A Brief History of
Individual Events Nationals

LINDA J. FRYAR*

While the oral tradition may have been instrumental in producing major works of literature like the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* it is not the method of preference when recounting the relatively short, recent history of Individual Events Nationals which began as an independent enterprise and which presently operates under the jurisdiction of the National Forensic Association. With the rapid turnover in the profession of directors of forensics, and with the replacement of the intercollegiate contestant pool every four years, a special need is created to detail the development of this national championship in intercollegiate speaking. This project examines the growth of I.E. Nationals during the first fourteen years of its history.

Three areas of growth and development will be examined: major tournament results and records; administrative policies and evolving procedures; and election results. Research was conducted in the N.F.A. archives located in Engleman Hall of Southern Connecticut State University. Materials examined included complete tournament results for the first fourteen years, *N.F.A. Newsletters,* and the papers of Founder and Past-President, Dr. Seth C. Hawkins.

A variety of "national" championships in the field of intercollegiate speech have long existed. The Interstate Oratorical Contest has existed for over one hundred years. The National Debate Tournament, originally sponsored by the U.S. Military Academy, has convened annually since the end of World War II. The several forensic fraternities and honorary societies have venerable convention-tournaments on yearly or biennial bases which contain both individual events and debate competition but restrict entry to member schools of each given forensic society. These tournaments, however, are not "open" competition.

Possibly motivated by this background, Dr. Raymond C. Beaty of Ohio University and Dr. Jack H. Howe of California State

University, Long Beach both made tentative inquiries during the late 1960s concerning the feasibility of a national championship tournament in individual speaking events. Beaty reported in a letter to Hawkins that his requests were met with laughter and derision by the debate establishment. Further, there was some doubt as to whether there was enough competition in individual events to support such a tournament.

During the 1970-71 forensic season, Dr. Hawkins concluded that the rapid expansion of opportunities in individual events competition warranted the establishment of just such a national championship. Early in the spring semester of 1971, he decided to "unilaterally invent a national championship in individual events, declare it official by fiat, and send invitations." As he did not consider Southern Connecticut State a "defensible" geographical location for the tournament, the campus of Ohio Northern University in Ada, Ohio, became the site of the first championship.

No one overtly protested the legitimacy of the tournament, and, thus, the first national championship opened with 23 schools, 142 slots, six events, and three rounds with a direct cut to finals. Ohio University walked away with the sweepstakes title and 205 sweepstakes points followed by Maryland's 138, Eastern Michigan's 117, Southern Connecticut's 109, and Defiance's 80. Jim Molnar of Ohio University, gearing for his 1972 pentathlon title, became the first of several to win two national titles in the same season: in 1971, it was Prose Interpretation and Poetry Interpretation. The other national champions were from four different schools: Bob Frazier of Lehigh in Extemporaneous Speaking, Lisa Uhrig of Ball State in Impromptu Speaking, Ruth Brisbain of Defiance in Persuasion, and Cathie Craig of Georgetown-Kentucky in After-Dinner Speaking.

The roster of the original twenty-three schools at the 1971 I.E. Nationals provides an interesting commentary on the changing strength of forensic programs. Some of the strongest programs of 1984 did not attend in 1971, while a few of the major powers of fourteen years ago are now moribund. The pioneers were: American (DC), Ball State (IN), Defiance (OH), Eastern Kentucky, Eastern Michigan, Evangel (MO), Georgetown (KY), Heidelberg (OH), Kentucky, Lehigh (PA), U. Maine-Gorham (now Southern Maine), Maryland, Miami (OH), Niagara (NY), Ohio U., Ohio Northern, Purdue (IN), Shepherd (WV), Southern Connecticut, St. John's (NY), St. Rose (NY), West Chester (PA), and Wright State (OH).

Only four colleges have entered contestants at all fourteen I.E. Nationals, and only three people have been present at all fourteen.

The four colleges are Eastern Michigan, Ohio University, Southern Connecticut, and Southern Maine. In addition to Hawkins, Donald F. Peters of Niagara and Walter S. Stump of Southern Maine have never missed an I.E. Nationals.

With Hawkins on leave during 1971-72 at Bowling Green, it was convenient to retain the site of Ohio Northern for a second year. Still with three rounds plus finals, the 1972 I.E. Nationals attracted 33 colleges and 206 slots. Ball State won its only national championship to date, although, if the NFA sweepstakes system adopted the following year had been in force, Ohio University would have claimed the honors. Parkersburg became the first two-year school to attend and immediately broke into the top ten in sweepstakes. Finally, the 1972 tournament was the only I.E. Nationals held entirely during May.

Only one event was added during 1972, but it provides a curious historical footnote. Called Dramatic Pairs, it was the forerunner of the present-day Duo Interpretation. However, since east coast colleges offered the event as an acting event (without scripts, in costume, with blocking) and the midwest performed the event substantially as it is done today, both styles were allowed at Nationals. Apparently there was no judging bias, as the percentage of pairs in each style in finals roughly approximated the number of slots entered in each style.

Hawkins resisted continuing pressure from the midwestern forensic community which favored the creation of a governing organization for I.E. Nationals. A draft constitution for a National Forensic Association was produced at a "secret" meeting, convened at Miami University in Middletown, Ohio, by Raymond C. Beaty in January, 1973. It was presented to Hawkins as a fait accompli, and he contends that the tournament was removed from his control by "political pressure." While he recognizes the political reality that the NFA has become, even today Hawkins contends that "the tournament was taken away from [him] by arbitrary means" and that "one should have the right to operate something that one has invented."

A 65-college I.E. Nationals, with a dramatic increase in slottage, opened in 1973 at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti. A business meeting to approve the NFA constitution took considerable time, as it was approved article by article essentially as written by Raymond Beaty and edited by Hawkins. The only significant addition was the elected position of a Student Representative on the Executive Council. Carolyn Unnever of Central Connecticut State College narrowly defeated a then-unknown Plattsburgh under-

graduate named Edward J. Harris who was not at the meeting and was unaware that he had been nominated.

Hawkins defeated Eastern Michigan's Dennis M. Beagan for the presidency by a 42-9 margin. The vice-presidency went to Howe who was lauded in a nominating speech that made reference to the work he had put into the national intercollegiate results book. Raymond Beaty was elected as the first executive secretary, a post which includes certifying entries, scheduling the tournament, and supervising tabulations. Beagan and Peters became the first at-large Executive Council members.

In competition, home team Eastern Michigan won its first of seven national championships, while David Beale, a pre-tournament favorite, was Ohio University's last national pentathlon champion. Hawkins introduced the Founder's Cumulative Sweepstakes Award, punning years later that the award was his "defense against historical revisionists who might 'unfound' the tournament." His "fears," however, were unfounded. Ohio University, with the accumulation of points from a championship and two second-place finishes, won easily.

The NFA Constitution brought the 10% rule into effect, allowing non-finalists in events with large numbers of participants to qualify for Nationals. The concept of state championship waivers from the 7 school-12 contestant rule was legitimized, but the "no-5-Nationals" proviso and the "eight semester rule" remained unwritten law leading to challenges in later years. Due to the rapid growth of I.E. Nationals, preliminary rounds were extended to four, and sweepstakes and pentathlon awards lengthened to ten places.

1974 Nationals at Plattsburgh reached the 101 college mark (plus the only international entry ever — the University of London, England), a watershed that has been maintained each year since. Expository Speaking was added as an event, and a much needed expansion to semi-finals was begun in 1974. The business meeting produced both a new event and some controversy. Rhetorical Criticism was approved as an event for 1975 following a motion by Grace Walsh of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, and Hawkins was directed to draft the event rules. A heavily-debated proposal to remove Dramatic Duo was initiated by the suggestion that duo is not an *individual* event by strict definition. The vote to remove the event and replace it with Single Interpretation of Drama resulted in a tie which was broken when Hawkins, presiding as NFA president, cast his vote in favor of continuing Dramatic Duo as an individual event. In a second record-breaking action, Peters became the first person re-elected to any office in NFA.

1974 and 1975 produced the first consecutive championships at I.E. Nationals: Ohio University in sweepstakes and Bobbi Rowe Baugh of Stetson University as pentathlon winner. Further, the 1975 Niagara tournament saw the expansion of the Executive Council with the addition of two more at-large seats for a total of four. Howe became the first person re-elected to a multi-year term (as vice-president). Richard Haven became the first former contestant in I.E. Nationals to win an Executive Council position other than, of course, student representatives (he had competed at Nationals in 1971).

In 1976 I.E. Nationals came to California. Eastern Michigan began an unprecedented series of six consecutive national championships. Irene Zeigler's first place pentathlon finish set a record with three straight penthathlon titles for the same school. This mark was matched in 1981 and broken in 1982. Catherine C. Beaty, of Parkersburg, became the first community college coach to join the ranks of the Executive Council, but Ruth Bacon, of Heidelberg, had beaten her by one year for the distinction of being the first woman member of the governing board. Peters became Executive Secretary, the first move from an at-large seat to higher office. Quarterfinals were mandated in 1976 and the National Assembly later ratified the action. Ohio University became the first school to win the Founder's Trophy twice, and Raymond Beaty retired from forensics with three national championships and three second-place finishes in six years.

In 1976 Pensacola Junior College and the University of West Florida were discovered to have been competing as one school during the regular season and were forced to compete as separate teams at Nationals. It became necessary to define a "school" when it was discovered that Morehouse University and Spelman College, separate degree-granting institutions, were engaging in a similar practice in 1977.

George Mason University hosted the 1977 tournament at which Eastern Michigan completed the first "triple crown": first place sweepstakes, first place pentathlon, and first place Founder's Trophy. EMU added a second "triple crown" in 1980, and Bradley University performed the same feat in 1984. Initiation of two-year, staggered terms for at-large council positions was begun. Harris (Penn State) and Anita C. James (USC) were the first doctoral candidates elected to at-large positions, as all previous NFA positions, excepting student representatives, had been filled by full-time faculty. The presidency was turned over to Michael P. Kelley of California State University, Los Angeles, and the term of

TABLE 1
I.E. Nationals: Locations and Results, 1971-1984

YEAR	LOCATION AND HOST	REGULAR SWEEPSTAKES
1971	Ohio Northern University Margaret Ann Riggle	Ohio University
1972	Ohio Northern University Margaret Ann Riggle	Ball State University
1973	Eastern Michigan University Dennis M. Beagan	Eastern Michigan U.
1974	Plattsburgh State University Al R. Montanaro, Jr.	Ohio University
1975	Niagara University Donald F. Peters	Ohio University
1976	Calif. State U. Los Angeles Michael P. Kelley	Eastern Michigan U.
1977	George Mason University Bruce B. Manchester	Eastern Michigan U.
1978	Monmouth College of N. J. William A. Yaremchuk	Eastern Michigan U.
1979	U. Wisconsin at Whitewater Richard Haven	Eastern Michigan U.
1980	University of Montevallo Robert R. Kunkel	Eastern Michigan U.
1981	Western Kentucky U. Larry A. Caillouet	Eastern Michigan U.
1982	Ohio State University David A. Radanovich	Bradley University
1983	Illinois State — Normal Connie Day + Doug Jennings	Bradley University
1984	Georgia Southern College Janet B. Bury	Bradley University

office was reduced constitutionally from a 4-year to a 3-year term. By 1978 most association decision-making was taking place by mail ballot rather than at the National Assembly. As a result, Kelley chaired smaller meetings at Monmouth, New Jersey while Eastern Michigan won an unprecedented third straight championship. George Mason University became the first school to win the Founder's Trophy without having won regular sweepstakes at least once. The Trojans of USC produced a flamboyant pentathlon champion, William Allen Young, noted for wearing white gloves to claim his trophies.

YEAR	PENTATHLON WINNER	FOUNDER'S TROPHY
1971	Paul Balon Southern Connecticut	(not yet established)
1972	Jim Molnar Ohio University	(not yet established)
1973	David Beale Ohio University	Ohio University
1974	Bobbi Rowe Stetson University	Eastern Michigan Univ.
1975	Bobbi Rowe Stetson University	Ball State Univ.
1976	Irene Zeigler Stetson University	Ohio University
1977	Michael Garcia Eastern Michigan	Eastern Michigan Univ.
1978	William Allen Young U. Southern California	George Mason Univ.
1979	Michael Denger Eastern Michigan U.	Stetson Univ.
1980	John Capecci Eastern Michigan	Eastern Michigan
1981	Jon Capecci Eastern Michigan	Ohio University
1982	Teresa McElwee Eastern Michigan	Bowling Green State Univ.
1983	Mike Jones Eastern Michigan	Illinois State—Normal
1984	Brad Johanson Bradley University	Bradley University

Some incidental records were established in 1979. Wisconsin Whitewater, the host school, achieved the distinction of being the only Nationals to record a snowfall. The NFA added a second yearly business meeting at the Speech Communication Association convention. Anita James ended her Executive Council tenure after having represented three different schools in three years. According to Hawkins, the tournament results were "predictable."

A series of constitutional changes were set in motion at the 1980 Montevallo tournament, the most noticeable effects of which were the standardization of time limits of events. SCA affiliate status

Table 2
National Forensic Association Election Results to 1984

Term Began: April of	President	Past President	Vice-President	Executive Secretary
1971	[Seth C. Hawkins, Southern Conn.][1]			
1972				
1973	Seth C. Hawkins		Jack H. Howe, Calif. State Long Beach	Raymond C. Beaty, Ohio University
1974				
1975			re-elected	
1976				Donald F. Peters, Niagara University
1977	Michael P. Kelley, California State-LA	Seth Hawkins[2]	Albert Montanaro, Plattsburgh State	
1978				
1979			Catherine C. Beaty, Parkersburg	Edward J. Harris, Suffolk University
1980	Donald F. Peters, Niagara University	Michael P. Kelley		
1981			re-elected	
1982				Harris-Leiboff (see text)
1983	Edward J. Harris, Jr., Suffolk Univ.	Donald F. Peters	re-elected; office split (add Kelley)	Michael D. Leiboff, Mansfield Univ.
1984			C. Beaty + M. Kelley	

[1]There was no NFA in 1971; Hawkins was simply "in charge" of I.E. Nationals with appointed Board of Advisors.

[2]Upon expiration of term as Past President, NFA voted that the lifetime Executive Council position of Founder be given to Hawkins

	At-Large Seat 1	At-Large Seat 2	At-Large Seat 3	At-Large Seat 4	Student Representative
1971					
1972					
1973	Donald F. Peters, Niagara University	Dennis M. Beagan, Eastern Michigan			Carolyn Unnever, Central Connecticut
1974	re-elected	Michael P. Kelley, California State-Los Angeles			Paul Van Dyne, Penn State
1975	re-elected	Ruth Bacon, Heidelberg College	Ron Bough, Stetson Univ.	Richard Haven, Wisc.-Whitewater	Denise Gorsline, Eastern Michigan
1976	Kelley	Catherine C. Beaty, Parkersburg CC	Al Montanaro, Plattsburgh State	Michael D. Leiboff, Mansfield State	Chip Letzgus, Ohio University
1977	Anita C. James, Univ. of Southern Calif.		Ed Harris, Penn State		Shawn McGee, Ball State
1978	James, now at Santa Rosa J.C.	C. Beaty		re-elected	Molly Spengler, Illinois State
1979	James, now at Ohio Univ.	Jane Benson, Wisconsin-Whitewater	Montanaro		John Boone, Morehouse College
1980	Robert R. Kunkel, Montevallo			re-elected	Kevin Dean, Bowling Green
1981		Chip Letzgus, now at Morehead State	Montanaro		David Voss, Occidental College
1982	Robert Rosenthal, North Carolina-Wilmington	Christine Reynolds,[3] Univ. of Minnesota		Connie Day, Illinois State	Dan Donellon, Bowling Green
1983	Jack Kay,[4] Nebraska-Lincoln		Keith Semmel, Ball State		Tracy Anderson, Bradley
1984	John Williams, Western Carolina	Reynolds, now at Wisconsin-Eau Claire		Montanaro	Anderson + John Broer, Miami (OH)

[3]Letzgus resigned; Reynolds appointed to fill unexpired term, then elected in her own right.

[4]Rosenthal, taking appointment at Suffolk, was forced to resign unexpired term due to provision in NFA Constitution; Kay appointed to complete term in office.

was confirmed, facilitating the movement of NFA in the direction of a scholarly, journal-producing organization. Eastern Michigan won the "triple crown," earning enough points to take a third Founder's Trophy in ten years.

It was in 1981 at Western Kentucky, however, that the EMU dynasty reached its peak. Eastern presented retiring director Beagan with a sixth consecutive national championship. In the eleven years Beagan coached EMU to I.E. Nationals, the school recorded seven national titles, two seconds, and two thirds; three Founder's Trophies; and four national pentathlon championships, with Jon Capecci matching Bobbi Rowe's back-to-back first-place finishes. EMU continued to win penthathlon trophies until setting a record of five straight, climaxed by Mike Jones' 1983 mark of 105 points.

In 1981 Chip Letzgus of Morehead was the first former student representative to win an at-large council seat. He later became the first Executive Council member to resign. Michael D. Leiboff of Mansfield State began his sixth consecutive year as an at-large officer, then moved up to Executive-Secretary Elect in 1982.

In 1982 Ohio became the first state to host three national tournaments when Nationals convened at Ohio State. Bradley University became only the fourth college to win a national title, ending the EMU string and beginning a dynasty of their own which has now reached three straight national championships. The Rhetorical Criticism rules were expanded, in Hawkins' words, "rather as one widens a needle's eye to resemble the Marianas Trench." Bowling Green became the first college to elect a second student representative.

The National Forensic Journal was first published in 1983. To make the editorial position a non-voting Executive Council post, the vice-presidency was split to include administration and professional relations. Catherine Beaty assumed the position of Vice-President for Administration and Kelley became Vice-President for Professional Relations. Peters became Past President; Harris assumed the Presidency; and Leiboff assumed the post of Executive Secretary. Peters assumed his fourth different position in NFA, but Kelley topped him by taking his fourth different position without ever having been Executive Secretary. Robert Rosenthal was forced to resign his at-large position because of a constitutional provision against two officers representing the same school. Rosenthal had moved from North Carolina-Wilmington to Suffolk, from which school Harris functioned as an Executive Council member. In 1984 Tracey Anderson of Bradley became the first

student representative to run for re-election and win. She also became the first student co-representative sharing the post with John Broer of Miami (Ohio) when the National Assembly approved the action after a deadlocked election in the Student Assembly.

Some present office-holders have devoted a considerable number of years to the NFA. Seth Hawkins, of course, has served the association continuously since its inception. Peters has served a total of eleven years; Kelley ten years; Leiboff and Catherine Beaty nine years; and Harris and Montanaro eight years.

With a consistent attendance of over 125 colleges and over 1700 slots per season, I.E. Nationals is a viable entity. The continued growth of scholarly activities, including the National Forensic Journal and S.C.A. convention programs, points toward a healthy future for individual events competition and I.E. Nationals.

The Relationship of Judging Panel Composition to Scoring at the 1984 N.F.A. Nationals

JACK KAY and ROGER ADEN*

During the past several years the notion that forensic competition serves as a laboratory for the study and practice of communication has increased in popularity.[1] Today, as in the past, the competitive speech tournament remains the cornerstone of that laboratory experience. Here the student is exposed to critic judges who supposedly render thorough and impartial evaluation of the student's skill in various forensic events. The evaluation provides the student with feedback regarding progress in developing effective communicative skills. Just as the science student performs an experiment while being observed and evaluated by a skilled laboratory teacher, the student of forensics at the speech tournament is experimenting. He or she looks to the advice and evaluation of the critic-judge in order to receive maximum benefit from the laboratory experience.

Paralleling forensic competition with a science laboratory raises a number of important implications. Just as in the science laboratory where experimenter learning is highly dependent upon

[1]The notion of forensics as a laboratory was articulated at the first National Developmental Conference on Forensics. See James H. McBath, ed., *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective* (Skokie, 111.: National Textbook, 1975). A paper arguing for applying the laboratory perspective to competitive individual events was presented at the third AFA/SC A summer argumentation conference: Jack Kay, "Rapprochement of World$_1$ and World$_2$: Discovering the Ties between Practical Discourse and Forensics," in *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation,* ed. David Zarefsky, Malcolm Sillars, and Jack Rhodes (Annandale, Va.: SCA, 1983), pp. 927-37. More recently, a panel entitled "Individual Events as a Laboratory for Argument" was presented at the 1984 Central States Speech Association Convention. See, for example, Kenneth Johnson, "The Demands of a Scientific Laboratory," and Jack Kay, "Individual Events as a Laboratory for Argument: Analogues for Limited Preparation Events," both papers presented at the CSSA Convention, Chicago, 14 April 1984.

the quality of laboratory teacher supervision, student learning in the forensic laboratory is equally dependent upon the quality of critic-judge evaluation. Should critic-judges render unfair or un-informed evaluations, the quality of the laboratory experience diminishes as does the faith the student has in the laboratory. Thus, the laboratory metaphor suggests that considerable attention must be paid to the evaluative process.

Scholarship examining the theory and practice of individual events within the context of the laboratory metaphor is in its infancy. Although a few studies of critic-judge ballot comments have been conducted, no comprehensive research project describing judge scoring at forensic tournaments is extant.[2] The lack of such study seriously impairs the ability of forensic educators to claim that they are providing students with a quality laboratory experience.

The present study reflects a sensitivity to the need for investigation of the forensic laboratory and responds to a two-fold need. First, as has been argued, forensic educators must evaluate the quality of the laboratory experience provided to students. Such evaluation must occur at many levels ranging from empirical investigation of acquired learning and skill development to critical studies of student performance. Second, a need exists to validate or debunk the intuitive judgments made by coaches and students regarding judging practices at forensic tournaments. A frequent claim of both groups is that incompetent judging, not student performance, is a key factor in low student ranking and rating.[3] Such thinking diminishes the value of the laboratory experience for the student by fostering the belief that no matter what the student does to improve, he or she will not be fairly evaluated.

PURPOSE AND METHODS

The present study is a preliminary step within a systematic program of research designed to assess the quality of the forensic

---

[2]Several studies examining ballots appear in George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes, eds., *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation* (Annandale, Va.: SCA, 1981). However, these studies utilize extremely limited samples. The predominant scholarship in this area has been speculative rather than empirical. See, for example, Norbert H. Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics: Toward a Uniform Code in the 80's," *National Forensic Journal,* 1 (1983), pp. 19-31.

[3]The claim of incompetent judging can be heard from students and coaches alike at tournaments and in tabulation rooms. The point is also made by Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics," p. 19.

laboratory. Specifically, the study describes and analyzes judging panel agreement at the 1984 National Individual Events Tournament sponsored by the National Forensic Association held from April 26 through 30,1984 at Georgia Southern College in Statesboro. This event was selected because it represents the largest individual events tournament in the nation with substantial geographical diversity.[4] In addition, the tournament's use of two-judge panels in preliminary rounds allows for direct comparative analysis.

The original cumulative ballots for all preliminary rounds of all nine events at the tournament were obtained from the NFA executive secretary. The ballots contain the following information: judge name, judge school, round number, event, section number, contestant names, contestant codes, contestant ranks (one to five, with one high), contestant ratings (seventy to one hundred, with one hundred high). The information contained on the ballots was manually entered in a computerized data management program which is designed to generate descriptive statistics comparing judge agreement on student rankings and ratings.

Student rankings are compared on two dimensions. First, the program compares the *ranks* given to each student by each pair of judges. Judges are considered to be in agreement if they awarded the contestant the same rank or if they differed by only one rank. For example, if one judge gave the student a rank of two and the other judge gave the same student a rank of three, the judges are considered in agreement. When ranks differ by two or more, e.g., one judge ranked a student two and the other ranked the same student four, the case is treated as a disagreement. Second, the program compares the *degree of difference* in ranking. Judge pairs that gave to the same contestant in the same section of an event ranks of one and five, or ranks of one and four, are considered to be "split." Judge rating points are also compared by computing the *point difference* for each student in each round. The data base program produces a percentage total for level of ranking agreement (total number of agreements divided by the total number of cases), a percentage total for ranking splits (total number of splits divided by the total number of cases), and a mean total for point differences (total point difference divided by the number of cases).

In addition to the overall totals and percentages, the cases are sorted into various *demographic categories* and then compared. Judges are placed into a number of discrete categories, based upon

---

[4]Approximately 116 schools from 30 states are listed in the 1984 tournament booklet.

information reported on their cumulative ballots.[6] The categories include: (1) gender (male or female), (2) region (Heartland—Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wisconsin; Industrial Midwest—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio; Mid-Atlantic—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia; Northeast—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island; South-Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee; Southern Plains—Arkansas, California, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas),[6] and (3) judge type (coach judge or hired judge).[7] Percentages and subtotals are calcualted within and between the various demographic groupings as well as within and between the various events.

This study does not rely upon a sample of judge ballots at the NFA tournament but instead, examines the entire population. Consequently, inferential statistical tests are not performed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall Results

The study of the 1984 NFA tournament reveals a surprisingly low agreement rate—only 65.22%—among judging panels on student ranking (see Table 1). Considering the rather liberal definition of agreement used in the study (the same rank or a variation by one), the ranking agreement level is quite low. Such an agreement rate would not be acceptable in a social scientific research project

––––––––––

[5]The authors operated under the assumption that the school names appearing on the ballots are correct, unless no such school was registered for the tournament or a school name did not appear on the ballot. In such cases, an effort was made to determine the school name by consulting the schematic and other ballots filled out by the judge. The authors were able to account for every preliminary round ballot completed at the tournament.

[6]The regional categories include only those states with judges at the tournament. No attempt was made to determine the region of each hired judge. Instead, hired judges are treated as a separate region. Given the location of the NFA tournament, we suspect that the majority of hired judges are from the South. California is included in the Southern Plains region for two reasons: first, the small number of ballots from California judges makes the creation of a separate regional category impractical and, second, the California judges consistently agreed in the decision of their Southern Plain's counterparts, the region geographically closest to California in the study.

[7]Hired judges are individuals who identified the school affiliation of Georgia Southern College or are affiliated with a school not registered to compete at the tournament. The coach judge category probably includes some judges who were hired directly by participating schools but who do not ordinarily coach at the school.

utilizing coders practicing content analysis techniques. Dramatic ranking splits between judges (a student in the same section receiving ranks of 1 and 4 or 1 and 5) also occurred quite frequently. Almost 9% of the decisions involved such splits. The largest discrepancy between judges involved the assignment of rating points. On the average, judges evaluating the same student differed by 6.43 rating points. This difference appears especially high given the maximum discrepancy allowed on the 30 point ballot.

TABLE 1

"Overall Judge Agreement on Rank and Rating"

Rank Agreement:	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement
	4917	2622	65.22
Panel Splits:	1/4 Splits	1/5 Splits	% Split Decisions
	319	359	8.99
Point Difference:	Point Difference		Average Point Difference
	48,492		6.43

Several explanations may account for the relatively low agreement rate among judges at the 1984 NFA tournament. One possibility is that the quality of student performances was so similar that more precise differentiation was not possible. An alternate explanation is that judges did not employ consistent evaluative standards, either because many of them were untrained in evaluative methods or had received substantially different training. Unfortunately, this study design does not include techniques to account for the differences between judges. Until more sophisticated studies occur which thoroughly examine judge variables, accounting for the agreement rate is speculative. However, we should recognize that the relatively low judge agreement rate revealed in this study may have important implications for the notion of forensics as a laboratory. If judges and not student performances are responsible for the low rate of agreement, the forensic laboratory may not be a place in which students receive competent and fair evaluations. Success at the tournament may be more a function of chance than skill.

HIRED JUDGES VERSUS COACH JUDGES

A persistent complaint at forensic tournaments, including NFA Individual Events Nationals, is that hired judges are less qualified than coach judges. If such is the case, we should expect that hired judges would frequently disagree with coach judges. The study data reveals that panels composed of a coach judge and a hired judge agreed in ranking and points less often (62%) than panels composed exclusively of coach judges (almost 67%) although the difference is not large (see Table 2). Similarly, there are a greater number of 1/5 and 1/4 splits on panels consisting of a coach judge and a hired judge. The point discrepancy also is greater with mixed panels.

TABLE 2

"Agreement by Judge Type—Coach vs. Hired"

Rank Agreement:

Panel Type	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement
Coach/Coach	3246	1611	66.83
Coach/Hired	1589	974	62.00
Hired/Hired	82	37	68.91

Panel Splits:

Panel Type	1/4 Splits	1/5 Splits	% Split Decisions
Coach/Coach	207	215	8.69
Coach/Hired	107	137	9.52
Hired/Hired	5	7	10.08

Point Difference:

Panel Type	Point Difference	Average Point Difference
Coach/Coach	30,242	6.23
Coach/Hired	17,340	6.77
Hired/Hired	910	7.65

The study data confirms the belief that hired judges differ from coach judges in their evaluations although probably not as much as is popularly believed. Again, the reasons for this difference are not discoverable with the methods of this study. The results, however, do suggest that more attention needs to be devoted to a discussion of hired judge usage in the forensic laboratory.

AGREEMENT DIFFERENCES BY EVENT

This study reveals considerable variation on judge agreement levels between the various events (see Table 3). The event producing the greatest ranking agreement is Extemporaneous Speaking (72%) in contrast to the lowest agreement event of Prose (almost 62%). Extemporaneous Speaking also had the lowest point discrepancy and the least percentage of split decisions. Other high agreement events include Impromptu and After-Dinner Speaking. Events with low agreement levels include Prose, Rhetorical Criticism, and Persuasion. Table 4 shows that limited-preparation speaking events enjoyed higher agreement levels than did prepared public speaking events and oral interpretation events.

TABLE 3
"Judge Rank/Rating Agreement and Split by Event"

Event	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement	Point Difference	% Split Decisions
Extemp.	487	188	72.15	5.71	5.77
Improm.	593	279	68.00	6.58	7.91
ADS	476	229	67.52	6.31	7.37
Poetry	684	353	65.96	6.59	8.00
Duo	532	293	64.48	6.28	9.57
Expos.	569	314	64.44	6.17	8.94
Pers.	535	322	62.43	6.78	11.31
Rh. Crit.	303	187	61.84	6.78	10.00
Prose	738	457	61.76	6.62	10.96
TOTAL	4917	2622	65.22	6.43	8.99

Similarly, the study demonstrated considerable ranking differences between hired and coach judges within particular events (see Table 5). Events in which low agreement occurs between coach/coach panels and coach/hired panels include Impromptu Speaking (72.62% compared to 56.07%) and Rhetorical Criticism (62.94% versus 50%). High agreement events include Duo Interpretation and Extemporaneous Speaking, with differences under

TABLE 4
"Judge Rank/Rating Agreement and Splits by Event Type"

Event Type[a]	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement	Average Point Difference	% Split Decisions
Limited-prep.	1080	467	69.81	5.71	6.98
Public spkg.	1883	1052	64.16	7.50	9.44
Interp	1954	1103	63.92	6.50	8.47
TOTAL	4917	2622	65.22	6.43	8.99

[a]Events for limited-preparation include: Extemporaneous Speaking and Impromtu Speaking; for public speaking: Persuasion, Expository Speaking, Rhetorical Criticism, and After-Dinner Speaking; for interpretation events: Prose, Poetry, and Duo Interpretation.

Precise explanations for the large variance in judge agreement between events are difficult to formulate. The reason for the high agreement found in Extemporaneous and Impromptu Speaking may be that both events utilize a specific question or quotation as the artifact for analysis and thus judges focus their evaluations on the ability of a student to answer the question or provide insight into the quotation. The nature of these events may therefore account for the higher agreement level.

TABLE 5
"Rank/Rating Agreement by Event and Judge Type"

Event	Coach/Coach Panels % Rank Agreement	Coach/Hired Panels % Rank Agreement	Difference
Duo	64.63	63.99	0.64
Extemp.	72.46	71.05	1.41
Pers.	63.13	60.81	2.32
Expos.	65.99	63.16	2.83
Prose	63.04	59.45	3.59
ADS	68.56	64.49	4.07
Poetry	67.49	62.73	4.76
Rh. Crit.	62.94	50.00	12.94
Improm.	72.62	56.07	16.55

The low agreement level for Rhetorical Criticism is not a surprising finding. Given the relatively short history of the event and the few judges with direct expertise in the event, we can expect a low agreement rate. The same factors, however, do not explain why the event of Prose Interpretation, one of the oldest forensic events, also demonstrates a low agreement level.

Precisely what the event-agreement data demonstrate is difficult to discern. At the very least, the data suggest that forensic educators need to carefully examine the nature of each event in relationship to the evaluative standards used by critic-judges. The data do indicate that hired judges tend to agree more with coach judges when judging the events of Duo Interpretation, Extemporaneous Speaking, Persuasion, and Expository Speaking.

AGREEMENT DIFFERENCES BY GENDER

Overall, gender composition of judging panels is not a significant variable in rank agreement (see Table 6). The highest agreement percentage involves panels consisting of two female judges (just over 65%). Male/male and male/female panels follow closely (just under 65%).

TABLE 6
"Rank Agreement by Judge Gender"

Panel Gender	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement
Male/Male	1600	866	64.88
Male/Female	2355	1286	64.68
Female/Female	962	470	67.18
TOTAL	4917	2622	65.22

Despite the overall consistency in agreement, significant ranking discrepancy occurs within particular events (see Table 7). For example, female/female panels judging Prose agreed in over 68% of the cases while male/male panels agreed less than 58% of the time. The agreement discrepancy is similar for critics judging Extemporaneous Speaking and Persuasion.

TABLE 7
"Rank Agreement by Judge Gender and Event"

Event	Male/Male Agree %	Male/Female Agree %	Female/Female Agree %
Extemp.	67.78	74.82	77.89
Improm.	63.72	70.53	70.29
ADS	68.44	67.39	65.83
Poetry	68.04	61.19	74.87
Duo	60.21	69.52	61.62
Expos.	65.33	63.74	64.77
Pers.	68.64	60.48	58.92
Rh. Crit.	64.66	59.01	64.58
Prose	57.72	61.40	68.14
TOTAL	64.88	64.68	67.18

The high overall agreement level by gender is somewhat deceptive. Separating the data by event reveals that only Expository Speaking and After-Dinner Speaking have high agreement levels by all panel types. No consistent pattern emerges among the events in which agreement by gender is low. For example, in Prose Interpretation and Extemporaneous Speaking, female/female panels agreed more often than did male/male panels, whereas in Persuasion the opposite is the case. Further study is needed to determine the relationship between judging standards, event, and gender.

AGREEMENT DIFFERENCES BY REGION

Substantial difference can be observed between the regional composition of judging panels and their agreement level (see Table 8). The agreement percentage between various regional pairs ranges from a high of almost 79% to a low just under 55%. Regional pairs with high ranking agreement (over 70%) include: Heartland/Heartland, Heartland/Northeast, Heartland/Mid-Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic/South, Industrial Midwest/Industrial Midwest, and Southern Plains/South. Low ranking agreement pairs (under 60%) include: Southern Plains/Heartland, South/South, Southern Plains/Southern Plains, Heartland/South, and South/Hire.

TABLE 8
"Rank Agreement of Judges by Region"

Regions[a]	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement	Rank[b]
HRT/HRT	22	6	78.57	1(1)
HRT/NE	57	21	73.08	2
HRT/MA	67	25	72.83	3
MA/MA	50	19	72.46	4(2)
MA/SO	116	45	72.05	5
IMW/IMW	18	299	70.60	6(3)
SPL/SO	68	29	70.10	7
NE/HIRE	184	80	69.70	8
MA/NE	94	41	69.63	9
HIRE/HIRE	82	37	68.91	10(4)
NE/SPL	35	16	68.63	11
IMW/NE	273	130	67.74	12
NE/NE	27	13	67.50	13(5)
HRT/HIRE	112	54	67.47	14
HRT/IMW	358	181	66.42	15
IMW/MA	513	267	65.77	16
IMW/SPL	218	126	63.37	17
SPL/HIRE	111	65	63.07	18
NE/SO	44	26	62.86	19
IMW/SO	349	207	62.77	20
IMW/HIRE	759	460	62.26	21
MA/SPL	56	34	62.22	22
MA/HIRE	227	145	61.02	23
SPL/HRT	44	30	59.46	24
SO/SO	51	35	59.30	25(6)
SPL/SPL	14	10	58.3	26(7)
HRT/SO	63	51	55.26	27
SO/HIRE	205	170	54.67	28

[a]HIRE = Hired Judges   HRT = Heartland
 IMW = Industrial Midwest   MA = Mid-Atlantic
 NE = Northeast   SO = South
 SPL = Southern Plains

[b]Number in parentheses indicates rank of agreement percentage when two members of a region are on the same panel.

When judges from the same regions are compared to all other regions with whom they judged, the percentage of agreement ranges from almost 69% for Northeast judges to just over 61% for judges from the South (see Table 9).

TABLE 9
"Regional Comparison of Rank Agreement"

Region	Agree	Disagree	% Rank Agreement	Rank
Northeast	714	327	68.59	1
Heartland	723	368	66.27	2
Mid-Atlantic	1123	576	66.10	3
Industrial Midwest	3188	1670	65.62	4
Southern Plains	546	310	63.78	5
Hired Judges	1680	1011	62.43	6
South	896	563	61.41	7

Accounting for the differences in agreement between regions is difficult. One possible explanation may be that judges in different regions have varying standard of evaluation. For example, judges in the South might afford higher consideration to delivery whereas critics in the Industrial Midwest might emphasize content. However, a precise explanation must await further study.

Intuitively, when judges from the same region are on a panel, we should expect higher agreement. The data bear out this expectation with five of the seven uni-regional panels ranking in the top half of all panels (see Table 8). The remaining two uni-regional panels, however, rank twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth. The data demonstrate sufficient variation to warrant further study of regional differences in judging.

CONCLUSIONS

Although it is difficult to infer definite causal conclusions from the data, this study does demonstrate that the forensic laboratory is plagued by inconsistency. Low overall agreement levels combined with wide variations in agreement within other categories support this contention. Some disagreement is bound to occur when subjective decisions must be made by critic-judges. If forensic educators are to claim that their laboratory is a quality experience,

however, the wide discrepancies of judge agreement must be narrowed. If science teachers agreed on the laboratory work success of the science student only 65% of the time, fellow educators would likely scoff at the claim of a quality laboratory experience. Corrective measures are clearly needed. Further study, moreover, is essential before improvement measures can be implemented. Such study should ascertain the causes of judge ranking and rating variation by exploring such variables as judge experience, judge education, and event standards. Without such research the quality of the forensic laboratory will at best stagnate. The implications of such stagnation should not be taken lightly. First, forensic educators may not be able to claim that they are providing a quality educational experience for students. Second, students themselves may lose faith in the laboratory experience because of the inconsistent results they encounter. When students lose faith in the laboratory, they are also likely to become disenchanted with the subject matter. Forensics is no exception.

A Categorical Content Analysis
of Rhetorical Criticism Ballots

KEVIN W. DEAN and WILLIAM L. BENOIT*

When new students wander into the college forensics program, probably one of the last things on their mind is "rhetorical criticism."[1] Although rhetorical criticism has steadily increased in popularity since its introduction as a competitive individual event, it is still an endeavor shrouded in mystery—and much misunderstanding. It is qualitatively different from all other events, being a "meta-speech," a speech about a speech (or about rhetorical and communicative events). Unfortunately, there is a dearth of information available to assist the student and coach of competitive rhetorical criticism. Speech educators, forensics coaches, and competitors have a veritable smorgasbord of texts and self-help books available for other events, ranging from extemporaneous speaking to persuasion and oral interpretation. This situation is quite different for competitive rhetorical criticism.[2]

One answer to this problem is to turn to scholarly rhetorical criticism. Many resources exist in this area for the student and

[1]We employ the phrase "rhetorical criticism" in a way which encompasses competitive events called "rhetorical criticism," "communication criticism," "rhetorical analysis," and "communication analysis."

[2]Little information exists to guide the speaker or coach of competitive rhetorical criticism. For example, Don F. Faules, Richard D. Rieke, and Jack Rhodes, *Directing Forensics* (Denver: Morton Publishing Co., 1976), 2/e discusses extemporaneous speaking, impromptu speaking, persuasive speaking, expository speaking, oral interpretation events, and after-dinner speaking, but never mentions rhetorical criticism. The National Textbook Series of booklets includes several individual events but not rhetorical criticism. While a few articles have been published in scholarly journals, of the 270 forensics (non-debate) articles indexed in Ronald Matlon's *Index to Journals in Speech Communication Studies Through 1979,* only one (Paul A. Barefield, "Competitive Individual Speaking in Rhetorical Criticism," *Speech Teacher* 16[March 1967], pp. 109-14) deals with this individual event.

coach of competitive rhetorical criticism. While these materials are extremely valuable resources, they cannot be relied upon un-critically due to important differences between the two species of rhetorical criticism, scholarly and competitive.[3] They are, quite simply put, different games with different rules and different players. Given the lack of published material on competitive rhetorical criticism, and the fact that it differs in certain important aspects from scholarly rhetorical criticism, this essay is designed to begin to fill this gap in the literature by investigating the expecta-tions and standards judges employ to evaluate competitive rhetorical criticism, as evidenced by comments from ballots written in this event.

There are, of course, limitations to this source of information. Judges may not be able to record all of the thoughts—positive or negative—of an evaluative nature that cross their minds while judging a speech. It is possible that some judges may be unable or unwilling to articulate some of their reactions. Ballots rarely indicate which comments were, to them, the most important considerations. Some ballots are difficult to interpret. Finally, judge comments are limited by the speeches they judge—that is, the judge has no motivation to write down all of the standards they employ in judging this event, but only the ones occasioned by the speech at hand.

Despite these limitations, judges' comments do provide some insight in an area where little is currently available. First, these data do reveal which concepts the judges felt were important enough to pass along to the competitor. Comments which tend to recur—or, possibly more tellingly, are absent—point at least to some of the expectations and standards of a judge. An adequate sample of ballots—particularly if they are not limited to one region of the country—should enhance the likelihood that the majority of judges' expectations are included in the sample. Furthermore, in an activity like individual events, which stresses responsiveness to the audience, knowledge of those things that the audience (the judges) consider important enough to include in their comments should be of inestimable value to student and coach alike. Finally, the results of this sort of inquiry could be employed to inform subsequent research, more specifically, a survey questionnaire of coaches and judges, to supplement and confirm the findings from this effort.

---

[3]William L. Benoit, "Response to Hahn and Gustainis," *The Forensic* 68(Spring 1983): 3-5.

PROCEDURE

Over three hundred rhetorical criticism ballots from four tournaments held in different regions of the country were obtained for analysis.[4] Each ballot was subjected to categorical content analysis,[5] with the categories emerging from analysis of the data. A total of 1445 evaluative 'comments were identified, and then grouped into two overall areas: 776 comments on speech skills and 669 comments on rhetorical criticism. Each of these broad topic areas was further subdivided (the former into four categories and the latter into eight). Some of these sub-divisions were broken down into more specific categories as well. Finally, the evaluative comments in each specific category were divided into almost 400 positive and over 1000 negative comments. These data are displayed in Table 1.

DISCUSSION

The discussion of results will parallel the order of the twelve categories of Table 1. This table is grouped into those categories pertaining to "speech skills" and then "rhetorical criticism." The categories are ordered not according to any notion of importance, but simply according to frequency of occurrence. Each section is also divided into positive and negative comments. Inspection of the table reveals that some categories contain only positive or only negative comments, although most had some of each. The 776 comments which dealt with speech skills were grouped into four categories: delivery, organization, documentation, and time.

The single largest category of comments, comprising thirty percent (30%) of the total comments, is delivery. Contestants are praised for direct eye contact, purposeful gestures and movement, utilization of humor, enthusiasm, and a personable/conversational tone. Criticisms of delivery are considerably more varied. Physical

––––––––––

[4]The four tournaments represented in this study were: Rose Bowl Invitational, Miami University (Ohio), October 21-22, 1983; Aquarius XIV, Ball State University, November 4-5, 1983; Golden Eagle Invitational, California State University, Los Angeles, January 13-14, 1984; and Great Salt Lake Invitational, University of Utah, January 28-30, 1984.

[5]For discussion of the technique of content analysis which guided our analysis, see Richard Budd, Robert Thorp, and Lewis Donohew, *Content Analysis of Communication* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), Ole Holsti, *Content Analysis* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969), and Klaus Krippendorff, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980).

TABLE 1
"Comments Concerning the Speech and Performance"

CATEGORY	Positive	Comments	Negative	Comments
Delivery	overall	47	overall	8
	conversational	10	conversational	36
	eye contact/	9	eye contact	14
	enthusiasm	8	enthusiasm	22
	humor	7	humor	4
	language	4		
	gestures	3	gestures	34
	articulation/		articulation/	
	pronunciation	3	pronunciation	3
	manuscript (none)	2	manuscript	55
			choppy/memory	
			problems	36
			rapid rate	61
			over-dramatic	13
			volume soft	11
			pacing/movement	10
			lack confidence	5
			grammar	5
Subtotal: 427				
Organization	overall	44	overall	17
	introduction	31	introduction	26
	conclusion	20	conclusion	12
	preview	7	preview	18
	transitions	4	transitions	12
	thesis	1	thesis	2
			ideas too late	10
Subtotal: 204				
Documentation		25		62
Subtotal: 87				
Time		0	too long	18
			too short	15
			narrow topic	25
Subtotal:	58			
TOTAL for Speech/Performance:		776		

delivery comments center on stiff, mechanical, or choppy gestures; excessive movement; and shifting eye contact. Vocal delivery criticisms include memory lapses, improper grammar, insufficient volume, forced humor, sloppy articulation and pronunciation, choppy fluency, an overdramatic "interpy" quality (especially in introductions, conclusions, and on quoted material), lack of energy, monotone, and—most frequently mentioned—overly rapid rate of delivery.

One additional comment must be made concerning delivery: use of a manuscript. Over fifteen percent (15%) of all of the negative delivery comments concerned use of manuscript. Given the fact that all four tournaments included in the sample permitted use of a manuscript, this figure seems rather high.

The second largest cluster of comments oil speech skills concerns organization, or lack thereof. Although a majority of the comments are general, such as "speech flowed well" and "nice clear structure," numerous organizational comments refer to the presence or absence of a clear preview and appropriate transitions. Judges also pay particularly close attention to introductions and conclusions. Students are praised for creative, catchy, attention-getting devices which are also substantive and memorable and for conclusions which possess "impact"—usually meaning insightful discussions of the implications of the criticism. Interestingly enough, organization is the only category in the entire table containing more positive remarks than negative ones. Since there are over two and one-half times as many negative as positive comments in the overall sample, this is a striking finding. Closer examination reveals that the primary objects of positive ballot notations were introductions and conclusions, while most of the negative remarks related to previews and transitions.

It appears that contestants in several instances fail to provide sufficient documentation of the claims and assertions they submit to their judges. Most of the "who says that?" and "where did you get that information about. . . ?" comments relate to the effects of the speech, the original source for the critical method, and the historical/background information about the artifact(s) studied.

All four tournaments set a maximum time often minutes for their criticism events, and none included a minimum. Of the 1445 comments coded, 25 comments state that the topics are too broad, and 33 comments criticize students for exceeding the time limit or for having a speech that was too short. Of the 25 ballots claiming that the topic was "too broad for a 10 minute presentation," at least 12 were judging a criticism of a rhetorical movement. We find it interesting that the folk-wisdom that "the shortest poetry program wins" is not necessarily true in rhetorical criticism. For instance, at one tournament, 12 of the 15 judges who commented about time expressed the belief that the speeches they judged—ranging from 6:48 to 8:50—were too short and needed to be expanded.

The 669 comments on "rhetorical criticism" were grouped into eight categories: analysis, justification of methodology and artifacts), explanation of methodology, history/background, criticism

or judgment, and effects. It is interesting to note that these comments comprised over forty-five percent (45%) of all comments coded (see Table 2).

TABLE 2
"Comments Concerning Rhetorical Criticism"

Analysis	clear/interesting	34	unclear	7
	examples (good)	8	examples (poor)	37
	integrates description and criticism	4	doesn't integrate description and criticism	14
			Expand analysis	62
			Too general/too shallow	42
			Faulty assumptions	10
			Biased	7
Subtotal: 225				
Justify Methodology		33		67
Subtotal: 100				
Justify Artifact(s)		31		54
Subtotal: 85				
Explain Methodology		15		58
Subtotal: 73				
History/Background		26	Too much	3
			Too little	38
Subtotal: 67				
Criticism/Judgment		7		42
Subtotal: 49				
Critical Implications		9		32
Subtotal: 41				
Effects		7		22
Subtotal: 29				
			TOTAL for Rhetorical Criticism:	669

The application of the methodology to the artifact is the stage at which analysis, the bulk of most competitive rhetorical criticisms, occurs. The second largest category of all comments on the ballots (second only to delivery) concerns the speaker's analysis. Contestants receive praise for employing illustrative excerpts from the artifact under investigation, for making interesting, clear, and insightful conclusions, and for appropriate integration of description and criticism. Predictably, negative comments are more varied and tend to fall into seven groupings. The most common complaint simply calls for speakers to expand their discussions. Judges want students to provide more analysis, cite specific examples from the artifact(s), and to make the analysis more specific and in-depth.

Contestants are also criticized for an unbalanced use of description and criticism, making faulty assumptions, including biased statements, and vague assertions.

The data gathered suggest that judges request justification of the students' selected artifact(s) and rhetorical methodology as being, respectively, worthy of study and appropriate for that understanding. The methodology[6] is a framework or guideline to be used as a tool for opening up the artifact(s) under investigation by the student critic. It allows critics an opportunity to focus their study on identifiable elements of the communication act. Many methodologies are available for application to the students' selected artifact(s). Judges indicate that they consider it the critic's task to choose one approach and then justify the utility of that selection. More than thirty-five percent (35%) of all critical comments regarding rhetorical criticism suggest that students need to articulate more clearly the rationale for the methodology utilized.

All four tournaments in the sample provided flexibility for students to undertake "communication" as well as "rhetorical" events or artifacts for analysis or criticism. Incidentally, the tournaments held in the midwest seem to attract more "traditional" topics than do tournaments from the west. However, judges in both regions tell students that they need to justify the artifact(s) they endeavor to study. Statements of justification generally seem to be expected more of students who undertake non-traditional than traditional (speeches) artifact(s).[7] For example, two students are criticized for not providing specific information regarding the rhetorical significance of the television show (in one case) and the song (in the other case) that they chose to evaluate. Justification of artifact and methodology seem analogous to the "need to know" section many judges expect in informative or expository speeches.

Once a methodology has been selected by the student for application to the artifact(s), judges expect that student to explicate that methodology in the speech. This is not surprising, given the wide range of critical approaches adopted by students in competitive rhetorical criticism. Inclusion of such a section not only helps judges who are unfamiliar with the method, but also helps display the student's understanding of it. A total of seventy-three (73) comments from judges indicate that they possess this expectation. Nearly eighty percent (80%) of these remarks indicate that students

----

[6]Unlike some, we do not feel compelled to distinguish between "method" and "methodology," which we employ interchangeable.

[7]This was not always easy to discern as many ballots failed to record the rhetorical artifact under investigation.

need to be clearer in explanation of the critical method they selected to employ in their criticism.

Historical background of the artifact(s) studied was also a major area for comment. The vast majority (93%) of comments in this category requested additional information from the contestants. In most cases, "non-traditional" topics (songs, movies, literature, etc.) more often tend to evoke-this type of response from judges than traditional topics.

Some judges indicate their expectations concerning the need for the critic to criticize or render a judgment of the artifact(s). Ballots from 42 judges make it clear that students are expected to provide more evaluative, critical comments of the rhetorical artifact(s) under investigation. In most instances, judges write that students are spending too much time describing, rather than evaluating, the discourse in question. To a lesser degree, students fall short on the pronouncement of a judgment. Judges frequently want contestants to issue an overall judgment of the rhetorical success or failure of the communicative artifact. Most importantly, judges often expect the end judgment to be a synthesis of the total evaluation process. One student is criticized for apparently concluding that "this speech was a success, for it clearly met all of the steps of Burke's pentad." Apart from the fact that the elements of Kenneth Burke's pentad are not "steps," the mere fact that these elements are *identifiable* in the artifact hardly means that it was an effective one.

Rhetorical implications, or a discussion of the significance of the overall criticism, are desired by several judges. The basic question posited here is, "How can we benefit, learn, or grow from the results of your study; specifically what have we learned from your criticism?" Comments concerning implications focus both on the speaker's subject as a whole, and, more specifically, on the chosen method of analysis. Statements like "I'm really not convinced that you told us why in 1983 we should really be concerned," or "What conclusions can you draw from this method? It is applicable to any situation where [humor] is involved" can be found on thirty-two (32) ballots.

The final area, that of the least frequently occurring comments, deals with effects, those significant outcomes resulting (at least in part) from the rhetorical artifact(s) being criticized. Of the twenty-nine (29) ballots which discuss effects, over seventy-five percent (75%) wanted elaboration in this area. Comments such as "What direct impact did this speech have on the audience?" and "Did the song serve as a motivation for anyone to take specific action?" illustrate this category.

CONCLUSION

Because of the lack of published guidance of the formation and presentation of competitive rhetorical criticism, would-be competitors and coaches alike must seek advice elsewhere. One potential source of judge expectations is the ballots they produce while judging this event. Although this resource has limitations, spelled out earlier, it does have utility given the present state of literature on this event.

We found it interesting that there was very little difference between the comments coded from the midwestern and western tournament ballots—only in one instance (justification of artifact) did it seem worthy of comment. Given the fact that the number of comments coded were quite similar (730 from the west, 715 from the midwest), this comparison seems appropriate. While it would be useful to obtain ballots from the east or the south, this limitation does not seem severe in light of the degree of similarity between the two regions included here. Future studies, should there be any, might want to study ballots from national tournaments and to compare tournaments held early in the season with ones held later (this might be especially interesting as regards delivery, manuscript use, or sophistication of analysis, all of which plausibly could improve during the season).

From the data gathered here, the following judging criteria emerge in competitive rhetorical criticism:

1. adequate delivery skills (conversationality, enthusiasm, appropriate movement and gestures, direct eye contact, etc.)
2. memorized speech (no manuscript)
3. creative and substantive introduction and conclusion
4. clear preview
5. appropriate transitions
6. adequate documentation
7. focus of study appropriate for time limits of speech
8. judicious use of available time
9. inclusion of specific illustrations from the artifact(s) studied
10. analysis balancing description and criticism
11. justification of artifact(s) selected for study
12. justification of critical methodology
13. clear explanation of methodology
14. concise but complete explanation of the historical context in which the artifact occurred
15. clear judgment of the rhetorical effects of the artifact(s)
16. discussion of the implications of the criticism

We must caution that this list is not intended to be a description of "the complete rhetorical criticism judge." We make no claim that any specific judge holds these expectations, nor even that a majority of judges hold most of them. Rather, this represents a distillation of all comments made by all judges in this sample. Only a survey questionnaire of the sort suggested earlier can establish these sorts of claims. However, since the competitive rhetorical critic does not know the judges who will judge the speech during its development, this list is important as representative of the range of expectations that judges could possess.

We believe it important to point out that, while this sort of summary glosses over some differences, we did not find widely incompatible standards articulated by different judges. Judges did not tend to write comments which indicate directly incompatible expectations. Thus, it is possible for the student and coach to find guidance in our summary. The most likely sources of difficulty will be on questions of relative emphasis. For example, it may be that providing enough explanation of the critical method (number 11) to satisfy one judge would make it impossible, given time constraints, to include sufficient historical discussions (number 12) for another judge; or that the amount of time required to present a judgment of the effects (number 13) which one judge would consider adequate might preclude a discussions of the implications of a criticism (number 14) lengthy enough to satisfy yet another judge.

One final point remains to be made. We do not want to be interpreted as passing a value judgment on the appropriateness of the expectations we have elucidated from judges' ballots. That is, we do not make the claim that these are the expectations judges *ought* to have, only that these are the expectations they *do* have. However, only from a starting point such as this one (or from survey research as suggested earlier) which identifies what judges do want to hear from contestants can we begin to deliberate on the question of whether these expectations are appropriate ones. Despite the fact that these practical difficulties remain to be surmounted by students and coaches, at least they now have a more specific idea of the nature of the judges' expectations which they must attempt to meet.

Review of Professional Resources
Millard F. Eiland, Editor

PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGIATE FORENSICS
by Don R. Swanson and Raymond F. Zeuschner
Dubuque: Gorsuch-Scarisbrick Publishers, 1983

Some things in nature are inevitable—the return of the swallows to Capistrano, the frenzied rush of tiny lemmings off cliffs to a certain death, the yearly gathering of Monarch butterflies in Pacific Grove, California, and the semi- (or Tri-) annual migration of new students into Directors of Forensics' offices. Always they ask that same plaintive question. "What's 'fornensics' (or was it 'forentics')?" In response, the ever patient Directors of Forensics carefully explain the intricacies of team membership and tournament competition, as well as the varied individual events available, being careful not to omit even a single vital detail. After approximately the fortieth such lecture during the first week of classes, should even the casual observer wonder why so many Directors of Forensics exist on a diet of strong, black coffee; unfiltered cigarettes; and Cepacol lozenges?

Almost in answer to an unvoiced prayer for relief comes Swanson and Zeuschner's PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGIATE FOREN-SICS. At present, the book stands as the definitive introductory text for forensic competitors. The weary Director of Forensics with myriads of novice students would do well to consider giving their voices a break and strain the eye sight of their students instead. Certainly the text is not without flaws (which I will deal with later in this review), but to borrow an old CEDA cliche, "on balance" the positive values outweigh the negative ones.

Swanson and Zeuschner have gleaned the event rules, descriptions, as well as tournament and program procedures for their book from the American Forensic Association, the Northern California Forensic Association, the Pacific Southwest Collegiate Forensic Association and Pi Kappa Delta. In doing so, a broad cross-section of national practices is covered, avoiding for the most part any tendency toward a regional approach to forensics. Thus, Directors of Forensics nationwide should find the text applicable, regardless of their geographic location.

Containing five chapters and an extensive appendix, the text's over 200 pages cover an impressive array of forensic related topics. Chapter I (Introduction to Forensics) includes what forensics is and what team membership entails. Chapter II (Competing at

Tournaments) explains the inexplicable—how a tournament works and what is expected of a participant. In Chapter III (The Nature of Individual Events), Swanson and Zeuschner detail all ten A.F.A. individual events, as well as Readers' Theater, Duet Acting and an "innovative" event, Argumentative Analysis. The detail evident in Chapter III is less apparent in Chapter IV (The Nature of Debate). Nonetheless, NDT and CEDA debate, along with evidence procedures are dealt with. The new Director of Forensics, rather than the novice competitor, may find Chapter V (Hosting a Forensics Tournament) most interesting and instructive. Finally, the appendix of PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGIATE FORENSICS is a treasure trove of useful forms for the Director of Forensics and the student. From "Ballot Analysis and Personal Growth Plan" forms, to "Planning Sheets" for various individual events, to "Competitor's Record" forms, these pages should need only small adaptations to be helpful to almost all forensics squads. Sample ballots included may also help ease the anxiety of novices who wonder about those mysterious pieces of paper judges are scribbling on at tournaments. Of particular use to the harried Director of Forensics may be the "Absence Forms" which politely inform other professors that a student will be absent because of a forensic tournament. Thereby, the Director of Forensics can avoid wasted minutes (which compute to wasted hours over the year) at the typewriter tapping out these excuses.

In an attempt to ease the initial "jargon shock" which can afflict the novice student, Swanson and Zeuschner have included a glossary of terms in the text's appendix. We, as the initiated, sometimes forget that many of the words and phrases we regularly use can be and often are highly confusing to the beginner. "Breaking out" certainly conjurs up visions of prison bars and striped uniforms, while "briefs" must connote underwear to at least a few of the uninitiated—and a "bye" could mean a wave, a hug and a kiss to a few novices. Plus, despite the social atmosphere at tournaments, "pairings" have nothing to do with significant relationships.

A major concern for forensic programs countrywide is how administrators perceive forensics and how to maintain or improve these perceptions. Swanson and Zeuschner have done a laudatory job of defending the value of forensics and of explaining goals that students and administrators can be inspired by. Two of the main goals are:

1. "Forensics programs provide students with an opportunity to practice and increase communication skills through both competitive and non-competitive activities."

2. "The college fields and funds a forensic team which proudly represents it in intercollegiate competition at tournaments." (pg. 3)

Whether administrative pressures are aimed at a program which is focused primarily on number of trophies won or on number of "bodies" on the roll sheet, these goals are clearly in keeping with good educational practices. An administrator or budget committee would not likely quarrel with the nature of such goals.

As a recruitment tool the text may also be useful—assuming, of course, that inquisitive students take the time to scan Chapter I. The chapter develops an interesting and cogent presentation of both the reasonable responsibilities and the tangible benefits of team membership. In addition, Swanson and Zeushner use a strategy many Directors of Forensics have found helpful. They point out the success of former forensic participants and persuasively imply that present and future participants can also expect to reap simliar rewards in their careers.

Perhaps the most anxiety-relieving chapter for the nervous novice is Chapter II (Competing at Tournaments). With an amazing amount of detail—while avoiding confusing digressions—the text explains postings, panels, what to do when your code number isn't posted, and other vital "rites of passage" for the novice. At the same time, Swanson and Zeuschner espouse a courteous and responsible approach to tournament competition. An example of the good counsel offered is: "If you make a small error or slip, don't let it throw you—continue on as well as you can under circumstances— we don't apologize, we give speeches" (pg. 13). With this kind of advance information on what to expect and how to behave, the novices should be able to concentrate more on performance and less on perplexity at their first tournament.

In developing the chapter on individual events, the authors again are laudably thorough. The discussion of each of the ten A.F.A. events (plus Readers' Theatre, Duet Acting and Argumentative Analysis) includes purpose, description, procedure, limitations of material or topic, and evaluative factors. Furthermore, the beginning interpreter will learn how to select materials for interpretation, as well as how to prepare and use a manuscript. The section for each event also includes basic organizational patterns— a boon for students who have "forgotten" (or never learned) the value of organization while taking introductory speech.

Outlining is also covered in this chapter, although the percentage figures attached to each section of the speech could cause confusion and could confound the novice. "But coach, my conclusion is a

disaster because it's more than 3% of my speech!"

As I've alluded to in the previous paragraph, PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGIATE FORENSICS is not without minor flaws. Though not significantly detrimental, these small imperfections are worth noting. The text is probably not for the squad that focuses only on debate or only on I.E.s because its basic philosophy is that: "Forensic teams are not organized to serve only one type of competitor . . . There is a place for the debater and the individual eventer . . ."(pg. 3). With this orientation, the text is really aimed at multi-dimensional teams.

For some teams, also, the statement, "Any regularly enrolled student is eligible to participate in forensics" (pg. 4), may be a gross overstatement. Many programs have strict unit and grade require-ments. Thus coaches may have to exercise their vocal cords again in explanation. Later in the text, the authors do suggest that a "full load" of units and good grades are sometimes required, but, given the earlier statement, this latter one seems almost contradictory.

In keeping the text clearly organized, Swanson and Zeuschner make happy use of numbered lists. At times this emphasis seems tedious (at least to this reader). The text could be jokingly referred to as forensic's answer to the BOOK OF LISTS.

Sometimes the reader may be confused as to whom the text is aimed. Language shifts in the same paragraph from a "most squads" approach to an "our squad" focus. As a result, the text may seem to some people more of an "in house" publication for use by the Cal Poly SLO squad than a handbook for forensic squads in general.

Yet, despite these small flaws (after all, authors—and Directors of Forensics—are human), PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGIATE FORENSICS remains a valuable resource for the forensic student and for the perpetually overworked Director of Forensics. The book may not taste as good as a Cepacol lozenge, but it certainly makes the old vocal cords feel a lot better!

CHARLENE ARNOLD HILL
Director of Forensics
California State University, Los Angeles

The NDCF: A Spirit of Cooperation Prevailed

Michael P. Kelley

During the second week of September over one hundred members of the forensic community gathered at the Orrington Hotel in Evanston, Illinois, for the National Developmental Conference on Forensics (NDCF). In the words of the primary conference planner, George Ziegelmueller of Wayne State University, the purpose of the conference was to "continue the work that was begun at Sedalia ten years earlier, reexamine the issues facing forensics in the 1980s, and point to new directions for forensic educators in the next decade." The conferees labored four long and arduous days under generally "Indian summer" weather conditions to generate, debate, and approve or disapprove literally dozens of policy, value, and action recommendations on behalf of the larger forensic community. The changing season—the full bloom of summer giving way to the harvest of fall and the ultimate dormancy of winter—may serve as an appropriate metaphor for the climate of the conference. Just as the fruits of the fall harvest cannot be determined until the vagaries of the summer season have completed their cycles, the NDCF served as an assessment of what the forensic climate of the past ten years has nurtured and what the harvest possesses or does not possess as a result of our efforts over that decade. Conferences such as the present NDCF and the Sedalia Conference of 1974 are the hallmarks of a mature, not an immature, field. It is rare for any organization or group of organizations to launch an assessment of its progress when that agency or group is in its growth stage. Usually, it is only with growth behind us and with the onset of maturity that we begin to ask "where have we been and where are we going." Thus, if nothing else, the previous Sedalia conference and the present NDCF signal a maturation of intercollegiate forensic competition that is reflected in our contemporary penchant for self-study. Likewise, such self-study, unless mandated by statute (which it clearly isn't in this case), is rarely undertaken in the absence of felt needs or perceived problems. Based upon the topic areas outlined for consideration by the conferees, and based upon the various recommendations that were forwarded by the conference's work groups to the plenary session, there are many areas of concern in our field and there are many problems that need to be remedied by us as a profession. In a few months the

113

proceedings of the conference will be published under the able editorship of Donn W. Parson of the University of Kansas.[1] Provided herein are a few of the many issues that surfaced in the conference from the perspective of one of the conference participants.

Possibly the most significant result of the conference will prove to be the establishment of yet another organization, the Council of Forensic Organizations (CFO), to provide a *formal* mechanism through which the other existing forensic organizations can articulate and communicate issues and problems of mutual concern to the various intercollegiate forensic organizations. Of all the problems addressed by this conference, the need for interorganizational cooperation was probably the least perceived need ten years ago at the Sedalia conference. In 1974 the Cross-Examination Debate Association and the National Forensic Association were in their infancy. Today, ten years later, these associations surely represent the largest number of intercollegiate forensic competitors in debate and individual events respectively. Even younger still is the National Individual Events Tournament (NIET) sponsored by the American Forensic Association (AFA). In 1974 the most visible forensic associations were the separate and distinct national honorary societies, the AFA's National Debate Tournament (NDT), and the then newly established Forensic Division of the Speech Communication Association (SCA).

If anything, a thorough-going history of the last ten years in forensics could characterize the decade of the 1970s as the Decade of Territorial Disputes. As chronicled elsewhere in this issue,[2] the 1970s witnessed the burgeoning of individual speaking events-forms of competition that were viewed, at best, as ancillary in the 1960s and, at worst, as an aberration promoted by an insignificant minority within the field of forensics. The editor remembers well the 1973 AFA meeting in New York City where, aside from the then perennial concerns with the structure of the newly re-formed NDT, the major issues were to endorse the Forensic Division proposal and to establish a committee to investigate the AFA's role in national individual events competition. For this participant, that meeting signalled an unnecessary territorial dispute over and between governing bodies that lasted well into the 1980s. Today, newcomers to the forensic community may well be confused by the

---

[1]Hopefully, the next issue of the *NFJ* will be able to provide its readership with information on obtaining the proceedings of the conference.

[2]See Linda J. Fryar's "Brief History of Individual Events Nationals," pp. 73-83.

presence of a wide variety of national forensic associations, but those newcomers may also perceive that these groups exist within a climate of relatively peaceful coexistence. Such coexistence is due, in large part, to the many forensic educators who refused to succumb to the temptations of territorialism, but rather chose to find worthiness and educational values in all of these various groups.

It was this spirit of student-centered, educational concern for the activity of forensics that seems to have imbued the NDCF in Evanston. Cooperation and tolerance seemed to be evident throughout the conference. Indeed, the recommendation to establish the Council of Forensic Organizations has already been implemented. In what may become a significant, historical, turning point in the annals of intercollegiate forensics, the CFO was called into being at the national Speech Communication Association Convention in November. Already the CFO has moved to establish various lines of communication between the major forensic associations which includes a more careful collaboration and cooperation between agencies in the planning of SCA convention programming. Given that the council is a collectivity of appointees from other agencies without its own budget or staff and with only the SCA annual convention as a likely meeting time, its future progress and success will take another decade to determine. Nonetheless, inter-agency cooperation seems to have supplanted the previous climate that many in forensics openly labeled a climate of "distrust," "in-fighting," and "disrespect."

This spirit of cooperation and coexistence was reflected in numerous other actions at the NDCF. Most notable, from this participant's view, was the conference's action on Resolution 17 from the Educational Values Task Group. This lowest priority resolution from the most prolific task group proposed that "The National Debate Tournament Committee of the AFA should permit open entry in the National Debate Tournament to all tournament subscribers." While the constituency of the plenary session audience was well represented by NDT subscribers, the NDT group was by no means a majority. Thus, the plenary audience could have witnessed the emergence of a majority coalition of individual events and CEDA representatives (who had long ago ceased supporting NDT) that would force the NDT into a radical restructuring of its participation rules. In actual fact, the spirit of cooperation and tolerance prevailed and the resolution was overwhelmingly defeated. As an addendum, it must be observed that the only truly "open," competitive group in intercollegiate forensics

is CEDA. Any team that competes in CEDA debate is automatically ranked for the annual CEDA sweepstakes. All other groups/associations have some sort of "qualifying procedure." The honoraries only admit their own members to competition; NIET has two different qualifying procedures for subscribers as of a date-certain. Even the NFA's I.E. Nationals provides a qualifying floor in its "7 school-12 contestant" rules. To have passed the "open" NDT proposal would have been to continue to fan the fires of distrust and disrespect that seem to be clearly on the wane. Likewise, a resolution to impose a CEDA-like, "two topics per year" on the NDT was easily defeated.

The conference was more evenly divided on a resolution to shorten the tournament season by prohibiting competition before October 1 and after mid-April (with certain exceptions). The October 1 opening date was supported, but the end-season cap was defeated twice. The closeness of the vote on this issue was indicated by the willingness of the plenary session to "reconsider" the issue. Nonetheless, the end-of-season cap was defeated by a narrow margin. Further, both sides seemed to be voting on what they perceived to be best for the students from an educational standpoint. [The argument for a more restricted season: the longer season is merely competition for its own sake; the argument for an open-ended season: students enrolled in credit-granting forensic courses are discriminated against by arbitrary calendar dates.]

Numerous recommendations addressed professional concerns regarding judging standards, evidence standards, ethics, summer institutes, promotion and tenure, and rationale for the activity. Many recommendations were passed without debate or with only a modicum of discussion. Indeed, many of these recommendations are broad enough in their wording and sweeping enough in their intended application that their ratification by the larger forensic community will only be assessable years from now in another self-study on our then-current practices.

In summary, the NDCF served a healthy need within the forensic community. Conferees were free to meet under less-hurried and more directed circumstances than our weekly or annual tournaments and our regional and national conventions permit. This retreat atmosphere, in itself, could not have created a spirit of cooperation, understanding, and tolerance unless the conferees were already predisposed to such a mood. One cannot possibly imagine such a conference attitude having emerged even five years ago. All this bodes well for forensics. Quite conceivably the forensic community will meet again in 1994 to ritualize the decennial conference as a forensic tradition. At this vantage point, one would

doubt that that conference will observe fewer national forensic organizations than presently exist. Several of the existing organizations that many of us were proclaiming "dead" in the 1970s have demonstrated remarkable stamina and resilience. The history of forensics, however, has demonstrated a significant evolution in formats over the past fifty years. One would doubt that the competitive formats that exist today will remain wholly unchanged in the next ten years. For that reason, if for no other, the need for the forensic community to gather every decade or so for self-study and assessment may be a ritual that can serve us well. That, at least, seems to be the harvest of the 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics.

Ethics in Academic Debate: A Gaming Perspective

ALFRED C. SNIDER*

In his monumental work *An Essay on Man,* Ernst Cassirer has written, "The ethical world is never given; it is forever in the making."[1] Ethics is an extremely important issue in communication in general, and especially important in a competitive activity like academic debate. But, if Cassirer is correct, how should we go about developing guidelines and theories about what constitutes ethical conduct in academic debate? This work will attempt to deal with this issue by establishing a criteria for ethical conduct in academic debate, specifying the major ethical obligations towards each other held by the major participants in the academic debate situation, reviewing the major charges of unethical conduct currently observed in academic debate, and finally, indicating how a gaming paradigm as applied to academic debate can advance our understanding of the role ethics play in the debate situation.

This work approaches this topic from the perspective of gaming as a paradigm case for academic debate. Some previous work has laid the foundation for an exploration of ethics through gaming. Gaming is a useful method for understanding communicative behaviors in general.[2] It has also been argued that gaming can be applied to forensics as a useful paradigm case.[3] Two distinct works have attempted to establish that gaming is a viable paradigm for academic debate.[4] Rather than extensively review these previous

---

[1] Ernst Cassirer, *An Essay on Man* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1944), p. 61.

[2] Alfred C. Snider, "Gaming as a Form of Human Communication," paper presented to the World Future Society World Assembly, July, 1982.

[3] Alfred C. Snider, "Games Without Frontiers: Opportunities for Communication Scholars," *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* accepted for publication.

[4] Alfred C. Snider, *The New Debate: A Personal Essay* (Privately published: Detroit, Michigan, 1981); and, *Gaming as a Paradigm for Academic Debate* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 1983).

efforts, this work uses them as a point of departure for an exploration of the role of ethics in academic debate.

THE ETHIC OF HONESTY

Ethics concerns codes of behavior, specifically in the "ought to" or "should" sense of behavior. Duke notes that the ethics of game use is a very important issue.[5] While an issue of importance should be dealt with by strict criteria in the game design process, this is not possible, since many ethical considerations cannot be anticipated during the design process and must be dealt with during the play of the game itself. In attempting to compose an ethical code for the game of debate, the options are either to state a small number of criteria which lack precision or to produce a long list of criteria which restrict the options of the participant. Almost all philosophical disputations which attempt to determine whether a given pattern of behaviors is "ethical" or not give special attention to the particulars of the situation and the ends which are at issue. While murder is seen as unethical behavior by most individuals, nevertheless these same individuals might find it tolerable if it was committed in self-defense. Once we begin formulating ethical guidelines we are soon lost in a sea of "if. . . then" statements designed to take situational factors and the desirability of certain ends into account. What is true of general ethical guidelines is also true of ethical guidelines for debate. Recognizing that ethical considerations probably must be dealt with inside a given debate situation, it seems appropriate to opt for the course of generating a small number of generally applicable ethical standards.

Since academic debate is centered within the communication discipline, guidance for establishing ethical standards may be grounded within this field. Karl R. Wallace has examined the various ethics which apply to the teacher of speech and which are grounded within the public character of public utterance in a free society.[6] Wallace's work is chosen as a starting point for several reasons. First, it represents an attempt to develop ethical guidelines for a competitively oriented, public, persuasion situation, which academic debate certainly is. Second, Wallace attempts to synthesize concepts of ethics from a broad perspective, drawing on the general thinking of western civilization. Third, Wallace's guidelines are united by the ethical thread that I have found so revealing in

---

[5] Richard Duke, *Gaming: The Future's Language* (New York City: John Wiley, 1974), p. 104.

[6] Karl Wallace, "An Ethical Basis of Communication," *The Speach Teacher* (Vol. 4: January, 1955), pp. 1-9.

examining academic debate. These suggested ethical guidelines are presented by Wallace for application to the teaching of speech. It is my intention to demonstrate their relevance to the ethical standard of the game of debate. Wallace notes four such ethics: (1) during the moment of utterance the communicator is the sole source of argument and information, and thus has an obligation to present this data in an accurate form; (2) the facts and information presented should be done so in a fair manner and without distortion; (3) the communicator should reveal the sources of the information used; and (4) the communicator should respect diversity of argument and opinion. These four ethics seem to apply well to the game of debate. The fourth ethic is important in that a debate could not take place without some regard for the positions of those on the opposite side of the scenario. The first, second, and third ethics seem to have in common a notion of honesty in that communications should be accurate, undistorted, and from a revealed source. These first three imply that the debaters should honestly present their statements. Thus, the major ethical guideline for a debate should be some form of honesty, at least if we are to apply Wallace's ethics to academic debate.

In establishing guidelines for ethics in the game of debate, some lack of precision should be allowed. In other words, all matters coming under the aegis of these criteria may not be ethical matters, but that will have to be discussed within each debate. For example, a debater who misrepresents an opponent's position is perhaps guilty of an ethical offense, but perhaps not so if that debater merely "misunderstood" a confusing argument offered by an opponent. The only prescriptive standard of ethics in the game of debate should be HONESTY. Academic debate should not be a forum for lying. This does not mean that when the topic is "Resolved: that U.S. military spending should be increased," that only those believing this before the debate can be affirmative debaters. Certainly, persons in this position who are negative debaters would present the best case they could against their personal belief. Rather, it means that those involved should not knowingly deceive others involved. For example, falsehoods (either falsified facts or falsified testimony) should not be entered into the debate: debaters should not knowingly lie about what their colleagues or what they themselves have said during the round, and those keeping time should strive to be accurate and avoid giving additional time to a speaker they favor.

One problem in applying the ethic of honesty is that it may be thought of as assuming that there is a clear definition of truth. While this is a difficulty, it seems that the line is easier to draw

between something which "might" be true and something which is "definitely" false. For example, describing America's nuclear deterrent as "not strong enough" may or may not be true, but a statement to support such a position which knowingly and falsely reported the number of missiles would be definitely false. Determinations of this type, obviously, must be made within the context of a given situation, but nevertheless the guideline of honesty remains applicable.

One important issue in determining honesty is the concept of intention. If a participant makes an innocent and unintentional error in keeping time, this is not an ethical problem. However, if participants intentionally give their partners an extra minute in a rebuttal speech so that their odds of winning are increased, this would clearly be an ethical violation. Determining an individual's intention or "motive" in a specific situation is difficult, barring telepathy and/or the use of "truth serums" in a debate context. Because it is difficult to determine intention with absolute accuracy, does this mean that it is impossible to resolve ethical questions? Ethical issues are too important to be swept under the rug simply because such determinations are difficult. It seems that this problem can be resolved in several ways. First, judges and participants may wish to ignore the issue of intention totally. For example, many judges currently punish debaters for reading falsified evidence even if they did not actually engage in the falsification and even in cases where the debater had no knowledge that this evidence was tainted. Holding debaters and others responsible for their behaviors and not just for their intentions makes application a great deal easier, even if it does offer some cruel lessons to some unfortunate debaters. Even such lessons to the "unintentionally unethical" may help to heighten the awareness of ethics as an area worthy of concern as well as prepare students for the "real world" in which they may often be in a position to profit from the unethical behavior of another by merely acting like they "didn't know." Second, determination of intentionality could take place in a specific debate round, although this might be time consuming. Since the precise nature of ethical concerns is, in Cassirer's words, "forever in the making," this does not seem unreasonable. This sort of application, however, can only take place if the draconian measures utilized by some judges are suspended. For example, some judges contend that if an ethical charge is raised by a team which they cannot sustain, the team making such a charge should forfeit the decision. While not totally in disagreement with this position, since I believe that ethical

accusations should not be made lightly, it seems as if such a standard would have to be suspended in cases requiring substantial determination of intention. Thus, the issue of showing intent to commit a dishonest act is a thorny one, but it can be handled, and certainly ethical concerns are so vital to a productive debate process that this difficulty should not preclude us from generating some broad criteria for making ethical distinctions in academic debate.

Some may see "honesty" as inadequate as a single ethical guideline. This terseness of ethical guidance is advocated because if the ethic of honesty can be achieved, other debate practices now seen as unethical may become self-regulating. If debaters and judges are honest about their actions and motives, the situational nature of ethical disputes can be called into play. For example, a judge who is honest about the decision in the round by saying "The affirmative gave $10," will certainly find such honest communication as the beginning of moves to stop such behavior. If, however, such a pronouncement is tolerated, this would be an indication that such action was within the ethic of the community at large, and thus permissible. Honesty is the precondition for other ethics-related concepts. My desire is to allow for an open forum for discussion of ethics within gaming, not to compile a long list of what is or is not ethical. It seems to me that achievement of a basic ethic of HONESTY should allow this forum to exist. For example, if the situation in a debate round is honestly handled, then students can engage in other discussions, such as whether a given move meets a criteria of fairness. One of the purposes discussed within the conceptual map for a game of debate was that it serves as a contest to determine who did the better job of debating. This standard assumes and implies fairness, but this fairness can only be discussed and decided in the debate if there is honest communication taking place. This situational approach to ethical concerns in academic debate will be elaborated later in this work.

While the guideline of honesty seems broad, that is because the issue of ethics is a broad one and touches so many parts of the game of debate. Because ethics is so important, we would like it to be a cut and dried matter, but, because it isn't so easy, we must concentrate on its successful application. In determining the ethical or unethical nature of any occurrence within the game of debate, prescriptive action on ethical grounds should be limited.

Designer-Participant Ethics: By "designer" in the gaming sense I mean "tournament host" in the way referred to normally. Designer/participant ethics would include two elements. First,

there should be an accurate exchange of information about the individuals involved and the event planned. Designers should not deceive potential attendees of an event about the opposition, facilities, audiences, or other attractions. The participants, on the other hand, should also convey information honestly about number of attendees, their experience levels, and their identities. Second, there should be an honest effort on the part of designers and attendees to fulfill their obligations. Designers should try to supply promised facilities, meals, etc., while attendees should try to fulfill their obligations of showing up promptly to debate, following tournament rules, etc. In both these examples, it is an "honest" effort that is required, not a successful result.

Judge-Participant Ethics: After the round begins, the relationship between the judge and the participants is important. Two ethical considerations seem to enter into the judge/participant relationship. First, the participants have an ethical obligation to make an honest presentation of material. Participants should not present knowingly false information to the judge. Second, the judge has an obligation to the participants to explain the reason for decision after it has been made. This should include relevant issues for awarding the decision.

Designer-Judge Ethics: The designer (tournament host) and the judge form the administrative portion of the game of debate. Three ethical considerations seem to play a part in their interaction. First, they must engage in an honest exchange about judge assignment. The designer, for example, should be honest with the judges about how they are being assigned (randomly, rated by judge ability, geography, etc.). Conversely, the judges should engage the designer concerning how they would best be assigned (for example, a judge may wish to avoid judging close friends for fear of not being able to make a completely honest decision). Second, the judge should provide to the designer information about the decision once it is made—the correct win/loss designation, points, and reason for decision. Third, since the designer has assigned the judge to specific debates in good faith, the judge should make an attempt to judge the round honestly as an obligation to the designer.

Participant-Participant Ethics: While the simplest of the ethical applications to describe, this set of ethics is perhaps the most important. Two considerations appear here. First, participants should convey to each other an honest description of their position on the topic under debate. Second, the participants should convey to one another as honestly as possible their understanding of the position of the other team on the topic under debate. Participants, in other words, have an obligation to exhibit their true level of

understanding of the positions in the debate. While ethics is a very important part of the game of debate it is very much like most of the rest of the activity—it is a consideration to be actively experienced and discovered, not something to be prescribed.

CHARGES OF ETHICAL VIOLATIONS IN MODERN DEBATE

Although not a common complaint in print, it is not uncommon to hear coaches, students, and interested others express concern over certain supposedly "unethical" practices which take place in academic debate. Comments are often heard that debaters and coaches have "lost" their values, and that certain competitors will "do anything to win." My purpose here will be to identify ethical concerns, both legitimate and illegitimate. Certainly there are some activities in academic debate which can be identified as involving unethical practices. In speaking of ethics in debate, it is important to recall the criteria of honesty established. Thus, truly unethical debate practices, at least to me, involve some breach in this ethic of honesty.

The first ethical concern is with evidence. The use of evidence in academic debate is very important to the process in the round and the outcome as represented by the decision. "Asserted" arguments are not given nearly the weight that "evidenced" arguments are, while at the same time judges will accept counter-intuitive arguments more often if they are accompanied by evidence. Thus, debaters who would "manufacture" evidence or "distort" evidence which does exist would stand a far better chance at winning debate rounds.

Concern about evidence is certainly not new in academic debate. In the sixties, for example, as evidence became more prominent, various studies were undertaken to "backtrack" evidence in order to find out how much of it was "real" and how much was "unethical."[7] Every debater has stories about someone they knew, debated with, or heard about who utilized evidence unethically, but it rather hard to verify such stories. What is possible to examine, however, is the transcript of the final round of the National Debate Tournament, annually printed in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. The complete sources for all evidence are supposedly provided by the teams involved, and the evidence is backtracked and then reported on in the footnotes accompanying

---

[7]See, for example, Robert Newman and Keith Sanders, "A Study in the Integrity of Evidence," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* (Vol. 2: January, 1965), pp. 7-13; and Joy Miller, "More About Integrity and Evidence," *The Rostrum* (April, 1967), pp. 8-9.

the transcript. While not wanting to make specific charges, I think it is safe to say that in several instances (1964, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1975 and 1976)[8] some problems have been confronted with the evidence. If examples can be found in the final round of the NATIONAL DEBATE TOURNAMENT, and if it is a concern so much on people's minds, there certainly must be a number of instances of such unethical use of evidence which are not reported. Based on experience gained through debating, coaching high school and college debate, cross-checking evidence from debate handbooks, and editing a number of debate handbooks myself, ethical problems in evidence are not uncommon in academic debate.

The second ethical concern deals with the procedures during a debate round. Specifically, it is possible that the honesty criteria can be and at times is violated during a debate. For example, the time-keeping procedures may be dishonestly manipulated. Team members who are entrusted with timing the speech of their partners may find it advantageous to give their colleagues an extra thirty seconds in a rebuttal speech. While often timing problems arise out of simple error (forgetting to announce the time, not watching the clock, using the wrong time limits, etc.), this can be an ethical concern as well. Another problem which might take place during a round is inaccurate reporting of what has been done in other speeches. For example, a rebuttalist might claim that the other team "had no answer" for a given position, when in fact they did, and thus claim to have won the argument on that basis. Again, while faulty memory and faulty flow charting might be an explanation for this, there is some concern that this may be done "on purpose" in an attempt to gain the decision. Another possible ethical violation might involve the malicious misrepresentation of their own position by teams. An example illustrates my precise point here. If a negative team asks to see a brief read by an affirmative team, the affirmative may hand over a brief which is NOT the original one read in the debate, but a weak step-sister of the original block. The negative will then attack this brief on the basis of faults on THEIR copy, while the judge asking to see the same block at the end of the round would be shown the proper brief. Another example would be a negative debater who, having read a contradictory piece of evidence in a rebuttal speech, denies that any such card was read when questioned about it. Both of these examples, while sounding a bit far-fetched; come from my personal

---

[8]See *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* Summer issue, for each year.

experiences as a coach and a judge, so they do have a basis in fact.

A third category of ethical problems involves the judging of the debate. Judges, for example, may willingly vote for the team they actually thought lost the round because of some perverse reason. This might involve benefiting their own team, exacting revenge on a disliked team or coach, or because one team has substantially more "reputation" than another (a person who did not see the debate would not question the decision since the "favorite" won). Another example would be a situation where a designer would assign judges to a round because they knew of the biases at work and wanted to aid one team or another, thus attempting to "stack the deck." As already indicated, judges should be willing to be open about their motives in judging, a criteria which Wallace has identified as being applicable to *all* public communication.

While these three concerns represent, in my viewpoint, very real and pressing concerns in academic debate, others have gone much farther. Often it is popular to brand any practice one does not care for as "unethical." Some of these supposed "ethical" violations are considered here.

First, some argue that a coach has a clearly defined "ethical" role, and should not exceed it. For example, some argue that coaches should not do research, should not aid students in constructing arguments, and should not go over the flowcharts of other teams they have judged. While these may be valid concerns when carried to extremes by any coach, they do not seem to involve an ethical violation.

Second, some argue that anything other than random assignment of judges is unethical. At many tournaments, the designer will rank order judges, and then assign the better judges to those rounds which have the most bearing on the outcome of the tournament competition. Many argue that this is unfair, discriminatory, and leads to rampant elitism. Frankly, I find this hard to view as an ethical violation. If tournament organizers advertised random judge assignment and then proceeded to assign them on the basis of their quality, this would be a violation of honesty, but when the assignment of judges on the basis of perceived quality is announced and communicated to teams and judges, there seems to be little violation of honesty. The reason judges are placed in this manner seems clear to me—debaters and coaches want it that way. These parties are concerned that the best possible judge be put into each round, and certainly this is a greater concern when the round is more important. It is not unusual for judges who dislike being assigned on a "skill" basis (perhaps because of low skill levels,

which means judging assignments to lower quality and less important debates) to complain that their teams did not get a good judge in a given round when it was an important or "break" round. In almost all games, judges are assigned on the basis of their skill levels. For example, the umpires at the World Series are chosen as the BEST umpires during that season, and are rewarded by this assignment. Shouldn't we attempt to skill match for the benefit of all involved? Certainly this is an area of legitimate concern for many, yet it hardly seems an "ethical" concern.

A final supposed charge of ethics violation involves the use of a new and unfamiliar strategy. Whenever a team comes up with a new way to approach issues so that they have a greater chance of winning, certain parties are bound to claim that this is "unethical." For example, when Lichtman, Garvin and Corsi proposed the "alternative justification" case[9] which allowed the affirmative to "drop" entire action planks of their plan, many responded that this was "unethical," probably because they did not know how to answer it yet. One of my favorite personal examples was an affirmative team experiencing their first counterplan. They argued that since they didn't know much about counterplans, it was "unethical" to argue one against them. The response by the negative was that the lack of knowledge on the part of their opponents was hardly an "ethical" violation on their part. I am sure that every new technique which has emerged, from the independent advantage to the generic disadvantage, has been subjected to this criticism. Rather than being unethical, such practices are merely "new," and debaters have not thought out answers to them yet. For example, a certain practice might be "unfair" (providing a theoretical advantage to one side over the other, thus violating the equal opportunity criteria applied to procedures in the gaming paradigm), while not being "unethical." The two concepts, fairness and ethics, are blurred in many instances of this sort of argumentation.

EXPLORING ETHICS THROUGH GAMING

Of all of the criticisms of modern debate, the charge of ethical problems is perhaps the most compelling. Fortunately, gaming offers a very interesting and productive way to study and regulate ethics. Turning to the literature of game theory and game/simula-

---

[9]Alan Lichtman, Charles Garvin and Jerome Corsi, "The Alternative Justification Affirmative: A New Case Form," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* (Vol. 10: Fall, 1973), pp. 59-69.

-tion, we find a lot of attention devoted to ethical issues. This discussion, of course, cannot attempt to communicate the totality of this literature or even the totality of gaming as a paradigm for academic debate to the reader. It is hoped that interested readers will refer to the primary literature to better understand these concepts. While this essay is meant to be an illustration of the possible applications of these concepts, it is hoped that it can be useful to the reader when examined in isolation.

Schelling contends that ethical behavior has a lot in common with gaming.[10] As an example of this, Schelling discusses the implications of dishonesty and how lying can be related to gaming. Schelling reported that children aged 10-12 years, when questioned about lying, noted that truthfulness was necessary for reciprocity and mutual agreement. "Deceiving others destroys mutual trust." Schelling contends that children find truth socially useful, and that children have freely adopted a rule against lying. Schelling goes on to compare lying to game theory. He notes:

> Lying, after all, is suggestive of game theory. It involves at least two people, a liar and somebody who is lied to; it transmits information, the credibility and veracity of which are important; it influences some choice another is to make that the liar anticipates; the choice to lie or not to lie is part of the liar's choice of strategy; the possibility of a lie presumably occurs to the second party, and may be judged against some a priori expectations; and the payoff configurations are rich in possibilities, since a lie can be told for the good of the victim, the truth can be told to pave the way for a later lie, and a lie can even be told with the intention that it is not to be believed.[11]

Thus, gaming can provide some interesting new perspectives on lying and the behavior surrounding lying. Several reasons explain ways in which gaming approaches issues of honesty. First, gaming can help in studying the situation surrounding such behavior. For example, Fletcher notes that in different situations, lying may be permissible. For example, "if a small neighborhood merchant tells a lie to divert some 'protection' racketeers from their victims, no matter how compassionately the lie is told, he has chosen to do evil according to certain intrinsicalist ethics, though it might be considered a lesser evil."[12] Fletcher scorns this, and notes that in some situations, such as this one, "It is not inexcusably evil, it is

---

[10]T.C. Schelling, "Some Thoughts on the Relevance of Game Theory to the Analysis of Ethical Systems," in *Game Theory in the Behavioral Sciences,* Buchler and Nutini, eds. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1969), p. 46.

[11]Schelling, pp. 47-48.

[12]Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 64-65.

positively good." This is not to suggest that in certain debate situations lying is good, but it does indicate that any approach to ethics must recognize the "extrinsic" position of Fletcher, that the situation plays an important part in determining the ethical nature of an action. Schelling has noted that one must evaluate the consequences of an act, including the consequences on the behaviors of others, and one must be personally responsible for evaluating those consequences.[13] Gaming is not an answer to ethical problems, but it does provide a useful way of evaluating situation ethics. As Schelling notes, "It may be too early to credit game theory with much help, but surely there is promise."[14] His summary of Fletcher's position is that in the language of game theory, the situation ethic does not content itself with prescribing individual strategies but requires us to scan the entire matrix, evaluating each outcome, and attending to the preferences of others. "It is not the deed, but its intended (expected) consequences by which morality is to be judged. Ignorance is no excuse; one must think through the consequences and evaluate them; if necessary, predicting the behavior of others." The point seems to be that if all parties adhere to the ethic of honesty, then debate can serve as an open forum to explore the situational nature of ethical questions. Honesty is certainly not the only ethic in the game of debate, but it is a *non-situational* ethic. Other ethics are worthy of exploration, but they do not apply to all situations in a debate round. Through the ethic of honesty we can engage in a situationally specific discussion of ethics. Thus, gaming allows us to better understand the situational nature of ethics.

Second, gaming allows us to study how concern for other individuals guides our sense of ethics. One assumption that some have made about competitive games is that players will utilize strategies which only involve their self interest. Actually, it has become apparent that players develop concerns for other participants, which can be thought of as a function of ethics. Schelling has noted that some believe that rationality, as exhibited by players, is to be identified with selfishness. Disagreeing with this, he writes:

> This argument, I think, is not usually valid. There is no need to suppose that the payoffs reflect selfish interests. They reflect the player's valuation of the outcomes, and he can surely value them selfishly, altruistically, or in terms of justice or welfare. If a game reflects a lawyer's choice of strategy, the lawyer can be playing to

[13]Schelling, pp. 46-47.
[14]Schelling, p. 47.
[15]Schelling, pp. 56-57.

> maximize his fee, to get an innocent man acquitted, or to establish a precedent that he believes to be in the interest of justice. He may do this out of fun, pride, or ethical obligation, or to get revenge on an opposing attorney.[15]

Rapoport has also concluded that players are often vitally concerned with the welfare of other players.[16] In summarizing empirical research in this area, he notes that, players are often concerned not only with their own payoffs but also with what the co-player gets, sometimes empathizing with him, sometimes, on the contrary, deriving satisfaction from his losses, regardless of what they themselves get. The point here is that gaming recognizes that significant pressures will operate to make players concerned about the welfare of other players. For example, a team clearly winning a round might have a tendency to show mercy on the other team by easing up a bit, a tendency debate coaches live in fear of. Certainly not all will show such concern, but it is hoped that a gaming perspective can continually bring out more and more of such concern.

Third, gaming is a useful perspective for investigating how to deter ethical violations. Schelling has stated that gaming can be a very useful tool in examining deterrence as it might arise in capital punishment, international threats of military retaliation, and more generally in the whole realm of rewards and punishments.[17] Various methods can be explored and evaluated in terms of how to increase the motives for ethical behavior on the part of players. His suggestion, which might be considered for application to academic debate, is massive retaliation. Thus, unethical practices could be deterred if massive penalties (such as losing a ballot) were arranged. His hope is that deterrence will be effective, and thus massive retaliation will not be necessary in the vast majority of instances. This is certainly an area where more investigation is warranted in an attempt to relate gaming approaches of deterrence to the control of unethical debate practices.

The conclusion drawn from these points and other issues not covered here must be that gaming and game theory can provide a useful method of understanding and dealing with ethical difficulties. Schelling notes that substantial area exists for the utilization of game theory and the study of ethics, including ethical problems game theory has already addressed; that the use of game theory can be expanded into the discipline of ethics and philosophy;

---

[16]Anatol Rapoport, *Fights, Games and Debates* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960), pp. 280-290.

[17]Schelling, p. 54.

and, finally, that the conduct of a game itself is likely to give rise to new ethical concerns for study.[18] Schelling observes that game theory can study ethics as a constraint on human behavior. Such constraints can come from "religion, ethics, law, instinct, sentiment, taste, the nervous system and other parts of the human body, custom, the physical environment, and the contrivances we equip ourselves with."[19] As well, game theory can be especially helpful in examining constraints that affect "people's expectations about each other, for working out the social-behavioral implications of different ethical systems." Certainly this last ability is one of special import to academic debate. Ethical systems can be examined, according to Schelling, by looking at the interactive implications of ethical systems (how changes in constraints and payoffs make particular rules unnecessary or essential) and by examining the implications of coexistence between two radically different ethics.[20]

There are a number of reasons why the ethics of a game situation matches up well with the ethics of an academic debate situation. Duke, for example, has stated that a game is well suited to handling ethical concerns if it has a neutral, non-manipulative design.[21] Certainly the game of debate briefly outlined in the works mentioned earlier attempts to meet this criteria, especially by stressing the need for equality of opportunity among players. Schelling has observed that a game is well suited for handling ethical issues if it involves direct consequences of ethical choices.[22] Certainly in academic debate, the possibility of losing a ballot on an ethical issue (such as proven fabrication of evidence) does provide the needed consequences. Valavanis has posited that ethical issues are explored when the welfare of others is inter-related.[23] Certainly in an academic debate, players have the welfare of their partners and the school to think of, as well as the welfare of an opponent against whom they might violate ethical standards in competition.

This does not mean that there will be no ethical problems in the game of debate, nor does it mean that ethical difficulties can be defined outside of actual play. As Duke notes, "new ethical problems may emerge in the *use* of a game."[24] When ethical

---

[18]Schelling, pp. 53-54.
[19]Schelling, pp. 48-49.
[20]Schelling, p. 60.
[21]Duke, p. 105.
[22]Schelling, p. 58.
[23]Stefan Valavanis, "The Resolution of Conflicts when Utilities Interact," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (June, 1958), pp. 156-169.
[24]Duke, p. 104.

problems do develop, it is best to let the operator (in this case, the judge) merely observe how ethical disputes are played out in the round. In the best spirit of a liberal education, the debaters should decide by their argument. Duke notes that the "simplest, most straightforward rule is that the operator should blend into the woodwork at the earliest possible moment and let the game proceed with a minimum of operator intervention."[25] Thus, in a debate, ethical disputes are open to argument.

A couple of issues need to be raised in pre-emption to possible arguments against the position that gaming can operate as a way to approach ethics within academic debate. One would be that ethics is necessarily connected with values, and values are very rarely discussed in a debate context. It seems less than sage to argue that values are EVER excluded from intellectual concerns. As Bremer notes, intellectual curiosity probably cannot exist without moral concern.[26] Certainly issues such as politics and economics, often discussed in debates, have important ethical components. As Schelling has noted, it is not possible to abstract "ethical man" as separate from "economic man" and "rational man."[27] These concepts are related. Academic debate provides a fertile area for a discussion of ethics, values, and morals. Another objection may be that not all will be willing to play the game ethically. Of course, this is true. However, the implication must not be that this demonstrates that gaming is a FAILURE at studying ethics, but means that gaming is a fertile area for ethical study BECAUSE not all will obey the same set of applied ethical standards. As Schelling notes, when we develop a sort of "social contract" between players to play the game "ethically," we "must take as a premise that not everybody will sign the contract."[28]

Ethical concerns are prevalent in academic debate, both in a discussion of the issues implied by the topics, and by the practices which emerge in academic debates. Gaming provides not an answer, but a feasible methodology for handling the study of such ethical disputes.

CONCLUSION

There are various paradigms which are applied to academic debate. In deciding which paradigm to utilize, we should keep in

---

[25]Duke, p. 107.
[26]Stuart Bremer, *Simulated Worlds: A Computer Model of National Decision-Making* (Princeton: N.J., Princeton University Press, 1977), p.6.
[27]Schelling, p. 51.
[28]Schelling, p. 52.

mind the various intellectual and educational opportunities a paradigm may offer. Ethical concerns are important for communication, education, and competition. A viable paradigm for academic debate should offer a way to understand and teach about ethical concerns. Gaming, as a paradigm for academic debate, does not pretend to offer hard and fast rules for determining what is ethical and what is unethical. It does, however, provide us with a useful perspective on ethics as well as a methodology for increasing our understanding of ethical issues. Cassirer was correct, the ethical world is never a given, but it is always in a state of becoming. The ethic of honesty may well be a standard, but hopefully one that is flexible enough to put debate in the "state of becoming" that Cassirer would approve of. Gaming is one valuable method for aiding us in understanding this never-ending evolution.