

one critic. Of course, the size of a panel depends on the assumptions used when developing the schedule.

Because changes in entry are a constant part of managing a tournament, the later the rounds are paneled the better. They will be more accurate. This is a limitation of manual tournaments, however, because they need to be paneled and double checked much sooner than a computer managed tournament. Larger tournaments matched by hand can take days to section and double-check. All the while, every change that comes in affects the panels and can take a great deal of time to adjust and incorporate. Computerized tournaments, however, are much faster to set up the panels. Event lists can be manipulated in seconds and each event should take only a few minutes to process. Apart from the speed advantage in computerized matching, there is no need to conduct a double check of the panels because the computer will not omit or change any name found on the event list.

A. Matching Preliminary Rounds

Setting up preliminary round competition involves a number of considerations. Generally, there are three different philosophies for matching individual events: power, matrix, and random. Power matching individual events is rare because the size of events means that it is difficult to truly put the best people against one another and people in weak panels may advance to the elimination rounds by virtue of being mediocre. People who prefer to power match rounds will begin with one or two randomly sectioned preliminary rounds and then place the best participants together in the third or fourth preliminary round. Generally, I believe, that elimination rounds in individual events are better suited for power-matching. If there is a need for more extensive power matching because of very large entries, using semi-finals and finals is a way to place the best students against one another.

Matrix matching has the advantage of distributing contestants broadly so that they do not meet one another multiple times, it distributes their speaking positions so that they will tend to speak at the beginning middle and end of a panel over three rounds, and it prevents as much as possible people from the same school meeting. Matrix matching involves creating a sectioning grid and then transferring the list of contestants from the events list to the matrix. An example of this follows where there are 24 people in an event. Each number represents the individual's number on the list:

Speaker	Panel 1	Panel 2	Panel 3	Panel 4
1	1	7	13	19
2	20	2	8	14
3	15	21	3	9
4	10	16	22	4
5	5	11	17	23
6	24	6	12	18

The pattern simply lists the contestants in a diagonal from left to right and then works up. Other variations are, of course, possible.¹³ This pattern places members of the same squad in different speaking positions and mixes the speakers on the list so that speakers from the last schools entered will

compete against the first schools entered. Round 2, further rotates the contestants by taking the third speaker in the first panel and then distributing contestants from there by working vertically down the panels. For example:

Speaker	Panel 1	Panel 2	Panel 3	Panel 4
1	15	21	3	9
2	4	10	16	22
3	17	23	5	11
4	6	12	18	24
5	1	7	13	19
6	14	20	2	8

And, round 3, using the same pattern will look like this:

Speaker	Panel 1	Panel 2	Panel 3	Panel 4
1	17	23	5	11
2	24	6	12	18
3	13	19	1	7
4	20	2	8	14
5	15	21	3	9
6	22	4	10	16

This system has the advantage of mixing the contestants well, controlling for conflicts among schools, and giving people the opportunity to speak in different positions. Consider speaker 1, for instance, this speaker in round 1 spoke in the first position, in round 2 the fifth slot, and the third slot in round three. For manually operated tournaments a schematic such as this makes a great deal of sense.

Matrix matching, however, does possess some serious disadvantages. First, it is possible for the matrix to repeat itself. Because it is a pattern, depending on the number of speaking positions, the number of rounds, and the number of panels, rounds may repeat themselves. A second problem is that people entered next to one another in numerical order tends to be protected from meeting one another. In this example, speakers 1 and 2 will never meet which means that depending on the position at entry, some students are protected from ever competing against the best speaker in the tournament. Third, although the idea of giving students different speaking positions may be appealing, double entry makes that goal impractical. Even if a student is slotted to speak third, the odds of that happening greatly diminish if they or other students are double or triple entered.

Perhaps the most serious disadvantage of this system, however, is that because all subsequent rounds are based on the rotation of the first round, following rounds need to be pre-matched before the tournament starts and changes have been made. Adds or drops affect subsequent rounds and may require that the rounds be resectioned. However, once subsequent rounds are resections after changes have been made, then the advantages of matrix rotation are significantly diminished.

Random matching on the other hand is just that. The contestant list is completely scrambled and then the contestants are placed into panels and speaker order. Most tournament directors do not use truly random matching

however. Most tournaments impose constraints on individual matching. Such constraints might include: 1) students should not meet members from their own schools unless no other alternatives exist, 2) students in extemporaneous should not draw the same topics as other members of their school, 3) students from the same region should not meet one another, 4) as much as possible students should not hear a speaker more than once.

Random matching, however, makes no attempt to place a speaker in different speaker positions. Instead of being placed first, middle, and last as in matrix rotation schemes, a randomly matched speaker might occupy any of the speaking positions. Some tournament directors prefer a matrix for this reason. However, double and triple entries largely make this constraint irrelevant and there is little evidence to support that different speaking positions give a contestant a competitive advantage. Brydon and Curtis, for instance, found that speaker position had almost no effect in competitive tournament success.¹⁴

The tournament director also needs to decide what happens when a student fails to show for a round. Many directors choose to record the student as a no show and keep the student in competition. While this has the effect of not upsetting the matrix, the problem is that if the student fails to show in all rounds, the contestants in those panels have an unfair advantage. A preferable approach, I believe, is to drop the student from competition after one no show. With a computer, the rounds are matched individually and a student can be added, dropped, or re-added in a few minutes. The effect of round by round matching is panels that are better balanced with equal numbers of contestants and fewer no-shows.

Regardless of the system employed by a tournament, the staff should be careful to check the panels to ensure that students and judges have not seen one another before in the tournament and that panel distributions are not repeated. Matrix matching is typically used by people who manually match individual events rounds because it is easier to ensure a diversity of competition. The computer is much faster and has the advantage of being able to match and rematch rounds accurately taking into account adds, drops, and changes from the previous round.

B. Judging

The tournament director also needs to decide how judges will be assigned. Judges can be randomly assigned, they can be assigned based on their perceived expertise, and by the number of rounds they owe the tournament. Judges can be assigned on other bases as well. The question the tournament director needs to answer is how many constraints should be placed on the assignment of judges. In answer to this question, there are several pragmatic concerns. First, as much as possible, for every round on a judge should have a round off. Or, if fewer off rounds are available, the off rounds should be rotated among the judges so that everyone eventually gets a break.

A second consideration has to do with hired judges. Hired judges, unlike the typical critic brought by a school, attend a tournament to work. Usually, the more rounds judged, the more money they make. Consequently, using hired judges first makes sense as long as they are not placed in a position of making the tournament run late as they try to get from round to round.

Third, the director needs to decide whether critics should be able to select themselves out of certain events. For instance, if a critic expresses a desire to judge interpretation only, should that request be respected? Again, this depends on the director's view of what the role of the tournament is as an educational vehicle. If the goal of the tournament is to find the best interper, orator, impromptuer, or whatever, then highly specialized and trained judges are more desirable in those events. However, if the goal of the director is to provide the students with a variety of audiences, then a randomly selected judging pool is probably preferable. There are situations, of course, where certain critics should not judge certain students and they should be allowed to recuse themselves. For instance, if someone has a relative competing, it would be inappropriate for them to judge their relative. Similarly, a coach should not critique one of their students.

C. Recording

When the ballots are returned from the round, the process of recording results begins. This can be done any number of ways. In manual systems the results are entered onto contestant charts by hand. It is much easier to use a computer spreadsheet or database because the results can be added and the contestants can be sorted easily based on competitive success. The Tournament Manager is even faster because it displays the panel in speaker order and results can be entered by simply using the ten-key. It is a fast and simple process.

Regardless of the specific procedures, however, the method of recording remains relatively the same. First, the ballots for the entire event are collected and ordered from panel one through the end. Although recording can proceed before all the ballots from an event are in, it is faster and more accurate to process all of the ballots from an event at once. This is a two person process. The first person should then read the results listed on the cover sheet (if a cover sheet is used) to the recorder and when finished the recorder should read the recorded results back to the first person. The first person should check the actual ballots and not the cover sheet. If any discrepancies appear between the cover sheet and the ballots and where the critic's true intention is not known, the cover sheet should be adjusted to reflect the ballots. Because the ballots are the record returned to the school, they are assumed to be accurate. If the director decides against using cover sheets, the ballots are read to the recorder and the recorder reads the entered results back to the first person who checks against the ballots.

During the course of recording, the recorder may discover students have no showed for a round. Here a decision needs to be made by the tournament director. If contestants no-show for a round, do they receive the worst possible score for the round (rank of 5 and rates of 0) or should they be eliminated from competition either by giving them a very high rank of 9 or dropped from the tournament altogether. Sometimes students will miss the first round and show to subsequent rounds. They may ask the director to "average" their scores so that they are not penalized for the missed round. As a rule of thumb, if the contestant no-shows because of a tournament error in posting or scheduling, then averaging scores may be appropriate. However, if a student no-shows because of the student's own error, then averaging scores is an unfair advantage.

D. Advancing to Elimination Rounds

Advancing to the elimination rounds is a fairly simple process. Based on the results of the preliminary rounds, the top contestants are selected for a final or semi-final round. The size of the final or semi-final panels is typically similar to the average size of a preliminary round panel which is usually six.

Selecting the elimination round participants simply involves a process of sorting the contestants and taking the top six (or whatever the appropriate number is). This is much easier to do with a computer than by hand. Because a manual recording sheet cannot be manipulated or rearranged, there are many opportunities to omit a contestant who should be advanced. In case of tie, the tournament director needs to make a decision about how ties will be broken. Some tournament directors favor taking a clean break even if this means that the elimination round panels are uneven.

In other words, suppose that the fifth, sixth, and seventh contestants all share a cumulative rank of 7 and rates of 70, 72, and 75 respectively. Some tournament directors prefer to take all the tied contestants even if that decision yields a 7 person final. Other directors limit the final panel to a number and will break ties based on rating points which, as we noted earlier, are subject to much disparity.

Once the final round participants have been selected, they are placed into speaking order and assigned critics. There are a variety of systems used for determining final round contestants. Some tournaments drop the student's worst ranks and rates and then advance the students with the highest adjusted scores. However, Littlefield found that almost all systems yield virtually identical pools of elimination rounds of contestants.¹⁵

Typically, three critics judge IE elimination rounds. However, when three critics are not available, often two critics are used and any ties are broken based on the contestants preliminary round performances. Computers are much faster and accurate for advancing students than a manual system because once the ranks and rates have been recorded, the computer will be able to calculate who should make the elimination rounds and who should not.

E. Tournament Manager and Matching Rounds

The Tournament Manager software employs a modified random distribution of contestants. In other words, the contestants are distributed randomly in each round with the exception that students from the same school are constrained from meeting one another. While the software operator may decide to override the modifications, the program checks for school conflicts and adjusts panels accordingly. That is the only constraint applied by the software.

The Tournament Manager also uses ballot cover sheets. A ballot cover sheet lists the judge's name, the names and codes for each of the speakers, and has a place for the critic to enter the rank and rate for each competitor. The reasons for this are simple. First, cover sheets are a convenient device for double checking results entry. After the ballots have been read to the computer operator, they can be checked against the cover sheet. And second, after all the ballots have been returned to students, cover sheets provide the tournament director with a record of each individual round in case there is a

dispute. Many tournament directors, however, do not like cover sheets because there may be a discrepancy between the ballots and the covers. I have never found this to be a problem as long as the director is clear about what the procedure will be in case of disagreement. My belief is that the individual ballot is that the student receives back should be the final say if the critic's intention is not clear and cannot be determined. Of course, if a director prefers not to use them, they are not mandatory.

After all is finished, the last task a tournament director faces in managing the individual events tournament is the distribution of results. This involves the production of a list of contestants for each event, their scores in each round, and their final placement. Although this can be produced by hand, it is much easier to use a computer to dedicated management package to avoid recopying errors.

III. Conclusion

Forensics tournaments are very special and unique events in our system of education. They provide contestants with more speaking opportunity, practice, and feedback in one weekend than most students will receive in a year of typical classroom instruction. Individual events tournaments have grown in size and frequency and more and more students are being introduced to forensics through individual events.

The purpose of this paper was to describe in a very brief fashion how an individual events tournament can be managed. I am an advocate of computer-aided tournament management because they offer tournament directors a fast and accurate method of handling large numbers of entries and many rounds of competition. However, effective manual tournaments can be run even if they are slower and require a significantly large labor force.

The task of managing a tournament begins with the decision to host one. The very basic issues surrounding tournament configuration such as what dates, events, rules, divisions, and conflict patterns will all help determine the success or failure of the tournament. Creating the schedule, developing ballots, and deciding how contestants and judges will be paired are all issues that require a director to have a firm vision of the mission of the tournament. Will it focus on education? Competition? What is the rationale for the events selected and the divisions offered? All of these are concerns of a director months before the tournament begins and yet these are philosophical issues that give the tournament its personality and its drive.

Finally, the organization of entries, double-checking, creating competitive panels, and recording results are all the logistical considerations that directors need to understand to implement their vision of their tournament philosophy. Every tournament is a reflection of the hosting program's vision of a forensic education, both with regard to its aspirations and its practices.

When one considers that an average tournament of 300 individual events slots will generate more than a thousand ballots, it is apparent that careful planning and tabulation procedures are necessary to ensure an effective and timely tournament. Ultimately, I believe, tournaments succeed or fail because of the work that is done beforehand and because the people managing the tournament know how to be accurate. Most of all, however, tournaments succeed or fail because the director understood the role of the tournament as a part of a forensic education and developed a way to implement the vision.

- ¹Gregg Phifer, "College Leagues and Tournaments," *Essays in Forensics*, James H. McBath, ed. (American Forensic Association: Hannibal, Missouri, 1970), p. 42.
- ²Donald W. Klopff, "Tournament Competition in the Individual Speaking Events," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 3 (January 1966): 33.
- ³Steven B. Hunt and Edward S. Inch, "The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association, (64th, Albuquerque, NM, February 12-16, 1993).
- ⁴Tournament Manager can be obtained from Edward S. Inch, Department of Communication & Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.
- ⁵Michael P. Kelly, "A Paradigmatic View of the Individual Events Revolution/Structure," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
- ⁶James W. Pratt, "The NIET and the NFA: What is their impact on Event Descriptions and Conflict Patterns," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
- ⁷C. Thomas Preston, "The Impact of Written Ballot Criteria on the Frequency and Type of Ballot Comments in Collegiate Limited Preparation Speaking Events," *National Forensic Journal*, 8 (Fall, 1990): 172
- ⁸A discussion of ballot forms and criteria references can be found in Preston, pp. 177-178 and Scott L. Jensen, "A Content Analysis of Public Address Critiques: In Search of Uniqueness in Evaluative Criteria and Judging Practices," *National Forensic Journal*, 8 (Fall 1990), pp. 158-161.
- ⁹Kristine M. Bartanen, "The Use of Criteria Referenced Ballots for Individual Events," *National Forensic Journal*, 8 (Fall 1990), 139.
- ¹⁰Don F. Faules, "Judging Forensic Events," in *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*, Don F. Faules and Richard D. Rieke, eds. (International Textbook Company: Scranton, PA, 1968), p. 261.
- ¹¹Michael T. Nicolai, "The Professional and the Lay Judge: A Comparison of Competitive Rankings in Forensics Tournaments," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
- ¹²The issue of training has been addressed by Michael T. Nicolai, "The Use and Abuse of the Hired Judge Pool," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
- ¹³George Ziegelmuller, "Forensic Tournaments," in *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*, Don F. Faules and Richard D. Rieke, eds. (International Textbook Company: Scranton, PA, 1968), pp. 283-325.

- ¹⁴Steven R. Brydon and Curtis L. Carroll, "The Effect of Speaking Position on Success in Forensics Competition," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Seattle, WA, February 18-21, 1984).
- ¹⁵Robert S. Littlefield, "An Analysis of Tabulation Procedures Used to Produce Contestants for Elimination Rounds and National Individual Events Tournaments," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (4): 202-205.

RECLAIMING CITIZENSHIP IN A COMMUNITY OF ARGUERS: A REPLY TO BRODA-BAHM

T. C. Winebrenner

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

In many respects, one is hard-pressed to fault Ken Broda-Bahm's (1994) description of the manner in which argument norms are generated in academic debate. Broda-Bahm depicts academic debate as a hierarchical argument community in which "a close-knit network of 'national' level debaters create a way of thinking, a way of including some arguments and styles of argument while excluding others" (29). National-circuit debaters constitute a leadership whose argumentative behavior presumedly exemplifies "good" debating, a celebrity status which rank-and-file debaters aspire to attain. Seeking recognition as "good debaters," the rank-and-file replicate styles and modes of argument employed by national-circuit debaters as a way of elevating their own stature in the community. This bestows upon those practices the force of "normative conventions" (29). Thus, national-circuit debaters legitimize argument practices by engaging in them, and rank-and-file debaters normalize practices by replicating them.

As an attempt to account for the way particular conventions are weaved into the fabric of academic debate, the notion that the styles and strategies of high profile teams are adopted by lower profile teams has much to commend it. Certainly, there is considerable anecdotal evidence to support this thesis. For instance, cases or arguments which meet with success in national-circuit tournaments are regularly brought back to regional-circuit tournaments by rank-and-file teams.

However, while his account of the dissemination of argument norms is cohesive, Broda-Bahm's contention that this process holds promise as a cure for the ills of academic debate is decidedly superficial. The entire discussion draws heavily from McKerrow's (1990) rendering of argument communities. The reference seems appropriate. As a collective, the academic debate community relies on argument for the orderly and rational resolution of

disputes, and its citizens ascribe to a set of argument "rules" for generating and evaluating community discourse (McKerrow, 28-30). Broda-Bahm proposes that, as an argument community, academic debate recognizes two groups of citizens, the leaders (national-circuit debaters) and a rank-and-file.

The status accorded to national-circuit debaters, he argues, allows them the freedom to initiate argument norms. For the most part, this is grounded in McKerrow's discussion of argumentative legitimacy, a determination based on perceptions about the "rightfulness" with which an arguer engages in a particular behavior (Broda-Bahm, 27-28; McKerrow, 31). Or, as Broda-Bahm reconstructs argumentative legitimacy, whether the behavior is initiated by "someone within the community who has the standing, the recognized authority, to make a claim of the kind being made" (27). Given Broda-Bahm's description of the academic debate community, the only citizens possessing sufficient authority to challenge normative conventions are national-circuit debaters. Thus, it is those citizens of the community to whom he appeals for self-reflection, embodied in a return to "meta-argument," or the practice of arguing about the legitimacy of argument norms. "The logical and ethical weaknesses of the current debate community will have the best possibility of changing if and when teams with credibility are capable of arguing that they should change, or at least are capable of demonstrating that such issues could be honestly considered in a debate forum" (34). The alternative, he warns, is submission to the kind of external restraint which "cripples the argument community" (34).

There is a third group of citizens in the community, citizens whom Broda-Bahm seems intent on disenfranchising — the teachers and critics who assume the task of mentoring debaters. To suggest that teachers and critics are not citizens of the argument community would be short-sighted — they introduce debaters to the community, they train debaters to participate in community activities, and they facilitate the discourse without which there would be no community. Broda-Bahm gives lip-service to these citizens, admitting that they "have a role to play" in addressing the ills of academic debate, presumably by setting an agenda for correction through public discussion and publication (33). He minimizes that role, however, by asserting that the *debate round* is capable of addressing its own problems. It is better, he argues, to think that community discourse — though meta-argument — is capable of change.

Having admitted that teachers and critics are citizens of the community, Broda-Bahm immediately sets out to expatriate them. They would, he implies, "reform the process from the outside," cautioning that "historically, there is not much evidence to recommend the success of an external rules-based approach" (34). However, such reform would not represent interference by outsiders. Teachers and critics are *essential* members of the community, and their input is *fundamental* to the process of self-reflection.

A closer reading of McKerrow suggests that critics occupy an authoritative position in the argument community which transcends that of Broda-Bahm's community "leaders." In arguing for the legitimacy of norms generated by national-circuit debaters, Broda-Bahm equivocates McKerrow's concept of "authority" with "social status." There is little question that national-circuit debaters are held in esteem by the rank-and-file, that the rank-and-file strive for the recognition and acceptance which attaches itself to national-circuit

debaters, and that the rank-and-file emulate the behavior of national-circuit debaters. What this means is that national-circuit debaters occupy a preferred position in the *social* hierarchy of academic debate. Why is this the case? Broda-Bahm, quoting McGee (1993), provides the answer: "The hallmark of these national-circuit teams is their consistent competitive success, and, indeed, their ability to define by example how debate 'should be,' or what it is to be a 'good' debater" (Bahm, 29; McGee, 157). Recognition attaches itself to national-circuit teams because they succeed more frequently, or on a higher plane, than do rank-and-file teams. As McKerrow explains, however, status in the *authority* hierarchy of an argument community is derived from "compelling response or compliance. Though an argument may be legitimate and justifiable on other grounds, if spoken by one without power to enact its sanctions or its rewards, it may well fail to move people to belief or action" (31). National-circuit teams may exemplify success, but they do not award it; only critics are empowered to dispense the rewards and sanctions by which success is measured. National-circuit debaters may influence social acceptance — by holding in high regard debaters who follow the lead of the social elite — and thereby constitute new argument norms. But, such norms are bound to be transitory — even the social elite eventually will abandon behavior which critics refuse to reward (Howe 1981, 3).

It is wholly fitting that the academic debate community vest such power in educators rather than debaters. In McKerrow's discussion of general standards for judging argument norms, he adds to legitimacy and authority a concern with teleology — the notion that argumentative behavior must be related to the community's "purpose, or reason for being" (31). As van Eemeren puts it, "a collection of people should be called a community if they...share a set of rules for verbal or non-verbal behavior *which are authorized and guided by the uniting rationale for their common aspirations*" (qtd. in McKerrow, 28, emphasis added). This is echoed by Toulmin (1984) in his discussion of argument fields: "The characteristic differences between the kinds of argumentation conducted in adjacent fields...are best understood in terms of the respective purposes of the enterprises concerned" (275). In the case of academic debate, that purpose is to develop and hone argumentation skills, an objective evident in the moniker "academic," as well as in the fact that debate makes its residence in a larger community of educational activities. As should appear evident, a community which aspires to educate ought to vest legitimate authority to constitute and judge norms in teachers rather than students.

Broda-Bahm is forced to reject this reading of the debate community. He chooses, he indicates, to view academic debate "not simply as a group of students who engage in hypothetical arguments for educational and competitive purposes, but as a community in its own right that establishes and enforces argumentative norms within its own context" (28). Broda-Bahm now is caught in a circle of his own construction. While he calls upon community leaders to establish argument norms, his community calls upon critics to enforce those norms. Thus, the authority Broda-Bahm asks national-circuit debaters to wield wisely, is extended only to the citizens he would disenfranchise. Ultimately, he seems less interested in "understanding the very real speech behaviors of this community" than he does with reconstructing the community in such a way that it *appears* to augur for the resurrection of meta-argument in academic debate.