making. The connection between critical thinking and debate is best explained by Harrigan (2008) when she explains that "switch side debate contributes more greatly to the cultivation of a healthy ethic of tolerance and pluralism, generates the reasoned reflection necessary for critical thinking, or instills responsible and critical skepticism toward dominant systems of belief" (p. 37). Every individual, whether they remain a student of argumentation or not, will be placed into the position of decision-maker. In a democracy we are bombarded with different ideas all framed around the idea of what is best, in business we are bombarded by ideas about what course of action is the best for our company, and in our personal life we are constantly making decisions about what is best for ourselves, our friends, and our families— debate puts participants in a more advanced position in all of those situations. Strait and Wallace (2008) explained that "critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare its relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which choice is preferable" (p. 40). Scholars have also pointed to the need for a critical and well-informed public to question decision-making at the policy level (Zarefsky, 2007).

Students of debate learn the skills needed to be better citizens (Zompetti & Williams, 2007) however, it is not always clear if those learned skills transfer to the rest of their lives. In a conversation with former debaters I believe that I can hear how they applied the skills they learned to the rest of their lives. While the conclusions might not suggest direct correlation, the research seems to illustrate that participating in debate is a transformative decision and likely affects how people carry out routine decisions as well as more complex decisions. This leads to the final research question:

RQ #5: How, if at all, do the critical thinking and analysis skills gained from debate affect participant's identities as decision-makers?

Method

The goal that I set forth was to better understand how people relate their sense of identity to debate. In order to achieve this goal I situated this study in the interpretive tradition, which focuses on meaning from the perspective of the actors themselves (Baxter & Babbie, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Interpretive scholars look to identify and understand the meaning-making similarities that communication or the phenomena in question hold for the participants, rather than focusing on between-group differences (Baxter & Braithwaite, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Leininger, 1994). This meaning-making goes beyond researcher-identified terms and focuses the study in regard to the individual's point of view (Bochner, 1985). The research is focused on the subjective reality of the participants (Braithwaite & Baxter, 2005) and is consistent with Mead's (1934) symbolic interactionist perspective, which identified that reality is constructed through the lens of social interaction.

Participants

I conducted 27 interviews. Though I reached theoretical saturation at about 9, I continued to ensure that I heard nothing new. Theoretical saturation is the point in the interviewing process in which the kind of comments being made become redundant and no new information is being gathered from the participants. The participants ranged in age from 19-57. There were 19 males and 8 females. The participants ranged from 4 years of high school experience to 41 years of debate and coaching experience.

Procedure

In order to find the population best able to relay their experience, purposeful sampling techniques were used (Spradley, 1979; Tashakori & Teddlie, 2003). Everyone in the study was selected because they met the following criterion: they participated in two or more years of academic debate. Upon approval by the University's Institutional Review Board, I recruited members of the college Lincoln Douglas debate community via e-mail and flyer solicitation at tournaments around the United States.

Once participants had replied to my inquiries, I scheduled telephone interviews at their convenience. Interpretive researchers utilize interviews because they are one of the most common and tested methods to approach certain kinds of questions (Fontana & Frey, 1994). The individual interviews were focused on participants' experiences, feelings, and thoughts (Johnson, 2002; Straus & Corbin, 1998). They were traditional, in-depth interviews (Kvale, 1996; McCracken 1988; Smith, 1995) which started with a set of open-ended questions but had the flexibility to be guided by the responses of the participants (Spradley, 1979; Smith, 1995). Dealing with the issue of identity and its change over time, I relied upon the retrospective interview technique. This technique is a methodological tool that allows participants to recall their memories at various points in their lives.

The interview began with an explanation of the study and how the material would be used as data. I explained the participants' rights and emphasized their agency in the form of the power to skip any question or end the interview at any time. Each interview lasted for about an hour and was audio taped after consent by participants.

Data Analysis

The transcripts of the interviews provided the data for analysis in this study. I used analytical coding (Lindlof &Taylor, 2002) to identify key concepts in the data. I read each transcript and highlighted information that I thought connected to or answered a research question. As I collected the comments I thought important to each question, I also listened for any repetitiveness, redundancy and forcefulness (Owen, 1984; 1985). This allowed me to identify themes around the research questions. This analysis fits into the notion of symbolic inter-

actionism because the language choices and stories told by the participants guided the research.

Results

Responses from debaters in this study showed three primary themes: how their identity was communicated through being a debater, how they learned to relate and communicate with people through debate, and how identity formation and empowerment through debate seemed to be interconnected. Responses that fit into all of these three themes were reported by all participants in the study. I chose some exemplars to illustrate how these themes were illustrated in the participants' responses. While some of the responses were more direct to these themes than others, and these were not the only themes available from the data set, these were the most forceful, prevalent, and consistent (Owen, 1984; 1985).

Identity Communicated Through Definition

Ehninger and Brockriedge (1978) explained that terms can be explained in a variety of ways based on the way that the given word was constructed in context. This helps legitimize the idea that social construction is the key to defining words and ideas. There are many different ways to define terms and concepts. Complex legal concepts are often high level abstractions based on very precise definitions. When posed questions about their identity and what it meant to be a debater, participants constructed their answers in a variety of ways. The four ways that participants defined being a debater were: in comparison to alternatives, through their self-concept, through the skills they acquired, and through their team.

Being a Debater in Comparison to Alternatives

The questions that talked about what it meant to be a debater offered some rich data. Some people related what it meant to be a debater to other things: "I wasn't good at sports, so debate was something I could be good at. For me, it was like somewhere to belong, to fit in" (IV 1). The concept of identity came into play often when defining oneself as a debater using alternatives.

> I was not a girly-girl. I never played with Barbie dolls or liked pink. Debate was aggressive, not girly at all. I wanted to debate, I wanted to argue. I mean, not a lot of girls were the inside speaker, but I always was. Guys were shocked to see this little blond girl eat their lunch; they got embarrassed and I showed them that I was better than them right away. I always felt bad when I didn't like cheerleading or the mall, but debate gave me something academic that my mom could be proud of and that I didn't have to just pretend to like. (IV 3)

In addition to sports and gender norms, debate was often explained as an alternative to passivity and inaction. "Being a debater meant

doing something. My town had less than 1,000 people. It was either sit and do nothing or join a team. We had debate and band—and I didn't want to be a band geek" (IV 2).

Being a Debater Improved Self-Concept

Defining what it meant to be a debater against alternatives was not the only way that people explained what it meant to be a debater. Many people explained being a debater as to what it meant to them and what it said about their self-concept. "Being a debater meant that I was one of the 'smart kids' in school. In movies and TV and stuff they always made debaters out to be the nerds who later made it in life and I was happy to be one of nerds now to make it later" (IV 1). The competitive nature of debate also seemed tied to participants' self-esteem. "I wasn't good at school. Classes were boring and I hated listening to lectures. I was good at debate because it was all on me. I gave all the speeches. I either won or lost" (IV 3).

But the ideas of self-concept and self-esteem were not always understood through an individualistic frame; they were often viewed through the lens of the other. "My parents were really proud of me when I started debating. Anything with trophies got my dad fired up. Being a debater meant being worth cheering for" (IV 5). This sense of looking at oneself through the lens of the other was not restricted to families. "I liked that teachers called on me. My social studies teacher [in high school] would always ask me what I thought because I could take the opposite opinion. I got better in class when my opinion seemed to matter" (IV 3).

Relating Through Debate

People find ways to relate to other people based on their self-concept. Debate as an activity seemed to empower people toward communicating more and feeling more confident, but debate also functioned as the subject of relating, too. Participants came to not only find themselves in the activity, but found ways that others viewed them and how to reconcile all of those factors with a larger identity. The two main themes that arose from relating were family and team/group identification.

Relating to Family Through Debate

Building a family identity can be hard given the diverse roles that people take within a family. The systems theory of family communication helps explain how people play roles and are constrained by how they perceive themselves as "fitting" into the family. What the research for this study found was that participants helped understand their role better, as a marker of expanded identity, and found ways to appreciate diversity throughout the family system. Two representative examples that flow from child to parent, then from parent to child will help illustrate the use of debate as a tool for relationship building similar to families.

There were quite a few stories told by participants that showed how debate as an activity was a generational engagement. Fathers, mothers, daughters, and sons often reported that they had family members who participated in debate. More often than not though, the connection was not solely a categorical one, but the connection helped them create an identity as a child or parent and offered each a way to better understand the other. Children found ways to interpret affection and increase their interpersonal connection. But the increased connection was not solely from child to parent, it seemed to go both ways:

> I got to talk to my son more when he started debating. I mean, maybe it wasn't just because he started debating, but, it . . . made it easier. He was at that age when I wasn't cool anymore and debate gave us something that he wanted to listen to me about. It was like him following in my footsteps, I was really proud. I could see myself in him and when he did good I remembered how it felt to compete and win and I was that much happier for him. I worked 9-5 Monday through Friday most of the time he was in high school, but I always went out on the weekends and judged for his team. We spent a lot more time together because of debate and it made us closer. (IV 5)

Beyond parental-child bonding, there was a connection between siblings as well. "For one tournament my senior year I actually partnered with my little brother. He was awful and it was the only tournament all year I didn't break...It was my favorite tournament. We still talk about it" (IV 3). And, sometimes, it allowed siblings to connect who would not have otherwise had the chance:

> My brother and me don't have anything in common. He was the captain of the football team. Not just a good player, he was the captain. I did band, played chess, and loved debate. We couldn't have been more opposite. I must have went to every game he ever played: football, baseball, hockey, basketball, he even played lacrosse. Right before my state final round my junior year, his senior year, he walked into the room and sat in the back. He skipped [school event] and drove out to [name edited out] town to watch me for once. It meant the whole world to me. He was so happy when I won. He called me a debate jock. I used to have "debate jocks" written on our team shirts because it let me tell that story. (IV 4)

The connections made either through increased identification or comparison was a consistent theme in participant responses.

Debaters Reported a Sense of Team-Identification/Group Belonging

While the familial connection was a major theme for how participants related through debate, many participants also explained their team dynamics. Participants grounded their identity not only in the activity and what it meant to them individually, but also in how they existed in the larger group of their teams. Teams created social net-

works, they were support systems, and they were instances of voluntary-kin relationships.

Teams were social networks because they let new people meet and build connections. Twelve participants found dating relationships from their debate team. "I met my boyfriend on my team in college. There is no way I could have been with a non-debate boy. It's not just him though, all our friends are on the team" (IV 3). But it was not limited to dating relationships; over a third of the participants met their eventual husband or wife in debate.

> I was on the team with my wife for two years, then I coached her for two years. All the time we spent together made me sure that she was the person I wanted to spend the rest of my life with. There is so much intense time spent working together, sharing each other's successes and failures. You're vulnerable in front of each other, you're proud in front of each other . . . We have three kids, been married 17 years, and won a [affiliation omitted] top speaker award. (IV 5)

The social network aspect of teams showed consistently not only in building relationships, but making connections.

In addition to relating through debate teams as a social network, participants also related to team members as a support system. "When my G.P.A. dropped, my teammates were my tutors. They wanted all of us to be able to travel and my G.P.A. went from a 2.7 to a 3.3 when I graduated. I couldn't have done it without them" (IV 2). And while there was a lot of support reported from participants about grades and competitive success, there were also stories about how the team became a support system while they were students in college and far from home.

> I would have quit school if it hadn't been for debate and my teammates. We drank a lot, we ate too much, and being part of that team of losers saved my life. We all stay in contact . . . They taught me a lot about how to help people—to be a good friend. (IV 6)

The need for social support is high when away at college, and participants continually regarded their debate teammates as a support network to lean on and trust.

The final way that participants constructed ways to relate with teammates came from classifying the team as voluntary-kin. While no one actually said the words "voluntary-kin", most used family language to describe people not biologically tied to them. Participants described teammates as "like a brother" or "like a sister". They described their debate team as "a family." To relate a story about the person on the team they loved to hate, one participant evoked the term "black sheep." Still, this story stuck out to help illustrate this theme:

> My students have become like another set of my children. You

spend so much time watching them grow up, it's amazing. I know which ones have gone to grad school, law school, and gotten married. It's not like a normal student professor relationship because you get to spend so much more time with them and you usually get them for 3-4 years. When I go to [professional] conferences now it is like a little family reunion. I see how all the kids look grown up, married, and a lot of them with their own little debate families. (IV 4)

The connections made between debate and voluntary kin relationships are not just in the relationships between people, but also constructed in the locations of their future meetings.

Identity and Empowerment Interconnectedness for Debaters

The linkage between debate and civic engagement seems clear. Students learn advocacy skills and engage in conversations about political issues during their participation in debate. After learning those skills though, the participants in this study help explain how they have put those skills to work. Their responses illustrate how empowerment affects peoples' identities. Students of debate feel empowered as advocates because they possess the specialized skills taught in debate to understand and challenge policy options. These advocacy skills empower them to take part in civic activities more readily than those who feel overwhelmed by the system. It affects their identity because the increased skill sets allow debaters to see themselves as part of the political process rather than a passive agent being acted upon by politics. The responses seem to consistently show how empowerment leads to action and how the diverse skill set taught in debate validates people to increase their self-concept and alter their identities.

First, participants consistently talked about how they were empowered to take action. "I haven't missed a state or national election in 22 years. I've missed some local ones, but I've voted in most of those too" (IV 5). But the connection between civic engagement and debate is not just in the exercise of voting, but in the rationale behind it. "You get involved because you learn how screwed up things are. Every time you cut a harms card about how bad the world is, it is like its own reason to try to do something about it" (IV 6). In addition to facilitating the action and helping to justify the rationale for that action, participants reported that learning to debate created a conceptual framework within which engagement fit.

I remember coming out of [high] school and wanting to change the world and not having any idea how. You're 18 years old, you don't know how anything works, but your heart is in the right place. Debate showed me how stuff worked. Get up and go protest. Go out and start getting people to sign petitions. Bitch, moan, make noise. Debate demystified the process. Everybody that you know who made a difference started out just wanting to help . . . You can engage the process in the language needed

to actually get something done. Knowing how the world works is the first step to actually giving your voice a chance to be heard. (IV 4)

So many messages seemed to be about how the mechanics of debate and learning the process facilitated future actions.

The root cause of the facilitation of future action seemed to come from the empowerment that people felt from the skills acquired in debate. Participant responses indicated that debate affects not only how people see the world around them, but how they see themselves in that world.

The first time I really felt smart was after a debate round during a judge's critique. It wasn't like school and if I chose the right letter, but the judge was telling me that I really impressed her with the way I thought about a topicality argument. I felt really good about myself afterward. I don't know how to say it the best, but debate made me feel like I could be better. I heard that I was smart in rounds and that made me smarter in the classroom. Once I felt good enough to try, I kept getting good feedback. That really translated to helping me feel good enough to try to get internships, jobs, and admit that I really want to run for a state office. I am working on a campaign for the governor and one day I hope to get elected. I wouldn't feel like I was capable of even trying something like this if I hadn't done debate. (IV 1)

In addition to encouraging people through positive messages and forming an identity as capable people, participants also explained how debate made them able to understand other peoples' identities as well.

The thing that debate taught me that I wouldn't have gotten anywhere else is open-mindedness. I lived around the same people who all had the same views my whole life. I mean, come on, the first gay person I ever met was on my debate team. I didn't have any experience with diversity . . . Learning about different people taught me that there are always two sides to any argument. You learn that people aren't bad or good because of their opinions. I learned to talk more honestly with people and give them the benefit of the doubt more. It made me realize Republicans aren't stupid or mean or evil; they just look at issues a ton different than me. It makes it easier to get people. (IV 6)

Discussion

The results revealed the interconnection between the research questions. The answers to research question number one were interwoven with the answers to research questions four and five. It appears that empowerment is communicated by debaters through the acts of civic engagement and that empowerment displays itself clearly in their abilities as decision-makers. Also, the answers to research questions two and three were closeness connected. Participants responded

that the empowerment felt through debate does translate across contexts and that identity transformation is what affects debaters beyond their competitive years. In addition to the direct findings, there were some very interesting theoretical applications to the findings as well.

Debate has often been explained as a forum for argumentativeness and verbal aggression (Blair, 2006; Dimock & Dimock, 2009; Harrigan, 2008; Mitchell, 1998). Positioning debate as an alternative to sports seemed to bring about a very interesting gender dynamic. Males seemed to view debate as an alternative to physical contests which they were not good at in school. Males also tended to view debate as a way to compete and win without actually engaging in sports. Many of the same philosophies of sports entered into the discussion—fairness, competition, practice—but they were bracketed in a way that positioned debate as an alternative to athletics. Females seemed to view debate as an alternative to passivity. Argumentativeness is typically a trait that is constructed in very masculine terms (Infante, 1982; Stewart, 1986; Swift, 2008a) and female debaters liked the forum for them to be able to engage equally. Supported by theoretical stances on gender and identity (Wood, 1994) the findings support that females viewed debate as an alternative to gendered systems of identity construction where they were expected to be supportive, nurturing, and non-aggressive.

Empowerment as a function of debate has been seen in previous research (Dauber, 1989; Swift, 2008b: Warner & Bruschke, 2001). Previous research has not yet looked to the effects of that empowerment on debaters' lives after their competitive careers have ended. The results of this study suggest that the way that debaters communicate the empowerment they felt during the activity is through civic action. While the connection between debate and civic engagement has been stated theoretically (Bellon, 2000; Hollihan & Riley, 1987; Hunt, 1997; Rehg, 2002; Smith & Popovich, 1980; Williams, 2006; Williams & Young, 2006) it has never been tested in any empirical way. Here the findings overwhelmingly support the theoretical assumption that debate increases participants' civic engagement, but now future research can look at that civic engagement within the greater framework of empowerment.

Finally, the findings of this study help to illustrate the transformative nature of participating in academic debate. Whether it be through empowerment, civic engagement, increased critical thinking skills, interpersonal skills, or increased language skills; the lessons learnt in debate alter a person's sense of self and the way they construct their identity. Tracy and Naughton (1994) explain that an individual's sense of "self is constructed, maintained and challenged by self's and interlocutor's communicative practices" (p. 282). The discourse of debate alters participants' sense of self through direct feedback and verbal competition, which explains why debate as an activity is a unique case study in the aptitude of communication to shape reality. The participants consistently described themselves as different for

having done debate, articulated a clear meaning for what it meant to be a debater, and described how their worldviews had been altered by engaging in the activity. In a world where debate programs are being slashed from university budgets all around the country, more scholarship needs to be produced that examines more closely the transformative nature of the activity. It will not only help create a justification for the existence of debate programs, but it will also help our scholarly community preserve a forum that facilitates many of the best things about education.

REFERENCES

Augoustinos, M., Walker, I., & Donaghue, N. (2006). *Social cognition: An integrated introduction*. Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.

Baxter, L. A., & Babbie, E. R. (2004). *The basics of communication research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Baxter, L. A., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2008). Relational dialectics theory: Discursive things that go bump in the night. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 349-361). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bellon, J. (2000). A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. *Argumentation & Advocacy, 36*, 161-175.

Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Identity and discourse*. Edinburgh, U.K., Edinburgh University Press.

Bergen, K. (2010). Accounting for difference: Commuter wives and the master narrative of marriage. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 47-64.

Blair, J. A. (2006). Argumentation, autonomy, and democratic choice. Paper presented at the 11th Biennial Wake Forest Univ. Argumentation Conference, Boca Raton, Florida.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bochner, A. P. (1985). Perspectives on inquiry: Representation, conversation, and reflection. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 27-58). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Braithwaite, D. O., & Baxter, L. A. (2005). *Family communication theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond 'identity'. *Theory and Society*. 29, p. 1-47.

Cox, E. S. & Jensen, S. (1989). Redeeming part of debate's education mission via public formats. In B. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument: Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 440-45). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dauber, C. (1989). Debate as empowerment. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 25*, 205-207.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Derryberry, B. R. (2005). Traditions and memories as elements of forensic team building. *Forensic*, 90, 17-26.

Dewey, J. (1954). *The public and its problems*. Chicago: Swallow Press.

Dimock, J. P., & Dimock, A. (2009). Debating about policies and policy debating: Issues and non-issues in policy debate. *Journal of the Communication, Speech & Theatre Association of North Dakota*, 22, 9-18.

Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity*. Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press.

Eemeren, F. H. van. (2002). Democracy and argumentation. *Controversia: An International Journal of Debate and Democratic Renewal*, 1, 69-84.

Ehninger, D. (1970). Argument as method: its nature, its limitations, and its uses. *Speech Monographs*, 37, 101-111.

Ehninger, D., & Brockriede, W. (1963). *Decision by Debate*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

Ehninger, D., & Brockriede, W. (1978). *Decision by Debate*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishing.

Eisenberg, E. E. (2001). Building a mystery: Toward a new theory of communication and identity. *Journal of Communication*, 51, 534-552.

English, E.; Llano, S.; Mitchell, G.; Morrison, C.; Rief, J.; Woods, C. (2007). Debate as a weapon of mass destruction. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 4, 221-225.

Ennis, R. (1987). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. In Baron, J. B., and R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice* (pp. 9-26). New York: W.H. Freeman.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361_376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gentry, J. (2000). But when they shine: Great students in policy debate. *The Forensic*, 85, 2, 1-9.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, New York: Anchor Books.

Goodnight, G. T. (1982). The personal, technical, and public spheres of argument. *Journal of the American Forensics Association*. 18, p. 214-227.

Harrigan, C. (2008). Against dogmatism: A continued defense of switch side debate. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate*, 29, 37-66.

Hecht, M. L., Collier, M. J., & Ribeau, S. A. (1993). *African American communication: Ethnic identity and cultural interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hollihan, T. A., & Riley, P. (1987). Academic debate and democracy: A clash of ideologies. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, 399-404.

Howell, W. (1943). The effect of high school debating on critical thinking. *Speech Monographs*, 10, 96.

Hunt, S. B. (1997). The values of forensic participation, in T. C. Winebrenner (Ed.) *Intercollegiate Forensics* (2nd Ed). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Infante, D. A. (1982). The argumentative student in the speech communication classroom: An investigation and implications. *Communication Education, 31*, 141-148.

Johnson, J. M. (2002). In-depth interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 103–119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

La Ban, F. K. (1980). Academic debate: Can we afford it? *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 34*, 73-74.

Leininger, M. (1994). Evaluation criteria and critique of qualitative research studies. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 95–115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). Qualitative communication research methods (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meltzer, B. N. (1967). Mead's social psychology. In J. G. Manis & B. N. Meltzer (Eds.), Symbolic interaction: A reader in social psychology (pp. 5–24). Boston: In B. M. Montgomery & S. Duck (Eds.), *Studying interpersonal interaction* (pp. 162_178). New York: Guilford Press.

Mitchell, G. (1998). Pedagogical possibilities for argumentative agency in academic debate. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 35, 41-61.

Mitchell, G. (2000). Simulated public argument as a pedagogical play on worlds. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 36, 134-151.

Mitchell, G. (2010). Switch-side debating meets demand-driven rhetoric of science. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 95-120.

Munksgaard, J., & Pfister, D. (2003). The Public Debater's Role in Advancing Deliberation: Towards Switch-Sides Public Debate. In *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)* (pp. 503-509). National Communication Association.

National Forensic League (2007). *Benefits of National Forensic League membership.* Retrieved February 23, 2011, from http://www.nflonline.org/AboutNFL/Benefits

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70,* 274-287.

Owen, W. F. (1985). Thematic metaphors in relational communication: A conceptual framework. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 49,* 1-13.

Rehg, W. (2002). The argumentation theorist in deliberative democracy. *Controversia: An International Journal of Debate and Democratic Renewal, 1,* 18-42.

Rowland, R. & Fritch, J.E. (1989). The relationship between debate and argumentation theory. In B. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument: Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 457-463). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Sanders, J. A., & Wiseman, R. L. (1994). Does teaching argumentation facilitate critical thinking? *Communication Reports, 7,* 1, 27-35.

Smith, J. A. (1995). Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis. In J. A. Smith, R. Harre, & L. V. Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 9_26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, D. & Popovich, H. (1980). Academic debate: The dean's perspective. *Association for Communication Bulletin, 34,* 68-72.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Strait, L., & Wallace, B. (2008). Academic debate as a decision-making game: Inculcating the virtue of practical wisdom. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate,.* 1-36.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stewart, D. J. (1986). A standard of ethics for argument. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 71,* 53-60.

Swift, C. L. (2008a). *This house would ethically engage: A critical examination of competitor and coach leadership in National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) debate.* Doctoral Dissertation. Louisiana State University, May, 2008.

Swift, C. (2008b). The (un)conventional Director of Forensics: Leader, pedagogue, and ethicist. *Conference Papers -- National Communication Association, 1.*

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tracy, K. & Naughton, J. (1994). The identity work of questioning intellectual discussion. *Communication Monographs, 61,* 281-302.

Warner, E. & Bruschke, J. (2001). 'Gone on debating:' Competitive academic debate as a tool of empowerment. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 22,* 1 -21.

Whalen, S. (1991). Intercollegiate debate as a co-curricular activity: Effects on critical thinking. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation),* 391-397.

Wiese, D. R., & Varda, S. J. (2005). *Achieving our debate community: An examination of the New Left in academic collegiate debate.* Conference proceedings – National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation), 498-505.

Williams, D. C. (2006). Argumentatively competent citizens: Building blocks of democracy. Paper presented at the "Thinking/Speaking a Better World," held in Koper, Slovenia.

Williams, D. C. & Young, M. J. (2006). Argumentation and education: Preparing citizens in cultures of democratic communication. Paper presented at the Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation. Amsterdam.

Winkler, C. (2010). The impact of policy debate on inner-city schools: The Milwaukee experience. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation),* 565-571.

Wood, J. T. (1994). Engendered identities: Shaping voice and mind through gender. In D. R. Vocate (Ed.), *Intrapersonal communication: Different voices, different minds* (pp. 145–167). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wood, J. T. (2000). *Relational communication: Continuity and change in personal relation-ships* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zarefsky, D. (2007). Making the case for war: Colin Powell at the United Nations. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 10,* 275-303.

Zompetti, J. P. (2006). The role of advocacy in civil society. *Argumentation, 20,* 167-183.

Zompetti, J. P., & Williams, D. (2007). Democratic civic engagement and pedagogical pursuits: Using argumentation and debate to energize concerned citizens. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation),* 519-528.