

and its focus be placed on technical argument (for that would mean dispensing with the many benefits it offers), but rather it suggests that the skills developed within forensics programs might be expanded to include a greater emphasis on dialogic skills. Differing from viewpoints that privilege either dialectic or dialogic modes of communication, this author supports a both-and orientation that recognizes the potential for dialectic and dialogic modes of discourse to complement and inform one another. For example, the research skills used in competitive styles of debate can contribute to well-informed dialogue on a given issue. Similarly, honing the dialogic skill of listening to understand can further enrich and complicate competitive debate. Being continuously self-reflexive about how we train advocates encourages us to draw upon the enabling aspects of perspectives that will inform pedagogy that is ever-evolving to meet the needs of both students and the public at large.

REFERENCES

- Bruner, M. L. (1996). Producing Identities: Gender Problematisation and Feminist Argumentation. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 32: 185-198.
- Corcoran, J. (1988). *An Introduction to Non-Policy Debating*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Crenshaw, C. (1995). The Arguer's Identity: A Feminist Perspective on the Practice of Argumentation Theory. *Speaker and Gavel* 32.1-4: 13-25.
- Crenshaw, C. (1996). The Normality of Man and Female Otherness: (Re)Producing Patriarchal Lines of the Argument in the Law in and the News. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 32 : 171-184.
- Foss, S. K. & Griffin, C.L. (1995). Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for Invitational Rhetoric. *Communication Monographs* 62: 2-18.
- Fulkerson, R. (1996). Transcending Our Conception of Argument in Light of Feminist Critiques. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 32: 199-217.
- Gearhart, S. M. (1979) The Womanization of Rhetoric. *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 2: 195-201.
- Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Goodnight, G. T. (1987). Public Discourse. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4: 428-432.
- Hauser, G. A. (1987) Features of the Public Sphere. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4 : 437-441.
- Hawes, L. C. (1999) The Dialogics of Conversations: Power, Control, Vulnerability. *Communication Theory* 93: 229-264.
- Holub, R. C. (1991) *Jürgen Habermas: Critic in the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Hyde, B. & Bineham, J. L. (2000) From Debate to Dialogue: Toward a Pedagogy of Nonpolarized Public Discourse. *Southern Communication Journal* 65: 208-223.
- Jarrett, S. C. (1991). *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Makau, J. M. (1990) *Reasoning and Communication: Thinking Critically About Arguments*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Makau, J. M. (1992) Revisioning the Argumentation Course. *Women's Studies in Communication* 15 : 79-91.
- Mallin, I. & Anderson, K. V. (2000) Inviting Constructive Argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36 : 120-133.
- McPhail, M. L. (1996) *Zen in the Art of Rhetoric: An Inquiry into Coherence*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mifsud, M. L. & Johnson, S. D. (2000). Dialogic, Dialectic, and Rhetoric: Exploring Human Dialogue Across the Discipline. *Southern Communication Journal* 65: 91-104.
- Mitchell, G. R.(1998) Pedagogical Possibilities for Argumentative Agency in Academic Debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35: 41-60.
- Mitchell, G. R.(2000) Simulated Public Argument as a Pedagogical Play on Worlds. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36: 134-150.
- Palczewski, C. H. (1996) Argumentation and Feminisms: An Introduction. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 32: 161-169.
- Panetta, E. M. (1990) A Rational for Developing a Nationally Competitive National Debate Tournament Oriented Program. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 27: 68-77.
- Phillips, K. R. (1996) The Spaces of Public Dissension: Reconsidering the Public Sphere. *Communication Monographs* 63: 231-248.
- Putnam, R. D.(1995) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6.1: 65-78.
- Schiappi, E. & Keehner, M. F. (1990) The Promise of Cross Examination Debate Association. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 27: 78-85.
- Starhawk. (1988). *Dreaming the Dark*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stewart, J. & Zediker, K. (2000) Dialogue as Tensional, Ethical Practice. *Southern Communication Journal* 65: 224-242.
- Tannen, D. (1998). *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Weiss, R. O. (1995). *Public Argument*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America,
- Williams, D. E. & McGee, B. R. (2000) Negotiating a Change in the Argumentation Course: Teaching Cooperative Argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36: 105-109.
- Wood, J. T. (1992). Gender and Moral Voice: Moving from Women's Nature to Standpoint Theory. *Women's Studies in Communication* 15: 1-24.
- Wood, J. T. (1994). *Who Cares? Women, Care, and Culture*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ziegelmüller, G. W. & Kay, J. (1997). *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.



Community, socialization, and judge inclusivity: Why Academic Debate should broaden its judging pool horizons

ANDREW BUTLER, MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

The forensics communities have studied the role of their judges, specifically within the area of intercollegiate policy debate. One subject is the role of "lay-judges" within the policy debate community. The purpose of this article is to argue that the policy debate community is not particularly accessible to members of other academic disciplines. The article suggests that one way to expand the debate community is to include outside voices and thoughts through increasing the number of judges from academic communities outside debate.

Purpose

Forensic scholarship has always attempted to discern, evaluate, and critique the role of "debate judge." Researchers have attempted to try and understand judges' paradigms on debate by using a broad range of procedures. From looking at ballots to judging philosophy sheets, researchers attempted to construct an overall theoretical basis for debate (Henderson & Boman, 1983; Cox, 1974; Brey 1989; Brey, 1990). Each of these works makes a point of studying judges within the debate community. While this is a valid goal, there must be as much attention placed on the ability to reach out beyond the formal debate community to find critics. If the final goal of the community is to have an increased relationship with the rest of the academic world, this paper argues that the community needs to look at expanding the scope of judging to include members from outside the debate community. Using theories on community and socialization, the argument is made that the debate community uses socialization to train judges to understand its rules, jargon, practices, nuances, and things of the like. This social training makes it difficult for people within the debate community to accept someone from outside the community as a reasonable critic. This paper examines three pertinent areas for this topic: 1) a discussion of community and how debate matches sociological definitions of community; 2) the issue of diversity and how logical diversity should be just as essential a goal as diversity among debaters is; both are key issues; and both seek to draw people from different backgrounds into the activity; and 3) a discussion about issues of socialization and how the debate community uses socialization to educate judges by creating certain norms. This section will also discuss the impact these norms have on the problem of judge inclusivity.

*ANDREW BUTLER is a 1995 graduate of Middle Tennessee State University, served as Graduate Assistant Debate Coach for MTSU, and is presently an adjunct instructor at MTSU.

Debate as a community

Community has been studied in the sociological tradition as early as 1887 in Ferdinand Tonnies' book, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tonnies looked at the local community (*gemeinschaft*) versus the larger society (*gesellschaft*). Community theory based on that thinking dominated the basis for the most prominent American sociological theories (Lyon, 1987). According to Lyon (1987), "The concept of community was so central to early American sociology that [an] outline of the development of community theory and research is in many ways an outline of American sociology as well" (p. 8).

Jones (1995) found that "definitions of community have largely centered around the unproblematic notion of place, a 'where' that social scientists can observe, visit, stay, and go. Their observations had largely been formed by examination of events, artifacts, and social relations within distinct geographic boundaries" (p. 19). The geographical idea of community is most commonly studied, but a second way of viewing community emerged. Stamm (1985) believed that the least investigated element of community was looking at the concept as a process. This process can be the interaction and socialization among the people in the community or a shared interest or common endeavor among people (Follett, 1919). It is on this element that this work will focus. This author argues that the debate activity is a community and that it illustrates how the community creates and builds norms through the socialization process.

Rubin (1983) described five areas that help define communities, and these five elements can also be used to define the debate community as a community. Rubin suggested that a community is not required to be bound by geographic location. Additionally, he argued that community's main function was to act as a mediator between the individual and society. Also, people could relate to their societies through both geographic and non-geographic substructures or communities.

Rubin (1983) identified five structural characteristics that need to exist in a community to mediate relations between an individual and society. These include five characteristics: an intermediate size, key institutional settings, relative stability, concreteness, and significant primary and secondary interaction. These characteristics and how they relate to the debate community are where this paper begins its analysis.

The first characteristic was that the community must be an intermediate size. It must be both small or contained enough to give people a sense of community and large enough to help them feel like they are part of a broader social structure (Rubin, 1983). That broader social structure is something a smaller group cannot offer because it is too small to sustain that type of social structure. The debate community is small enough to maintain a sense of community amongst themselves and large enough to connect them with the broader academic community.

Rubin's (1983) second requirement was a community's focus on institutional settings. Rubin argued that this focus must "[convey] to its members a sense of significant incorporation in society via membership in the organization" (p. 57). Debate institutions rely on organizations within the community to determine standards for its debaters, judges, and other participants. They set the rules for debate programs to follow. The order that Rubin discusses happens through the individual debate institutions.

Third, the community must have a certain level of stability (Rubin, 1983). It must have been in existence for a long time, the members must have been associated with it during their lives, and it must be important to them. A community thrives on people continuing their desire to be a part of the community. Debate, in its present competitive co-curricular form, has been stable; it goes back at least to the mid-20th century. An example of its longevity can be seen by George Musgrave's book, *Competitive Debate*, being published in 1945.

Fourth, the community must have some a clear social structure (Rubin, 1983). It cannot just be an interest-based community (a group linked a common interest). The interest they share connects them more than the people with the interest do. In a community, people must also be able to interact, identify, and connect with each other (Rubin, 1983). Additionally, the people in the community interact with each other regularly. People inside this community are people who devote their lives to the well-being of this community and that devotion is what connects them.

Fifth, Rubin (1983) argued that there must be significant primary and secondary interaction occurring in the community. Members of the debate community have interaction through the attendance at debate tournaments over weekends, at yearly conferences like the National Communication Association and on the Internet with the email-discussion group: e-debate.

This prelude of discovering what community is acts to briefly incorporate academic debate into community theory. If part of the function of a community is a "process," as Stamm argues, then potential socialization patterns that exist within this particular community must be investigated. The thesis here is that evidence of these patterns can be illustrated, and within the debate community, that is done most prominently through the role of the debate judge in the community.

The problem of judge diversity

There are renewed efforts to increase diversity in competitive debate. There are efforts to increase access to debate for people who might not have it otherwise. The Open Society Institute and Urban Debate Leagues across the country have emerged and have become a vital source of debater inclusiveness within the activity (Wade, 1998; Berger, 1998). These programs target not only minorities, but also

other youth around the country. These efforts are just the latest ones in an attempt to promote inclusivity in intercollegiate debate; they are meant to bring a more diverse group into high school and collegiate debate. These diversity-based programs do a tremendous job in "growing debate" in terms of both providing experienced leadership to high school programs that may need it and to introduce debate to students who might not have the opportunity to participate in it.

While programs like the aforementioned ones promote diversity among debaters, a different kind of diversity is consistently denied: the diversity of judges. By judge diversity, this work specifically refers to the background of the judge. This level of diversity is just as important as debater diversity, but it is widely forgotten in the NDT and the CEDA organizations. Debate scholarship has discussed the "lay judge" and their importance for at least 30 years. There is a view that the judge/critic "is to further the educational goals of debate. A pressing question is how to select qualified judges in order to insure that the activity accomplishes the purposes for which it was designed" (Cox & Honse, 1991, p. 49). In fact, most invitations to college policy debate tournaments state that schools must bring "qualified" judges to accompany teams to tournaments. There are two implications for the concept of "qualified." First, there is no universal standard for a qualified judge. It can vary from tournament to tournament. Qualified could mean the number of debate rounds that someone has judged in the past, but a tournament where the standard is this specific is rare. A second issue is whether or not the term "qualified" is a function of background. Most debate critics have a background in the activity. They have most likely had debate experience in high school and/or college and are now coaching (or have coached) academic debate. Would someone from outside of the "debate community" be qualified to judge at a tournament? The discussion and answers about this question seem mixed.

Holm (1940) argued that to be the most effective, judges needed to be trained in the debate activity. This kind of judge would know about debate theory and how to apply that theory and those concepts to each debate round (Flood & Cripe, 1982). Additionally, the obligations and burdens of each side in a debate round and arguments that are embodied in a topic are significant for a debate critic. Does this mean that a critic must understand the nuances of permutation theory to decide a round? Others argue that arguments made by debaters should be able to be evaluated by people both inside and outside the debate community.

As a community, debate judges are expected to know how to evaluate critical arguments and how to measure pre-fiat and post-fiat obligations or the difference between them. Judges have been socialized through contact with debaters in teaching them, contact with fellow coaches, or through their own debate training to be versed in the rules of competitive debate. This author argues that judges are socialized inside of this debate community about areas of jargon (i.e., "T" and "turn"), evaluating arguments (pre- vs. post-fiat), and style

(speed), just to name a few examples. When debaters become graduate assistants and graduate assistants become directors of debate, the bulk of the judging pool in competitive debate is a result of socialization from inside the community. With that socialization process, the community isolates itself from the rest of academia. The practices learned through that socialization make it unlikely that the community will accept a person that either resists attempts of socialization inside the community or one who comes from outside the community. Because the members of the debate community have similar experiences (most come from debate backgrounds), members of this community are more accepting of someone who comes from this same community.

The point of coming from the same community is a powerful issue. The desire to build the bridges between debate and other academic circles is a valid one. By not placing an emphasis on introducing members of academia that are outside the imagined debate community to debate, however, the desire to build these bridges will not lead to sustainable action. The best way to build those bridges is the increased involvement of academia in competitive debate through judging. A way that academia outside the actual debate community can discover the benefits and the efforts of the activity is to participate in evaluating students who work in that activity.

The problem of socialization

Spencer (1970) described the two different perspectives on the issue of socialization:

In the narrower sense, it tends to be confined to the social learning of children, to the processes whereby they acquire the values of adult society so as to participate fully within it. In the broader sense, it may be extended to adults whenever they join a new social group and are expected to acquire a new set of values before participating fully within it and even, logically, to social deviates who have to be taught to conform. (p. 127)

By examining socialization in a broader sense, one can look at the impact socialization can have on the debate community. Specifically, a community can reject debate judges that have not been subjected to the socialization processes of the debate community.

There are conventions or norms that mediate behavior among members of a community. In the debate community, conventions are used to adjudicate debate contests. If the vast majority of the judges are a product of the same community, the argumentative strategies become preconceived ideas of what is accepted as valid argumentation (Gotcher & Greene, 1988). Those ideas are more likely to mirror the argumentative ideas of the debaters that come from the same community because all are the product of the same socialization patterns. Powell (1985) described the theory of socialization by studying editors at two publishing houses:

Socialization theory argues that 'scripts' are laid down for an individual by the groups to which he or she belongs. Both the person's social self and the behavior of others will act out the script, but the script determines most of the appropriate behavior. This argument holds up well for occupations in which there is formal schooling or training, extensive anticipatory socialization, or process of mortification or conversions. (p. 148).

In debate, the community mostly lays down the "scripts." The activity "is bound by rules governing areas like speaker duties, time constraints, speaking order, rebuttal limitations, etc." (Gotcher & Green, 1988). Debate norms are issues above these standard rules. Some examples of these norms include the in-round jargon that was mentioned earlier and stylistic devices; additional research can discover additional examples. For the purposes of this work, "scripts" allow the community the ability to accept critics who follow the same scripts and reject others who do not or choose not to follow those same scripts. This makes the community less likely to accept potential judges coming from outside the debate community. The so-called "lay-judge" is something that is currently nonexistent at "national" circuit tournaments and used sparingly at regional tournaments. Gotcher and Green (1988) argued that "while the representatives of the public realm may be experts in their respective fields, there are no guarantees that they are prepared to fully appreciate the rules governing the debate contest" (p. 91). The denial of entry for judges like these who come from outside the debate community, however, implicitly means that they have little to offer the activity. Can it be that intelligent womyn and men, like university professors and law students from outside the debate community, newspaper reporters, etc., are incapable of giving the activity something by participating in the debate process, but because their "scripts" are different or even blank, they are excluded? This question deserves the debate community's attention.

The height of the socialization process is the suggestion to include these lay judges and educate them about "our" process before they judge their first contest. Biggers and Gotcher (1984) illustrated the tendency toward the education of debate norms in the early years of CEDA. They wrote:

To be an informed listener, it is important that the judge have at least a passing knowledge about current thought on CEDA debate theory. Most of our judging pool (other than coaches and graduate students who are active in the activity) will have had little or no experience with CEDA debate. Many debated years ago, were in programs where they got limited training, were involved in NDT programs, or were only marginally involved in debate anyway. The common denominator is lack of information about what is important in a debate round (p. 81).

The question then and now is: Who decides what is important in a debate round? The argument of this work is that the community

makes those decisions and someone from the outside who thinks differently is seen as wrong. Biggers and Gotcher (1984) believed an informed listener meant a person that understood the community's rules. There should, however, be a shift of thinking from the duty of the judge to change for the activity to the activity growing to accommodate judges' different perspectives from different schools of thought. A debate community-socialized judge can be informed about the current year's topic, but more important, they have knowledge of debate norms or the process of the community. In some ways, this knowledge is even more important than topic knowledge. With knowledge of community norms, then a judge within the socialized community is more likely to better understand the issues surrounding a topic. An example comes when college debaters and coaches judge in high school debate tournaments. The judge from the college debate circuit may be less knowledgeable about the high school debate topic, but they are very knowledgeable about the process of debate. It is their knowledge of the process that makes them attractive to high school programs when they seek judges for their tournaments.

When it comes to the issue of transmitting those community specific processes or norms to others, it is an attempt to educate the outside community about what the debate community calls "our" norms. It might also, however, succeed in limiting the "outsider's" own ideas and informed opinion that they might bring to debate. Without making a transition in thought, the attempts to bridge the gap between people within and outside of this debate community, or "the uninformed and the informed listener" (Biggers and Gotcher, 1984, p. 82) will not happen.

Implications and areas of further research

This research is a beginning acknowledgment in the hard task of promoting debate and its benefits to other academic areas of the university. Those with only a brief glimpse of the activity have their own caricature: people who haul around boxes with sheets of evidence and speak at an incomprehensibly high rate of speed. One way to alter this image in other parts of academia could be the infusion of other academic areas into the debate community. Others will bring their own perspectives and their own experiences into a contest. The possibilities for symbiotic relationships with the rest of academia are something that the debate community will eventually need to examine if the promotion of debate settings in the broader academic world becomes a priority for the existing debate community.

There are limitations to this work. It is neither a qualitative nor a quantitative work. It is a theoretical work that examines past debate scholarship to determine if there were findings consistent with community and socialization theories. This was done in an attempt to discover a method for academic debate to combine efforts with the broader academic world. Qualitative work can be undertaken with any examination of student, coach, and judge attitudes about, and a

desire to have, people from outside the debate community as judges for debate tournaments. A quantitative study would survey the same issues. Other research can examine the presence of socialization inside the debate community and attempt to determine how social learning occurs within the community. This paper argues broadly that social learning comes from having debate judges who are former debaters now acting as judges. The development of certain norms, which were gained as a debater, will continue as debaters move into the role of being a judge. Further research should determine if this pattern exists and if it is consistent with findings in socialization theory.

Conclusion

The argument proffered here is that the debate community and its processes are available to be studied in more detail at some later date. Judges outside the community must be accepted in order for academic debate to have a greater acceptance level in academia, and to increase diversity. Davis (1990) argues that the lack of judges from outside the debate community can reinforce elitist thought, and further, it risks the educational legitimacy of the activity. By examining whom the community uses to adjudicate its competitions, a way can be discovered to involve additional academic departments in the activity and move closer to the goal of promoting debate in a broader realm of academic settings. By broadening the activity to attract judges from other disciplines, it is possible to enhance the reputation of debate throughout the entire academic community. The desire for diversity must be a top priority in both the debating and judging pool; both have equal importance.

REFERENCES

- Biggers, T. & Gotcher, M. (1984). On Consideration of Judging in CEDA Debate Tournaments—A Modest Proposal. *CEDA Yearbook*, 5, 80-83.
- Breger, B. (1998). Building Open Societies Through Debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 19, 66-68.
- Brey, J. (1989). A Descriptive Analysis of CEDA Judging Philosophies Part I: Definitive Acceptance or Rejection of Certain Tactics and Arguments. *CEDA Yearbook*, 10, 67-77.
- Brey, J. (1990). An Analysis of CEDA Judging Philosophies-Part II: Accepting Certain Tactics and Arguments with Reservations. *CEDA Yearbook*, 11, 72-79.
- Cox, E. S. & Honse, T. (1991). Inexperienced and Experienced Debate Judges: Beyond "Name Calling." *CEDA Yearbook*, 12, p. 48-66.
- Cox, R.J. (1974). A Study of Judging Philosophies of the Participants of the National Debate Tournament", *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11, p. 61-71.
- Davis, B. (1990). In Defense of the Lay Judge. *Rostrum (February)*, p. 17-8.
- Flood, R.E. & Cripe, N.M. (1982). *Modern Competitive Debate: A Guide for the Beginning and Intermediate Student*. Amherst, N.Y.: Poppenberg's Press.
- Follett, M.P. (1919). Community is a Process. *Philosophical Review*, 28, 6, 576-588.

- Gotcher J.M. & Green, R.W. (1988). The Role of the Critic and the Audience-Centered Model of Debate" Problems and Possibilities. *CEDA Yearbook*, 9, p. 88-95.
- Henderson, B. & Boman, D. (1983). A Study to Determine if Debate Judges' Judging Philosophy Statements are Consistent with the Later Related Ballot Statements, *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 19, 191-198.
- Holm, J.N. (1940). A Philosophy of Judging Debate. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 1, p. 5-11.
- Jones, S.G. (1995). Understanding community in the information age. In S.G. Jones (Ed.), *Cybersociety: Computer-mediated communication and community* (pp. 10-35). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lyon, L. (1987). *The community in urban society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Powell, W.W. (1985). *Getting into Print: The Decision-Making Process in Scholarly Publishing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rubin, I. (1983). Function and structure of community: Conceptual and theoretical analysis. In R.L. Warren & L. Lyon (Eds.), *New perspectives on the American community* (pp. 54-61). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Spencer, P. (1970). The Function of Ritual in the Socialization of the Samburu Moran. *Socialization: The Approach from Social Anthropology*. (ed. Mayer, P.), 127-157.
- Stamm, K.R. (1985). *Newspaper use and community ties: toward a dynamic theory*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Wade, M.M. (1998). The Case for Urban Debate Leagues. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 19, 60-65.



The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(copy and forward to your library acquisition officer)

Name _____

Department _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Please enter a subscription to **THE FORENSIC** at the subscriber rate of \$20 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription is for a complete series which begins July 1st of each year. At the time of subscription, you will receive all previous issues that have been published during the subscription year.

Check one:

One Year \$20 Two Years \$40 Three Years \$60

On subscriptions outside of the United States, add \$15 per year for foreign postage.

Prices effective through June 30, 2002

Make checks or money orders payable to PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL

Order from your subscription agent or directly from:

Pi Kappa Delta National Headquarters

125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38

Ripon, Wisconsin 54971

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through the National Headquarters

THE HISTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA by Larry Norton

_____ copies @ \$7.50/each

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1998 DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

edited by Robert S. Littlefield - _____ copies @ \$5/each

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1995 DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

edited by Scott Jensen - _____ copies @ \$5/each

Articles from past issues of THE FORENSIC are available upon request.