

debate arena.² Considering only the unwritten rules related to acceptable untimed communiques, the "knowledgeable" debater has a significant advantage over the "uninitiated" competitor.³

Experienced teams not only know how to extend their time allotments, they also use the extended time to enable themselves to be less responsible for communicating during the "on clock" time. Thus, shells are provided "off clock" in a clear and understandable manner which provides a footing on which the experienced judge can complete the arguments using whatever he or she *can understand* during the "on clock" presentation. Hunt (1994) illustrated in his characterization of many CEDA debates "... a spewing blurring of arguments for the sake of speed hoping that judges will reconstruct something interesting from the morass at the end of the round." (131). Once the fairness dimension of time keeping is disregarded, abuses which increase speed are invited.

As with unwritten rules in all social interactions, the evolution of debate has brought with it sanctions which serve to protect its members (Selby & Garretson, 1981). Within this protected arena (Cox & Adams, 1993), individual behavior toward "outsiders" may be judged to lack civility (Bartanen & Hanson, 1994). No doubt some of that judgment may be simply because the behavior is different from the norm in the greater community; nevertheless, the contrast with expected conduct is often sufficient to offend the uninitiated and to deter further participation (see Frank, 1993; Steinfatt, 1990).⁴

While the causal link of the deterrence from participation to the unwritten codes of behavior is inferential, the barriers to continued participation in debate are more factual. Loge, (1991) established that Black participation in academic debate is far below the percentage of Blacks who are enrolled in college. Similarly, Stepp (1991) has reported data which clearly reflects white male domination of CEDA tournaments. Simerly, Biles and Scott (1992) confirmed that "little has been done to remedy the underrepresentation of minorities in collegiate debate" (32). Others have verified the exclusive nature of participation in debate (Griffin & Raider, 1992; Harris & Boone, 1985; Logue, 1985a; Logue, 1985b; Logue, 1987; Stepp, 1992; Stepp, 1991).

Collegiate debate as currently practiced by this "select group" has been defended in terms of contribution to learning how to research, to organize, and even to adapt to the idiosyncrasies of individuals⁵ (McGee, 1993; Stanfield, 1993; Broda-Brahm, 1994). Stanfield grouped these skills within the domain of "information processing." Certainly, all of these are valuable real world skills which debate, even as currently practiced, facilitates in participants; however, the study of information processing lends no support for high speed, or indiscriminate handling of data (see for example Schroder, Driver & Streufert, 1967). Information processing theory, as with communication theory, demands that individuals deal with complex ideas in sophisticated ways (see Bartanen, 1994).

In contrast to the existentialist assumptions of the Doers stands the view that there exists *essences* which should characterize and thus restrict the evolution of competitive debate. We have attempted to promote an essence view by arguing that debate should be based on the model of the idealized public arena (Cox & Adams, 1994). This argument was no more than a revitalizing of positions articulated by Davis (1916), Ehninger and Brockreide (1963), Howe (1981), Howe and Brownlee (1993), Mills (1964), Wenzel (1980),

and Weiss (1985). From the perspective of this definition, debaters would not be expected to adapt to the particular judge as an individual; instead the individual judge would assess each debate based on a knowledge of argumentation and how reasonable individuals should react.⁶

In this regard, we have proposed that the appropriate standard for adjudicating debate is that of *reasoned communication* (Cox & Adams, 1993). This standard emphasizes that debate should be viewed as a communication event which stresses intelligibility of the symbols used in the transaction and that this oral communication should be judged on its reasonableness in assigning a victory (Freeley, 1996; Makau, 1990, Frank, 1993).

The view that competitive debate should reflect the character of quality communication (encompassing of all five cannons) is reinforced by the view that forensics is an extension of the communication classroom, a view which has been adequately supported by others (Freeley, 1996; Hollihan & Baaske, 1994; Patterson & Zarefsky, 1983; Rybacki & Rybacki, 1991; Winebrenner, 1994; Ziegelmueller, Kay & Dause, 1990) and has intuitive appeal given that collegiate debate falls under the jurisdiction of institutions of higher education and is typically supported by departments of communication.

By its philosophical posture and through its linkage to communication education, PKD lends intellectual support to the "extended classroom" metaphor for debate. Previous actions by PKD have supported the co-curricular nature of forensics. One strong demonstration of this has been the three Developmental Conferences and the resolutions passed at each. Leadership in this direction remains essential given the fracturing previously discussed (Preston & LaBoon, 1995; Danielson & Pettus, 1990).

Given the contrast in philosophies, it is understandable that individuals who support the "extended classroom" metaphor for debate would argue strongly that debate is not a game. Unfortunately, in so doing they have neglected a key word, ONLY, in the metaphor of the Doers and summarily dismissed alternative meanings for "game," in particular the more obvious meaning of an open, well-defined, regulated contest.⁷ Indeed, Winebrenner (1994) and Sommers and Roper (1993) in attacking the "game only" approach admit that debate does have the nature of a game and by this admission tacitly concede that a part of the essence of collegiate debate is its contest component.

The "extended classroom" is an acceptable metaphor of debate because in the extension are the adjustments for direct competition. However, a clearer metaphor is that of "educational game" or more specifically, "a reasoned communication game."

We hope that Pi Kappa Delta will support the amended metaphor with the attendant implication that the manifestation of this metaphor would be more efficiently realized if appropriate written rules for the contest were more fully developed, publicized and enforced.⁸ The "experiment" with Officiated Debate (Adams & Cox, 1993; Adams & Cox, 1994; Huebner, 1995) detailed in the next section, operationalizes the specifics of the type of rules that PKD might promote. However, in general, the focus needs to be on endorsing practices in debate which would be associated with the finest traditions of oral communication which PKD was founded to protect, articulate and advance: communication that celebrates civility and respect.⁹

These guidelines should help to open the contest since everyone could have

Missing

living document subject to improvement between tournaments based on analysis of their apparent impact, or lack thereof, during actual rounds. A chronology of our experiences with (see also, Adams & Cox, 1994) and then an assessment of OD follows.

History of the Innovation

On March 7, 1992, the first tournament using OD was held at Central Missouri State University. This experimental tournament had CEDA's sanction (as did the other tournaments discussed here) and awarded both team and individual trophies. We invited four quality teams. The tournament had three preliminary rounds and a final/consolation round. During each round, one of the two debates followed normal practice and the other followed rules of OD. We videotaped all rounds with three interlocking cameras which permitted viewing activity across the front of the room. We also audio taped a discussion with the four coaches during lunch. In the final round, which was officiated, K-State defeated Southwestern on 2-1 ballot.

In the discussion with the coaches, they indicated that they were aware of unfairness in the current practice especially regarding extending the allotted time. Analysis of the videotapes showed clearly that the OD rounds corresponded to expectations of public speaking while the standard rounds resembled an interpersonal dispute, and sometimes a group discussion. Tag teaming and exceeding time limits, which did not occur under officiated conditions, were frequent occurrences in the regular round. Less obvious, but still observable, was the civility of the officiated sessions versus the abusiveness of the other. Delivery rates remained excessive but were reduced when the debaters spoke from the DSA without the assistance of their partners.

Even given the differences in the rounds, the debaters responded favorably to OD. They answered open-ended questions regarding the extent to which the rules did/did not impede their ability to debate. They discounted any impact. Two said they preferred its fairness, and two said they would like more opportunity to experiment with the right to object during cross examination.¹⁸

On December 12, 1992, the Kansas City Power and Light Company (KCP&L) sponsored the National Invitational Officiated Debate Tournament (NODT). In conception, the tournament was to have eight top teams from across the country participate during the last weekend of the semester. The top CEDA ranked school from each district was invited to send its best team. The top school from five districts accepted. Then, schools which ranked in CEDA's top 15 were invited. Two more schools agreed to send teams. We, then, secured a quality area team to complete the slate of eight.¹⁹ However, at the last minute, two schools were forced to cancel. All invited teams were sent copies of OD rules.²⁰

The tournament had four preliminary, a semi-final and a final round. The preliminary and semi-final rounds had three Jurors plus the Moderator. The final round had five Jurors and the Moderator. While the experience and philosophies of the Jurors varied, all were experienced in deciding debate contests. In the final round, Cornell won the toss and chose to represent the affirmative, but, in a closely contested debate, they failed to successfully defend their case in a 3-2 decision.

Penalties were called with slightly greater frequency at the NODT than at the experimental one. In two preliminary rounds and the final round, preparation time was deducted at least once. However, in each case the fourth offense came late in the debate when the side had excessive preparation time. Apparently, the debater decided that the loss of time was inconsequential.

During one round, a moderator read a book and did not call any penalties. Still, even under that condition, few infractions occurred perhaps because the debaters were self monitoring based on their knowledge of the rules and perhaps because of their uncertainty early in the debate as to whether the moderator was monitoring their behavior. The experience did demonstrate the importance of cooperation on the part of the moderator. In subsequent tournaments, we trained all moderators.

Debater response to the NODT was not unanimously favorable. One debater in particular saw no merit in being required to stand at the front of the room. A few thought it unfair that they were limited in their ability to exchange notes and evidence with the opposition throughout the debate. However, the responses to the tournament were positive, overall. A second NODT failed to materialize due to scheduling problems at the end of the fall semester.

Since the NODT, OD divisions have been part of three tournaments at Central Missouri. The first of Central's tournaments had six teams. At the second tournament there were twelve entries. The last of these tournaments hosted a six-team OD division.

The experience with recruiting and training moderators at Central Missouri has been positive. These moderators have all been college graduates, most have been graduate assistants from speech and mass communication, and some have come from the social sciences, the library staff and English. Having moderators has also helped to recruit and maintain faculty as judges. Our experience at Central, with admittedly small tournaments, provided a modicum of support for the belief that sharing the burden might help to involve very competent individuals in the judging process who would otherwise not feel capable of meeting the challenge. Derryberry (1991) documented the benefits of involving such individuals in the debate program beyond having personnel for judges.

The experience at Central Missouri also demonstrated an unexpected benefit. The presence of the Moderator as someone who was not expected to render a decision contributed to the public-arena atmosphere in OD rounds. The speaker had at least one human face to observe while presenting arguments.

The 1994 Bi-Province Tournament held in Georgetown, Kentucky offered a division of OD which attracted six teams.²¹ From a training and recruitment standpoint, the tournament was a success. Perhaps because of the training location's proximity to the continental breakfast, over twenty people attended the training. A majority of them indicated that they had long since stopped judging debate. After the training, a sufficient number was recruited to meet the guarantee an adequate number of trained moderators for the tournament. Two of the individuals who had stopped judging debate, in turn, agreed to judge an OD round; so, while OD did reduce the total judging pool, it served to replenish partially what it had taken.²²

At the 1994 Gateway Tournament hosted by University of Missouri at St. Louis six teams entered the OD division. Undergraduate students from upper

level communication²³ courses were trained and functioned adequately as moderators. A division of OD failed to make at McNeese State in January of 1995.

Assessing the Innovation

In assessing the "great experiment," there have been many outcomes which we must deem undesirable, but, many of the outcomes are positive and support the workability of its design. In terms of undesirable outcomes, the scheduling of OD as "division" of debate produced two negative effects. First, it contributed to the misperception that OD was another "type" of debate as opposed to a representation of a philosophy of competitive debate. Second, interrelated with the first, the emergence of OD contributed to the very splintering which we wished to mend. OD has obviously contributed directly to the splintering, generating OD divisions at five tournaments. It also contributed indirectly to the formation of National Educational Debate Association. Horn, Underberg and others were encouraged through OD that someone was making an attempt to revitalize debate. As a result, they formed NEDA (Horn, 1994)

On the positive side of the ledger, we believe that we showed conclusively that highly competitive teams could adapt to a public-speaking paradigm. Responses to the tape of the final round of the NODT support this conclusion. Robert Weiss (1994) used the tape in workshops as an example of what competitive debate should be. Results are less conclusive as to OD's division of labor ability to increase the judging pool and thus make competitive debate more open to the greater academic community; but, given the brevity of "experiment," the amount of support is encouraging. In toto, after observing officiated rounds in seven different tournaments at four locations, involving 19 schools and 32 teams, we feel secure in concluding that the concept is workable given appropriate conditions.

Finally, we concur with Preston and Jensen (1995) that the discussion stimulated by this "experiment" has had positive benefits. However, the effects of discussion are often short lived. The effects are likely to fade unless the final result is some change in the dynamics of the system of competitive debate. Toward this end, we urge PKD, as a fraternity dedicated to educationally sound practices in forensics, to exert leadership.

Leadership Possibilities for PKD

PKD needs to chart the direction for the majority of critic educators who desire that debate be based on an educationally sound model. If PKD would announce after its national council meeting in San Antonio that there would be an "experimental division" of debate at its 1997 national tournament, it would prompt many directors to model their tournaments accordingly, as they did when PKD introduced the Argumentation Analysis event. This process of improving debate would be furthered if PKD published guidelines for judge intervention. If at the same meeting, PKD announced that moderators, with the power to exact preestablished time penalties, would be used in all out rounds, and then directors, including those at this year's provinces, follow this lead, it would be a major first step in eliminating these unfair practices.

Beyond the specific suggestions above, our experience with OD prompts us to suggest other systemic changes. Some have advised us that our failure was

in not attacking excessive speed directly. It might be prudent to encourage judges to have a "Comprehensibility card" ("C" card) to display when he or she is unable to distinguish sounds produced by the debater.²⁴ Such a card might contribute to the debater's awareness of his or her audience. If the debater does not adjust, the judge would be justified in likewise ignoring the debater. Similarly, the opposing team could see the "C" card and adjust their strategies accordingly. In a paneled round, when one or more critics found the rate of delivery inappropriate, the debaters could have an early indication of what rates would be acceptable.

As with the comprehensibility card, a "Topicality card" ("T" card) may be of benefit in reinforcing a fundamental argumentation rule. Whenever a First Negative Constructive raises the issue of topicality, the Juror would prop up the "T" card. Thereafter, as long as topicality remained an unresolved issue, the "T" card would remain up. However, if the "T" card came down the contestants should conclude that to continue existing topicality arguments would be a waste of time. The "T" card would be especially useful to contestants in paneled rounds because they would be able to determine throughout the debate the relative importance of topicality in the round.

Huebner (1995) recommended that OD be made more "user friendly." Certainly, the more efficient the system, the better. Hopefully, the entire PKD community will accept the suggestion and work to devise a system which will support quality debate in the most cost effective manner. In particular the National Council might view this suggestion as an opportunity for PKD to provide leadership for the entire debate community.

One clear possibility for enabling judges to help reshape competitive debate in an educationally sound way is the use of a presentation clock which shows to both the speakers and the critic(s) the time remaining. A prototype of this presentation clock was used at the national tournament in Shreveport.²⁵ The use of this clock permits one person to serve as both moderator and decision maker without surrendering the control of time, procedures and inappropriate behavior. With the adoption of such clocks, less personnel would be needed to administrate OD. In out rounds, one official could be designated as moderator or the duties of moderator could be divided among the panel members.

The use of the presentation clock provides additional advantages. For one, it insures that everyone is governed by the same time system. This system, also, provides a mechanism to insure equality of timing and thus the recognition of fairness. Finally, because it uses a visual modality, there are no disruptive time signals and it encourages contact with the "audience" in order to monitor remaining time.

Another means of making the systemic change less costly would be the elimination of flags to mark the Designated Speaking Area. As long as there was a rule that the speaker must present arguments from a location separate from his or her preparation area, as would be appropriate for public debates, flags would not be needed.²⁶

Eliminating the moderator would remove one of the checks on power and the assurance of at least one attentive auditor for the debater. Still, it might have merit as an interim step in correcting the current course of debate. This interim step, of course, assumes 1) the majority of debate educators who wish change will participate as critics and 2) intervention rules are clearly

established both to empower reluctant individuals to intervene where necessary and to restrict those who would intervene simply to demonstrate their omnipotence. Within this interim step, the use of a trained moderator in out rounds would function to demonstrate better how debate should be regulated thus setting the tone for preliminary rounds. Quality in out rounds should be sufficient to permit their being open to the academic community which in turn should help in recruiting both moderators and judges.

The judging rules in OD stressed the use of reasoned communication as a standard in the context of the argumentation rules. Development of these guidelines might be desirable. If these guideline were formulated they might facilitate the construction of a ballot which highlighted cohesion of ideas presented, use of evidence, issues raised/positions advanced in cross examination, and clarity of presentation, a ballot of this quality would be of benefit. A model for this ballot might be the NFA-LD ballot (see Carroll & Harris, 1994)

Any change in debate which improved it as an extension of the communication classroom would be desirable. Where the accepted means of winning a debate is to out spread the opponent, debate fails in its goal of training citizens to function meaningfully in a democratic society. Communication skills, in their truest sense, are much more than presentational; they are analytical. Skilled communicators do not just weigh down the opponent with irrelevancies, but help the audience to understand the vital issues despite the complexities and the distractions of shallow analysis. As expressed by Zarefsky (1994), in his SCA Presidential Address: "We have too often robbed public speaking of its concern for the public... and failed to understand how performance makes and sustains our culture" (p. 11). He continued by castigating the treatment of argumentation and debate "as an intellectual backwater of programs staffed by paraprofessionals and undeserving of our support" (p. 11). It seems apparent that the academic community expects and Zarefsky reflects the ideals that the field should have for itself.

Finally, the need is to be educational, fair and civil (Cirlin, 1995; Bartanen & Hanson, 1994) without sacrificing any of the rigor that has been the hallmark of debate experience. In order to achieve this it is essential to have a paradigm shift (see Barker, 1990). Systemic change in debate can be compared to the paradigm shift in clock making. As Barker (1990) documented regarding watch making it was a Swiss who discovered the digital watch but his colleagues could not conceive of anything but spring-driven time pieces with two hands. Thus, the Japanese, who were not shackled by centuries of watchmaking to one mind set, designed and manufactured digital watches which now dominate the industry. In debate we have for so long had one judge (except in elimination rounds) who was expected to adjudicate under even pitiful conditions and with nothing but unwritten protocol. In that context, Officiated Debate seems radical, unwieldy, impossible. Two people in the room seems like a major shift. The enforcement of civility appears radical. The emphasis on time keeping seems frivolous. However, it is just such a paradigm shift which is needed to carry debate through the 21st century.

Pi Kappa Delta can be the organization that sheds the blinders to permit the needed paradigm shift. The Developmental Conferences and proceedings are right headed; the experimental format at the national tournament was beneficial. Can we continue this progress by changing our paradigms and looking past our old terministic screens?

References

- Adams, W. C., & Cox, E. S. (1994). The officiated approach to return tournament debate to the public arena. In E. Inch (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference* (pp. 74–80). Fargo, ND: Pi Kappa Delta.
- Adams, W. C., & Cox, E. S. (1993). *Rules for Officiated Debate*. Warrensburg, MO: Central Missouri State University.
- Barker, J. (Speaker). (1990). *The Business of Paradigms* (Videocassette, 2nd edition). Brownsville, MN: Chart House Learning Corporation.
- Bartanen, K. (1994). Imagining otherwise: A response to Broda-Bahm. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79, 38–40.
- Bartanen, K. & Hanson, J. (1994). Advocating humane discourse. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 80, 16–22.
- Broda-Bahm, K. T. (1994). Community Concepts of Argumentative Legitimacy: Challenging norms in national-circuit CEDA debate. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79, 26–35.
- Brummett, B. (1994). *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Carroll, S. M., & Harris, E. J. (1994). The NFA's-LD approach to return tournament debate to the public arena. In E. Inch (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference* (pp. 63–73). Fargo, ND: Pi Kappa Delta.
- Cox, E. S., & Adams, W. C. (1995). *CEDA at a Crossroad: A National Survey for Data-Based Decision Making*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Cox, E. S., & Adams, W. C. (1994). The need to return tournament debate to the public arena. In E. Inch (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference* (pp. 37–43). Fargo, ND: Pi Kappa Delta.
- Cox, E. S., & Adams, W. C. (1993). An answer to the call for experimentation by the CEDA Assessment Conference: A descriptive study of a peer-judged round. *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 34–53.
- Daley, I. (1994). The ADA approach to returning tournament debate to the public arena. In E. Inch (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference* (pp. 44–47). Fargo, ND: Pi Kappa Delta.
- Danielson, M. A., & Pettus, A. B. (1990). *Status of forensics programs: A survey*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago.
- Davis, W. H. (1916). Is debating primarily a game? *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, 2, 171–179.
- Derryberry, B. R. (1991). Utilizing interdepartmental feedback in forensics coaching. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal*, 21, 15–23.
- Elhninger, D., & Brochriede, W. (1963). *Decision by Debate*. New York: Dodd, Mead.

- Frank, D. A. (1993). Debate as rhetorical scholarship: Changing Delivery Practices in CEDA. In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings* (pp. 75-79). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Freeley, A. J. (1996). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Gill, A. (1994). *Rhetoric and Human Understanding*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Griffin, J. C., & Raider, H. J. (1992). Women in high school debate. In D. A. Thomas & J. P. Hart (Eds.), *Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice and Teaching* (pp. 8-14). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Habermas, J. (1993). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1973). *The Silent Language*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Harris, E. J., & Boone, G. M. (1985). *An examination of participation in NDT by gender*. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Convention. Providence, RI.
- Herbeck, D. A. (1983, April). *The nature and the scope of evaluative criteria: An argument for nonintervention*. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago.
- Hollihan, T. A., & Baaske, K. T. (1994). *Arguments and Arguing: The Products and Process of Human Decision Making*. New York: St. Martins.
- Holtzman, P. D. (1970). *The Psychology of Speaker's Audiences*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Horn, G. (1994, March). Personal telephone conversation.
- Horn, G. & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: An unfulfilled promise. In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings* (pp. 37-75). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Howe, J. (1981). CEDA's objectives: Lest we forget. *Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA*, 2, 1-3.
- Howe, J., & Brownlee, D. (1993). The founding principles of CEDA. In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings* (pp. 249-262). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Hovland, C. I. (Ed.). (1959). *The Order of Presentation in Persuasion*. New Haven: Yale.
- Huebner, T. M. (1995). Officiated debate as a viable alternative: A preliminary survey. In S. L. Jensen (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Professional Development Conference* (pp. 118-127). Lake Charles, LA: Pi Kappa Delta.
- Hunt, S. B. (1994). A response to the developmental conference. In E. Inch (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference* (pp. 131-33). Fargo, ND: Pi Kappa Delta.