

made. These teams, though financially challenged, are taking an average of eight different students to tournaments throughout the year. The number of students per team is comparable to the top fifty teams as reported by Tom Murphy, "Respondents reported an average of 10.60 students participated in more than six debate tournaments in 1989-90 . . ." (CEDA Yearbook 1992). The comparison may give some insight into the philosophical view of many Select programs. Limited budget does not necessarily mean limited participation by the number of students. Clearly, participation in the Select Sweepstakes does limit the participation of students in the number of tournaments they can attend not how many students may participate.

Full Time Coaches

The next question in the questionnaire is to evaluate how many coaches are designated for these debate teams in the question: What was the total number of full time faculty and/or graduate assistant coaches your team had for the 1997-98 debate season? The most frequent response to this question was one full time coach for the team. Seven responses (63.6%) indicated one full time coach for their debate team. No full time coach was the second most common response with two answers of zero (18.2%). One response each (9.1%) of two full time coaches per school and four full time coaches per school rounds out the replies.

Total Budget

The fourth question tried to detect how much money each school had to participate in debate. The survey asked, What was the total budget for the debate team for the 1997-98 season? Of the ten valid responses, eight different answers appeared ranging from \$1,500 as the smallest budget to a high of \$16,000. Eighty percent of all valid responses show a budget below \$10,000. There were two responses for a budget of \$6,000 and two responses of \$9,000. Each of the following was the lone response for a school's debate budget \$1,500, \$5,000, \$7,000, \$10,000, \$12,500, and \$16,000. The mean budget for all valid answers totaled \$8,200.

National Tournament Participation

Only 27.3% (3) of the schools said they participated at the 1998 National CEDA Tournament at Rochester, New York. Nearly 73 percent of the respondents did not attend the National Tournament. An initial reaction to why these schools did not attend may be that the location of the tournament and the budget of these schools made it impossible for them to attend. An equal number of responses display that coaches did not attend because they felt their students weren't ready or good enough to participate. Only two categories of reasons why the team did not attend the National Tournament emerged. Five answers exhibit a lack of money in the budget prevented participation. An additional five answers explain that the coaches did not believe their students were ready or good enough to debate at the National Tournament.

Why Participate in Select?

Budget considerations are the main reason teams compete in the Select Sweepstakes as described in seven of the eleven responses. Surprisingly, three responses showed they did not know they were participating in the Select Sweepstakes. A final response said that the debate students needed to concentrate on academics as their program of study was too rigorous to compete at more tournaments. It is encouraging that none of the responses suggested "philosophical differences" as a reason the school had limited participation.

Participate in Select again?

The vast majority of participants expect to participate in the Select Sweepstakes next year. Ten answers (83.3%) said they plan to be in the Select Sweepstakes for the 1998-99 debate season. Two coaches expressed they would not participate in the Select Sweepstakes next year if their budget is increased enough to travel to more than six tournaments and one coach declared they would not participate because their team would be traveling to more than six tournaments. These reactions reenforce the reason for competing in the Select Sweepstakes as budget limitations.

Change the Name to Division II?

There is an annual discussion in the debate community concerning the creation of a division system in debate. This question seeks the opinion of the people who would be affected the most, the coaches who would be competing in the division. Three categories of responses to the question, Would you support a change in the name from Select Sweepstakes to Division II Sweepstakes, explain why 58 percent of the coaches are against changing the Select Sweepstakes to Division II Sweepstakes. Three responses indicate that "Select" distinguishes and honors programs that compete against larger programs with the disadvantage of a small budget. Two responses said that Division II means "not as good" as Division I. Two responses suggest that Division II is indicative of second class status though they compete against the same competition as Division I.

Maximum Tournament Attendance

What is the maximum number of tournaments that should be allowed for a school to participate in the Select Sweepstakes competition? The current maximum is six. This is where most of the discussion about the Constitutional Amendment focused. What is the most appropriate maximum number of tournaments a school may attend to be eligible for the Sweepstakes? It is difficult to decide which limit would be best to keep a level debating field of teams that have limited travel possibilities. All responses to this survey question were either six or eight tournaments. Seven of the twelve respondents did prefer the status quo. Although the vote is not an overwhelming majority, the coaches did favor keeping the maximum number of tournaments attended to six.

Additional Comments

The final question is an open-ended question that allowed the participants to include any comments they wished to. The questionnaire asked, "Please feel free to express any ideas, concerns, or suggestions you have concerning the Select Sweepstakes." Two responses commented that more information about the Select Sweepstakes is necessary for the CEDA community. Two responses indicate a concern for the lack of enthusiasm showed for this award at the CEDA Nationals Award Ceremony. Two responses said they felt a lack of recognition and respect from the organization's membership because their school had limited participation. Additional comments included, "My administration loved it . . . they almost doubled my budget." and "It is a great idea, it allows the smallest squads to be competitive at something on the national level."

CONCLUSIONS

The Select Sweepstakes can be a viable competitive opportunity for schools with limited resources. First, more information must be distributed to the community about the Select Sweepstakes. Three coaches participated in the Sweepstakes not knowing their school was part of the division. The organization needs to promote the Select Sweepstakes to let members know this option exists. Schools that travel to a limited amount of tournaments have an opportunity to compete equally, on a national scale, against all debate teams. This can be the mechanism to keep these schools as members of the Cross Examination Debate Association. If the participants in the Select Sweepstakes feel they are "looked down upon", the Select Sweepstakes will fail as these schools leave for alternative debate organizations. Positive publicity concerning the Select Sweepstakes may help the perception coaches have that there is a lack of respect for the participating schools. Members of Select Sweepstakes and the rest of the organization are equally responsible for changing the perception. How this can be done efficiently is a matter for further study.

A second consideration of the continuance of the Select Sweepstakes is the availability of regional debate tournaments. As these schools have limited budgets, they rely on attending regional tournaments. The movement toward large national tournaments hurts the small school in a couple of ways. It limits the participation opportunities of the Select school as it cannot afford to attend these tournaments. Some schools may only be able to afford one or two national tournaments, depending on their location, before depleting their entire budget. National tournaments also take regional competition away from the regional tournament. Thus, even if the Select school can attend a regional tournament, there may be limited competition for Select schools to compete against. Strong, well-supported, regional tournaments are important to the livelihood of a Select Sweepstakes school.

Predicting the success or failure of a first year program is difficult. Continued study and evaluation are essential to determining the program's worth. Further research of resource challenged debate programs is encouraged. Just because a student attends a few debate tournaments a year does not mean they are less important than a student who attends many. These students should have an opportunity to learn through debate. Select Sweepstakes may be the mechanism that will provide students a unique opportunity to debate in CEDA. I believe the Select Sweepstakes can be successful in giving schools with limited tournament participation an opportunity to compete and succeed in the Cross Examination Debate Association. The Select Sweepstakes gives a national competition to teams that would otherwise be unable to support a "nationally competitive" debate team. It has the potential to keep debate programs and students active in the organization.

REFERENCES

Murphy, T. L. (1992). A survey of top CEDA programs—1989-90. *CEDA Yearbook*, 53.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

1. How many CEDA sanctioned debate tournaments did you attend during the 1997-98 debate season?

**11 valid responses 4 minimum 7 maximum 5.64 mean
.67 standard deviation**

2. How many total students competed for your schools at these tournaments?

**11 valid responses 5 minimum 15 maximum 8.06 mean
3. 11 standard deviation**

3. What was the total number of full time faculty and/or graduate assistant coaches your team had for the 1997-98 debate season?

**11 valid responses 0 minimum 4 maximum 1.18 mean
1.08 standard deviation**

4. What was the total budget for the debate team for the 1997-98 debate season?

**10 valid responses \$1,500 minimum \$16,000 maximum \$8,200 mean
\$4,083.84 standard deviation**

5. Did you participate at the CEDA National Tournament at Rochester, NY?

3 Yes 8 No

5a. If you answered no for five, please explain why you did not go to the tournament.

Five responses of a lack of money

Five responses of students are not ready or good enough

6. What was the most important factor in determining your participation in the Select Sweepstakes?

Seven responses of budget considerations

Three responses of not knowing they were participating

One response that students needed to concentrate on academics

7. Do you plan to participate in the Select Sweepstakes next year?

10 Yes 3 No

7a. If you answered no for seven, why will you not participate next year?

Two responses of no were given if the budget was increased.

One response of no described the team will travel to more than six tournaments.

8. Would you support a change in the name from Select Sweepstakes to Division II Sweepstakes?

5 Yes 7 No

8a. If you answered no to question eight please explain why you would not support a name change.

Three responses indicate that "Select" distinguishes and honors programs that compete against larger programs with the disadvantage of a small budget.

Two responses said that Division II means "not as good" as Division I.

Two responses that Division II suggests a second class status though they compete against the same competition.

9. What is the maximum number of tournaments that should be allowed for a school to participate in the Select Sweepstakes competition? The current maximum is six.

0 four 7 six 5 eight 0 ten

10. Please feel free to express any ideas, concerns, or suggestions you have concerning the Select Sweepstakes.

Two responses commented that more information about the Select Sweepstakes is necessary for the CEDA community.

Two responses concerning the lack of enthusiasm showed for this award at the CEDA Nationals Award Ceremony.

Two responses concerning the necessity for small budget schools to be recognized and respected by member of the organization for what they do as they see a lack of respect for these programs.

"My administration loved it . . . they almost doubled my budget."

"It is a great idea, it allows the smallest squads to be competitive at something on the national level."



Cloning Ourselves to Death: A Plea for Real Audiences/Real Forensics

KENNETH HADA

An unfortunate trend in forensics is a growing tendency toward "cloned" presentations: ones that are mechanistic and virtually automated. This essay challenges this trend by arguing that students should be allowed "truth through personality." After reviewing several critiques of contemporary forensics a solution, in the form of expanding the judging pool to include non-traditional judges is suggested.

Cloning in forensics refers to the automated, hypnotic, robotic, meticulously imitative approach to performances, especially, in public discourse and oral interpretation, but also in debate. Of all academic disciplinarians, communication arts teachers and forensics coaches should not only promote with religious vigor the inherent human right and unique glory of free speech, we should take every measure to continuously guarantee that earnest students may realize his/her opportunity of expressing "truth through personality."¹ We should consider Bakhtin's (1990) concept of "answerability" in art. Art, in his system, becomes "mechanical" when there is no unifying principle between external and internal meaning. "The three domains of human culture— science, art and life— gain unity only in the individual person". He claims that unfortunately the relationship between the human and his art becomes "mechanical" and "external" nullifying the very core relationship of the artist and his art. The result is, in Bakhtin's words, "art is too self-confident, audaciously self-confident, and too high-flown, for it is in no way bound to answer for life". Such conditions lead to the perplexing realm where performers find themselves in an "unanswerable" status concerning their involvement with art. This basic idea in Bakhtin leads him to very penetrating analyses of the general nature of art in relation to life and values. For this paper, I think his starting point of a divided artist is worth considering. Cloning in forensics competition is simply a manifestation of the mechanical approach in art that results from our unwillingness to be answerable to a greater audience in life. We may claim "inspiration" (as Bakhtin decries) or we may justify our practices in any number of ways, but in the end, we should recognize this fundamental flaw. Forensics, as currently practiced, too frequently divorces the artist from the art, and thus removes him/her from real

life. In forensics events, a natural unification of science, art and life could occur. As it is, our practices have made us appear "high-flown" and unanswerable before outside observers.

A variety of forensics educators and communication researchers have commented on the relationship of audience to performance. "As we approach the twenty-first century" and similar phrases have been occurring regularly in our journals and in informal discussions. It is safe to conclude that the forensics community at large is involved in self-analysis and introspection concerning its practices and future. Generally, college forensics programs are on the decrease across the nation as many have noted. This fact has given rise to considerable discussion in attempts to determine the causes of this. For example one could look at Kristine Bartanen's 1996 article in which she assesses the "professional climate of forensic education" (1-21). Schroeder and Schroeder demonstrate the change in forensics, noting its movement from a spectator event on campuses and in communities to the current practice of isolated tournament atmospheres (13,14). The Fall 1996 issue of *Argumentation and Advocacy* provides representatives of each of the major forensics organizations an opportunity to explain their mission and practices and offer a prediction for their future viability.² In 1995, Larry Schnoor titled his keynote address to the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta Professional Development Conference, "What Direction are We Traveling?" In that same issue, of *The Forensic*, two other articles appeared concerning how others (especially administrators) view forensics. On and on I could go. Suffice it to say, the six years since I have been involved in forensics, such introspection has continuously been the primary topic of discussion, formally and informally, at all levels of tournaments, conferences and workshops. Although self-analysis is important, I am beginning to wonder if our continuous discussion suggests that we have not really solved our problems. Maybe we are overlooking a basic element—audience—which could potentially provide renewed vigor in forensics.

A common factor that most of these discussions and/or pronouncements of mission statements have concerns the implicit (and sometimes explicitly stated) need for forensics to provide students an opportunity to develop their skills for service within the greater community. In order for this to happen, each of these organizations intimate that forensics activities should be conducted in a practical and genuine manner which leads to positive social and academic development of both the debater and the community (McDonald, 84ff). McDonald's editorial introduces the format wherein nine different organizations explain their *raison d'être*. He says: "as long held practices, traditions become entrenched by ritual and re-enactment," yet he concludes that such is "liberating" because it "eliminates uncer-

¹ I am indebted to the nineteenth-century clergyman, Phillips Brooks, whose use of this concept is central in his famous 1877 Yale Lectures are reprinted in *Lectures on Preaching*. Baker Book House, 1969.

² See pages 81-100 in the "Forum." *Argumentation and Debate* 33 no.2 (Fall 1996).

tainty or unwillingness to participate" (81). Once again the clarion call for the twenty-first century is sounded: "debate and forensic organizations" must remain "dynamic and responsive to the needs of the communities they serve" (82). He reminds us that debate and forensics organizations have a "practical" not "ontological" reason for being (83). Having thus prepared the reader, nine organizations are then presented. What is striking about those statements is what they all have in common. I seriously doubt if an intelligent reader unfamiliar to these organizations could recognize a substantive difference in their stated procedures. A central question arises. If we all have similarly stated goals, and yet there is continually growing dissatisfaction with our practices, could we not conclude that possibly our "long held practices" are not as liberating as we would all like to believe?

We need to move towards real audiences to hopefully alleviate misplaced theorizing at the cost of communicative performance. Studies such as those conducted by MacIntyre and Thivierge provide us with very interesting research which demonstrates the relationship between pleasant audiences and speaker anxiety.³ They conclude that a speaker's "expectations about the audience can influence the affect the speaker brings to public communication. ... that audience characteristics interact with speaking contexts in complex ways ..." (466). Unfortunately such insight remains ignored when it could be implemented. Our tournaments provide no audience. If this research is at all meaningful in what it suggests for speakers, we cheating our students by not providing them audiences. How do our tournaments allow us to evaluate audience analysis and speaker anxiety? In professional settings, our former students will encounter audiences who will have a myriad of responses to their presentations. If speaker anxiety is related to pleasant audiences under certain conditions (and to unfriendly audiences in certain conditions) as their study suggests, we need to make an intentional effort to provide audiences in forensics.

The "Recommendations from the 2nd 1990 National Developmental Conference on Individual Events" provided some interesting comments that have largely gone unheeded. Let me highlight three of them in summary form. They include seeking a "variety

³ Consider also Kristin B. Valentine, et al. addressing audience response to performance studies, such as oral interpretation. At the heart of their study is the assumed link of "communicative relationships" between performers, audience and texts (171). Their study recognizes two general kinds of audience responses: stimulus-based (Program, Discussion) and response-based (Read, Buy, Identification) (174). Though they are not specific in their conclusions, they do suggest that kinds of studies such as their own are helpful in understanding a basic fact—audience is comprised of varieties of personalities with their presuppositions, implementing any number of factors into the judgment of the performance. No single audience exists, one could say. Rather, any "interpretation" by members of the group will be affected by multiple factors in a pluralistic setting, some consistent with what the performer intended and some not. Such is the real world. We should be providing complex audiences for our performers. This study is missing one key ingredient for it to have any effect on forensics—an audience other than a solitary, burnt-out coach who has been driving at all the wrong hours and drinking way too much caffeine.

of forums for students," diversifying "performance venue" and promoting "the educational benefits ... to the larger public" (25-26). Risking oversimplification, I offer a proposal which would be a significant step towards fulfilling these sensible recommendations. We should incorporate lay judges into our tournaments. The National Educational Debate Association has made this fundamental in debate tournaments. What NEDA has done in debate, we should consider doing in individual events. Lay judges consisting of professional people from fields other than speech communication should judge some of the rounds at a tournament. I prefer some combination of lay and "expert" (coaches) judges in a round. The rounds could successfully be judged by five to seven people. This at least could move us toward an approximation of reality, for the so-called lay judges would come from a variety of backgrounds having a variety of political and cultural beliefs. They will not be locked into a rigid judging pattern. They will bring a sense of spontaneity to the tournament. Their ignorance will be a source of insight to the competitors. Since our students are talking about important issues of policy and cultural values, why not let them communicate their findings to an audience of judges who will eagerly listen to them?

We can improve forensic education by placing students into a meaningful context. Forensics education should cause students to perform before a greater professional community as other academic disciplines require interaction with professionals through internships, practicums, etc. Critics could argue that current forensic practices do require students to perform before their professional community—professional rhetoricians and speech communication experts. Student teachers perform before professional teachers; business interns perform in a business environment; etc. However, we must remember that forensics is primarily a means to an end, and not an end in itself. The skills perfected within forensics are directly applicable to *all* other professions. Therefore, how much more necessary it is that forensic students be involved with a diverse audience. They should be communicating to real people in real terms, so that we, the "experts," can offer clearer and more honest guidance toward their development. Lay judges will make bad decisions. They will sometimes use indiscernible criteria for making a decision. They will, therefore, be actually reflecting reality, which predictable judging obscures. The presence of lay judges will encourage students to communicate, not imitate. Responses on ballots will force students to reconsider their pet arguments and artificial styles. Students will have to seriously consider the fuller ramifications of audience analysis. Inappropriate behavior of participants would decrease when faced with judges other than familiar coaches regularly seen on the circuit. Even "expert" judges frequently make decisions based merely on personal preference. There is no sure way to guarantee that any of us can always choose the better of the performances. So it should not threaten us if non-experts make choices based on their criteria. Considering the way we currently run tournaments, there are varieties of judges already. Forensic coaches

have multiple backgrounds and preferences and biases. Moreover, we often take colleagues along with us for our part in the judging pool, but there is little quality control concerning those volunteers. They may teach in related disciplines, but they rarely have definable criteria for judgment. Ultimately, judging is a matter of preference by any audience.

There are some issues which should be noted when using lay judges. First, the host tournament will have to prepare in advance and work harder to line up judges. Visiting teams should be expected to bring along lay judges as well. Second, we must be careful not to line up uncles and aunts and upper classmen judging their former teammates. Third, the tournament host should provide essential, general information for the judges in advance of the tournament. We should not tell them what to look for, but how to look. We should encourage them to consider this experience a live performance, so they should respond honestly from their perspective.

Several positive benefits could arise. First, this can highlight the host university, in particular, and collegiate forensics, in general, before local communities. This can evolve into a very helpful support base. Organizations such as civic clubs, retired teachers associations, church groups, etc., along with community leaders from almost any field are often looking for ways to volunteer service (and it is not unreasonable for the local forensics squad to return a favor or two). Second, I would like to see the final rounds show-cased in a prominent, well-advertised place, in order to make the tournament a special event which a community could watch. Participants could benefit from lay judges in addition to an even fuller audience. Finally, the greatest benefit is for student competitors. We are not providing them with adequate opportunity for true audience analysis. The absence of this, I contend, has led to a negative self-image where competition is misconstrued and "excellence" is considered only in partial ways. We have created an in-grown culture where jargon and group think is considered intelligent and where plastic is substituted for flesh. With these comments, I add my voice to the ongoing conversation calling for revision in forensics. If we do not take heed, our current practices will make sheep of us all.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1990). *Art and answerability. Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Bartanen, K. M. (1996). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensics education, part I. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. 81 no.4, 1-21.
- Clark, B. (1996). Recommendations from the 2nd 1990 national developmental conference on individual events. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. 81 no.3, 25-28.
- MacIntyre, P. D. and Thivierge, K.A. (1995). The effects of audience pleasantness, audience familiarity, and speaking anxiety and willingness to speak. *Communication Quarterly*. 43, 456-66.
- McDonald, K. M. (1996). Extending the conversation: Continuity and change with debate and forensics organization entering the 21st century. *Argumentation and Advocacy*. 33, 81-83.

- Schnoor, L. (1995). What direction are we traveling? Keynote address to the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta Professional Development Conference, March 22, 1995. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. 80 no.4, 2-7.
- Schroeder, A. B. and Schroeder, P. L. (1995). Educational objectives and forensics: An administrative perception. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. 80 no.4, 13-21.
- Valentine, K. B. et al. (1995). Two measures of audience response to performance. *Communication Reports*. 8 no.2, 170-77.



Editor's Notes

The editor has virtually exhausted the existing backlog of submitted essays. As always, the editorial board is very interested in essays written by faculty or students; on any subject connected to the practice or theory of intercollegiate forensics.

Associate Editor for Book and Educational Resource Reviews

Margaret Greynolds, a former editor of the *FORENSIC*, has agreed to serve as Associate Editor for Book and Educational Resource Reviews. Professor Greynolds will solicit and help with the preparation of reviews. Please contact either Professor Greynolds or the editor for information about reviews or suggestions for appropriate subjects. Professor Greynold's address:

Margaret Greynolds
Georgetown College
400 E. College
Georgetown, KY 40324-1696

Pi Kappa Delta to Host Constitutional Convention

The National Convention held at Fargo, North Dakota, agreed to a motion to host a Constitutional Convention sometime prior to August, 2000. The format for the convention includes:

MOTION: That the National Council be empowered to plan and implement a Constitutional Convention on or before July 15, 2000, with proposed constitutional revisions submitted to the PKD membership by September 1, 2000. The proposed revisions will be voted on by the membership by means of a mail ballot, such voting to be completed by November 1, 2000.

OPERATION:

1. The National Council will select a Constitutional Convention Chair prior to the end of the 1999 Convention. The Constitutional Convention Chair will be responsible for implementing the Constitutional Convention process with the oversight of the National Council.
2. The CCC will commission 3-5 research papers recommending specific organizational and constitutional changes. The aim of the papers will be to propose changes in PKD consistent with the long-term health of the organization and which are consistent with the Mission Statement for PKD adopted by the National Council. The papers will be completed on or before August 31, 1999. The authors will receive a modest stipend for their work and the papers will become the basis for further constitutional revision discussion. Complete papers or excerpts will be printed in the *Forensic* and be made available on-line.
3. The National Council and the CCC will appoint reaction groups of 3-5 people, including students where appropriate, to respond to proposed changes and ratio-

nales presented in the invited papers. Invited paper authors will be encouraged to incorporate emergent ideas into revised papers and specific constitutional proposals.

4. The CCC and National Council will schedule time, outside the Convention Structure at the 1999 NCA Convention in Chicago, for public hearings on position papers and/or other possible constitutional changes. Public discussion via the KEY, the Internet, and other forums will be encouraged.
5. The CCC and National Council will schedule a Constitutional Convention. The Convention, open to any and every PKD member, may or may not be scheduled immediately before or after the proposed 2000 Off-Year Tournament, but should be held no later than July 1, 2000.
6. The Constitutional Convention shall deliberate about constitutional issues and, by majority vote of those attending, propose specific constitutional changes to be submitted to the membership.
7. The results of the Constitutional Convention shall be submitted to a mail ballot vote of PKD Chapters, using existing PKD Constitutional guidelines for conducting mail ballot votes. The mail ballot shall be concluded on or about November 1, 2000. Those constitutional revisions deemed accepted will take effect January 1, 2001, except such changes that might negatively affect the prudent operation of the 2001 National Convention. Such changes will take effect at the conclusion of the 2001 Convention.
8. It is understood that the Constitutional Convention is not bound by issues raised by the position papers and may or may not adopt proposed changes and may choose to adopt other changes not proposed in the position papers.

Michael Bartanen (Editor of the FORENSIC) is the Constitutional Convention Chair. **IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN REVIEWING POSITION PAPERS; OR OTHERWISE PARTICIPATING IN THE ADVANCED PREPARATION FOR THE CONVENTION, PLEASE CONTACT HIM.**

Further details on the time and place for the Convention will be forthcoming.

Pi Kappa Delta National Council Adopts Mission Statement

Forensics, as an extension of the classroom, seeks to create articulate citizens. Forensics participants, as students, and coaches and judges as teachers, seek to encourage an environment where: there is respect for others; there are standards for achievement; there is ethically responsible communication; there is knowledge about important issues; there is intellectual stimulation; and there is nurturing of the general skills of informed advocacy and aesthetic appreciation.

To achieve that outcome, Pi Kappa Delta seeks to:

1. Lead the effort of finding ways for all forensics organizations to work together whenever possible to strengthen the activity at levels and in all forms.
2. Foster the nurturing of the personal and professional lives of forensics educators.
3. Encourage the active and meaningful participation of alumni in the forensics activity, the national association, and the local chapter.

4. Strengthen the ties between forensics and both the communication discipline and the broader community.
5. Provide an environment where learning and growth are seen as equal in value to competitive success.
6. Increase the diversity of the forensics activity and the association. Encourage respect for both the diversity of ideas and life experiences. Enhance the role of forensics as a means of promoting respect for diversity in society.
7. Make forensics relevant and significant to the lives of students.



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 \$30 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 \$30 _____ Two Years \$60 _____ Three Years \$75

On subscriptions outside of the United States, add \$12 per year for foreign postage.

Prices effective through June 30, 1998

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 @ \$10/each

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1989 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.