

than heterosexuals? Additionally, do different sexes or genders attempt to employ differing or similar coping strategies? What can one group learn from another? Finally, again in an attempt to most closely replicate the methodology of Jensen and Jensen (2004), some questions need a greater degree of clarity and applicability. For example, the question asking the respondent to identify the number of children currently in the home was difficult to replicate without the potential for confounding the variable's original intent. Since many of the former coaches had been out of forensics for quite some time, the number of children currently in the home no longer accurately reflected the familial unit that was present during their tenure as coaches. Many had been divorced, remarried, and had reconstructed familial units into blended families since their coaching tenure. Also, the relative ages of the children have the potential to greatly influence the degree of stress perceived by the participants when torn between the pressures of coaching and family commitments. Younger husbands, wives and partners may feel greater perceptions of abandonment than older life participants. Young children may also feel a greater sense of abandonment than older children who have developed individual interests and activities. This may have created some decline in the richness of the descriptive data. Future research should be conducted using an updated instrument designed to capture current relevant data from dedicated familial units over an extended period of time.

Given these limitations in the study, some conclusions can be advanced. First, both of the original goals of the study have been met: 1) to validate previous findings within the literature that forensic educators feel frustration at what they see as a negative relationship between balancing coaching duties and family commitments; and 2) to provide quantitative validity to the literature through statistical rather than primarily anecdotal evidence. Though the study population reported in Jensen and Jensen (2004) was "generally neutral to the idea that forensics and family/personal relationships compete with one another" (pp. 12-13), when merged with the data set of former coaches in *study one*, the group, *current and former forensic educators*, as a whole exhibited a dramatically negative perspective with regard to the outcomes of balancing forensics and family.

Second, this study has helped to clarify the relationship between increased personal and family pressure and non-standard work. Jensen and Jensen's (2004) study concludes that forensic educators dedicate an average of 75 hours per week towards their career. This study sets the number at 56 hours, but does not include time spent traveling on weekends to attend competitive tournaments. There can be no argument that forensic educators work non-standard schedules which include numerous weekends and holidays. The stresses to self and family are further exacerbated by working, for most, Monday through Friday and juggling the teaching, research and service commitments of a 'regular' faculty member. All of the research cited reported a positive relationship between the number of weekends or

holidays worked and the level of conflict between work and family life. Nonstandard work duties have been found to be strongly associated with personal, marital, social, health, and organizational consequences. This study would seem to confirm Jensen's (1998) categorization of the director of forensics as an "at-risk population" (p. 28).

One positive finding is that even though this study would seem to validate the previously reported "burn-out" rate for forensic educators at six years or less (Bartanen, 1996a; Gill, 1990), in this case a mean of 4.83 years, Jensen and Jensen's (2004) data set was comprised of coaches with a mean of 16.34 years of coaching experience. Since 74.8% were in a committed relationship (married, committed, or life partner) at the time of the survey, clearly some forensic educators are 'beating the burn-out odds.' How did the forensic educators included in the Jensens' (2004) work avoid relational suicide while balancing successful careers in forensics? Obviously, those coaches who successfully balance forensics and family should be identified and studied. Further research should be conducted to identify and develop successful coping strategies for our "at-risk" population of forensic educators. Professional forensic organizations should take the lead in not only encouraging successful coaches to engage in a mentoring process, but in the development and offering of educational, relational workshops and retreats for forensic families.

In conclusion, the greatest single asset of the forensic community is its people. To continue to ignore an "at-risk" population is something that is not only counterproductive to the goals and objectives of an educational experience rich in forensic experiences for future generations, but something we continue to do at our own peril.

END NOTES

¹ This is slightly less than the figure reported by Gill (1990) and Bartanen (1996a) of an average of six years.

² This figure (50.35 hours) is smaller than the figure reported by Jensen and Jensen (2004) of "almost 75 hours" (p. 8). However, this discrepancy may be accounted for by survey error. As Jensen and Jensen (2004) note, "The number, in actuality, is probably higher because some individuals separated forensic travel time from coaching and administration; these results include reported travel time as part of the other category" (p. 8).

³ Questions which could confound the reporting were omitted (e.g. How many children live at your home?). The number of children currently living at home could be significantly different than the number living at home during their former coaching tenure.

⁴ Some researchers caution that participation in debate teaches and reinforces skills that are often in direct opposition to successful interpersonal skills necessary to maintain healthy relationships (Burnett & Olson, 1998). For example, Colbert (1994) and Infante, Trebring, Shepherd, & Seeds, (1984) have argued that debaters often exhibit increased verbal aggression. Additionally, Hetlinger & Hildreth (1961) reported that debaters value friendships less and find it difficult to maintain relationships outside of forensics. Olson (2000) concludes "As such, even the relationships forensic participants have, may not be healthy due to a constant and inherent world view that each position needs to be debated, and each controversy must have a winner" (p. 8). Therefore, additional study may identify a relationship between past forensic participation and current relational conflict. The possible relationship between forensic participation and aber-

rant behavior is clearly beyond the scope of this study.

REFERENCES

- Baba, V.V. & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinization of job context and job content to employees' quality of working life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 379-386.
- Bast, G.H. (1960). Ploegnarbeid in de industry. Arnhem: Contractgroepvoering Productiviteit Van Loghum Slaterus. (Cited in Health Consequences of Shiftwork, By D.L. Tasto, M.J. Colligan, E.W. Skjei, & S.J. Polly. SRI International Corporation project URU-4426, March 1978.
- Bartanen, K.M. (1996a). A Preliminary Assessment of the Professional Climate of Forensic Education, Part I. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 81, 1-21.
- Bartanen, K.M. (1996b). A Preliminary Assessment of the Professional Climate of Forensic Education, Part II. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 82, 1-16.
- Blau, G. & Lunz, M. (1999). Testing the impact of shift schedules on organizational variables. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 933-942.
- Bohle, P. & Tilley, A.J. (1998). Early experience of shift work: influences on attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 61-79.
- Burnett, A. & Olson, C.D. (1998). The dark side of debate: the downfall of interpersonal relationships. *Speaker & Gavel*, 35, 31-45.
- Came, B. (1989). A difficult job to take home. *Macleans*, January, 9, 36-37.
- Colbert, K. (1994). Replicating the effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and verbal aggression. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79:3, 1-13.
- Communication Technology. (1998). First published in *The Journal of Social Sciences*, December. Retrieved on October 5, 2005, from www.cordis.lu/euroabstracts.
- Cronn-Mills, D.D. (1999). Wandering by the Oasis of Wellness: Implications of Mentoring and Modeling Behaviors in Forensics. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Dickmeyer, S. (2002). Give it to me straight, doc, how much longer can I coach: The length of the individual events season and its effect on the wellness of coaches. *National Forensic Journal*, 20, 57-61.
- Deaton G., Glenn, R.J., Milsap, S., & Milsap, S. (1997). Forensic and Family: Attempting to Avoid the Collision. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Drenth, P.J. D., Hoolwerf, G. & Thierry, H. (1976). Psychological Aspects of Shiftwork. In P. Warr (Ed.), *Personal Goals and Work Design*. (pp. 209-233). London: Wiley.
- Fenwick, R. & Tausig, M. (2001). Scheduling stress: family and health outcomes of shift work and schedule control. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 1179-1198.
- Gill, M. (1990). Why Forensic Coaches Quit: A Replication and Extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-188.
- Gilstrap, C.A. & Gilstrap, C.M. (2003). Managing Emotions in Forensics and Family: A Family Dialogue about Emotion Labor and Emotion Work. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 88, 3-15.
- Gleick, James (1997). Push-Me Pull-You Internet Management. First published in the *New York Times Magazine*, March 23, 1997. Retrieved on October 5, 2005, from www.around.com
- Hetlinger, D.F., & Hildreth, R.A. (1961). Personality characteristics of debaters. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 47, 398-401.
- House, J.S. (1980). Occupational Stress and the Mental and Physical Health of Factory Workers. *Research Report Series*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Infante, D.A., Trebring, J.D., Shepherd, P.E., & Seeds, D.E. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 50, 67-77.
- Jamal, M. & Jamal, S.M. (1982). Work and non-work experiences of employees on fixed and rotating shifts: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 20, 282-2983.
- Jamal, M. & Baba, V.V. (1997). Shift-work and department type related to job stress, work attitudes and behavioral intentions: a study of nurses. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 449-464.
- (1997). Shift-work, burnout and well-being: a study of Canadian nurses. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 4, 197-204.

- Jensen, S. & Jensen, G.L. (2004, November). The Contemporary face of Forensics and Family: A Survey Analysis of the Relationship between Forensic Education, Participation, and Family Status. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Jensen, G.L. & Jensen, S. (2003, November). Pursuing Forensic Goals while Protecting Family Time: An Application of Brock's Commodity Theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Miami, FL.
- (2001, November). Assimilating Families and Forensics: Balancing Forensics Education and Family When Two Become One. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Jensen, S. (1998). Preserving the Pedagogy: The Director of Forensics as an At-Risk Professional. *Speech & Theatre Association of Missouri Journal*, 28, 28-41.
- Jones, K. (1997, November). Forensics and Divorce: When Two Worlds Collapse. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kaplan, J. (1996). The Most Stressful Jobs. *Men's Health* (September), 128.
- Lauer, R. & Lauer, J. (1997). *Marriage & Family: The Quest for Intimacy*. Chicago: Brown and Benchmark.
- Littlefield, R.S. & Sellnow, T.L. (1992). Assessing Competition & Stress: The Perceived Effect of Tournament Atmosphere on Students and Coaches. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 1-10.
- Maurice, M. & Monteil, C. (1965). Vie quotidienne et horaires de travail: Enquete psychosociologique sur le travail en equipes successives. Paris: Paris Institut des Sciences Sociales du Travail. (Cited in Health Consequences of Shift Work, by D.L. Tasto, M.J. Colligan, E.W. Skjei, & S.J. Polly. SRI International Corporation Project URU-4426, March 1978).
- Mann, F and Hoffman, L. (1960). *Automation and the Worker*. New York: Henry Holt.
- McDonald, K.M. (2001). Demanding Expectations: Surviving and Thriving as a Collegiate Debate Coach. *Argument & Advocacy*, 38, 115-120.
- McFarland, Steve. (2005). The Two Faces of Parental Involvement. The Internet Monk. Retrieved October 5, 2005, from www.theinternetmonk.com
- Newton's Third Law of action/reaction. Retrieved October 5, 2005, from www.physics.brown.edu
- Nissan's Pivo: The Cabin that Rotates 360 Degrees. (Sept. 30, 2005). Retrieved October 5, 2005, from News.com.com
- Nolte, Paul J. (2005). Nolte Notes: A Push-Me Pull-You Market. Financial Sense On-Line: Uncommon News for the Wise Investor, August, 2005. Retrieved October 5, 2005, from www.financialsense.com
- Noran, A. (1995). Literature Search on the wives of fighters. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 10, 65-79.
- Olson, C.D. (2000, October). Infusing Debate with Wellness: Starting Correctly. Paper presented at the 2000 International Debate Education Association Conference, Budapest, Hungary.
- Preston, C.T., Jr. (1995) Contributory Factors to Coach Burnout and Brain Drain in Forensics: Some Suggestions for Credibility and Activity Survival. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 80, 16-22.
- Siegfried, Tom. Powers of the Fruit Fly in Flight. *The Why Files, Science Matters*. Retrieved October 5, 2005, from www.whyfiles.com
- Shamir, B. (1982). Work schedules and the perceived conflict between work and non-work. Working Paper No. 3, the Hebrew University Bertelsmann Program, Jerusalem.
- (1983). Some antecedents of work/non-work conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 23, 98-111.
- Sotile, W. (1997). Today's Medical Marriage. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 277, April 16.
- Staines, G. & Pleck, J. (1984). Nonstandard Work Schedules and Family Life. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol 69, No 3, 515-523.
- Tanner, Alex. (2005). The Push-Me Pull-You Conundrum of Advertising in a PVR World. Retrieved October 5, 2005, from www.netimperative.com
- Venette, S.J. & Venette, P.A. (1997). Too Much of a Good Thing: The Director of Forensics and Wellness. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2, 244-248.

Whitney, S.A. & Johnson, S.L. (1996, November). ‘Til Finals Do Us Part: An Analysis of Committed Relationships among Forensic Educators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Williams, D.E. & Hughes, P.C. (2003). The Forensic Family: A Call For Research. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 88, 29-36.

Appendix A

Program Demographics of Respondents

Program Element	Frequency		Percent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Full time staff	42	18	70.0	30
Part time staff	47	13	78.3	21.7
Graduate assistants				
Zero	50		83.3	
One	10		16.7	
Two	6		10.0	
No other staff	60		100.0	
Tenure track positions				
Zero	23		38.3	
One	31		51.7	
Two	6		10.0	
Number of students traveling				
Five – Seven	11		18.3	
Eight – Ten	34		56.6	
Eleven – Fifteen	15		25.0	
Individual Events participation	45	15	75.0	25.0
Debate participation	53	7	88.3	11.7
CEDA participation	14	46	23.3	76.7
NDT participation	7	53	11.7	88.3
LD participation	31	29	51.7	48.3
Number of weekends traveled				
Seven – Eight	20		33.3	
Nine – Ten	26		43.3	
Eleven – Twelve	14		23.4	

n=60 for all groups

Appendix B

Respondent Demographics

Survey item	Frequency	Percent
Years of coaching		
One – Two	14	23.3
Three – Four	16	26.6
Five – Six	17	28.3
Seven – Eight	7	11.7
Nine – Ten	4	6.7
Eleven – Twelve	2	3.4
Title		
Director of Forensics	6	10.0
Ass’t Dir of Forensics	54	90.0
Rank		
Associate Professor	6	10.0
Assistant Professor	36	60.0
Graduate Assistant	16	26.7
Adjunct/Instructor	2	3.3

n=60 for all groups

Appendix C

Intercorrelations Between Attitudes and Relationships of All Respondents

Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Contributed to end of relationship	1.00	.37	.43	-.14	.18	.45	.37	-.26	-.01	.36
2. Time from relationships	.37	1.00	.20	.24	.28	.26	.25	-.37	-.13	.25
3. Negative impact on relationships	.43	.20	1.00	-.04	.40	.66	.53	-.23	.11	.37
4. Negative impact of child(ren)	-.14	.02	-.04	1.00	-.02	-.11	-.04	.20	.12	-.26
5. Influence long term family plan	.18	.28	.40	-.02	1.00	.32	.27	-.41	.16	.30
6. Relation stronger w/o forensics	.45	.26	.66	-.11	.32	1.00	.63	-.21	.16	.24
7. Choose family or forensics	.37	.25	.51	-.04	.27	.63	1.00	-.31	.26	.21
8. Incorp family into forensics	-.26	-.37	-.23	.20	-.05	-.21	-.31	1.00	.00	-.35
9. Decisions based upon forensics	-.01	.13	.11	.12	.16	.16	.26	.00	1.00	.06
10. Years coaching	.36	.25	.37	-.26	.40	.24	.21	-.35	.06	1.00

n=105



A Deliberative Balance: President Bush's Stem Cell Policy and the Public Sphere

BLAKE ABBOTT, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Abstract: On July 19, 2006, George W. Bush vetoed the first bill sent to him by Congress. The bill would have authorized federal funding for expanded embryonic stem cell research to include the creation of new embryonic stem cell lines from embryos discarded from in vitro fertilization clinics. The veto used governmental policy to establish a clear position that was meant to bring discussion on this issue to a close again. President Bush's stance on stem cell research, however, not only betrayed the spirit of his initial compromise, but opened up his policy to public scrutiny in new ways as well. This article analyzes an interview between Tim Russert and White House Chief of Staff Josh Bolten on Meet the Press on July 23, 2006. The interview 1) reflects an internal tension between taking a moral stance and reaching a compromise in governmental policy, and 2) exposes the limits of supporting public policy with reasons that are primarily based on private morality.

One of the most contentious debates to surface in the American public recently has centered on the controversy over embryonic stem cell research. Supporters of the research have noted that it has the potential to bring about wonderful advances in medicine and could possibly help scientists fight or perhaps even cure Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, and a wide variety of medical conditions that plague millions of people around the world. Opponents of embryonic stem cell research, however, have argued that to achieve a desired outcome it uses immoral means: the destruction of a human embryo. They further argue that the human embryo should be afforded the same rights that fully formed and breathing human beings have to be protected against unnecessary violence, so destroying this life in the hope of improving other lives in the future is wrong. This debate has reached massive levels in American society, and many famous people have joined in the discussion. Conservative political and religious figures like Rush Limbaugh and Pat Robertson oppose embryonic stem cell research, while actors like the late Christopher Reeve and Michael J. Fox, as well as former First Lady Nancy Reagan have supported its expansion. It has also become a part of policy debates in the Federal Government.

On July 19, 2006, George W. Bush vetoed the first bill sent to him

BLAKE ABBOTT (M.A. Wake Forest University) is a Ph.D. student at the University of Georgia, Athens, GA, and is currently a Graduate Assistant with University of Georgia's Debate Team. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Southern States Communication Association Competitive Papers program for Southern Forensics Association, April 2008 in Savannah, Georgia.

by Congress after he took office, the “Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.” The bill he vetoed would have authorized federal funding for expanded embryonic stem cell research to include the creation of new embryonic stem cell lines from embryos discarded from in vitro fertilization clinics. His actions follow the policy guidelines that he established on August 9, 2001, that federal funding could be used to support existing stem cell lines but would be prohibited from supporting the creation of new lines when such creation involves the destruction of human embryos. The policy was an attempt to create a compromise between supporters and opponents of embryonic stem cell research. The veto, however, was momentous, and it sent a clear message against expanded embryonic stem cell research.

While President Bush’s veto is notable by itself, his rationale for it is even more important to examine. He cited the need to respect a “moral boundary” when deciding the limits of biomedical research: “the taking of innocent human life.” This rationale makes a number of assumptions: 1) that an embryo is equivalent to innocent human life, 2) that taking an innocent human life is wrong under any circumstances, and 3) this stance should hold no matter what potential benefits could come from the taking of innocent human life. President Bush’s policy with regards to stem cell research generated some debate initially, but his compromise that became part of a clear governmental policy provided some measure of closure to the debate, even if it was artificial or temporary.

In his veto, he used governmental policy to establish a clear position that was meant to bring discussion on this issue to a close again. Despite his efforts, his veto, and the discourse surrounding it, ended up re-focusing public debate on the issue in a way that called into question not only his veto but his original policy. As a result, stem cell research became an important issue in many Congressional races throughout the country. In other words, President Bush’s stance on stem cell research not only betrayed the spirit of his initial compromise but opened up his policy to public scrutiny in new ways as well.

This article highlights this phenomenon by analyzing an interview between Tim Russert and White House Chief of Staff Josh Bolten on *Meet the Press* on July 23, 2006. Focus will be given to the part of the interview that deals with the Administration’s policy regarding embryonic stem cell research and President Bush’s veto of the “Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.” Bolten’s rationalization of the Bush Administration’s policy on embryonic stem cell research and Russert’s subsequent challenges to the logic of the policy has two main effects: it 1) reflects an internal tension between taking a moral stance and reaching a compromise in governmental policy, and 2) exposes the limits of supporting public policy with reasons that are primarily based in private morality. Before discussing the interview specifically, however, a look at scholarly discussions of both deliberation in the public sphere and the discourse surrounding the morality

of embryonic stem cell research is important.

Deliberation in the Public Sphere

The public sphere is a concept that has been thoroughly defined, re-defined, and challenged in the last century. John Dewey began the discussion with his plea for "the improvement of the methods and conditions of debate, discussion and persuasion" (1954, p. 208). In order for such discussion to occur, people needed a way to communicate with each other about political and social issues of the day. Thus, Habermas considered the public sphere, which he defines as "a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens. A portion of the public sphere comes into being in every conversation in which private individuals assemble to form a public body" (1974, p. 49). Habermas' concept seems to indicate a single section of public discourse that focuses important policies that affect most or all citizens in a society. Numerous scholars have commented on the effectiveness of this concept (see Fraser, 1990; Goodnight, 1982; Squires, 2002). Some have also attempted to refine definitions of the public sphere to make them more vivid. Michael Warner (2002), for example, has established seven characteristics of a public that range from self-organization and attention to time-bound poetic world making. By contrast, Robert Cox (2006) has a more pragmatic definition of the public sphere: "the realm of influence that is created when individuals engage others in communication—through conversation, argument, debate, and questions—about subjects of shared concern or topics that affect a wider community" (p. xx).

Additionally, scholars have viewed the public sphere as distinct from other areas in society. Goodnight has attempted to complement Habermas' view of the public sphere by dividing argumentation into three separate spheres: personal, technical, and public (1982). Each sphere connotes "the grounds upon which arguments are built and the authorities to which arguers appeal" (Goodnight, 1982, p. 216). Fraser (1990) argues that Habermas' concept of the public sphere is singular and fails to account for other public spheres. Fraser then includes what she calls "subaltern counterpublics" into her conceptualization of public discussions of policy (p. 70). These counterpublics offer ways for people in subordinated positions to join together in an attempt to initiate progressive change on either a social or political level. Squires (2002) theorizes oppositional public spheres even further by establishing three categories for groups outside dominant thought: enclave, counterpublic, and satellite. Each group maintains a different relationship with the larger public sphere. DeLuca and Peebles (2002) have argued that the concept of the public sphere alone does not account for the role that technology has played in transforming the way that people communicate with one another. As a supplement to the public sphere, DeLuca & Peebles have suggested that theorists consider the "public screen," which "highlights dissemination, images, hypermediacy, spectacular publicity, cacophony, dis-

traction, and dissent" in public communication (p. 145).

The presence of a public sphere, in its many forms, is a prerequisite for political and social discussion in the United States. Within this space, however, citizens still must deliberate over the issues that affect them personally and the community at large. While this discussion usually does not directly involve the government, the position and policies of the government are often subjects of discussion in various aspects of the public sphere. Many advocates of the public sphere argue that its decisions should influence policy outcomes of decision-making bodies in any society (see Habermas, 1992; Levasseur & Carlin, 2001). A concept that appears to make some use of public sphere literature is deliberative democracy, explained by Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson (2004) as:

[A] form of government in which free and equal citizens (and their representatives), justify decision in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of reaching conclusions that are binding in the present on all citizens but *open to challenge in the future* [italics added]. (p. 7)

The last part of their definition is particularly crucial for this paper because often public sphere scholars discuss deliberation within this forum in terms that assume that the public sphere's work ceases at the point where a policy is enacted by a decision-making body. Deliberative democracy assumes that debate within both publics and counterpublics does not cease at the point where some consensus is reached. Rather, deliberation is a process that *must* continue after decisions have been made so that possible errors can be corrected, and the closure evoked by a policy decision is temporary. Darrin Hicks (2002) argues that deliberation has three great promises that make it a preferable function of democratic principles: the promise of inclusion, the promise of equality, and the promise of reason.

In order for deliberation over public policies to be successful, both as a process for determining outcomes and as a means for enhancing citizen interaction in a democracy, points of contention must be recognized and debated in the public. These points of contention, what Goodnight (1991) calls "controversies," become the places where such political and social discussions gain traction and focus. Goodnight notes that:

An orientation begins to take shape in which the fate and fortune of argumentation is bound up in the discourses of controversy, as controversies themselves put at stake the implicit understandings of, and relationships between, communication and reason. Within this orientation controversies are no longer only disappointments, the dross of failed communication, signs of improper reasoning and broken consensus, the persiflage of conflict, unpleasantness to be averted, or mere stunning performances. Rather, controversies are places where communication