delta could speak more loudly on behalf of non-competitive forensic activities. Do we present outstanding chapter awards as a major highlight of the national convention? Are the awards for service, fellowship, and scholarship as impressive, or even more impressive, than those for tournament success? Is a biennial rather than annual national convention an important protection of local chapter time and resources for campus and community projects? How do we communicate chapter achievements to the national membership? I hope that *The Key* will become a vehicle for publication of non-competitive accomplishments and opportunities. For example, this publication could help the membership to become more aware of how to participate in Campus Compact service activities, or of the resources of the A. Craig Baird Center for Public Advocacy and Debate, or of the work of the DebateWatch project. The publication can also be a forum for dissemination of innovations in tournament practice.

I have invited you to think today about a few ideas that mark this organization as distinctive within the broader forensic community and about a few other ideas that might strengthen the mission and practice of forensics. Competition is and will remain a key motivation in our activity. Educational mission—training citizen-orators for the 21st century—needs to be the driving force and determinative end of our work. Only then will our programs fit well within the speech communication departments that should be their homes; only then will our programs fit comfortably at the center of liberal arts colleges rather than teetering on the peripheral high-wire.

In January, I had the opportunity to visit the Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia. The Center, as I'm sure most presidential libraries and monuments know, highlights the many accomplishments of Jimmy and Rosalyn Carter. The largest and most central image there, however, is a nearly life-size photograph of the Carters' walk down Pennsylvania Avenue on inauguration day. It is a walk of confidence, of hope, of new initiatives. Since metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies, I choose the confident walk to public leadership, rather than the treacherous walk of the tightrope act, as the guiding metaphor for forensics education. In this context, wider is better.

Works Cited

- Bartanen, Kristine M. (1996) "A Preliminary Assessment of the Professional Climate of Forensic Education, Part I." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 81: 4; 1-20.
- Bartanen, Kristine and James Hanson (1994). "Advocating Humane Discourse." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 80: 1; 16-22.
- Clark, Donald Lemen. (1957). *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ferryberry, Bob R. (1994). "Keynote Address." In *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference*, March 17, 1993, edited by Edward S. Inch.
- Enninger, Douglas. (1974). *Influence, Belief, and Argument*. Glenview: Scott Foresman.
- Freedman, James O. (1996). *Idealism and Liberal Education*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Guernsey, Lisa. (1996) "Penn Names 48 to National Commission to Combat Incivility in American Life." *Academe Today* (<http://chronicle.com>): 12/09/96-04.
- Hiley, David R. (1996). "The Democratic Purposes of General Education." *Liberal Education* 82: 1; 20-25.
- Liswood, Laura A. (1995). *Women World Leaders*. London: Harper Collins.
- McBath, James H., ed. (1975). *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*. Skokie: National Textbook Company.
- McMillen, Liz. (1996). "Scholars Gather to Ponder the State of U.S. Democracy." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 11, 1996, p. A16.
- Minnich, Elizabeth K. (1995). *Liberal Learning and the Arts of Connection for the New Academy*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Norton, Larry. (1988). *The History of Pi Kappa Delta, 1913-1987*. Henry, IL: M&D Printing.
- "Regents Honor Memory of A. Craig Baird with New Center and Named Professorship." (1996). *The Iowa Gazette*. Iowa City: Department of Communication Studies of The University of Iowa.
- Shaping the Future: New Expectations for Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology*. (1996). Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
- Thomas, David A. and Stephen C. Wood. (eds.) (1993). *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall Hunt.

WHY SHOULD LOCAL CHAPTERS SUPPORT THE NATIONAL TOURNAMENT?

Bob R. Derryberry
Southwest Baptist University

Article based upon a paper presented at the Pi Kappa Delta Professional Developmental Conference, March 19, 1997, Northern Kentucky University

A CONSIDERATION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DIMENSIONS

The longevity and strength of Pi Kappa Delta are often attributed to the vitality of local chapters and the success of the national convention-tournaments. Historically, from the origin of the fraternity's roots of 1913, clear recognition has been given to the necessity of establishing and maintaining chapters that are active locally as well as nationally.

The early literature and commentary of Pi Kappa Delta emphasized the perspective that responsibilities must be assumed by local chapters to fulfill dual categories of obligations. For example, in the March, 1937 issue of *The Forensic*, editor Alfred Westfall set forth the duties of the "good chapter." Within his listing of obligations of the local unit, he noted that the chapter should plan and carry through a well balanced forensic program which will bring opportunity to as many students as possible" (p. 97). This early forensic educator also observed that because the chapter is a part of the national organization, its obligations must include goals such as "attending the national conventions and taking part in them." For the chapter to be "healthy," he said, it "should function on its own campus and contribute something to the national organization to help it to grow and function" (p. 98).

As today's fraternity sponsors and participants look beyond the time-honored admonition to maintain active chapters, major dimensions of Pi Kappa Delta affiliation require careful attention. Certainly, no aspect of fraternity participation is more critical than the choice of involvement in the national tournament. Particularly, since decisions surrounding participation are so demanding for the local chapter, they require constant review and evaluation. Thus, the objective of this discussion will focus upon the potential benefits and possible disadvantages to consider in the decision making surrounding involvement in the national tournament.

POSITIVE ASPECTS FROM THE CHAPTER PERSPECTIVE

The Link with Tradition

As a director of forensics, one of my most important reasons for emphasizing participation in the Pi Kappa Delta National has to be the opportunity for the local chapter to experience being a part of a larger forensic picture. Certainly, the individual speech team receives stimulation from its own traditions, travel, and service dimensions; but the experience of the national develops a fraternal appreciation that is not possible in isolation. As Don Swanson noted in 1993, the national involves more than a national tournament. "It is," he said, "a celebration of all our forensic efforts, energies, aspirations, and accomplishments over the past two years" (p. 1).

A Part of Forensic Evolution

A second benefit of the Pi Kappa Delta Tournament-Convention from the chapter perspective is the opportunity to participate in the evolution of forensics at a national level. Just as participants bring unique talents and preparation perspectives to share in competition, the total atmosphere of the tournament-convention affects the forensic perspectives of competing speakers and the programs they represent. In his definition of the national experience, Swanson described the dynamic exchange associated with the convention when he wrote in 1993: "We perform, celebrate, analyze and modify the art of forensics at this biannual event" (p. 1). Edward Inch, echoing the same influence of the national competition of 1995, wrote: "They [the national tournament and convention] define who we are as a community and what we represent. PKD is more than a tournament and convention, it is an experience that helps shape who we are" (p. 1).

Exposure to Forensic Diversity

The national tournament offers a wide range of forensic competition. Even though the fraternity was originally established for the purpose of providing recognition and mutual support for debaters and orators, the organization has now grown to include all standard individual events plus different types of debate.

Additionally, the Pi Kappa Delta National demonstrates the organization's willingness to incorporate new events and even experimental choices. The 1993 convention, for example, offered student congress, the 1995 tournament incorporated parliamentary debate, and the 1997 invitation brought back group discussion as a competitive event. Thus, the actual experiences of chapter members continue to be challenged and enriched by a combination of new and traditional forensic options.

Team Building and Inclusiveness

From a chapter's perspective, the Pi Kappa Delta National offers the opportunity to develop and reinforce the concept of team. Despite current trends toward fragmentation within the forensic community, the Pi Kappa Delta Tournament demonstrates a commitment to hosting a variety of forensic events in a single setting that allows development and reward of diversity. Particularly, since the national tournament schedule allows a student to enter both debate and individual events, the two dimensions can be pulled together in a team effort.

Further, the Pi Kappa Delta National reflects a chapter viewpoint as it invites and encourages all team members to make a commitment and contribution to their squad's success. In contrast to some forensic contests, Pi Kappa Delta entries are not based upon prior win records or specified finishes. Although chapters may exercise their own qualifying standards, the national organization remains "chapter supportive" as it allows speakers who earn membership to compete.

From still another viewpoint, the national tournament has the potential to limit squad fragmentation. Individualism and responsibility remain important goals, but they can be united in teamwork for the national effort where all prepared chapter members can contribute. The resulting emphasis upon teamness can have a lasting influence upon chapter members who perceive themselves as a part of a united effort. As noted by this writer in a prior presentation of 1995, "the commitment of a group to its team status exerts a strong influence upon local program development" (p. 14). Such a quality also "permeates and improves many program dimensions" (p. 14).

Benefits of the Multiple Awards Tradition

The Pi Kappa Delta Tournament practice of presenting excellent and superior awards to the top ten and the next twenty percent of event finishers and teams with similar records offers numerous advantages. As a chapter-team works for a squad achievement, the multiple awards tradition encourages team goals and performance. For the individual speaker, the award system can mean that competition is preserved within the broader frameworks of fraternity and teamwork. Not only do chapters and individual speakers benefit from the system that allows multiple awards, but the practice also reinforces the Pi Kappa Delta tradition at local and province tournaments as well.

It is helpful to recall that the system of rewarding competitors and chapters for excellent and superior performances at the national tournament has developed through years of forensic deliberation. Specifically, the history of Pi Kappa Delta's award practices has included the recognition of individuals and team places with trophies, certificates and medals. It has also reflected trends, compromises and the adoption of new policies that benefit speakers and chapters. As Larry Norton explains in *The History of Pi Kappa Delta 1913-1987* (1987), the excellent-superior certificate policy fully emerged in 1961, and the procedure continued until 1985 when hardware replaced certificates for the same levels of achievement (p. 179).

Importantly, for today's speakers, the awards system continues to support competitors as it preserves and reflects the Pi Kappa Delta tradition. A student from my own team typifies the reactions of numerous competitors when he states: "I prefer the PKD practice of presenting multiple awards because the tradition tells us that we are competitors while we are also working as a team within a fraternity." The official 1997 National Convention Tournament Invitation also reflected the same goal when it formally announced the procedure for determining awards at the national:

Gold plaques will be awarded to individual and team winners of superior ratings (top 10%) in each individual and debate event. Silver plaques will be awarded to individual and team winners of excellent ratings (next 20%) in each individual and debate event. (p. 4)

Capstone Tournament

No listing of features of the national tournament is complete without mention of how the tournament functions as a capstone forensic experience. For many programs and speakers, the Pi Kappa Delta National is the last tournament of the academic year, and it serves as the culmination of fraternity participation for many undergraduate competitors. For others, it marks the final competition for the entire squad, even though specific individuals or teams may compete in other national settings.

POTENTIAL PITFALLS FOR LOCAL CHAPTERS

Despite the successes and educational features of the Pi Kappa Delta National from the chapter viewpoint, a number of challenges-disadvantages continue to confront individual speech programs as they function as part of the Pi Kappa Delta National. From my experience, I mention a number of problem areas along with brief suggestions for enhancing the national tournament experience.

Cost of Tournament Participation

Since a number of panels have devoted attention to the issue of cost associated with the Pi Kappa Delta National, the topic is given only brief discussion in this presentation. However, no treatment of potential pitfalls is complete without recognizing the ongoing problem of the heavy expense associated with participation in the national tournament.

Responding in an informal discussion via the Internet, Scott Jensen (1997) recently stressed that one of the most critical issues facing our fraternity "is keeping our organization and its many services affordable for the

membership." Jensen mentioned numerous ideas for increasing revenues and saving important fraternity dollars. "The bottom line," he said, "is that everything must be considered negotiable. We must be willing to examine ourselves and make hard choices." My agreement must also stress an examination and promotion of the national tournament's best features as a partial response to the perceived problem of excessive costs.

Despite its simplicity, my initial suggestion calls for a stronger emphasis upon the uniqueness of the Pi Kappa Delta philosophy that must pervade the tournament experience. I believe that our fraternity can better articulate and "sell" the mission and advantages of its national tournament. While always remaining open to any improvement, the tournament-convention should impress upon the Pi Kappa Delta membership its special goals and purposes. Instead of merely emulating other national contests, specific tournament and fraternity distinctives must be identified and better communicated to chapter supporters and potential programs in recruitment. Additionally, I must also contend that the cost issue will diminish as a disadvantage as chapter feedback and participation increase through involvement in planning and evaluating the national tournament experience.

Specifically, the issue of cost can be appraised and understood more comprehensively through continued open discussion, tournament evaluations, and opportunities for dialogue via publications and Internet conversations. The clarification and promotion of the Pi Kappa Delta National as including more than a tournament is also vital in understanding the issue of cost.

Limitations upon Student Entries

Limitations upon the number of individual events a speaker or interpreter may enter can easily become a problem that is closely linked to the issue of tournament costs. Since the price for the tournament in terms of fees, travel and days spent away from classes is expensive, most coaches and participants want to make the most of the national tournament experience. For the members of my team, the limitations upon the number of events, especially in pattern A, are particularly restrictive.

With the freedom to enter at least two events per competition pattern, some students would have the opportunity to participate in one additional event that they develop throughout the academic year. Others may be able to gain valuable experience in preparing a late year event for the Pi Kappa Delta tournament while also enhancing their team's participation.

Confusion Accompanying Event-Philosophy Determination

Although Pi Kappa Delta leadership endeavors to remain sensitive to the ever-changing world of forensics, the determination of individual event and debate options for the national tournament can become a participation barrier for the local chapter. The tournament offerings with accompanying justifications can be especially troubling if particular philosophical stances are perceived to accompany administrative choices.

Specifically, chapters need to be able to understand and promote the Pi Kappa Delta National as an educational experience that provides a balance between standard forensic event expectations and the unique features of Pi Kappa Delta. Such a balance is not easily achieved.

Decisions regarding tournament offerings and their rationale for inclusion require constant and sensitive evaluation. Of course, the "forensic pain"

associated with tournament choices becomes more evident when the wide scope of interests within the fraternity is considered. Ed Inch, while planning the tournament of 1995, reflected upon the diversity of thought within the organization when he wrote in 1994: "It has been said in recent years that our tournament has attempted to follow other national organizations rather than lead" (p. 42). He revealed his basis for decision making, especially about individual events, when he explained:

At one level, I think we should lead the forensics community rather than try to emulate what every other national tournament does. But, at another level, I think that providing our members with "more bang for the buck" makes sense. If students can attend our tournament AND qualify for another, then shouldn't we give them that opportunity? (p. 42)

As he planned the tournament, Inch also raised questions about elimination rounds, types of debate, and topics utilized for competition.

My position as a coach and chapter sponsor is that questions about debate categories, individual event options, novel event experiments, and the assignment of value for entries in determining team awards must receive broad and open discussion. While a consensus requires patience, time and communication, the openness and resulting decisions can underscore the participatory feature of the fraternity. Further, the tournament director should not face such questions alone. Deliberate and ongoing attention by the Kappa Delta National Council backed by the feedback responses of local chapters can be helpful in formulating tournament offerings.

Certainly, the recent undertaking to change the tournament invitation to include a formal set of guidelines can help reduce confusion while communicating the national's policies, standards and procedures. However, with the creation of a formal tournament publication, practices must remain open for systematic study and review. From the chapter viewpoint, an understanding of all tournament dimensions such as event guidelines, number of entries allowed, debate options, and eligibility of competitors requires careful and ongoing communication.

Inadequate Sweepstakes Boundaries

From my viewpoint as an educator and coach, a significant liability of the Kappa Delta National is the lack of a clear and reasonable limit upon the number of debate entries that may be counted in the overall sweepstakes awards competition. While the fraternity has taken clear steps in building an equitable structure for calculating points earned in individual events, debate entry possibilities remain almost open-ended. Thus, with the tournament structure of 1997, a competing college or university could enter any number of debate units that meet judging requirements with the understanding that approximately eighteen of those may count toward a squad's overall sweepstakes achievement record.

My position is that while numerous teams may be allowed to compete, only a reasonable number (five, six, or even eight) should be allowed to count toward sweepstakes awards. With this approach, team-chapter finishes would have a better chance of being based upon competitive achievement rather than upon the number of competitors a program may enter in the tournament. In

other words, a reasonable boundary would make the "forensic playing field" a fair arena for all participants.

Judging Diversity

As a coach and evaluator of forensic competition, I often hear descriptions of judging associated with particular tournaments and philosophies. For example, I note that some adjudicators are described as "CEDA judges," others are labeled "IE judges," and some even receive the designation of "PKD judges." Since Pi Kappa Delta is composed of a wide variety of programs with different forensic perceptions, diverse judging preferences are apparent and expected at nationals.

Some competitors and coaches may view the variety of judging orientations as a negative aspect of the Pi Kappa Delta National. While a broad range of judging philosophies may initially signal uncertainty for some speakers, the diversity can contribute to the overall growth of contestants. Throughout the tournament experience, speakers have opportunities to receive a variety of feedback from "lay" and "professional" judges who populate the judging pool. In an atmosphere of forensic diversity, competitors become aware of critic perspectives that encourage or require adaptation. Additionally, they may experience an environment that allows forensic innovations that may not be possible at some tournaments. In a sense, one could argue that a setting such as the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament is an appropriate place to attain the freedom suggested by Jeanine Congalton and Clark Olson (1995) when they discuss the art-science approaches to individual events; they write: "Competitors should not be denied the opportunity to introduce new ways of practicing old events. Simultaneously, judges must be willing to empower competitors to explore creative expression in competition" (p. 16). Certainly, Pi Kappa Delta can serve as a "forensic home" for a variety of judging perspectives. In doing so, it can encourage an atmosphere of freedom and learning for competitors and judges. By recognizing and utilizing diversity, inaccurate assumptions toward judging can also be modified or changed through the tournament experience.

CONCLUSION

This paper has focused upon involvement in the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament as a chapter-team responsibility. In assessing the national from the chapter perspective, numerous benefits are highlighted including involvement in a tradition and the on-going evolution of forensics. The advantages of exposure to forensic diversity, opportunities for team building, and the positive award structure of the tournament are also examined.

Since an important dimension of the fraternity's strength rests with the individual chapter, a number of potential pitfalls affecting local programs are discussed. These include the expense of participation, limitations upon entries, potential barriers posed by forensic offerings or the sweepstakes structure, and a possible misunderstanding of judging diversity.

As an educator and long-time supporter of Pi Kappa Delta, this writer quickly affirms that benefits from the chapter viewpoint far outweigh encountered disadvantages. Still, problems exist that chapters can best identify. This paper has endeavored to emphasize that such problems deserve careful attention to preserve and enhance the competitive-fraternity experience of participants.