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This issue of THE SPEAKER, marking the beginning of a new academic year, seems a suitable place for us to pause and consider some of the objectives of our forensic programs. Although at first reading these comments may seem appropriate for our faculty members, a closer scrutiny will reveal that they concern principles of vital concern to each TKA member.

The sweep of forensic programs has made debate "big business," not subject to anti-trust legislation, to be sure, but creating new responsibilities for the forensic director. The budget of one thousand to eighteen hundred dollars of a dozen years ago, financing participation in eight or ten tournaments, is, for many schools, a thing of the past. Today's budget may range from two thousand to ten thousand dollars, and the debate program consists of a dozen or more tournaments, usually more.

The debate director no longer is sole custodian of forensic activities. He is assisted by other members of the faculty or graduate assistants, or both. While those who work with him may relieve some of the demands on his time, they do not relieve his responsibilities, for the major decisions still are his.

In the midst of a debate season which now extends from October through early May (check your AFA REGISTER to find the increasing number of tournaments and the lengthening of the debate season) it is perhaps almost inevitable that the debate director spends the major portion of his time in planning a debate program and training his debaters. It is important, though, that in the endless mass of details, the hours of work, and the weeks of travel the director not lose sight of the real purposes for which his program exists.

All of us would agree, I believe, that debate programs exist primarily to provide a challenging educational opportunity. This is the type of education which cannot be provided in the usual classroom situation. And the students who are sufficiently attracted by a forensic program to participate for several years rarely are "usual" students. These are tomorrow's leaders in business, in education, in government, medicine, and law. And the forensic program can provide a type of training essential to their success.

We are, however, not merely directors of forensic programs. We are, first and foremost, educators and our prime educational responsibility exists in the classroom, not in the debate meeting. We are expected to educate far more students than those who participate in our debate programs. Tempting though it may be to slight our classes at the
height of a debate season, to do so is to do less than the job for which we were hired.

The debate director must apply the same high standards to his debate program that he applies to his classes. He must stretch both budget and time to train and travel as many students as possible. The four or the eight who receive a disproportionate share of effort and expense may fill a case with trophies but such trophies are hollow justification for a debate program. In the final analysis, the success or failure of the debate program must be measured not in the number of trophies won but in the education of the students.

Why are these responsibilities of importance to Tau Kappa Alpha? The answer is both simple and significant. The heart of TKA is the local chapter. The director of the forensic program is the chapter sponsor, and the forensic program provides the candidates for the local Tau Kappa Alpha chapter. The strength of our local chapter depends on the forensic director and his program.

As we move on in a time which will try man's patience and challenge the right of free men to live out their lives in freedom, organizations such as Tau Kappa Alpha will become increasingly important. Surely civilization itself does depend on “intelligent, responsible, and effective speech in a free society.”

NEW DATES
FOR
NATIONAL CONFERENCE
April 18, 19, 20, 1962
INDIANA STATE COLLEGE
TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA
During last spring's meetings of the Student Council, many members became aware that there is a need to crystalize the role of student government in Tau Kappa Alpha. I campaigned on the idea that we could find a definite role in the society and justify our existence. The prospects for fulfilling this goal seem good. As this is my first contact with the members of Tau Kappa Alpha, I would like to outline my ideas on what can and should be done in student government.

The structure and the functions of the Tau Kappa Alpha Student Council are outlined in By-law XI of the Constitution of our society. Article III of this By-law lists eight functions of the Student Council. Yet the experience of past presidents indicates a difficulty in transforming these functions into concrete acts. One reason for this is that the student is active in Tau Kappa Alpha for only a short period of time. Consequently it is difficult for him, on a national scale, to carry on much of the continuous work of the society. This, of course, means that any function must be carried out through a close relationship between the Student and National Councils. But even the realization of this relationship fails to make effective the role of the Student Council.

In seeking a remedy for this problem, one of the first plans of your Student Council was to conduct an evaluation of student participation in Tau Kappa Alpha. This would have been an indirect way of studying the role of the Student Council. This is no longer necessary. President Hagood has established a committee—composed of the Student Council officers, Dr. John Austin, and Dr. Bert Bradley—with this end in mind. I hope that a report can be prepared by the time of the National Council meeting in December.

The report of the 1960-61 Student Council will be referred to the committee. This report contains some important ideas for reform of the Student Council. The first idea, more effective representation on the National Council, expresses a legitimate desire on the part of the students to know more about what is going on in the organization. To what extent this is possible or even desirable is an open question. I hope to attend the National Council meeting in December in order to present ideas on changes in the Student Council. As for the National Conference in Terre Haute, the President of Tau Kappa Alpha will be invited to report to the Student Council on TKA affairs.

(Continued on page 19)
NEW TKA CHAPTER
New Mexico Highlands University

In an impressive ceremony conducted at La Mancha Restaurant in Galisteo, New Mexico, on Friday evening, April 14, a Chapter of Tau Kappa Alpha was installed for New Mexico Highlands University of Las Vegas, New Mexico. Dr. Wayne C. Eubank, professor of Speech at the University of New Mexico and head of its speech department, initiated the candidates, being assisted by Walter F. Brunet, professor of speech at Highlands University and sponsor of the local chapter.

As part of the ceremony each new member was called upon to give a speech on the value of speech training in his life to date. Dr. John S. Johnson, Assistant to the University's President and a member of Tau Kappa Alpha in his undergraduate days at Lawrence College, Wisconsin, pointed out in his speech the value of such training in his career.

Dr. Eubank then detailed in a fascinating manner some of the past activities of the organization as well as its future objectives. His speech had considerable meaning since he was president of the national chapter from 1951 to 1955.

The five students who received Tau Kappa Alpha pins were E. Louis Abeyta,
senior from Tucumcari, New Mexico; Harold Martinez, junior from El Rito, New Mexico; Charles I. Romero, senior from Las Vegas, New Mexico; and Victoria M. Smith, senior from Haskell, Texas. At the present time, the seniors of this group are pursuing their post graduation careers. Mr. Abeyta is now employed with the government in Washington, D.C. and is working on his law degree. Mr. Lawrence has received a speech assistantship at the University of Colorado in Boulder. Mr. Romero has also received a speech assistantship and is attending the University of Arizona this fall at Tucson. Mrs. Smith has accepted a teaching position in Texas.

In addition two associate members were initiated. They were Joseph H. McGinnis, an instructor at Taos Junior High School, Taos, New Mexico, and Lorenzo Tapia, assistant now to Senator Chavez of New Mexico. These were so honored because they were instrumental in forming the Forensic Club of Highlands University. Dean Quincy Guy Burris of Highlands University was awarded an honorary membership.

The installation of the Tau Kappa Alpha Chapter was attended by the members of the Highlands Forensic Club. These students who hope to achieve membership in Tau Kappa Alpha were greatly encouraged by the initiation of its new members and were inspired by the ceremony.

The present Forensic Club on the Highlands campus has been active in speech work for the past six years under the direction of Mr. Brunet. Its activities encompass debate, extemporaneous speaking, oratory, and oral interpretation. The Club encourages the conscientious students on the campus who are interested in speech activities to join. The members of the Club receive valuable experience through the many speaking situations which are afforded them.

Last year, members of the Forensic Club attended three national debate tournaments: the Texas Christian University Tournament, Fort Worth, Texas; the Golden Eagle Tournament at Amarillo, Texas; and the Tournament at Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado. The year proved to be successful for the traveling teams who brought back to Highlands two first place trophies, one in oral interpretation won at the Amarillo tournament and the other in debate won at Adams State College.

Other forensic activities include participation in the annual Brutsche oratorical contest held in the first part of April, with trophies and cash prizes going to the top four winners. These are provided by Mr. Ralph Brutsche, a New Mexico Home builder whose interest in oratory stems from his work at the University of New Mexico where he won many honors in debate and other speech fields. We are looking to the time when the forensic club members have gained sufficient experience in oratory work so that they may take part in the National Inter-State Oratorical Contest.

The Club also actively participates in promoting Highlands Day Annual High School Speech Tournament and other speech activities on the campus.

The Forensic Club looks toward the future enthusiastically. Next year the traveling debaters hope to add another debate tournament to their list. The Forensic Club also hopes to establish an extemporaneous speaking contest for campus students. By these advances, the Club with the guidance of Mr. Brunet hopes to train more speakers who will qualify for Tau Kappa Alpha.
COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE DISCUSSION AND DEBATE
NATIONAL DEBATE PROPOSITION AND DISCUSSION QUESTION
FOR AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1961-1962

As of August 7, 1961, the Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate of the Speech Association of America announces the results of the preferential poll of directors of forensics of American colleges and universities to determine the debate proposition and discussion question for nation-wide use during the 1961-1962 forensic season. As shown by the tabulation on the reverse side of this page the results are:

**National Debate Proposition**

Resolved: That labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of anti-trust legislation.

**National Discussion Question**

What procedures should the Federal Government follow to protect the civil rights of all citizens?

The Committee appends no qualifications or definitions to the announced proposition or question; any “official” interpretations by the Committee are forbidden.

If circumstances should arise which render the regularly selected proposition or question unsuitable, the Committee may, by two-thirds vote, rephrase the proposition or question, or select an entirely new proposition or question. Your representative on the Committee will be pleased to supply further information concerning the rules under which the Committee operates.

Those directors of forensics who will be in attendance at the convention of the Speech Association of America at New York, New York, in December, 1961, are cordially invited to attend the open meeting of the Committee. Details of time and place will be listed in the convention program.

Respectfully submitted:

American Forensic Association
Kim Giffin, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Unaffiliated Colleges
Murray A. Hewgill, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Tau Kappa Alpha
Nicholas M. Cripe, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana

Delta Sigma Rho
Auston J. Freeley, John Carroll University, University Heights, Cleveland 18, Ohio

Phi Rho Pi
Lloyd P. Dudley, Pueblo College, Pueblo, Colorado

Pi Kappa Delta
Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi (Chairman for 1961)
**SUMMARY OF NATION-WIDE PREFERENTIAL POLL OF DIRECTORS OF FORENSICS TO DETERMINE THE DEBATE PROPOSITION AND DISCUSSION QUESTION FOR THE 1961-1962 FORENSIC SEASON**

### DEBATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolved</th>
<th>AFA</th>
<th>Unaff.</th>
<th>TKA</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>PKD</th>
<th>Tot. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the U.S. should adopt a foreign policy which includes the option of taking initial action against potential enemies.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1087 IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1262 II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives should be discontinued.</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1195 III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the United States should withdraw the Connally Reservation from its Declaration of Adherence to the International Court of Justice.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1074 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of anti-trust legislation.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1322 I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- How can the United States best meet the challenge of communism?
- What procedures should the Federal Government follow to protect the civil rights of all citizens?
- How can the problems of world population expansion best be met?
- What should be the agricultural program of the U.S.?
- What should be the policy of the U.S. on disarmament?

In the above tabulations each first-place vote was scored five points, each second-place vote four points, each third-place vote three points, each fourth-place vote two points, and each fifth-place vote one point.
PROGRAM OF EVENTS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE TAU KAPPA ALPHA CONFERENCE

At this time of the year, most schools are planning their debate and forensic program for the year. Let us hope that all schools of Tau Kappa Alpha are giving every consideration to attending the National Forensic Conference to be held Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 18-20, 1962. NOTE THE CHANGE IN DATES. This change was made necessary due to a sudden 700 student increase in enrollment at Indiana State College in Terre Haute, Indiana, the host school for this year.

As a result of the questionnaire, we have learned that the schools are overwhelmingly in favor of the format of last year's conference, including the time schedule of events. Thus this coming year the format will be the same except for two small changes in discussion. We all had time to participate in forensic events, get the work of the national organization accomplished, time for sociability. Thus again this year, we shall hope to have the same pleasant national meet.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEBATE

2-Man Debate

1. Proposition—Resolved: that labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of anti-trust legislation.
2. Each school may enter one pair of debaters (2 people) prepared to debate both sides of the topic.
3. There will be six preliminary rounds of debate for all teams entered in the tournament. From among those teams the eight top teams will be picked to run through a quarter-final, semi-final, and final round in order to determine the champion of the division.
4. Debates will be conventional style: 10 minute constructive speeches, 5 minute rebuttal. A five minute recess between constructive and rebuttal speeches will be permitted.
5. Judge: Each school participating in this 2-Man debate division must furnish a qualified critic judge who must be available for the elimination rounds.
6. Any team more than ten minutes late for any round will forfeit that round of debate.
7. Awards—Tau Kappa Alpha certificates will be awarded to the top eight debaters in the division as determined by the individual scores of the six preliminary rounds of debate. Plaques will be awarded to the championship school, the runner-up, and the other two semi-finalists. The top school will also be awarded one year possession of the rotating trophy.
8. The official American Forensic debate ballot labeled “Form C” shall be used throughout the tournament.
9. Judges may give a critique at the end of the debate but they are requested not to disclose their decision.

4-Man Debate

1. The national proposition will be debated.
2. Each school may enter one affirmative and one negative team in this division.
3. Each school participating in this division must furnish a qualified critic judge who will be available for judging all eight rounds.

4. There will be eight rounds of debate for each team entered.

5. Debates will be conventional style: 10 minute constructive speeches, 5 minute rebuttal. A five minute recess between constructive and rebuttal speeches will be permitted.

6. Judges may give a critique at the end of the debate but they are requested not to disclose their decision.

7. The official American Forensic debate ballot labeled “Form C” shall be used throughout the tournament.

8. Any team more than 10 minutes late for any round will forfeit that round of debate.

9. First, second, third, and fourth place plaques plus the first place traveling trophy will be awarded. Final standings will be determined by win-loss record. Ties will be broken by totaling combined speaker’s points of the four debaters representing each school. Certificates will be awarded the top four affirmative debaters and the top four negative debaters according to speaker points.

Public Speaking

1. Each school may enter two student speakers. Men and women will compete in the same division. Students entered in Public Speaking cannot enter Extemporaneous Speaking.

2. All contestants will participate in the first two rounds. The final round will consist of the eight speakers who received the highest ratings in Round I and II. In all rounds the order of speaking will be determined by drawing numbers.

3. Each speaker will deliver a speech on the subject of his choosing. This speech must be persuasive in nature, designed to inspire, convince, or actuate.

4. The speech must not be more than 10 minutes in length.

5. The speeches may be delivered with or without notes.

6. The judges will be selected from the coaches present at the national conference. The same number of judges will be used in each section of the first two rounds. At least three judges will be used in each section.

7. In the first two rounds each judge will rank the first four speakers in his section 1-2-3-4, the remaining speakers will receive 5. All speakers will be rated superior, excellent, good, or fair. These ratings will be given a numerical value. Superior will be 90 or above; excellent, 85-89; good, 80-84; fair, 75-79.

8. The eight finalists will be selected on the number of superior ratings they receive. Ties will be broken by ranking number and, if necessary, percentage points.

9. At least three judges will be used in the finals. They should be judges not used in the preliminary events.

10. In the final round, each judge will rate those whom he considers to be the three best speakers superior, the remainder excellent. He will give a numerical value to the rating for the purpose of breaking any ties.
11. The top three speakers will each receive a plaque denoting superior. The other five speakers will receive certificates denoting excellent. No first, second, third placements will be made.

**Extemporaneous Speaking**

1. Each school may enter two student speakers. Students entered in Extemporaneous Speaking cannot enter Public Speaking. Men and women will compete in the same division.
2. All contestants will participate in the first two rounds. The final round will consist of the top-ranking eight students.
3. The time will be five to seven minutes.
4. Speakers will draw their topics in the order listed on the schedule 30 minutes before speaking time. Each speaker will receive three topics from which he will select one. The topics should be handed to the chairman or judges at the time of speaking.
5. The speech may be delivered with or without notes at the option of the speaker.
6. The topics will be selected from the area of international affairs for the last six months prior to the Conference.
7. Each school entering should provide one judge.
8. Each speaker will be rated in both rounds. Speakers averaging a total score of 90 percent or above will be rated superior; 85 percent, excellent; 80 percent, good; 75 percent, satisfactory; below 75 percent, poor.
9. Three Tau Kappa Alpha Plaques and five certificates will be awarded.
10. The method of choosing winners shall be the same as for Public Speaking.

**Discussion**

Round I Wednesday 8:30-9:30 a.m.
Round II Wednesday 10:00-11:00 a.m.
Round III Wednesday 12:00-1:00 p.m.
Round IV Thursday 8:30-9:30 a.m.
Round V Thursday 10:00-11:00 a.m.
Round VI Thursday 12:00-1:00 p.m.

1. Discussion topic: "What procedures should the Federal Government follow to protect the Civil Rights of all citizens?"
2. There will be six rounds of discussion utilizing the national topic. No students will be eliminated unless they fail to attend discussion sessions or refuse to cooperate with other discussants.
3. Each school may enter as many as four discussants, but must provide a competent judge if more than one student is entered.
4. Discussants will be assigned to panels of 5-8 members. The personnel of each panel will remain unchanged throughout the six rounds of discussion. Each round of discussion will be evaluated by a different critic.
5. Discussants may not participate in debate, but may enter an individual speaking event.
6. For Round I, the chairman will be assigned by the Discussion Supervisor. Chairmen for subsequent rounds will be chosen by the respective groups.
7. Suggestions for the six rounds of discussion:
   Rounds I and II: What is the problem and how serious is it?
Rounds III and IV: What are the various solutions with the advantages and disadvantages of each?
Rounds V and VI: What is the best solution or solutions?

8. Awards: Four plaques indicating superior work shall be awarded to the four best discussants in the six preliminary rounds. Certificates of excellence will be given to six additional discussants. (Should the number of discussants be few in number, awards shall be limited to the top 20%.) Methods of judging and rating of discussants shall be the same as those in Public Speaking and Extemporaneous Speaking.

Schedule of Events

April 17, 1962: Registration: 7:00-10:00 p.m.

April 18, 1962:
8:30-10:00 a.m. Debate, Discussion, Round I
10:00-11:30 a.m. Debate, Discussion, Round II
11:30-1:00 p.m. Debate, Discussion, Round III
1:00-2:30 p.m. President’s Luncheon
2:30-4:00 p.m. Round I of speaking events, Student Council Meeting, National Council Meeting.
4:00-6:00 p.m. Student Elections
7:00-10:00 p.m. Social event for all participants.

April 19, 1962:
8:30-10:00 a.m. Debate, Discussion, Round IV
10:00-11:30 a.m. Debate, Discussion, Round V
11:30-1:00 p.m. Debate, Discussion, Round VI
2:30-4:00 p.m. Round II of Speaking Events, Student and National Council Meetings
4:00-6:00 p.m. Free Time—tour of city
7:00-9:30 p.m. Banquet.
9:30-11:30 p.m. Meeting of Coaches and Social Hour for Students.

April 20, 1962:
9:00-10:30 a.m. 2-Man First Elimination Round; Round VII, 4-Man
10:30-12:00 noon 2-Man Second Elimination Round; Round VIII, 4-Man
12:00-1:00 p.m. Lunch

Since this is Good Friday the following schedule is proposed subject to later action by National Council or participants at the conference:
1:00-3:00 p.m. Free for Religious Services
3:00-4:15 p.m. Finals in 2-Man debate and both speaking events.
4:15-4:45 p.m. Awards Session
The Indiana State College Speech Staff of thirteen will be honored to host TKA for the 1962 National Conference. Your wish will be our command. The student body of 5300 will be on hand also to extend traditional Indiana hospitality to each visiting TKA member.

The college lies in the heart of the city. Major hotels are within two blocks, and eating facilities are abundant.

While ours is an old city, TKA will find her warm-hearted and vitally interested in educational endeavor.

Otis J. Aggertt, Director
1962 National Conference

REMEMBER
National Conference
April 18, 19, 20, 1962
Indiana State College
Terre Haute, Indiana
STANDARDS FOR JUDGING REFUTATION

HERBERT L. JAMES

This paper will summarize and interpret the results of a pilot study on standards for judging refutation.

Questionnaires were forwarded to sixty-eight representative college and university coaches of debate. Fifty-seven (84%) questionnaires were returned.

The questionnaire included twenty-nine questions requiring a "yes" or "no" response or an "affirmative" or "negative" vote. These questions were prefaced with the following instructions: "If you believe it is impossible to make a generalization, you may leave the question blank. It will be understood that your answer represents a generalization which may admit an occasional exception."

The questions and the replies were as follows:

1. If an affirmative team has failed to make out a prima facie case, but the negative team has failed to recognize this deficiency, would you necessarily vote negative? 14% replied that they would vote negative; 81% replied that they would not necessarily vote negative; 5% did not reply.

2. If an affirmative team has failed to make out a prima facie case and the negative recognizes this deficiency by making only a passing reference to this omission, would you vote for the negative team? 53% replied that they would vote for the negative team making a brief reference to a deficiency in case structure; 33% would not vote for the negative; 14% did not reply.

3. If an affirmative team fails to demonstrate how their proposal would remove the evils, and the negative makes brief reference to this omission, would you vote for the negative team? 49% would vote for the negative team which makes a brief reference to the failure of the affirmative team to demonstrate how their proposal would remove the evils; 37% would not vote for the negative team; 14% did not reply.

4. If the second negative constructive speaker has developed serious objections (evils) to the affirmative plan, would you expect the first affirmative rebuttal speaker to refute these objections? 96% would expect the first affirmative rebuttal speaker to refute plan objections; 4% would not.

5. Would you penalize an affirmative team that failed to refute negative evils in the first affirmative rebuttal speech? 79% would penalize an affirmative team for failing to refute negative evils in the first affirmative rebuttal; 12% would not penalize an affirmative team; 9% did not reply.

6. Would you necessarily vote against an affirmative team that failed to refute negative objections in the first affirmative rebuttal speech? 16% would vote against an affirmative team failing to refute negative objections in the first affirmative rebuttal; 79% would not vote against the affirmative; 5% did not reply.

7. If a definition of terms is contested not in the first negative constructive speech but in the second negative constructive speech, would you accept this contested issue? 32% would permit the second negative to contest a

* Professor James is Director of Debate at Dartmouth College. This paper was presented at a meeting of the Speech Association of America Convention at St. Louis, Missouri in December, 1960.
8. Would you necessarily penalize an affirmative team for introducing the affirmative proposal in the closing seconds of the second affirmative constructive speech? 39% would penalize an affirmative team for introducing the affirmative proposal in the closing seconds of the second affirmative constructive; 54% would not penalize an affirmative team; 7% did not reply.

9. Would you penalize an affirmative team for introducing the specific provisions or planks of their proposal in the first affirmative rebuttal spot? 96% would penalize an affirmative team for introducing the planks of their proposal in the first affirmative rebuttal; 4% would not penalize an affirmative team.

10. Would you penalize an affirmative team for withholding until the final rebuttal speech a refutation to one or more vital issues? 82% would penalize an affirmative team for delaying refutation of a vital issue to the final rebuttal; 11% would not penalize an affirmative team; 7% did not reply.

11. If the second negative constructive speech is devoted entirely to the development of new and more serious evils in the affirmative proposal, would you penalize the negative team? 18% would penalize the second negative constructive speaker who devotes his entire speech to the plan evils; 68% would not penalize the negative; 14% did not reply.

12. In your coaching, do you insist upon some direct refutation of the affirmative case (i.e. need) in the second negative constructive speech? 67% insist upon some direct refutation of need in the second negative constructive speech; 28% do not require direct refutation; 5% did not reply.

13. Generally speaking, do you attach more importance to a negative approach which combines direct refutation of the affirmative case with constructive objections to the affirmative proposal? 93% endorse a negative approach which combines direct refutation with constructive objections; 2% do not attach more importance to this combined approach; 5% did not reply.

14. Would you accept the introduction of specific evils in a specific affirmative proposal in the first negative rebuttal speech? 64% would accept the introduction of plan evils in the first negative rebuttal; 25% would not accept these arguments; 11% did not reply.

15. Generally speaking, do you attach more weight to direct refutation of the affirmative arguments than you do to the constructive development in the negative case (i.e. advantages for retaining the present system and/or new and more serious evils in the affirmative plan)? 63% consider direct refutation by the negative team more valuable than constructive arguments; 25% do not attach greater weight to direct refutation; 12% did not reply.

16. If an argument can be refuted without the introduction of counter evidence, would you penalize a team for a lack of such evidence? 2% would penalize a team which neglected to use evidence in refutation; 96% would not penalize a team for failure to introduce counter evidence; 2% did not reply.

17. Do you believe an affirmative team, if pushed, should attempt to demonstrate that their proposal could be or would be adopted? 43% maintained that an affirmative team should offer reasonable proof that their proposal could be or would be adopted; 52% believed that the affirmative responsibility was restricted to the concept of "should"; 5% did not reply.
18. If the negative team introduces a counter proposal, do you believe this should necessarily be introduced in the first negative constructive speech? 66% replied that the negative team should introduce counter plans in the first negative constructive; 34% did not believe this was necessary.

19. If an affirmative team neglects to demonstrate their needs are inherent in the present system, and the negative team detects this weakness in analysis but offers no constructive defense of the status quo, do you believe the burden has been sufficiently shifted to the affirmative team? 46% replied that the burden of moving forward with the argument had been sufficiently shifted to the affirmative; 36% replied that this negative approach was insufficient; 18% did not reply.

20. Ultimately do you award decisions to the team winning the issue and/or issues in the debate? 84% award decisions to the team winning the issue or issues in the debate; 2% do not base their decision on the issue; 14% did not reply.

21. Do factors other than superior reasoning and/or evidence reflect in your decision as to which team won or lost a given issue? In awarding a given issue to a team, factors in addition to reasoning and evidence influence 80%; 18% award an issue to a team solely on the basis of superior evidence and reasoning; 2% did not reply.

22. If a given issue appears inherently "loaded" affirmatively or negatively, do you tend to compensate in favor of the team with the inherent disadvantage? 39% compensate for "loaded" questions; 48% do not compensate; 13% did not reply.

23. Is your overall evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation affected by organization and delivery? 100% believe that skill in refutation is affected by organization and delivery.

24. If you detect weaknesses in evidence, but these weaknesses are not discovered by the opponent, does your judgment influence your evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation? 54% permit their judgment of evidence to influence their evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation; 37% are not influenced by their own judgment; 9% did not reply.

25. If you detect weaknesses in reasoning, but these weaknesses are not detected by the opponent, does your judgment influence your evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation? 62% permit their evaluation of reasoning to reflect in their evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation; 29% are not influenced by their own judgment; 9% did not reply.

26. The affirmative team successfully demonstrates that the present system is unsatisfactory, but under negative attack fails to demonstrate that the affirmative proposal will remove the evils and that this proposal will not result in new and more serious evils. For which team would you vote? 2% would vote for the affirmative; 96% would vote for the negative; 2% did not reply.

27. The affirmative team has failed to demonstrate a need and/or the negative team has neutralized the need issue, but all negative objections to the affirmative plan have been disproved. For which team would you vote? 14% would
vote for the affirmative; 77% would vote for the negative; 9% did not reply.

28. The affirmative team wins the need issue and demonstrates that their plan would not result in new and more serious evils, but they failed to prove under attack that their plan will solve the needs. For which team would you vote? 17% would vote for the affirmative; 74% would vote for the negative; 9% did not reply.

29. The affirmative team establishes the need issue and demonstrates how their proposal will solve these needs, but they are unable to refute the negative objections (evils) to the affirmative plan. For which team would you vote? 33% would vote for the affirmative; 51% would vote for the negative; 16% did not reply.

Within the narrow limits of this study, what conclusions seem warranted?

1. Judges are strongly influenced by the order in which arguments are introduced.
   a. A significant minority (39%) would penalize the affirmative for introducing their plan in the closing seconds of the second affirmative constructive.
   b. An overwhelming majority (96%) would penalize the affirmative for introducing provisions of their plan in the first affirmative rebuttal.
   c. The first affirmative rebuttal speaker is expected to refute negative objections to plan. Many judges would penalize the affirmative for failing to do this. Most judges would not vote against an affirmative team for failing to refute plan evils in the first affirmative rebuttal, though a minority (16%) would.
   d. A vast majority (82%) would penalize an affirmative team for withholding until the final rebuttal speech a refutation to one or more vital issues.
   e. A majority (54%) would not accept a contested definition of terms in the second negative constructive speech.
   f. A majority of judges would accept the introduction of plan evils in the first negative rebuttal.
   g. A majority (66%) expect a counter plan to be introduced in the first negative constructive speech.

2. Factors extrinsic to the debaters' utterances influence a judge's evaluation of refutation.
   a. A significant minority compensate for a "loaded" issue.
   b. A majority permit their evaluation of evidence to influence their judgment.
   c. A majority permit their evaluation of reasoning to influence their judgment.

3. Direct refutation is the most vital method of refutation.
   a. A majority of judges attach more weight to direct refutation than to constructive negative cases; however a vast majority favor a negative approach which combines the two.
   b. A majority of judges coach their teams to use direct refutation in the second negative constructive; however most would not penalize the negative for devoting the entire second negative to plan evils.

4. Skill in refutation is affected by a variety of factors which follow no set pattern.
   a. If an argument can be refuted without the use of counter evidence, a
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vast majority of judges would not penalize a team for the lack of evidence.

b. While a minority (18%) awarded issues on the strength of superior evidence and reasoning alone, all judges are influenced in their evaluation of a speaker's skill in refutation by organization and delivery (style and selection are also factors).

5. Judges will not vote against an affirmative team for failing to make out a *prima facie* case unless the negative discovers this deficiency.

6. A majority of judges will vote against an affirmative team which loses *any one* of the stock issues—need, workability of plan or plan evils; however, a significant minority will permit an affirmative team to lose *one* of the stock issues.

---

STUDENT PRESIDENT’S PAGE . . . (Continued from Page 5)

Among the other suggestions made by the Student Council were the questions of financial support and changes in forensic activities at the National Conference. These suggestions will be presented in December.

In the above I mentioned that the Student Council can operate effectively through a close liaison with the National Council. This does not mean that students cannot carry out functions on their own. Let us consider an example of what the students can accomplish through their representatives. One of the functions of the Student Council is to carry on research on the relative values of different kinds of forensic activities. This sounds like a nebulous function, and at present it is. But by earnestly pursuing this project, we can make a most significant contribution to Tau Kappa Alpha. Most of us have participated in forensic activities, from debate to oral interpretation of Lithuanian limericks. Most of us have ideas on the relative values of such activities. If the Student Council could compile a report, based on such ideas, it would be a meaningful contribution to the society.

In concluding, I believe I can say that matters look hopeful for the Student Council this year. Through the work of the Student Council, Dr. Austin, and Dr. Bradley, and with the help of the National Council student participation should become crystalized into a meaningful part of the Tau Kappa Alpha Society.
TAU KAPPA ALPHA NEW MEMBERSHIP LIST, 1960-1961
(The following is a list of new members processed through the office at Athens, Ohio)

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Frances Leiser Chandler Mildred Gene Levi William Housel Stricklen

ALMA COLLEGE
Joan Ellyn Wilson

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
Donald Joe Adams

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
John W. Gray William J. McDonald Howard Jerome Strickland
Jim Marvin Kilpatrick John T. S. Melzer Billie Jean Walker

BELLARMINE COLLEGE
Alan Louis Adelberg G. Edwin Hamilton Rev. J. Morgan Miller
Mrs. Benson S. Alleman Rev. Mel Mahony Louis Arthur Read
Michael Theodore Dues

BEREA COLLEGE
Sharon Marie Newkirk

BUTLER UNIVERSITY
Edward Clinton Ezell

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY
Barry Lee Laird

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
Patricia D. Boyles Henry Jerry Jisha Lucille Marshall Pederson
Franklin T. Gerlach Janet Sue Miller Linda Lou Schaffner
Ralf-Peter Hagedorn Charles Ray Muller Prateep Siamchai

COLORADO COLLEGE
Nancy Mae Dehlin David Wallace Furgason James Edward Spencer
L. Christopher Griffiths

DENISON UNIVERSITY
Loren Gregg Carlson John Parker Huber John S. Lowe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF DENVER</strong></td>
<td>John Quincy Adams III  Hank Doliner  Diane Catherine Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles H. Bennett  Henry Winfield Enberg  Charles Anthony Pincoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth G. Bryan  Harold Yewell Hunker  John Culver Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jere Claude Corlett  M. Daniel McLallen  Timmy Dent Tindall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUKE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Danny Ross Chandler  Emmelyn Susanne Logan  Henry Edward Seiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William J. Griffith  Eric Vaughn Mock  John Albert Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARLHAM COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Donald Gene Farrior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMORY UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Gerald Harvey Cohen  Archer Dickerson Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMORY &amp; HENRY COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Glenn Stevenson Bingham  Edwin Neel Legard, Jr.  Albert Dardew Towe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Stanley Brown  James Stuart Warden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVANSVILLE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Mardelle Lillian McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>Frank William Biglow  Ronald Keith Cacciatore  James Gordon Shapro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Simon Brooks  Joseph Fleming  Michael P. Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Mills Ripley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Stephanie D. M. Bass  Patrick C. Kennicott  Glyndon Daughtry Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HANOVER COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Richard Alan Aughe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOWARD COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Lydia Ann Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIANA STATE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Donna Martha A. Biddle  David Howard Everson  Amy Jo Osburn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE
Walter Junior Becker
Karen Lee Koto
Carl W. McIntosh
Gary Ronald Nelson
Thomas D. Peckenaugh
Margaret Eleanor Pickett
Marie Georgia Routh
Louise June Settlemyer
Dorothy June Skriletz

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Lois Ann Coleman
Margaret Yvonne Cowsar
Charles Clinton Lewis
James Otis Naremore

MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
Lowell John Borgos
Bruce William Burton
Phillip McFarland
Marcia Marie Krog

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
David E. Hurlacher
Ivan Svetozar Mandukich
Jennings Randolph
Norman Allen Mirne
B. Bruce Wagener
Maraline A. Myers

MERCER UNIVERSITY
Rebecca Ann Bethune

MIDDLEBURY
Robert L. Coe
John P. Connors

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Jack L. Rudio

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Margaret Ann Ballou
Donald F. Burke
Diane Doris Gilbert
Norman F. Murphy
Joseph F. Phelan
Irene J. Vlahakus
Elizabeth Ann Watman
Ruth Ann Wovkonish
Merle Gilbert Wright

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
Roy A. Heimlich
Robert Kerman
Howard W. Muroff

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Barbara Jean Lazynski
Timothy Lee Pickering

RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE
Robert Earl Shoun

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
Jay Darwin Bond, Jr.
Wallace E. Garthright, Jr.
Roland B. Brandis, III
Walter Samuel Griggs, Jr.
Emory David Shiver, Jr.
NOTICE TO CHAPTER SPONSORS

When filling in the subscription card to The Speaker for new members, please be sure that the expiration date given on the card is not the date the member will graduate from college. The expiration date should be determined by adding two years to the graduation date.
# CHARTERED CHAPTERS OF TAU KAPPA ALPHA

**Chapter Sponsor:** Please check the listing of your chapter and let the Editor know of any changes or corrections needed.

## INSTITUTION AND LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
<th>Sponsor and Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Alabama, University, Ala.</td>
<td>Prof. Annabel Hagood, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma College, Alma, Michigan</td>
<td>Prof. M. Harold Mikes, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.</td>
<td>Prof. Jack W. Murphy, Dept. of Speech &amp; Dramatic Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.</td>
<td>Prof. Richard Rea, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State T. C., Muncie, Indiana</td>
<td>Dr. David Shepard, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College, Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>Rev. Joseph M. Miller, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea College, Berea, Kentucky</td>
<td>Prof. Margaret D. McCoy, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va.</td>
<td>Dr. Roger Sappin, Dept. of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young Univ., Provo, Utah</td>
<td>Prof. Jed Richardson, Speech Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell Univ., Lewisburg, Pa.</td>
<td>Dr. Frank W. Merritt, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>Dr. Nicholas M. Cripe, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital University, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas Ludlum, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Inst. of Tech., Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Prof. Donald Marston, Director of Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Caldwell, Speech Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University, Worcester, Mass.</td>
<td>Prof. Neil R. Schroeder, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td>Mr. James A. Johnson (Dept. of Bus. Ad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa</td>
<td>Dr. Walter F. Stromer, Director of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina</td>
<td>Prof. Joseph E. Drake, Dept. of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison Univ., Granville, Ohio</td>
<td>Dr. Lionel Crocker, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Denver, Denver, Colo.</td>
<td>Dr. John T. Austin, School of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.</td>
<td>Dr. Herbert Wing, Dept. of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University, Durham, N.C.</td>
<td>Prof. Joseph Wetherby, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.</td>
<td>Prof. E. Orville Johnson, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>Dr. James Z. Rabun, Dept. of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory &amp; Henry College, Emory, Va.</td>
<td>Prof. Roy C. Brown, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.</td>
<td>Prof. Ted J. Foster, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.</td>
<td>Mr. Gerald Mohrman, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.</td>
<td>Dr. Grezz Chifer, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.</td>
<td>Dr. D. M. Allan, Dept. of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana</td>
<td>Dr. Stanley B. Wheaton, Speech Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard College, Birmingham, Ala.</td>
<td>Prof. G. Allan Yeomans, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Dr. Osborn Smallwood, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana S. C., Terre Haute, Ind.</td>
<td>Dr. Otis J. Agerett, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.</td>
<td>Prof. Gifford Blyton, Dept. of Eng., Speech and Dramatic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Memorial Univ., Harrogate, Tenn.</td>
<td>Prof. Earl Hobson Smith, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach State College, Long Beach, Calif.</td>
<td>Dr. Joseph A. Wagner, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge, La.</td>
<td>Dr. Waldo W. Braden, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>Rev. William Davish, S.J., Dept. of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va.</td>
<td>Dr. Harold Garrettson, Dept. of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester College, N. Manchester, Ind.</td>
<td>Prof. Paul Roten, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankato State College, Mankato, Minn.</td>
<td>Prof. V. E. Beckman, Div. of Language &amp; Lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park, Md.</td>
<td>Prof. L. Denton Crews, Jr., Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State College, Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>Prof. Janelle Bonibouef, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</td>
<td>SPONSOR AND ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Univ., Macon, Georgia</td>
<td>Dr. Helen G. Thornton, Coach of Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Univ., Oxford, Ohio</td>
<td>Dr. Bernard F. Phelps, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.</td>
<td>Prof. Donald Sprague, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Miss., University, Miss.</td>
<td>Dr. Clyde E. Reeves, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg, Miss.</td>
<td>Prof. Bennett Strange, Speech Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State Univ., Missoula, Mont.</td>
<td>Dr. Ralph Y. McGinnis, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>Prof. Harold B. Chinn, Dept. of Eng. and Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College, Murray, Ky.</td>
<td>Prof. J. Albert Tracey, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio</td>
<td>Dr. James L. Golden, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.</td>
<td>Prof. Phyllis Williamson, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.</td>
<td>Dr. Wayne Eubank, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Highlands Univ., Las Vegas, N. Mex.</td>
<td>Prof. Walter F. Brunet, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Univ. of New York, State Col. for Teachers, Albany</td>
<td>Prof. Samuel Pritchard, Jr., Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Univ. (Univ. Hts.), New York City</td>
<td>Prof. George B. Sargent, II, Dept. of Speech &amp; Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Univ. (Wash. Sq.), New York City</td>
<td>Dr. Merritt B. Jones, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.</td>
<td>Prof. Leonard F. Sommer, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Hunsinger, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University, Athens, Ohio</td>
<td>Prof. Lorin C. Staats, School of Dramatic Arts and Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Univ., Forest Grove, Oregon</td>
<td>Prof. Albert C. Hingston, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.</td>
<td>Prof. Keith S. Montgomery, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.</td>
<td>Prof. Agnes G. Doody, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Richmond, Richmond, Va.</td>
<td>Dr. Bert E. Bradley, Jr., Dept. of Speech and Dramatic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke College, Salem, Va.</td>
<td>Mr. William R. Coulter, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y.</td>
<td>Prof. Joseph Fitzpatrick, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anselm's College, Manchester, N. H.</td>
<td>Prof. John A. Lynch, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn.</td>
<td>Dr. Donald N. Dedmon, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.</td>
<td>Mr. Charles R. Gruner, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara College (U. of Calif.)</td>
<td>Dr. Upton S. Palmer, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.</td>
<td>Dr. M. G. Christoffersen, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion, S.D.</td>
<td>Dr. Harold W. Jordan, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South. Calif., Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>Dr. James H. McBath, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist Univ., Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>Dr. Harold Weiss, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Prof. Robert L. Hickey, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University, Medford, Mass.</td>
<td>Mr. Robert M. O'Neil, Packard Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.</td>
<td>Dr. A. G. Kershner, Jr., Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>Prof. George A. Adamson, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University, Logan, Utah</td>
<td>Dr. Rex E. Robinson, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Dr. Dwight Freshley, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Huber, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Poly. Institute, Blacksburg, Va.</td>
<td>Prof. E. A. Hancock, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana</td>
<td>Prof. Joseph O'Rourke, Jr., Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa.</td>
<td>Prof. J. E. Victor Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green, Ky.</td>
<td>Prof. Russell H. Miller, Dept. of Speech &amp; Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mich. University, Kalamazoo, Mich.</td>
<td>Prof. Deldee M. Herman, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.</td>
<td>Frederick A. Neyhart, Dept. of Speech &amp; Dramatic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Univ., Salem, Oregon</td>
<td>Dr. Howard W. Runkel, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Wm. and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.</td>
<td>Prof. Donald L. McConkey, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenburg College, Springfield, Ohio</td>
<td>Dr. G. Vernon Kelley, Dept. of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Univ., Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Rev. Vincent C. Horrigan, S. J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>