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EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

At long last I am proud to present Volume 29 of Speaker and Gavel. Many thanks to the Editorial Board and my office help for their contributions to this effort. As a new Editor, I am proud to continue the tradition of developing the field of forensic theory and practice begun so many years ago. Continuing the tradition of keeping up with the cutting edge of competitive practice, this volume contains an example of rhetorical criticism, a symposium on Persuasive Speaking, and the results of a survey of NDT debate participants about reforms being considered for the activity.

This Volume begins with an incisive critical analysis of Hubert Humphrey's civil rights rhetoric. Both rhetorical critics and participants in Rhetorical Criticism should benefit from Wilson's insights into Kenneth Burke's Cycle of Terms.

The symposium on Persuasive Speaking is the culmination of efforts that began with a panel presented on problems and prospects for Persuasive Speaking at the 1991 Speech Communication Association convention in Atlanta. The panel contributors, all past participants and active forensics coaches, agreed to revise their papers in light of the respondent's comments. The respondent, Jim Klumpp of the University of Maryland, draws on a long history of forensic practice and critical analysis in providing both a summary and a gentle critique of these authors' positions. The active participant would do well to heed some of the cautions and some of the compliments that these practitioners and scholars have for the Persuasive Speaking event.

I am also pleased to present the tabulated results of a survey conducted to assess community feelings on the prospects for reform of NDT debate. Several issues, including the length of the season, the use of a CEDA topic, and reform of the district process, are all addressed.

Speaker and Gavel welcomes critical reactions to this first effort, and encourages all readers, whether students, professors, competitive participants, or scholars, to submit articles for consideration. Making our discipline and our activities better, and our understanding deeper, is what this publication is all about. Please join this effort.
HUBERT HUMPHREY'S CIVIL RIGHTS
ARGUMENTS FROM 1948 TO 1964:
A CYCLE OF ORDER COMPLETED
Paula Wilson
Lynchburg College

In a time of impending social crisis thirty years ago, his [Humphrey] was the first
voice I ever heard, a lone voice persistently demanding basic human rights for
all Americans.
—Jimmy Carter

For Hubert H. Humphrey, “civil rights was not just a social and political
cause. It was a part of his upbringing, his creed, an extension of his religion
and something deeply imbedded in his mind, heart and spirit.” Humphrey
was involved in numerous legislative programs during his tenure as a United
States Senator, but he fought “more bravely for the civil rights cause than
for any other in his life.”

This essay will provide an examination and location of Humphrey’s civil
rights arguments as well as some insight into the way Humphrey’s persuasive
technique was constructed and executed. The construct of order or what
Kenneth Burke calls the “dramatistic process” will constitute the method-

1 Hubert H. Humphrey: Late A Senator From Minnesota, 137. These were the remarks
of Ofield Dukes. Humphrey was to have received the Martin Luther King, Jr. Hu-
manitarian Award on January 14, 1978 at the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta.
However, Humphrey died the night before and so the program was changed to a
memorial service.

2 Beginning in 1948 as a U. S. Senator, Humphrey fought for civil rights and many
other issues as well including, farm subsidies, federal aid to education, rent controls,
public housing and federally controlled medicine. In his first two terms alone Hum-
phrey sponsored 1,044 bills. Albert Eisele, Almost to the Presidency (Minnesota: Piper
Co., 1972): 177. For a complete listing of Humphrey’s contributions to the senate see
“Highlights of the Legislative Record of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey,” Hubert H.
Humphrey: Late A Senator from Minnesota, 17–25.


4 There are several works that chronicle Humphrey’s life and political career, but
that do not adequately cover his civil rights contributions. For instance see, Michael
Armine, This is Humphrey (New York: Doubleday, 1960); Edgar Berman, M.D. Hubert:
The Triumph and Tragedy of the Humphrey I Knew (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons,
1979); Winthrop Griffith, Humphrey (New York: Morrow, 1965) and Carl Solberg,
Hubert Humphrey (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1984). There are also some works
that deal with Humphrey’s civil rights rhetoric, but not in any comprehensive way.
For example, Gladys Zehnpfenning, Hubert H. Humphrey: Champion of Human Rights
(Minneapolis: T.S. Denison and Co., Inc., 1966); Bernard Brock, “Hubert Humphrey’s
1948 Civil Rights Speech” Today’s Speech 3 (1968): 43–47; David M. Jabusch, “The
O. Norvold, “Rhetoric as Ritual: Hubert Humphrey’s Acceptance Address at the 1968
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ological framework for this study. Humphrey’s appeals will then be examined according to how they are grouped in several of his speeches. Nearly all of Humphrey’s civil rights speeches follow the same tri-part order: induce guilt through fear and morality, formulate purification through mortification and enumerate redemption as spiritual refinement.

The Dramatistic Process

Kenneth Burke defines human beings as being “goaded by the spirit of hierarchy,” or simply “moved by a sense of order.” Burke’s argument is that people are incited and socially bound by certain principles of organization and status. An individual or group’s acceptance of position and hierarchical structure constitutes the organizational principle of a dramatistic society. To be more specific about what we may learn of a dramatistic society, given its particular hierarchical structure, we must look at a societal hierarchy of motives, or why and how people succumb to a certain order.

Society itself is a “dramatistic process,” and this process involves acceptance and rejection, guilt, purification and redemption. Because humans are imperfect beings, a person or group may fall away from a hierarchy. As Barry Brummett explains, “guilt is a powerful motive because it threatens a lapse into uncontrolled mystery. Guilt must be expiated, and the person or group must achieve redemption that leads back to secure hierarchy (reinstatement of the old or establishment of a new one).”

The revelation of a new hierarchy, or reinstatement of an old one, is the task of the ideologist. This revelation or reinstatement can be attained through the liberation of people from “an underlying system of social tenets.” The characterization of a rhetor as either an ideologist or a moralist can help in determining how rhetoric functions. For instance, the moralist will engage in criticism to goad moral norms, but it is the ideologist who “engages in revelation to liberate society from the hidden system of oppression.”

Hierarchies can only be revealed or reinstated when redemption is achieved through purification. Purification is either an act of mortification or victimage. The South could have been the obvious scapegoat for Humphrey, but also an incredible alienation to both Humphrey and the civil rights

---

9 Burke, Permanence and Change, 278.
12 Lee, 300.
Humphrey’s focus was not on the south, rather, his focus was to have the nation restore itself to its constitutional hierarchy through self sacrifice. Accordingly, this essay will concentrate on mortification.

The process of mortification involves some sort of self sacrifice in order to atone for the sins that have caused guilt. Mortification functions “as a kind of governance, an extreme form of ‘self control’. . .” Mortification is “a systematic way of saying no to Disorder, or obediently saying yes to Order.” Mortification can occur on personal, national or universal levels. However, “once a national identity is built up, it can be treated as an individual; hence like an individual its condition can be presented in sacrificial terms.”

Group identification can be built on any number of premises provided the basis for the cohesion is something each audience member is potentially connected to or capable of understanding. The treatment of a vast audience, as though it had a single identity, supposes that groups of people can act, and can be acted upon, collectively.

Identity, either individual or national, is based on the relationship people have to order. Order is natural to human beings. Furthermore, “proper order” is paramount to a society’s functioning without impairment. Trans-

---

13 For example, alienation of the civil rights cause occurred at the Democratic National Convention in 1948 where the Dixiecrats formed their own party and walked out of the convention in protest of the adoption of the civil rights plank.

14 Alienation of Humphrey himself occurred upon entering the Senate in 1949. Senators, particularly those from the south, showed disdain for Humphrey because of his civil rights commitment at the 1948 convention. Humphrey explained later that “my actions at the Democratic Convention had elicited bitterness and antagonism far beyond what I expected. I was treated like an evil force that had seeped into sanctified halls.” Hubert H. Humphrey, The Education of a Public Man, (New York: Doubleday, 1976): 124.

15 Walter Mondale said that when it came to the South, Humphrey “would try to be as non-abrasive as he could be. There were no dividends from making people mad just to make them mad.” Interview with Walter Mondale by the author, July 21, 1989.


19 In discussing the norms of a collective identity Leland Griffin refers to the crisis period of a movement as a “time of mass decision; of collective catharsis, purification, the resolution of public tensions,” “A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements,” Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, William Rueckert ed., (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966): 466.

20 “Natural Order” is the cycle of guilt, purification and redemption with a verbal component. Burke, Rhetoric of Religion, 216. Furthermore, this “Hierarchal Cycle” is what “characterizes the persistent problem of Order.” Burke, The Rhetoric of Religion, 232.

21 Kenneth Burke, Permanence and Change, 283. According to Burke, “Order” applies to either “natural regularities as tides and seasons, or to socio-political structures in which people can give or receive orders in which orders can be obeyed or disobeyed, in which offices are said to pyramid in an orderly arrangement of powers and responsibilities.” Burke, The Rhetoric of Religion, 181.
gressing order, or order that moves across steps, can trace the relationship between social hierarchy and guilt. Each step from within the process of Order is considered to be "‘Terministic Conditions’ for ‘Original Sin’ and ‘Redemption’ [which are] intrinsic to the Idea of ‘Order’.”

We can use this sense of order as a methodological tool to analyze the way society can fall from hierarchical structures. That is, we can see where order is breached and then where guilt ensues.

Thus with hierarchies, either social or natural, "‘there is necessarily a mode of ‘order’ that is not merely regular but ordinal . . .’" Furthermore, in order to be precise as a rhetorical critic, it seems necessary to view each part in a given hierarchy as it exists alone and/or as a part of a system.

Hierarchies can be scrutinized by associative ultimate terms. An ultimate term places order on ideas and values and functions to unite dialectical terms. The ultimate term is generally one that opposing sides would both adhere.

An ultimate term “would be a ‘guiding idea’ or ‘unitary principle’ behind the diversity of voices. The voices would not confront one another . . . rather, they would be like successive positions or moments in a single process.”

The ultimate term functions as a part of order, that which guides an audience through a series of steps toward acceptance or rejection of a situation.

Burke’s dramatistic approach for analyzing political discourse is particularly useful in the case of Humphrey because it provides a way of analyzing the steps taken toward and acceptance of Humphrey’s proposed course of action. The allegiance to order is apparent in each of Humphrey’s speeches. The textual analysis that follows will comprehensively view and locate guilt, purification and redemption in the discourse.

Humphrey’s Civil Rights Rhetoric

Guilt

Humphrey’s approach to guilt had two basic components: he had appeals to fear in the one hand, and moral reproach in the other. The double fisted argument contended that discrimination would make America weak and vulnerable to communism. Guilt also manifested itself in the form of a contradiction of American beliefs and values. Americans believed in the constitution, but held values separate from the constitution on the issue of equality.

The Cold War had effectively begun in 1947. For the rest of that decade, like many other liberals, Humphrey fashioned his rhetoric to expose the hypocrisies of a democratic nation that practiced discrimination. Juxtaposing mendacity with democratic ideals provided focus on the prevalent concern...
of the threat of communism, a weak U.S. foreign policy, and the U.S. Constitution.

The vocabulary Humphrey used to assail communism handled the threat of communism in three ways. First, Humphrey preached that bigotry would lure communist infiltration; second, Humphrey argued that discrimination created international vulnerability; and third, Humphrey said that bigotry would jeopardize America’s free world leader status.

Humphrey often spoke of the communistic threat being invited in by America’s prejudiced behavior. For instance, in 1950 at a testimonial dinner for civil rights proponents, Humphrey warned, “The denial of human liberty, the betrayal of democratic ideals, is the sin and the crime of Communism and other totalitarian doctrines” and “we live in a psychosis of fear because of the evil and ruthlessness of the totalitarian power.”

Given the “red scare” of the 1950s, the argument posing bigotry as an invitation to communism seems effective, but Humphrey took the argument one logical step further: being vulnerable to communism is the admonition of a weak U.S. foreign policy. Much is in jeopardy, according to Humphrey, because discrimination in America, “penetrates our foreign policy and adulterates our domestic policy .... We can no longer afford the luxury and the waste of second class citizenship.” Humphrey had it appear as though bigotry and discrimination would open the door to communism, and thereby weaken foreign policy. This weakening in policy would then diminish the position the United States held as the leader of the free world. Humphrey would say, “we are losing face in Asia. We are losing it all over the world.” Fear against communism was an important appeal for Humphrey and for civil rights, but moral rebuke was also extremely effective.

The communism argument was organized in a problem-solution format: a failure to support civil rights would invite communist behavior, but the supposed invasion could be thwarted with support of the civil rights cause. Humphrey would say, “Our secret weapon [against communism and fascism] is the fulfillment of the democratic ideal of human equality. This ideal is embodied in political form in the civil rights proposals which are now before the Congress of the United States.” Furthermore, Humphrey would argue, “Those of us who strive for the enactment of civil rights legislation by the Congress do so because we are convinced that the enactment of such legislation will help us as a nation in the world struggle against communism.”

30 Washington Report No. 9, Radio Broadcast Transcript, April 24, 1956, Humphrey’s remarks to the 84th Congress before the Senate Judiciary Committee on legislation on civil rights, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Speech Text File, Box 5, p. 4.
Humphrey’s communism arguments, were fully developed. A lack of civil rights would cause communism while at the same time supporting civil rights could thwart communism. Finally, overall the argument defeated segregationists’ arguments that proponents of civil rights communistic sympathizers.

A related argument Humphrey liked to use was that discrimination in America was a form of hypocrisy. However, he was careful to observe American inconsistencies without pin pointing duplicity. Despite the Brown vs. Board of Education decision, discrimination remained a part of American culture. In order not to estrange his audiences, Humphrey would caution people that while allies and enemies may interpret our actions (or lack of them) on civil rights as hypocritical, Americans were not being hypocritical, they were just being inconsistent. Quoting Gunnar Myrdahl’s “American Creed”, Humphrey said,

> The American people, he says,—all the people north, south, east or west—have feelings of guilt about the inconsistency of their faith and practice. They are not, however, he continues, a hypocritical people . . . because Americans constantly talk about their shortcomings and constantly strive to eliminate them.31

According to Humphrey, practice and faith meant beliefs and values. Humphrey does not blame his audience for holding particular beliefs, instead he polarizes the issue of racism as a matter of personal prerogative and reduces the issue to a matter of human imperfection. No one in his audience is immune to human imperfection, and perhaps more important, human imperfection is understandable and forgivable. Since the infraction on society is forgivable, a return to order becomes possible.

The inconsistency between constitutional values and personal beliefs steeped in bigotry were characterized by Humphrey as the waning moral image of White America. Humphrey would capitalize on what has been called a “concern over the moral image of White America merged with the popular identification of constitutional law with national civic morality.”32 The country had begun to reinterpret constitutional principles in light of Jim Crow laws.

The ordinance of the constitution held that freedom had to be available to all citizens. One could not believe that minorities were inferior and at the same time hold democratic values. Thus, “constitutional moralism” had to do with the attempt to reconcile incompatible values and beliefs regarding civil rights.33

Waning morals, particularly in the 1950s, were ample cause for guilt. In an address to the New York City FEPC Rally in 1950 Humphrey charged the nation with an ebb in its morals saying, “Americans now realize that discrimination is a denial of our creed. We have been a nation plagued with a guilty conscience.”34

31 Congressional Record 92 (June 25, 1951): 7020.
33 Burk, 132.
Humphrey merges constitutional moralism (the value of favoring civil rights) with identification with the Constitution (belief in that hierarchical structure). Dialectical opposition over civil rights becomes joined with constitutional standards and principles. Ultimate order is developmentally imposed in a sequence so as to unite opposing groups with a single “guiding idea.”

For example, consider Humphrey’s remarks in a 1950s radio show: “The moral challenge of our democratic faith places upon our Government and our people the obligation of affording equal opportunity to all people regardless of race, color or creed.”

To the 50th convention of the NAACP Humphrey said, “Now this moral principle of human equality is written into the Declaration of Independence...” The appeals to the Constitution and to moralism work together with national concern over moralism. The natural progression of the argument stipulates to reject civil rights would be to defy the Constitution and to act in amoral ways.

The appeals toward threats of communism and weak domestic and foreign policy operated in conjunction with constitutional moralism as a way of inducing guilt. Blending all of these variables Humphrey would typically preach: “discrimination is the skeleton in our closet. Our enemies have exposed it. They parade our sin before the world.”

National identity built around threats of communism and inconsistent value and belief structures posed the country as a single individual. This meant, as an individual, the conditions necessary for purification could be presented in “sacrificial terms.”

Purification

As a way to purge hierarchical sacrilege, Humphrey coalesced the public into one national identity and forged a national petition on behalf of civil rights. For instance, in 1959 Humphrey spells out what must be done in order to achieve purification:

But the ultimate victory for civil rights... can come only through a commitment of the conscience of the American people to give all citizens equal opportunities and equal justice and rights... I mean by this that every... American who ever overhears a remark which displays bigotry is involved. And it does not matter where the State or community is. The citizen who sees or hears an expression or example of bigotry or discrimination is involved.

35 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives 187.
37 Address to the 50th Convention of the NAACP, July 15, 1959, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Speech Text Files, Box 9, p. 9.
38 Congressional Record 92 (June 25, 1951), 7020. This vein of expression was well used by Humphrey. For instance, in a speech to the Civil Rights Leadership Conference on February 17, 1952 Humphrey said, “It is the spirit of democracy that we need to strengthen to meet the threat of brutalitarianism. That spirit has been the victim of a lingering and stubborn infection that saps our strength—the infection of discrimination. This is the skeleton in our closet. This our Achilles heel. Hubert H. Humphrey Papers Appearance File, Box 3, p. 4.
39 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, 165.
And if he says nothing . . . he is morally guilty for a part of the crisis we have
today.⁴⁰

Americans were admonished to do more than remain silent on the issue
or to "look the other way." The terms for purification were made very clear.
It had become more than a matter of conscience: it had become a matter
of action.

Humphrey had gone from suggesting that his audience take the problem
to heart to asserting that they are "obliged" to act toward "resolving civil
rights" and to "applying ourselves diligently." Applying one's self diligently
in an effort to better one's self is an act that would purge the guilt ridden
portion of the old identity.

Moreover, the identity under change ostensibly functioned as a national
identity; an identity held by the entire country. This national identity had a
national conscience, "the conscience of the American people" and "a nation
plagued with a guilty conscience."⁴¹ Expiation of guilt had transcended
personal contrition and became what Humphrey referred to as "national
shame." Humphrey said of the impending 1957 Civil Rights Act, "I say to
you that it is nothing short of a national shame that our country hasn't long
ago taken action to protect and to guarantee the right to vote to every
American . . . ."⁴²

The "Terministic Condition" necessary for purification and redemption
in this situation was to embrace the notion of national shame, or guilt over
civil rights. A transgressing order is notable in Humphrey's discourse. Ac
cording to Humphrey, the onus of "sin," "guilty conscious," "moral chal-
lenge," "obligation," and "national shame," lay with the people of the United
States, a conscience of one. Order was breached when society ceased to
honor its own rules. Guilt become national shame, a byproduct of the col-
lective realization that what Americans preached in terms of freedom, was
not what they practiced in terms of civil rights.

The purification act that the country was admonished to take had to do
with controlling personal prejudices. The struggle for civil rights, Humphrey
said, was "one for men's minds."⁴³ Changing a belief system is an extreme
form of self control, but it was necessary to balance the degree of guilt with
the measure of purification. The entire nation was to blame for the fall from
its constitutional hierarchy, and purification had to come from the source
of the violation, the people themselves. In a radio broadcast in 1950 Hum-
phrey said,

I think it should be clearly understood that these are not laws to eliminate
prejudice. Prejudices are in the minds of men. You cannot eliminate prejudice

⁴⁰ Address to the 50th Convention of the NAACP, pp. 2-4.
⁴¹ Address to the New York City-Wide FEPC Rally, January 31, 1950, p. 1.
⁴² "Face the Nation" a CBS Television Broadcast, August 28, 1957, Minnesota His-
torical Society, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Audio/Video Department.
⁴³ Address at the Testimonial Dinner for Civil Rights Champions Under the Auspices
of Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, March 1, 1950. Hubert H. Humphrey Papers
Speech Text File, Box 2, p. 2.
by law, but you can eliminate the action of a prejudiced mind. You can control them."

Purification could be bestowed upon Humphrey's audience so long as it exercised self control over its prejudices. The eradication of intolerance was a way to say no to Disorder and yes to Order, and a return to Order was essential for redemption.

Redemption

As Humphrey articulated it through the years, redemption can be envisaged as a scene or condition that is the result of act-centered rhetoric. Humphrey's view was that act transformed agent. The predominant ratio located within the discourse that best illuminates the relationship between Humphrey's audience and himself, is the act/agent ratio.

Act-centered rhetoric was a way to provoke choice, and by virtue of making the right choice, (that is, between the southern manifesto and civil rights), to then take part in post war responsibilities. By the use of phrases such as "the blessings of free government," civil rights becomes transformed into human rights. Once the issue is transformed, concern is not focused upon the rights of minorities, but rather, on the blanket concern for the rights of human beings. Humphrey states,

"yes, this is far more than a party matter. Every citizen has a stake in the emergence of the United States as the leader of the free world. That world is being challenged by the world of slavery. For us to play our part effectively, we must be in a morally sound position."

Each audience member now has a hand in the helping of the United States as the leader of the free world. However, before the audience can act or "do" anything, as Humphrey put it, it must choose to be "in a morally sound position." Those who would do nothing to support the civil rights cause would be cast as a-moral agents because of their failure to produce moral action (which was to support civil rights).

In Humphrey's discourse, act-centered rhetoric also takes on the form of more specific mandates, those articulated earlier that functioned as self-sacrifice in the mortification and redemption process. Burke explains,

"the idea of an agent is implicitly in the idea of an act, we can say that in the idea of redemption therefore is implicit the idea of a personal redeemer. Or,

---


46 "Civil Rights Speech to the Democratic National Convention, July 14, 1948, Minnesota Historical Society, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Audio/Video Department.

47 Brummett correctly points out that "an act ideologically assumes that agents are responsible for who they are, that people make themselves through their actions. An act-centered rhetoric therefore will say much about what people should and should not do." "A Pentadic Analysis," 256.
if you think of redemption as a condition or situation (a 'scene'), then you may extract the same implication by thinking of a redeemer as an instrument, or agency, for bringing about the condition.48

Through the use of act-centered rhetoric, there is created a redemptive scene. The redeemer in this case is not Humphrey, but an agent transformed, the audience itself. Aspiring to a redemptive scene is possible only when the process of mortification has been completed. That is, people must be nationally aware and willing to address the civil rights issue; they must be willing to support it, and eventually they must take steps toward recognizing personal bigotry. Humphrey said, "we made an auspicious step toward absolving ourselves of this sense of guilt with the publication of the report of the President's Committee of Civil Rights . . ."49 and "we must act now to redeem ourselves in the eyes of our own people and the rest of the world."50

Overtly saying that enactment of civil rights legislation points the way to redemption, Humphrey warned of the 1960 Civil Rights Act, "I say that this is not just a civil rights bill; it is something far bigger. The enactment of this bill now is an urgently needed demonstration of our democratic faith."51

Thus, for Humphrey, redemption was a situation that could only emerge from a process of mortification. Humphrey's audience could not manifest redemption as much as they had to "arrive" there. Redemption was a situation where, by virtue of abolishing Jim Crow laws through the 1964 Amendment, people were made to deal with their private prejudices. They were called to examine the nature of their own humanity. Redemption had become the very condition of humankind, it was a spiritual conquest. Civil rights, Humphrey said, was "the spiritual, political dignity of every human being."52 To support the civil rights cause was to "stand committed as a nation to a doctrine which elevates man to the God-like plane of true equality."53 On its highest level the civil rights cause went beyond the parameters of the Constitution and became a source of spiritual refinement.

As President Carter had observed, Humphrey's voice was a lone and persistent one speaking out on behalf of civil rights. Humphrey foisted the civil rights cause into the center of national debate at the 1948 Democratic National Convention and "ushered in the second era of redressing racial injustice in America."54 He worked relentlessly until the 1957 and 1960 civil rights acts were passed, but it was the 1964 civil rights amendment that Humphrey said, "was the culmination of my work and my own vindication."55

The cycle of order began in 1948 and was finally completed in 1964.

49 Address to the New York City-Wide FEPC Rally, p. 1-2.
50 Remarks by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on the Floor of the Senate, October 17, 1949, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Speech Text Files, Box 2, p. 5.
52 Address to the 50th Convention of the NAACP, 9.
53 Address to the Civil Rights Leadership Conference on February 17, 1952, p. 3.
Conclusion

Humphrey’s arguments concede the human tendency to abide by certain structures of governance. This allegiance to order was at the base of Humphrey’s civil rights arguments. The dramatistic process reveals that Humphrey’s approach was to morally liberate and add to his audience’s belief system a terminology reflective of ideological unitary principles in order to deliver them from their guilt and return them to hierarchical standing.

The ultimate terms Humphrey used redirected focus onto certain tenets of the Constitution. This was profitable to the criticism of Humphrey’s rhetoric in two ways. The primary terms Humphrey used, “communism,” “morals,” and “constitution,” were indicative of the prevalent concerns for that time period. This terminology developed the guilt necessary to prompt action. Intolerance would foster communism and discrimination violated the moral tenets of the constitution. In both instances the terms “communism,” “morals,” and “constitution,” functioned as ultimate principles. The civil rights cause, as Humphrey articulated it, paralleled these important principles to both squelch certain oppositional arguments, such as civil rights proponents were communistic, and to elevate the civil rights issue to a place of national concern. Furthermore, Civil rights appeals which involved the Constitution were potentially very persuasive with the opposition because the Constitution provided a standard fundamental to all those involved in the debate. The Constitution itself became the guideline for hierarchical standards.

The Constitution as hierarchy allows us to see plainly where society had succumbed to disorder (communism and immorality). The Constitution would also provide direction toward a return to order. “Improve the social fabric of our country”, Humphrey stated, by returning to fundamental American values, “first class citizenship.”

The return to order could be attained by way of purification action, self control over prejudicial beliefs. The ultimate terms used for purification have primarily to do with building a national identity. Contrition to “national shame,” and a “national guilty conscience,” would have the entire audience purified as though it were a single person.

The violation of hierarchy had been reduced to human imperfection and despite varied opinion on the civil rights matter, identification with the constitution meant individual and flawed identities could be shed for a strong collective identity. A national identity also permitted collective penance. According to Humphrey, deliverance from disorder would not be to civil rights per se, but to “the democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group.”

Redemption was truly a return to perfection as humans would seek it. The
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spiritual overtone as a guiding principle to return to hierarchy was appropriate for Humphrey,\textsuperscript{59} and was fitting to the cycle his audience was moved to complete. The ultimate order or scheme of things had transcended human convention and frailty to a "God-like plane of existence."

The transition within the hierarchic series proceeds from communism and immorality to the Constitution and beyond to spiritual perfection. This progression represents what Burke calls "the principle or 'perfection' of the ultimate design.\textsuperscript{60} The mastery of Humphrey's civil rights rhetoric was its ultimate design: an ontological pilgrimage or cycle of order where fundamental truths embedded in the Constitution were discovered and rediscovered as toward personal and social refinement.

\textsuperscript{59} Even though he rarely discussed his religious upbringing, Humphrey's religious convictions had much to do with his feelings on civil rights. For instance, he would typically argue: "I can never understand how one can be a Christian and not have a sacred regard for human dignity. . . . When the New Testament tells us that we are all one in Jesus Christ, I can see no room for segregation, bigotry, or intolerance." Winthrop, 42.

\textsuperscript{60} Burke, \textit{A Rhetoric of Motives}, 195.
TOWARD ENHANCING THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

Timothy Sellnow
North Dakota State University

This essay is a response to two questions posed to me for this project: "What do you think is the most serious weakness in contest persuasive speeches?" and "What are you doing, as a coach, to try to improve upon this weakness?" To answer these questions, I begin by reviewing the justification for forensic education that has been established by the forensic community. Next, I outline my position that the proliferation of the problem-solution organizational pattern is a key concern in persuasive speaking contests. Finally, I describe how and why I believe the standards offered by experiential education reduce the excessive dependence on the problem-solution format.

Endorsed Justification

At the Second Developmental Conference on Forensics and at the Developmental Conference on Individual Events, members of the forensic community endorsed a justification of forensics that emphasizes its educational value. McBath (1984) and Murphy (1984) summarize some of the ideas that were supported at the Second Developmental Conference on Forensics. McBath describes forensic activities as, "educational laboratories in which students experiment with skills and develop their own abilities and styles of argument" (p. 10). Murphy (1984) discusses individual events specifically when he states that forensic educators should try to "maximize [the] educational experience" for their students (p. 91). McBath describes this educational experience as having "unlimited potential for individual undergraduate development" (p. 6).

At the Developmental Conference on Individual Events, participants justified speech competition by referring to it as an extension of the classroom with relevance to real life. Haught (1989) states that individual events allow students to "further explore classroom concepts" (p. 37). Mills (1989) stresses the practical potential of individual events by describing such competition as a "field experience" where theories propounded in classrooms can be tried and perfected (p. 39). Perhaps Hunt (1989) best summarizes the educational relevance of individual events when he claims that "communication classes in rhetoric and public address and oral interpretation reflect/teach theory and practice that are necessary and essential to life" (p. 34). If individual events competition is to meet these criteria of justification, the contestants should make use of the information they learn in their communication classes, and do so in a manner that is relevant to the real world experience.

A common complaint about current contest persuasive speeches concerns the overwhelming exploitation of the problem-solution pattern of organization. McKiernan (1989) indicates that competitors have a “detachment from the educational possibilities of the forensic activity as a whole (p. 42).” Dunlap (1989) suggests that the result of such a detachment is that “too many [students] learn to pander to a judge without learning the responsibility to adapt to an audience” (p. 46). An important example of this detachment from the established principles of public speaking concerns the disproportionate use of the problem-solution organizational pattern in contest persuasive speeches. Dunlap suggests that current competitors adhere to an “internal criteria” of “clear solutions to life-threatening problems” (p. 46). The result is that the majority of students select a basic problem-solution format. Allen and Dennis (1989) compare this dependence on the problem-solution pattern to the common complaints about rhetorical criticism, “We hear a lot of comment about ‘cookie-cutter’ rhetorical criticism, but in fact, we hear more ‘cookie-cutter’ problem-solution patterns in persuasion than we do formulaic application in criticism” (p. 54). As Mills (1989) states, “there is nothing inherently wrong with this approach so long as it best reflects the intent and/or goals of the speech” (p. 40). Unfortunately, few students consider the variety of other reasonable patterns when writing their contest orations.

Support for the claim that contest persuasive speeches are dominated by the problem-solution format can be found in a recent study of interstate oratory speeches. McKelvey (1991) compared the organizational patterns of the speeches from the finalists at the National Interstate Oratorical Association’s national tournament for the years 1988, 1989, and 1990 to the patterns discussed in a sample of eleven current introductory public speaking textbooks. He discovered 20 different persuasive patterns advocated by the authors of the texts. Yet, the only patterns used in the sample of competitive speeches were problem-solution and problem-cause-solution. Clearly, the finalists at this national tournament are taking a limited perspective on persuasive speech organization.

The proliferation of the problem-solution organizational pattern in persuasive speeches contradicts the forensic community’s justification for individual events in two ways. First, the problem-solution pattern is only one of many organizational strategies discussed in public speaking, persuasion, and rhetoric classes. Consequently, the persuasive speaking event is not maximizing its potential to encourage the continued exploration of classroom concepts. The Speech Communication Association lists demonstrating “awareness of alternative organizational patterns” and selecting “organizational patterns that are appropriate to the topic, audience, context, and purpose” as essential college sophomore speaking competencies (Quiantly, 1990). The false assumption that persuasive speech topics must be approached from a problem-solution perspective does little to develop these competencies. Second, students should not assume that the problem-solution format is always appropriate in the real world setting. The problem-solution pattern in forensics typically assumes that the audience does not
solution pattern in forensics typically assumes that the audience does not have a clear understanding of the problem and its consequences. In fact, many competitors strive to find topics or angles on topics about which judges have heard relatively little. The tendency is to devote the majority of the speech to creating an alarming new fear or irritation in the minds of the audience that can be resolved quickly in two or three paragraphs. Sellnow and Ziegelmueller (1988) found, for example, that contest orators in the 1980’s typically devoted less than 30% of their speeches to the solution segment. This experience will be of limited value when students are asked, in their future vocations, to advocate one solution over another in reference to a problem that is well understood by the audience. Experience with patterns of refutation or comparative-advantage, for example, would clearly be valuable in such instances. I admit that the problem–solution pattern is appropriate for many speaking situations in and out of the competitive setting. I simply believe that the persuasive speaking contest has, to a large extent, become a problem–solution contest. Few communication educators would endorse such a disproportionate emphasis on the problem–solution pattern in persuasion classes or units.

Suggestions for Avoiding Inflexible Organization

As is evident in the previous discussion, excessive dependence upon the problem–solution pattern contradicts the objectives established in the justification of forensic education. There are two general options available to forensic educators if they wish to alter the persuasive speaking event so that it is better able to meet its educational purpose. We can create additional events that require our students to experiment with other organizational patterns, or we can change our approach to the persuasive speaking event.

New Events

Events such as Inspirational Speaking, Crisis Management Speaking, Courtroom Advocacy, and Public Relations Speaking have been proposed as a means for requiring students to move beyond the problem–solution format (Dunlap, 1989). Speech To Convince is a category that continues to be offered at several invitational tournaments each year (Hawkins, 1989). Such alternatives deserve attention, but I am concerned that they address a symptom of the problem rather than the problem itself. There is nothing inherent in the persuasive speaking category that leads students to depend upon the problem–solution format. The descriptions of the persuasive speaking event offered by the American Forensic Association and the National Forensic Association do not limit students to a problem–solution approach. The National Forensic Association’s invitation to its individual events nationals states that persuasive speeches should be designed “to convince, to move to action, or to inspire on a significant issue” (C. L. Reynolds, personal communication, November, 1990). Similarly, the American Forensic Association’s national individual events invitation states that entries in persuasive speaking may “inspire, reinforce or change beliefs, attitudes, values or actions of the audience” (M. T. Nicoli, personal communication, September 1, 1990). Since many individual events tournament directors make use of these national
guidelines when composing their tournament invitations, we can assume that the decision to emphasize the problem–solution format is made by the students and coaches. Developing new events that require students to use organizational patterns other than problem–solution does not ensure that we are meeting our educational objective. There is no guarantee that such events would not result in the impulsive and disproportionate selection of other organizational patterns.

**Experiential Education Approach**

Any effort designed to overcome the lack of sensitivity and creativity in the organization of contest persuasive speeches must emphasize experimentation with persuasion theory and offer real world applications if it is to meet the justification standards of the forensic community. In an effort to overcome the temptation to focus excessively on a problem–solution format, I have moved closer to an experiential education approach to coaching contest persuasion. I became familiar with the teaching strategies of experiential education when I began working with the internship program in my department. I have found that systematically applying an experiential format to forensic coaching has made me better able to meet both of the above criteria.

While there are many prescriptions and standards for what constitutes good experiential education, the approach developed for the Off-Campus Experiential Learning Program at Alverno College has proven useful to me. This program stresses three steps: 1) goal setting, 2) reading the environment, and 3) reflecting (Wutzdorff & Hutchings, 1988). The following paragraphs detail the way I have systematically applied each of these steps to coaching persuasive speeches.

**Goal Setting.** Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988) state that goal setting is an “important factor in students’ ability to integrate their work into broader learning frameworks” (p. 65). The goals that students set for themselves are discussed with a supervising instructor to make certain that the goals are attainable and that they relate the new experiences to the material the students have already learned. I encourage my students to view the persuasive speaking event as an opportunity to share their feelings about an issue that concerns them. When we discuss goals, I insist that my students begin with a discussion of the issue. I ask them to tell me what changes they would like to see or avoid with regard to their topic. I next ask them to tell me what role a public speech to college students and professors might play in relation to the overall outcomes they would like to see. When I began this process four years ago, my experienced persuasive speakers responded to these goal-oriented questions with blank stares. This process, which is recommended in many basic public speaking texts, causes frustration for students who have selected an approach to a topic simply because it is a “good fit” for what “judges like.” I do not discourage students from setting competitive goals, however, I insist that the initial goals they set for their persuasive speaking experience be focused on the relationship between their topic and society. A few students who were unable to make this ad-
justment decided to approach other members of our staff for coaching. Most, however, have found such goal-setting discussions to be motivating.

The second area of goal-setting I use in the experiential approach concerns experimenting with the material students have learned in their classes. I ask students to tell me what type of organization, among other things, is most appropriate for contributing to the goals they have established. When I encounter students who have had limited or no communication coursework, I give them public speaking and persuasion materials to read. If my students can present a compelling case for using a problem–solution format, I do not resist. In nearly half of the cases, however, I find that my students select an organizational pattern other than problem–solution.

Reading the Environment. Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988) describe reading the environment as viewing an experience in “untraditional ways” (p. 65). They recommend having students who are engaged in experiential education distance themselves from their own experience in an effort to better understand the situation as a whole. In short, effective experiential learning requires that students grasp the full context of the situation they are experiencing. For the persuasive speaking experience, reading the environment requires students to carefully consider the role their messages can play in the realm of public deliberation. By doing so, students are able to avoid the typical or, in this case, traditional approach to the persuasive speaking contest. The tendency in contest persuasive speaking is, unfortunately, often limited to or reflective of the technical sphere of deliberation. The typical or traditional problem–solution speech portrays the public as the victim of some chronic or potentially chronic ill that can only be eliminated with the consent of those who wield either political or industrial authority. In this form, the persuasive speaker merely summarizes the rather prescriptive information that is made available by technical sources. Farrell and Goodnight (1981) and Goodnight (1982, 1989) warn that an excessive reliance upon arguments from the technical sphere seriously reduces the quantity and quality of public deliberation on important social matters. Farrell and Goodnight make a compelling argument that the public is too often addressed by the media or technical specialists as a helpless victim rather than as “a knowledgeable and responsible collection of citizens, making prudential judgments” (p. 295). Goodnight admits that the latter conception of the public is ideal. Still, the persuasive speaker who is willing to conceive of the public as capable of making intelligent decisions regarding its environment is, in a sense, making a contribution to quality public deliberation about an important issue. By realizing that a persuasive speech has the potential to stimulate or extend public deliberation, students are able to take an untraditional view. To stimulate this view, students must answer questions such as: “In what way is the current approach to the issue failing to take into account the public interest?” “In what ways is the current perception of the problem circumscribing communication about potential solutions?” “What role can or should public deliberation play in selecting appropriate decisions designed to resolve the problem?” Pondering such questions is likely to provide students with a better understanding of the social problems
addressed in their speeches and the means or options available to the public for solving, limiting or better understanding these problems.

In a practical effort to encourage an untraditional view of the persuasive speaking experience, I ask my students to deliver their speeches to non-forensic audiences. I require my persuasive speakers to deliver their speeches to public speaking classes or to groups in the community who are interested in hearing student speeches. After delivering their speeches, I ask my persuasive speakers to discuss their speeches with their audiences. These discussions focus on the speeches, specifically, and on the issues in general. I find these discussions to be helpful for my students in two ways. First, my persuasive speakers receive feedback that relates to their noncompetitive goals. Nonforensic audiences often respond to speeches on a practical level. This type of discussion can enlighten persuasive speakers as to whether or not their messages are actually persuasive. Second, these discussions have, on occasion, helped my persuasive speakers realize the difference between competitive and persuasive strategies. I consider persuasive strategies to be those steps which contribute to the process of public deliberation. Questions such as “What do the people say who don’t agree with you?” and “Do you really think that solution will work?” are not uncommon in these public discussions. I do not insist that my persuasive speakers incorporate all of the suggestions they receive during their public discussions. I am, at minimum, satisfied to have their awareness of the distinction between competitive and persuasive strategies heightened. It is interesting, however, that these public discussions often motivate my persuasive speakers to make changes in the organization and content of their speeches. My persuasive speakers also tend to reflect on these discussions when they receive ballots from forensic judges that contradict each other. I have found that having my students emphasize the public when writing and rewriting their persuasive speeches better enables them to read their environment. Most importantly, the realism generated by this approach makes the persuasive speaking contest a much more fulfilling experience for many of my students.

Reflecting. Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988) state that in experiential learning we must be concerned with what our students do and how well they do it, but we must be even more concerned about what they are learning in the process (p. 66). To evaluate this learning process, they state that instructors should ask students to articulate, for themselves and for others, the knowledge and skills they have obtained and how they can apply such knowledge and skill to other contexts. I ask my persuasive speakers to reflect on what they have learned at many points throughout the forensic season. Typically, such reflection works best if it takes place at least a day or two after a given contest. I find that the hours following a tournament are often consumed with reflection on winning and losing. It is typically not until the students have had some distance from a given tournament that they can reflect on what they have learned. I ask my students to reflect upon what their audiences are perceiving as strengths and weaknesses in their messages. We attempt to distinguish between comments that reflect on the social aspects of the speech and those which are specific to competition. I ask my students to reflect on the material they have learned in their classes and
reading when they speculate as to why components of their messages fall in the categories of strengths and weaknesses. These discussions do not have to be formal. I try to encourage my students to make such reflection a habit. Even brief conversations about a comment on a ballot can foster such analytical thinking. Whenever possible, I try to continue this general reflection process with my students after they have graduated. I find great comfort in hearing recent graduates tell me that they are able to use what they learned about persuasion from forensic competition in their vocations. Similarly, I want to know if my graduates feel the skills they developed in forensic competition do not apply to their daily lives.

Viewing persuasive speaking as experiential education is one means of assuring that the activity meets the standards offered in the justification of forensics. Setting goals, analyzing competitive and noncompetitive audiences, and reflecting on the learning process can help students to think about their messages in terms of the overall education process. Many coaches follow similar steps to those I have outlined. I simply find that the experiential education literature provides a helpful basis for systematically clarifying the educational purpose of persuasive speaking.

Conclusion

It has not been my purpose in this essay to condemn the persuasive speaking event. Persuasive speaking contests offer students important opportunities to experience the exhilaration and frustration of the persuasion process. I simply feel that a large number of students are not tapping the full learning potential of the event. I am confident that by viewing persuasive speaking contests from a more experiential perspective, forensic educators can help their students to reach this potential. Such consideration of the educational merit of persuasive speaking will contribute to its justification in the decades to come.
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COACHING TRENDS IN PERSUASIVE SPEAKING:
PAST AND PRESENT

Sheryl Friedley
George Mason University

At the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events (August, 1990), the group designated to discuss the current state of public address events focused much of their attention on persuasive speaking. As the discussion evolved, one of my colleagues noted that perhaps the key element in developing a successful persuasive speech is to identify a condition that is killing millions of people, can easily be remedied, and yet is unknown to the general public. While my colleague's comment prompted a muted chuckle throughout the room, most of us realized this "nervous" laughter was grounded in a significant grain of truth. In many ways, we individual events coaches have come to define persuasive speaking so narrowly and so formulaic that competitors are extremely limited in how they can approach and eventually develop their persuasive messages if they hope to be competitively successful.

As I recall my own undergraduate competitive experience grounded in both debate and individual events competition, as well as several years of coaching primarily public address events, I hope my observations will provide some insight into the evolution of persuasive speaking during those years. Specifically, I will explore both past and present trends of persuasive speaking in four basic areas: 1) the nature of the event, 2) various patterns of organization, 3) types of supporting evidence, and 4) some stylistic devices of performance. While there are no doubt other facets of persuasive speaking that reflect change over the years, trends in these four areas warrant our discussion.

Nature of the Event

Verderber (1988) identifies three basic types of persuasive propositions that may be phrased as three general purposes: 1) to reinforce a belief currently held by the audience (i.e., a speech to inspire); 2) to change or alter a belief currently held by the audience (i.e., a speech to convince); and 3) to move the audience to action (i.e., a speech to actuate). While persuasive speeches may clearly reflect any of these three proposition types, intercollegiate individual events competition has slowly narrowed the definition to focus on the "speech to actuate" as the model for a successful persuasive speech. In doing so, this approach to persuasive speaking then forces the persuader to select a problem in which the audience can take action to prompt change.

Perhaps if we examine the historical development of the persuasive speaking event, there may be a logical explanation for such a narrowing of the nature of the event. The Interstate Oratorical Association, formed in 1874,
hosted the oldest contest in forensics competition; however, the individual events activity as we know it today actually began as an “appendage” to intercollegiate debate during the 1960s. At that time, most competitors were debaters first and “orators” second. Even more specifically, they were NDT debaters grounded in policy debate that typically involved developing a plan that met needs or offered comparative advantages. Since NDT policy debate was prevalent back in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the addition of “oratory” as an individual event may have been perceived by many coaches and competitors as a viable outlet to explore value issues. As a result, the event known as “oratory” during that time period encouraged speeches that were geared to inspire and convince rather than to actuate. For example, Klopf and Rives (1967) encouraged speakers to explore topics that ranged from “racial issues to public apathy and contemporary social problems” (pp. 12–13). Reflective of the social concerns of the times, persuasive speeches often focused on convincing listeners of the need for equality in all areas of civil rights and reinforcing the value of strides to be made on these social issues.

As individual events evolved and gained its own autonomy separate from debate, coaches and competitors trained in policy debate may have felt the need to fill this void by creating policy-oriented persuasion in individual events. Regardless of the specific reason, persuasive speaking increasingly emerged as a “speech to actuate” with a clearly-defined problem and a clearly-defined solution that includes the need for specific audience action. While some tournaments (i.e., the Great Eastern series) do offer a separate event labeled “convince” and designed to include speeches that cannot involve audience action, this event draws considerably fewer competitors than persuasive speaking. Also, while finalists in “convince” may qualify to compete in persuasive speaking at national tournaments, such speeches have not traditionally won top recognition at either the National Forensic Association’s Individual Events Nationals or the American Forensic Association’s National Individual Events Tournament.

In shifting the nature of the persuasive speech from a “speech to convince or inspire” to a “speech to actuate,” topic selection for the event has certainly been altered. With a “speech to actuate,” the speaker is now forced to develop a problem, solution, and a mechanism to implement that solution within a ten-minute time frame; as a result, speakers have become more inclined to seek a clearly-defined problem with which the audience is already predisposed or, at the least, is uninformed. As such, the speaker is then obligated to develop only one-sided arguments to support the need for change; that task can be accomplished in considerably less time than developing two-sided arguments. A recent analysis of topics used by persuasive speakers competing in the 1990 National Forensic Association’s Individual Events Nationals reports that sixty-five of the 169 topics analyzed (38%) addressed medical and ecological concerns (Leiboff, 1990, p. 158). In short, persuasive judges are not likely to take issue with the claim that a disease is harmful or that the environment is polluted; instead, the judge’s evaluative focus shifts to the speaker’s proof of the relative harm (significance) of one topic compared to other topics in a round of competition as well as an assessment of the speaker’s proposed solution to the problem.

Furthermore, the nature of the “action” requested by the speaker has also
evolved during the past two decades. While persuasive speeches in the 1970s often called for legislative action that asked the listener to “write your Congressman,” such a call for action has now become labeled by most coaches and competitors as “contrived” and “ineffective.” In an attempt to move away from such an impersonal action step, speakers have begun to incorporate personal action directed specifically toward the listener while maintaining the call for legislative action that is so often necessary to remove inherent structural barriers in the system. The result is that the speaker’s “call for action” may be nothing more than asking the listener to become more informed or educated on the issue coupled with the legislative action necessary to bring about substantial change.

For example, the American Forensic Association’s 1989 National Champion in Persuasive Speaking asked his audience to become aware of their own illnesses that may be prompted by buildings with Sick Building Syndrome and to contact local building inspectors to insist that building inspections be conducted and results be made known. Only after the speaker recommended such individual action did the speaker then ask his audience, in a single sentence, to support federal legislation requiring building owners “to use specific types of systems” as well as “to clean and maintain their existing systems...” (Reynolds & Schnoor, 1989, p. 126). In addition, the National Forensics Association’s 1990 National Champion in Persuasive Speaking asked her audience to support both expansion and enforcement of legislation to provide a plan for asbestos removal in buildings. In the meantime, however, she also encouraged her audience to have their own homes inspected for dangerous levels of asbestos and then take appropriate steps to have the asbestos removed by professionals (Reynolds, Schnoor, & Brey, 1990). Again, both of these recent national champions illustrate the trend to focus on a personal involvement step developed in conjunction with a plea for legislative action.

**Patterns of Organization**

As the nature of the event has changed, so too have the patterns of organization that have evolved. With the advent of “oratory,” the speech to inspire or to convince focused almost solely on reinforcing or changing a belief. Similar to a basic first affirmative constructive in a “needs” case, the purpose of this speech was to convince the audience of a “need” for change; as a result, the speaker focused primarily on developing the reasons to justify such a change. According to Taylor (1984), this speech is most typically suited to use a simple topical outline organized around arguments of “need” that are appropriate. For example, a persuasive speaker hoping to inspire an audience to make a renewed commitment to strong family values might develop that claim by discussing three or four benefits derived from a society with strong family values.

As the persuasive speaking event has evolved into a “speech to actuate,” the purpose has now become two-fold: 1) to reinforce or change a belief and 2) to prompt specific behavior. Both the solution as well as the implementation of that solution have become important facets of the persuasive
speech. As a result, speakers have begun to employ a simple problem-solution or problem-solution-advantages pattern of organization to allow development of the solution and a resulting "call for action."

The American Forensic Association's 1990 National Champion in Persuasive Speaking developed her speech on the need to recycle paper by exploring the cause of the paper glut (problem), the environmental and economic harm resulting from this glut (problem), and what we in our communities can do to solve this paper recycling problem (solution) (Reynolds, Schnoor, & Brey, 1990). This basic problem-solution organizational pattern focuses two-thirds of the speech on problem (cause and harm) and one-third of the speech on solution (state government and local community).

One popular persuasive pattern of organization taught in public speaking classes in the 1970s and carried into forensic competition is Monroe's Motivated Sequence. This five-step pattern of organization designed for a "speech to actuate" includes the following steps: attention, need, satisfaction, visualization, and action. According to Jabusch (1985), these five steps most typically coincide with the parts of a speech in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Body (Problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Body (Solution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this pattern of organization is simply a more detailed variation of the problem-solution format, it does encourage the speaker to develop a visualization of the solution's impact as well as develop specific action to implement the solution. This visualization step allows the speaker to develop an explicit example to evoke an emotional response to the topic.

An effective example of the use of a visualization step can be found in the American Forensic Association's 1988 National Champion in Persuasive Speaking. This speaker, calling for regulation of medical devices, developed a poignant "visualization" of what might happen if we do not develop rigorous standards. The speaker told of a baby placed in a defective hospital incubator; rather than save this infant's life, the speaker explains how this defective medical device caused this infant's death (Boaz & Brey, 1988, pp. 113-114). The speaker's "visualization" of what could happen if we do not regulate medical devices provides a powerful springboard to the listener for a "call for action."

Use of Supporting Evidence

Heun and Heun (1986) suggest that when an audience is opposed to the topic, the speaker is more likely to develop arguments using inductive reasoning, moving from specific examples to broad claims. When contest "oratory" was viewed as an opportunity to reinforce or change a belief, those who opted to change a belief may have been predisposed to use inductive
reasoning patterns supported by specific examples and illustrations. For example, Sellnow and Zeigelmueller (1988) analyzed twenty-four speeches published by the Interstate Oratorical Association in Winning Orations over two decades. Their study compared the use of evocative appeals (i.e., use of dramatic quotations, narratives or stories, slogans, refrains, vivid passages of descriptions, and other strategies designed to illicit an emotional response) and logical appeals (i.e., the use of authoritative testimony, factual data, and statistical measurement) in successful orations prior to the 1970s and after the 1970s. They noted a general balance between the two types of supporting evidence prior to the 1970s, but almost a 25% increase in the use of logical appeals during the 1980s. In addition, they reported that speakers used extensive portions of their persuasive speech to explain and justify their unique personal involvement with the topic prior to the 1970s; after the 1970s, speakers rarely used more than a few sentences (if any) to explain unique personal involvement with the topic. Again, this shift from a general balance between evocative and logical appeals to a strong preference for the use of logical appeals in supporting evidence reflects the change in the nature of the event.

As the persuasive speech has moved from a “speech to convince” to a “speech to actuate,” the speaker is now obligated to develop a clear problem, a specific solution, and a concise call for audience action. Given the ten-minute time constraint, the speaker is more likely to select a topic in which the audience is either predisposed or, at the least, uninformed. As discussed earlier, the speaker is then obligated to develop only one-sided arguments and that task can be done in less time. Since Heun and Heun (1986) suggest that a deductive reasoning pattern is most often used when the audience already agrees with the topic, the speaker can then begin arguing from general claims that assert harm and significance.

The National Forensic Association’s 1989 National Champion in Persuasive Speaking claimed that “improper sewage disposal is having widespread effect on our environment, our health, and our quality of life” (Reynolds & Schnoor, 1989, p. 81). Once this undisputed claim was made, the speaker’s primary focus became to prove significant harm and a viable solution. Again, this form of reasoning lends itself to the use of logical appeals such as expert testimony, factual data, and statistical measurement to support such claims.

In addition, increased concern over ethical considerations in the forensics activity has placed a greater burden on the speaker to provide complete source citations (Friedley, 1983). Complete source citations usually include a name and/or title, the publication title, and the year of publication—sufficient information so that the original source could be traced. Understandably, the increased use of logical appeals and sufficiently-documented supporting evidence may leave little space for the development of the evocative, emotional appeals. Policy debate educators have already addressed a similar concern over the need for mounting evidence and complete source citation by adjusting time limits and allowing the judge and opponents to review evidence. For better or worse, the individual events activity has not yet addressed the issue of mounting source citations in persuasive speaking. Instead, speakers often find themselves forced to use incomplete or no source citations, inappropriately combine sources to minimize the need for
citations, or eliminate the use of evocative appeals so that the speaker can devote more time to documented logical appeals.

Use of Stylistic Devices

As the nature of the forensics activity as a whole has evolved over the years, so too has the nature of persuasive speaking and the stylistic devices used to present the persuasive speech. Early presentation style of the “oratory” allowed the use of a manuscript or certainly limited notes; after all, most “orators” at these early tournaments were debaters trying their hands at a second event and could not be expected to perform it from memory. While current event descriptions of persuasive speaking at the national level still allow the use of limited notes, any persuasive speech to be recognized as successful at the national level of competition will most certainly be memorized. The autonomy of individual events coupled with an increase in the number of regional tournaments throughout the year allows the speaker ample opportunity to develop and memorize a prepared manuscript.

A second stylistic device that has emerged in persuasive speaking is the use of a three-part forecasting statement similar to that found in an informative speech. While a clear thesis statement has traditionally been included in the introduction of an effective persuasive speech, the three-part forecasting statement has emerged in the 1980s. Because most persuasive speeches still use a basic problem-solution format, this two-part organization must now be adapted to a three-part organization. As a result, most persuasive speakers will determine if the audience needs more information to persuade them there is a problem or if the audience needs more information to persuade them there is a viable solution; depending on this assessment, the speaker will develop two of the three areas in either a problem orientation or a solution orientation.

While this stylistic device does add clarity, it often forces the persuasive speech to assume more of an informative style (i.e., “let me inform you of the problem, a solution, and what we can do to implement that solution”) rather than letting the cognitive dissonance created by the need naturally lead to a solution that can bring the audience back to a feeling of balance or consistency. In many ways, the use of a forecasting statement seems to “tip the hand” of the persuasive speaker’s agenda and thus undermine the speaker’s own persuasive effectiveness for the sake of explicit clarity.

Finally, as the persuasive speaker has moved to a “speech to actuate” that calls for specific audience action, the persuasive speaker has become increasingly obligated to provide devices to assist with that audience action. Specifically, persuasive speakers have begun to provide addresses on visual aids or handouts, letters that require only a signature and mailing, or valuable information on handouts the audience may carry with them as they seek to become better-educated consumers. Although visual aids of any kind have most traditionally been used in informative speaking, persuasive speakers use these stylistic devices to assist with the audience action and to set their speeches apart from others in a round of competition. As such stylistic devices become more prevalent, however, they too may be labeled as “contrived” for this event and speakers maybe encouraged to move away from their use in persuasive speaking.
Conclusion

As I recall how persuasive speaking has changed and evolved over the last twenty years, it is difficult for me to assess my role in this evolution. While I wish I could claim to be proactive in initiating changes for the better, it is probably far more honest to say that I have been reactive to "cutting edge" trends and, at times, I have struggled to reconcile my traditional training with such change.

Perhaps the most difficult issue for me to consider is how the nature of the event has evolved over two decades. My feminist friends would tell me that I have "sold out" to a male-dominated persuasive paradigm that values propositions of policy more than propositions of value and logical appeals supported by quantitative data more than emotional appeals supported by qualitative data. It is somewhat difficult for me to admit that I have participated in, and perhaps even encouraged, this shift to a male-dominated paradigm for the event.

I value the wide range of persuasive propositions, strategies and appeals that are used everyday life, and I believe that we, as forensic educators, owe it to our students to encourage them to develop the full range of their persuasive skills. However, as the coach of speakers who compete in a criteria-based activity that rewards success, I too can appreciate the value of clear definitions and standards to serve as criteria for evaluation of success. The dilemma facing the forensic community is either to create several persuasive speaking events (in an activity that some claim already suffers from a proliferation of events) or to accept the narrow definition as it now stands and seek to broaden it appropriately over time. Like many of my colleagues, I too hope that the persuasive speaking event will evolve to include more controversial topic areas that are more qualitatively significant than quantitatively significant, value the use of qualitative supporting evidence, and encourage the speaker to explore more unique personal involvement with the topic. I feel confident that as these shifts concerning the nature of the event evolve, so too will changes in structure and style.
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FORMULA VS. FRACTURED FORMULA IN CONTEXT PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

Christina L. Reynolds
Otterbein College

Todd Ambs, a 1980 Interstate Oratory Context finalist, spoke prophetically about what is today, the state of contest persuasive speaking:

So often, those of us in forensics use persuasive ploys instead of getting right to the heart of the problem. As a result, we tend to perform instead of persuade. And you in turn as an audience listen, but don’t hear. Please, if you do nothing else today, hear what I am saying. (1980, p. 48)

Ambs warned us then of an ominous shift in the fundamental nature of context persuasion, one that has damaged the uniqueness and power of contemporary persuasive speaking in forensics. Persuasive speaking, as it evolved over the past decade, has become a product that student competitors produce and perform, a message-centered artifact that audience members (judges and students alike) evaluate as message-centered argument. A number of factors have contributed to a perversion that removes the element of persuasion as a communication process from the formula. After an exploration of the assumptions that underpin a rhetorical perspective of persuasive speaking and a review of relevant forensic scholarship about the trends in contest persuasion, I will examine some particular speeches given over the last decade at the Interstate Oratory Contest in order to illuminate this shift in emphasis.

Education in rhetorical theory and criticism helps students and practitioners of communication remain cognizant of the need to find focus as a critic or communicator. Finding focus involves an understanding of the process-product (i.e., speaker-audience-message) relationship in rhetorical transactions. As Brock and Scott (1980) ask, “Does rhetoric refer to the process of inducing cooperation or to the product of that process? The obvious answer is that it refers to both, but the answer does not reduce the ambiguity. Historically and currently, the word [rhetoric] has been and is used in both senses (p. 17). Brock and Scott continue this line of thought by speculating on the impact of adhering to a historically grounded notion of product:

But the very idea of product, as traditional as it is for the critic, may be detrimental to the deepest fulfillment of the critical impulse if it is taken as a limit. This conclusion is especially apparent if one follows carefully the implications of the existence of any product, say an ordinary public speech. Where does the speech start? Where does it end? Does it start in the mind of the speaker as he interacts with his social and physical environment? (p. 17)

Brock and Scott make a crucial point: the assumptions we make about the nature and function of “an ordinary public speech” in a sense empower us to comprehend or attend to certain particulars of, about, or within that speech. These same assumptions may also limit our ability to identify and understand other important variables of a rhetorical transaction.
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Contemporary rhetorical theory and critical practice thus demonstrates an assumption of public discourse as the "human effort to induce cooperation through the use of symbols" (p. 16), and reminds us that cooperation emerges from the interaction between speaker, message, and audience. These notions are important because they suggest in contemporary forums like the competitive speaking round, students and judges have responsibilities that go beyond applying the rules of the event or assigning ranks and rating points. Charles Larson (1992) points out that the "focus in persuasion is not on the source, the message, or the receiver. It is on all (sic) of them equally" (p. 11). Larson agrees with Brock and Scott's understanding of communicative transactions as cooperative processes and argues: "the idea of co-creation means that what is inside the receiver is just as important as the source's intent or the content of the message. Persuasion is the result of the combined efforts of source and receiver" (p. 11).

Whether is it named Persuasion, Persuasive Speaking, or Oratory, it is clear that forensic professionals have articulated clear goals in event rules. The meaning and operationalization of these rules are relevant to ferreting out responsibilities that all participants have in the competitive persuasive speaking transaction. The AFA-NIET (1991) rules for Persuasive Speaking read: "An original speech by the student designed to inspire, reinforce, or change the beliefs, attitudes, values or actions of the audience" (p. 3). NFA I.E. National rules, and those of the Interstate Oratory Contest are highly similar. The process implications that Larson refers to are clear in event rules: a student's purpose in participating in this event ought to contain at least an element of motive related to inspiring, reinforcing, or changing the beliefs, attitudes, values or actions of the audience. Similarly, given receiver responsibilities in persuasion, motives of judges/critics ought to involve addressing a given student's effectiveness in inspiring, reinforcing, or changing the beliefs, attitudes, values or actions of the audience. Contemporary forensics practices suggest that we have lost this dimension of competitive persuasive speaking. The loss should frighten us because it is the dimension that makes this event unique in the realm of forensics. Participants have objectified persuasive speaking practices and evaluation to a point that removes audience responsibility for persuasive involvement. Contemporary practices allow me—as a judge—to deconstruct a student's message without asking myself "was I persuaded?" The following discussion of some recent literature relevant to contest persuasion will highlight how and why this state evolved.

In a 1983 study of "dread disease" orations, I concluded that the power of this type of competitive speech grew from the "relationship between subject matter and ethos for both the orator and the audience" (p. 133). Specifically, these orators elicited a two-pronged response from the audience:

the listeners find themselves in a role that involves more than functioning as a critic of the students' command of the principles of persuasive speaking, they are compelled to consider the ways that the speech content bears on their own lives. . . . The student then continues to build his or her credibility by using proof that reinforce audience involvement: examples and illustrations, especially the case study, attach an individual human element to evidence like statistics and expert testimony; claims about disease and its effects are presented as audience-specific in the speech's organization; and audience
action is called for in a way that illustrates specific benefits for both unseen victims of the disease and the immediate audience. (pp. 133–134)
The implication of this statement is that good persuasive speaking in forensic competition involves regarding rhetoric as process, and persuasion as audience centered.

Sellnow and Ziegelmüller (1986) highlighted a disturbing trend in competitive oratory. They compared Interstate Oratory Contest speeches from the 1960s and 1980s. They discovered that the 1980s speeches demonstrated a greater percentage of speech dedicated to the solution. More text space was dedicated to a plan, call to action and visualization in the 1980s. The orations of the 1960s demonstrated more space used to develop plan meet need arguments. Speakers of the 1980s spent more time describing the various steps they endorsed for solving their speeches’ problems, and the 1980s speeches place more emphasis on logical criteria. Sellnow and Ziegelmüller suggest that while this message centered approach to oratory is not necessarily bad, "It would be unfortunate, however, if too much of the emotional quality of 'Old fashioned oratory' were lost. A persuasive speech should be something more than a well-delivered first affirmative debate speech" (p. 87). Note that Sellnow and Ziegelmüller use the language of debate and argumentation to explain their findings. The language choice reflects their conclusion that orations in the 1980s appear to be formal debate constructive speeches, messages that emphasize logos, rationality, and prescriptiveness at the expense of ethos and pathos, and with a disregard for immediate audience effects.

Jensen’s (1990) research into the nature and function of ballot comments in public speaking events support the contentions of Ziegelmüller and Sellnow from another perspective, the audience, in contest persuasion. Jensen confirms the shift to message-focused, product-oriented judging criteria—to which, of course, students and coaches respond in kind when preparing and revising speeches. He found that comments based on the content of public address speeches dominate the attention of critics, and most of those comments are directed toward the original nature of what is presented and the construction of arguments.

The speeches students give in competition and the criteria that judges use to analyze public address events like persuasive speaking suggest that forensics participants assume a product-focused perspective on the persuasive transaction. This assumption leads to a critical focus on the message (the speech itself), an emphasis on logical appeals and rational thought, a disregard for immediate effects on the audience, and an overall regard for the enterprise of persuasive speaking as justificatory instead of cooperatively achieved. How and why did this shift in emphasis take hold? A closer examination of some competitive speech texts may reveal some answers to this question.

First, the development of a combination thesis statement-preview convention in persuasive speaking has had a profound impact on the tone of the speeches judges critique at tournaments. The “thesis statement-preview” first surfaced in competition in the event called Informative (nee Expository) speaking. When it comes to Persuasion, constructing such an animal is not necessarily difficult, but students have a hard time bridging the stylistic gap between articulating the major points of the speech—an infor-
mative demand stylistically—and presenting those same points as support for the claim that the thesis of the speech makes. Instead of persuasion in these speeches emerging or evolving cooperatively, persuasive intent and effect becomes a non-issue. Students do not acknowledge persuasive intent, and they do not encourage audience members to engage. Furthermore, in many of the cases examined for this essay, the students' role in the process, and the purposes for which they give these speeches, are not articulated even subtly. There is a clear lack of acknowledgement of speaker-message-audience interaction in contest persuasions.

Tim Sellnow (1982) presented “A Missing Beat” at the 1982 Interstate Oratory Contest. The subject matter of his oration was the development of the artificial heart. He claims in the speech that the FDA made a bad decision in refusing to allow the use of the Artificial Heart device:

My goal today is to prove to you that the FDA is making a grave mistake by holding up the therapeutic application of the artificial heart. To do so, first I'll explain the Artificial Heart's function. Second, I'll present the FDA's arguments against the artificial heart along with upholding arguments by the heart's backers. Finally, I'll offer practical solutions to this problem. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 45)

Observe that Sellnow states his specific purpose explicitly in the form of persuasive goals, a choice not common to most contest persuasions. But, the rest of the text points to some glaring symptoms of the problems articulated in the previous paragraphs. Sellnow mixes persuasive types. His persuasive goal suggests an advocacy speech, one that proves a particular condition or perspective is reasonable. He says as much in his goal statement. The preview, on the other hand, points quite clearly to a problem-solution organization, a pattern not called for by the requirements of the claim. Sellnow assumes that audience members know a problem exists. The conventions of contemporary competitive persuasion in 1982 (explicit in the AFA-NIET rules at that time) demanded that a student present a problem-solution speech. The message also utilizes a passive, informative verbal style to preview the speech body. The upcoming body, which should be presented in active terms as proof for his claim that the FDA should encourage the use of the Artificial Heart (which he leaves only implicit) is presented as information for the audience to absorb, not as persuasive proof.

David Levasseur (1988) examines the problem of overtly adversarial behavior on the part of lawyers:

Obviously, our courts and their adversaries, are going too far, and if justice is to prevail, then we must curtail the adversarial nature of our legal system. By first, confronting two of the crimes which result in an overly adversarial system, and then by mandating specific judicial reforms, we can perhaps balance the scales of justice once again. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 50)

Levasseur implies an actuate goal in sentence one, but he does not clarify his persuasive purpose or goals. He uses legal terminology to stylize the thesis and preview, but the language effectively nullifies presentation of the upcoming speech as actively persuasive. In effect, Levasseur is informing us of problems and solutions versus actively engaging an audience in a persuasive process.

Although no contest rules explicitly outlined organizational or structural
parameters in the late 1980s, these conventions were fully ingrained in the minds of students, coaches and judges. “The Best is Yet to Be,” presented by John Mietus Jr. at the Intestate Oratory Contest in 1987, dealt with the financial effects of catastrophic illness:

Congressional investigators estimate 20 million Americans today are victims of catastrophic illness, an illness which ultimately bankrupts its victims. ... [You may be asking, why isn’t there a program to help? That’s a good question, and a complex one. Let’s take a look at the misconceptions hindering a national catastrophic illness program, and then turn to the remedies available to make the last of life worth looking forward to. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 54)

The presentation of the content of this speech stylistically is clearly informative. Phrases like “let’s take a look at” or “and then turn to” are informative in nature and function, especially when used in structural previews. In this speech, no persuasive claim surfaces until paragraph 14 in the text, but that misplacement is less disturbing than the clear lack of persuasive intent and the informative language style.

The “well-delivered first affirmative constructive” tendency that Sellnow and Ziegemueller document surfaces full-blown in another speech given at the 1987 contest, “Mixing Your Medicine with Your Meals,” by Anne Demo. The subject of Demo’s speech was the improper use of medication:

These statistics indicate that Americans are not taking their medications correctly and one of the reasons for these errors is a simple lack of information. To understand the potential harm of prescription and over-the-counter medications, let’s explore, first, the problem of drug and nutrient interaction; second, how we can become a more informed medication-user; and finally, how we can support legislation to promote consumer education covering prescription and over-the-counter drugs. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 113)

This speaker assumes audience acceptance of some problem (at least three are implied: Americans aren’t taking their medications correctly, drug and nutrient interaction, and inadequate information provided to consumers about drugs they consume) and it assumes acceptance of actuation in the phrasing of the last clause, “how we can support legislation to promote consumer education ...”. Examining this speech reminded me of a comment made by a colleague a few years ago: “Persuasive speaking had become no more than a seven minute informative with a three minute solution step tacked on at the end.” If the speeches he evaluated in competitive rounds were at all similar in presentation to this one, his conclusion was well supported by evidence.

The examples above serve as fair documentation of the impact that an evaluative shift to product-focused persuasion has had on competitive speeches. And, I content that this shift is bad in that it removes the audience—especially critics and judges—as a persuasive target. Yet this is not the worst of the disservice to persuasive speaking as an enterprise.

If forensics is an educational enterprise, then the demands of a product approach to persuasion also limits what student speakers are learning about persuasion as a phenomenon. Remember that Larson’s view of persuasion involves focus on the source, the message, and the receiver equally. Removing the audience as a target has also negatively impacted on the students’ understanding of their relationship to the message and the audience. One
more example should illustrate how the product assumption hampers and limits a student’s inventional freedom. Mike Stolts gave “An Ounce Worth Pounds” in 1987. The subject of his speech was childhood obesity:

Obesity is potentially the most dangerous, yet possibly preventable childhood health problem. In order to understand and combat childhood obesity, we must first realize how widespread and dangerous the problem is. Then we will examine why more children are becoming obese. Finally, we will determine what we as parents, future parents, educators and citizens must do to insure that future generations will not grow up obese. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 127)

Stolts’ approach here is not too objectified. His purpose in addressing the audience is semi-explicit in the second sentence. His call to action is explicit in sentence four; Stolts’ persuasive goals are clear. There is an activity to the word choice that does not appear in many contest persuasions. Stolts includes the audience through the use of tense, active pronouns and words like “realize,” “examine,” and “determine.” I coached this speech and I vividly recall the discussions (and disagreements) we had about how he might engage the audience without stepping too far outside of the conventions of the event at the time. Our dilemma, and the ultimate irony, was that Mike was a “fat kid,” his coach was a “fat kid,” and many of the members of the audiences he addressed were fat kids. He was engaged with his subject, he wished to engage his audience, but convention kept him from doing so explicitly. He would not (and could not) say “I was a fat kid, and maybe you were, too” because by that time, that sort of ethotic appeal was taboo—at one point I clearly recall some coaches tell me they deemed that appeal unethical. What lessons are students learning about persuasion when ethotic appeals like establishing a source’s relationship to his or her subject are regarded as ethically suspect, unfair, and overtly discouraged through ballot commentary and low ranking?

Jensen’s findings about ballot criteria clearly indicate that students have enough to worry about without having their role in the persuasive transaction perverted. Students can gain an awareness of persuasion as cooperation and retain their inventional integrity if judges and coaches again begin to recognize—through judging criteria and coaching practices—the persuasive transaction as a process. In our classrooms, and in society at large, we speak of the “art of persuasion.” It is long past time that the artistic dimension again emerges in competitive persuasive speaking.

There are ways that coaches and judges can wrestle persuasive speaking back from mechanical conventions. First, we should encourage students to speak about subjects to which they feel connected (and as audience members, we must listen in good faith). Second, we must demand that students somehow share that connection with the audiences they address. Third, students must realize that they are not just giving a speech, they are attempting to persuade an audience. Thus, students ought to be able to explicitly articulate, in their speeches, 1) why they are speaking to the audience (persuasive purpose), and 2) what they hope to accomplish by speaking to the audience (persuasive goal). Students can do just that in creative and effective ways. Jay Brown delivered “The Burning Question of Our Nation’s Books” at the Interstate Oratory Contest in 1984 on the limited shelf life of twentieth century books:
The dramatic deterioration of our nation's library holding is a crisis which affects all of us who depend on books for information, entertainment, or aesthetic pleasure. Let me first explain what causes this deterioration and then discuss why current methods for dealing with it are inadequate. Thirdly, I'll explore why we are ignoring our written legacy, and finally, suggest what we must do to protect it in the future. (Schnoor, 1990, p. 392)

In a few sentences, Brown posture his intent. He includes the audience through active word choice, and engages listeners in a cooperative fashion. Brown does not explicitly outline his intent, but the content of this paragraph highlights that he observes a difference between where the audience is attitudinally, and where he would like them to be when he is done speaking. Another former student, Alan Jalowitz, did a fine job focusing on process in “Our Threatened Inheritance: In Support of an Independent Park Service” at Interstate in 1989:

I propose to convince you that we must remove the institutional threats to our nation’s natural heritage by making the Park Service an independent agency. To do this, we must first define the philosophical conflict which plagues our parks. Then we will investigate the effects of economic use on the parks. Finally, we will analyze the steps our entire society must take to save our cultural heritage. (p. 111)

Jalowitz’s persuasive goal is clear, he uses active and engaging language to delineate the audience’s responsibility to consider his subject matter personally, and his organizational plan seems consistent with what he hopes to accomplish. At the very least, the presentation of the thesis-preview in this speech is closer to operationalizing a transactional, cooperative approach to persuasive speaking, even if it is fractured by that good old problem-solution organizational pattern.

If coaches and judges encourage students to engage the process of persuasion, they also make their own commitment to honor and abide by their responsibility to actively engage. Therefore, coaches and judges deserve to hear statements that let them know where the speaker wishes them to be attitudinally and/or behaviorally, by the end of the presentation. Judging a competitive event like persuasive speaking does become tedious when the judge is not asked to engage, when judges are told quite early in persuasive speeches that they are present strictly to evaluate the students’ command of evidence, argument, and speech structure.

In the final analysis, students just demonstrating to judges that they have (or might not have) the tools to persuade is not what persuasive speaking was intended to be. Having tools is fine, but using them appropriately and effectively is another matter. At present, we ask students in persuasive speaking to acquire and show us the tools in their toolbox; we are not asking them to demonstrate their ability to use them. We should ask, and we should evaluate their skill in using the tools of persuasion, lest they attempt to use those tools in the future, and end up hurting themselves and others. Forensics educators have an ethical responsibility to assure that students know how to use the tools of communication responsibly. If we do not, we have done our students and larger society in which they live and communicate, the greatest disservice of all.
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SOME COACHING CONSIDERATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION FOR CONTEST PERSUASION
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As I judged a semi-final round of persuasion at the 1991 NFA National Individual Events Tournament, I was impressed by the obvious talent of the contestants who had advanced to the round. Yet at the same time, the round provided a classic illustration of what Kathleen Jamieson has recently referred to as generic calcification—a condition where rigid boundaries result in a predictable and static form of discourse that is by and large devoid of individuality. In this particular round, all six speakers presented speeches akin to the form of a first affirmative constructive speech, with frequently cited evidence and few personal, emotional, or audience centered appeals. If the speeches in this round were representative of successful contest persuasions—and my experience would agree that they are—then forensic persuasion has not only become a distinct genre of persuasive discourse, but it is also beginning to fall victim to its own guidelines. Is it possible that the forensics laboratory, once a form for creative experimentation, has become a laboratory merely for replication?

My task in this paper is threefold. First, I hope to share some coaching strategies for creation of ethos, message clarity, and presentation which I believe have helped students achieve both a modicum of tournament success and, more importantly, the ability to persuade. My intention with this information is suggestive rather than prescriptive, lest I fall prey to my own criticisms. Second, I will identify some of the trends in forensics which I believe have contributed to the "calcification" of contest persuasive speeches. Finally, I will suggest some possible avenues available to coaches wishing to encourage diversity in the event, and specifically to minimize the current trend toward "narrowing" the scope of contest persuasion.

Coaching for Contest Persuasion: Three Strategies

While most forensics persuasions tend to follow similar patterns, there are always some speakers who seem to do nothing "by the book" but who still deserve—and receive—recognition for persuasive excellence. My contention is that, in the contest setting, what allows these speakers a degree of success is their ability to develop ethos—a relationship of trust—with the audience. Although speaker ethos is obviously established in a myriad of ways, communication research suggests two approaches which are particularly important in establishing the relationship between speaker and listener. The first is the establishment of a degree of interpersonal involvement

---

1 I wish to express gratitude to Kenda Creasy Dean and David G. Levasseur for their contributions to this project.
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between the speaker and audience, and the second is audience awareness of emotional involvement between the speaker and the subject selected for discussion.

As Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes (1976) point out, persuasive speaking in forensics is the event which calls for the greatest degree of emotional involvement between the speaker and the audience (p. 215). In other words, true persuasion cannot occur in a vacuum; rather, a bond must be forged between speaker and audience. Basic communication courses identify this quality as being "audience-centered," the ability of the speaker to become rhetorically sensitive to the needs of the audience and a persuasive message's potential effect for them.

Typically, competitors are encouraged and rewarded for demonstrating how a problem directly affects the audience. However, it may be stretching things to show that bag ladies live in my backyard or that a nuclear power plant might be built on my campus. If students are committed to topics such as these, they need not be condemned because the topic "does not affect the audience" in traditional ways. Forensic competitors should be both encouraged and rewarded for using audience analysis in ways that are appropriate for the topic, rather than for forensic norms. I remember one competitor who, a decade after the fact, still stands out in my mind for her ability to make me care about sickle cell anemia—a disease that would be very unlikely to directly affect me or any of my family. She said,

I've been asked, "How does this affect me? This is a disease that predominantly affects blacks?" Well, when a tornado ravaged Xenia, Ohio, it didn't affect the majority of us in this room directly, yet the entire nation rallied to Xenia's aid. And, when an earthquake rumbled through Nicaragua, it didn't affect one of us here directly, yet the whole world lent a helping hand. So when a child is afflicted with one of the most devastating biological natural disasters—Sickle Cell Anemia—do we stop short in our concern because it doesn't affect us directly? Can we allow our concerns to be dictated by racial, social, or even ethnic boundaries? I hope not (Reynolds, 1979, p. 83).

Through appeals to compassion for the suffering of all human beings, this speaker showed that audience involvement and sensitivity to a subject could be extended beyond the realm of direct or personal experience to a harm. Although much of the “audience orientation” may be accomplished by rudimentary audience analysis, now and then a speaker must go beyond the norm to establish a sincere bond with an audience. As a freshman forensic competitor, I remember being told that visual aids were taboo in persuasion. Yet during a national final round in persuasion that year, I saw a speech advocating the use of chiropractors. During the speech, the speaker attempted to explain how the spinal cord passes through the spinal column without actually touching the vertebrae itself. To illustrate her point, she took a ball-point pen out of her pocket, made a circle with her thumb and forefinger, and passed the pen inside the circle without touching either finger.

This, indeed, was a visual aid in persuasion. If some judges were appalled (and most clearly were not, given her position in a national final round), I recall being absolutely captivated. With a simple illustration she taught me a concept that high school biology had failed to clarify. She demonstrated that she cared that the audience not only listen but that we understand her
She ignored a traditional judging expectation, but the bond created between herself and her audience added a dimension of caring and trustworthiness that had far more impact than conforming to narrow tournament expectations would have afforded.

Another method for “connecting” with the audience is achieved psychologically through the use of Monroe’s motivated sequence. More than an organizational tool, Monroe offers a psychologically based procedure to engage an audience and move them toward a desired action. The key to this sequence lies in its fourth stage, the visualization step. Here a speaker is called upon to construct a drama that will directly position the audience in confrontation with the topic at hand. The persuasive power of this positioning lies in the fact that the audience is made vividly aware of how the subject can directly affect them, thereby heightening the urgency of heeding the speaker’s call to action.

The 1981, Interstate Oratory champion, urging increased support for hospice care, reached out to the audience with the passage,

The fact is, for some of us, modern miracles will fail. Terminal illness is not discriminating: heart disease knows no season, sickle cell anemia has no cure. There is a cancer death every 80 seconds—and one out of every four people you’ve met this weekend will eventually have cancer. What if, when you call home tonight, you find it has hit there as well? It does happen (Creasy, p. 311).

Through these words the speaker placed the reality of the problem directly in the lives of her listeners. Such a confrontation heightens the urgency for involvement.

The second dimension of ethos worth noting is the degree of involvement and audience perceives between the speaker and message. As mentioned earlier, a persuasive speech must reflect the speaker’s convictions and ideals as much as it reflects careful research and analysis (Brooks, p. 334). Sometimes this may be accomplished through the content of the speech; at other times it may be evidenced through a particular dynamism of the speaker’s delivery. Unfortunately, recent trends in contest persuasion discourage the identification of this link.

Far too many judges adhere to the unspoken norm that personal examples in contest speeches are off limits. Branding such appeals as “cheap shots,” these judges charge that personal accounts serve as mere sympathy ploys rather than valid persuasive strategies. I take issue with this accusation. While students do need to learn the difference between using a motivational appeal and misusing a sympathy ploy, tactfully worded personal examples are perfectly appropriate in contest persuasion as they are in “real life” persuasion. Sincerity and conviction cover a multitude of technical sins a speaker might commit, yet one’s personal involvement with a topic is no excuse for sloppy scholarship or maudlin emotional appeals. I strongly urge students to select topics for their forensics speeches to which they are personally connected in some way. Furthermore, while this personal link between speaker and message need not be overtly stated sometimes a brief personal reference can compel an audience’s attention if only by its simplicity: “There is a reason I want to tell you about this.” One speaker I know of consistently used such a technique quite successfully in forensic competition. She always drew upon personal experience for her topics, and she always subtly and artfully alluded...
to this in the text of her speech. In one instance she mentioned a summer counseling job with migrant workers near her northern Ohio home; in another speech she referred to her student teaching experience in a bilingual school. Each time the personal example was brief and without embellishment. Yet her frank inclusion of herself with her topic heightened the audience's sense of commitment between the speaker and her suggested course of action.

Once a speaker has established ethos, a second coaching strategy worth emphasis is the crafting of a memorable message. Although research is inconclusive whether organizational clarity contributes to overall persuasiveness, we do know that organizational clarity increases audience retention of a speaker's message (Thompson, 1960, pp. 59-69). Since at least one of the persuasive speaker's goals is to help an audience understand a topic, organizational aids such as previews, reviews, and transitions are appropriate because they increase the listener's chances of comprehension. As Simons (1976) writes: "The persuader must work for at least a minimal degree of understanding of the message. The receiver needs to get the right impressions, or perhaps the right misimpressions" (p. 134). It is important to note that organizational clarity is not synonymous with organizational blatancy. As Quintilian stated, "The height of art is to conceal art." While previews, summaries, signposts, and transitions are important tools for the persuasive speaker, students should be encouraged and coached to use these tools subtly and creatively to clarify and augment their messages.

A final coaching strategy that merits attention is careful attention to delivery. Although we often like to underplay the importance of a stunning delivery in forensic success, few of us would deny its role in effective communication. Experience dictates that an energetic and forceful yet conversational presentational style that conveys the speaker's conviction is well advised in contest persuasion. The research of Benson and Friedley further supports the importance of presentational style, citing "the use of sincere, conversational delivery" as one of the most frequently listed judging criterion for persuasion (p. 2).

One particular presentational skill I emphasize with my students is effective use of eye contact. Direct eye contact is perhaps the most efficient nonverbal channel through which a communicator can enhance conversationality with an audience. Picking a spot on the back of the wall just above audience

---

2 Although scant in offering recommendations for skill enhancement, communication literature is consistent with an acknowledgment of the persuasive value of direct and sustained eye contact between speaker and audience. Gronbeck, et. al., notes that "our culture has become to expect eye-to-eye contact as a sign that a speaker is 'earnest,' 'sincere,' 'forthright,' and 'self-assured'" (p. 331). They further suggest that it is through direct and regular eye contact with individual audience members that a speaker establishes credibility. Osborn and Osborn claim that the "eyes are the most important feature of facial expression ... sustained eye contact suggests honesty, openness and respect" (p. 290). Finally, Lucas cautions that if direct eye contact isn't established and maintained, the speaker is likely to be "perceived as tentative, ill-at-ease ... insincere or dishonest" (p. 250). See also: Burgoon, J. K., Coker, D. A. and Coker, R. A. (1986). Communication effects of gaze behavior: A list of two contrasting effects. Human Communication Research, 12, 495-524 and Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. New York: Doubleday.
members' heads, panning the room like a television camera, or delivering impactful statistics to an empty chair will do little to persuade. Speakers must connect with their audiences; direct eye contact is a powerful way to forge this bond. I coach students to deliver one complete thought to one person before moving on to someone else. One thought may consist of a phrase, sentence, or short paragraph. The underlying principle is simple: give a complete unit of information to a given individual rather than splitting thought units. Whether the audience is two, twenty, or two hundred, as the speaker engages an individual audience member with direct eye contact an interpersonal bond of conversationality and intimacy is established and for that moment, while everyone else in the room is privy to the conversation, the speaker is enabled to create a one-to-one relationship.

As students begin to increase their ethos by a connecting with the audience and by establishing sincere commitment to their topic, make their messages memorable through structural clarity, and perfect their delivery style, they not only move towards success in contest persuasion, but towards effective public communication in other settings as well. While this discussion has not been exhaustive of the coaching strategies available to forensics practitioners, hopefully it will stimulate some further consideration on this subject.

Why Current Trends Exist and are Perpetuated

Education theorists have insisted for decades that modeling is a key to learning (Slavin, 1983). Forensics provides countless instances of coaches who use modeling to communicate to students how the activity is to be done. We may showcase a returning varsity member’s winning prose from last year’s competition at an early recruitment session, encourage novices to watch final rounds, show video tapes of national champion speakers in public address and limited preparation events, and disseminate former texts and cuttings of “winning” speeches and literature as exemplars. While such practices are clearly legitimate means to start a discussion of what forensics competition is, they represent only a beginning. Healthy growth is stymied if coaches and students spend their time merely mimicking masters of yesteryear. The incestuous product of such repetition results in a form with increasingly narrowed parameters.

A second explanation for the preoccupation with the “winning formula” can be examined through the analogy of the laboratory setting, which has been used to describe the forensics experience since the summer developmental conference of 1974. True, the laboratory for the experienced scientist is a place to test and experiment with new ideas and to challenge the limitations of known phenomenon—it is a place, noted Albert Einstein, where imagination is valued over knowledge. For the beginning science student, the lab serves a different function. It is a place to gain practical understanding and mastery of skills which constitute the foundations of the particular scientific field. Developmental psychologists praise this notion of stage learning and suggest that until the basics are mastered a student’s unique contribution to the field of knowledge, as spawned through creative learning, will be inhibited (Parker, 1978; Ritter, 1981). Given this orientation, critics should not condemn the basic biology student for observing the
amoeba's reaction to light, the basic chemistry student testing the reaction of litmus paper to acid, or the novice persuasive speaker using a problem-solution organizational pattern. The alarm should sound, however, when the more advanced science student, or forensics competitor, is merely regurgitating the repeatedly tested work of others that has known outcomes, where knowledge rules imagination.

An additional limitation viewed in the laboratory setting is time. Scientific laboratories can only accomplish so much in a finite period; time restraints place similar restrictions on the contest speaker. Ten minutes is not much time to present a cogent argument aimed at changing an audience's orientation and then moving them to concrete action. Audience orientations to such topics as abortion, capital punishment, and legalization of marijuana are likely to be firmly established, and the possibility of a medium to low credibility figure changing these orientations in ten minutes is highly improbable. This may explain why controversial topics tend to be avoided in persuasion and are more likely to be found in debate arenas, which afford speakers greater time to articulate and advance their positions.

New Directions in Contest Persuasion

Marie Hochmuth Nichols (1955) noted over thirty years ago that the art of communication involves choices: “Rhetoric operates in the area of the contingent, where choice is to be made among alternative courses of action” (p. 8). If we are to provide our students with the greatest possible understanding of communication, and specifically, persuasion: and if we are to provide students with a skill they can effectively utilize outside the realm of forensics, then we must reinforce at every opportunity the diversity of persuasive forms. As educator coaches we can initiate this process in three ways.

First, we must recognize and reinforce the cocurricular notion of forensics work by encouraging students who actively participate in forensics to either enroll in additional communication courses or do some outside reading in persuasion. A good place to start is with the basic public speaking texts of the field. Most of these books provide at least a cursory discussion of persuasive theory and illustrate how these concepts can be incorporated into speaking situations (for example, see: Gronbeck, et. al., 1990; Lucas, 1992; Osborn and Osborn, 1991; and Wilson, et. al., 1990). For the more advanced student, attention should be directed towards a course in persuasion and the texts available in that field (for example, see: Larson, 1989; O'Keefe, 1990; and Simons, 1976). These works elaborate various persuasive theories and their applications. One exercise might ask students to view their chosen topic from a variety of perspectives (e.g. social judgment, elaboration likelihood, information-integration, cognitive dissonance, reasoned action, etc.) to see if any new persuasive strategies could be identified.

Second, we coaches must expand our lexicon of “models of success” to include persuasive speakers outside of the forensics laboratory. Newspapers such as The Washington Post and the New York Times provide excellent sources of speeches for persuasive analysis. Addresses printed in Vital Speeches may also serve as exemplars of practical persuasion. Vital Speeches is particularly interesting for it contains materials from a cross-section of business, education, and political discourse.
In addition to modeling from contemporary discourse, students are well served by exposure to oratorical masterpieces from the past. The persuasive skills exhibited in the rhetoric of Churchill, Roosevelt, Kennedy, King, Reagan—not to mention classical figures like Cicero and Demosthenes—help students discover how rhetors overcame various rhetorical challenges, adding to the student’s own lexicon of adaptive persuasive skills. While exposure to such individuals can come through independent study and reading compendiums (for example, see: Andrews & Zarefsky, 1991 and 1992; Peterson, 1965; and Linkugel et. al., 1982), perhaps the best option is a course in public address. The breadth of exposure facilitated by such a course, coupled with group analysis and discussion of significant rhetors and various rhetorical forms, can greatly enhance a student’s understanding of persuasive strategy.

A final change originates within the forensics community itself. As communication educators, coaches of persuasion must take seriously two responsibilities which are currently under-emphasized. We must reinforce the understanding that the relationship between speaker and audience is essential to any persuasive effort. Forensics coaches can benefit from the wisdom of Kenneth Burke who maintains that the key to rhetorical success is identification. It was the ability of the contest speakers observed by Reynolds to identify with and involve the audience that caused her to praise their work. Creating such a bond between speaker and audience will often involve emotional appeal. As Sellnow and Ziegelmueller (1988) state:

Sellnow and Ziegelmueller conclude by lamenting how unfortunate it would be if the “emotional quality of ‘old fashioned’ oratory were lost. A persuasive speech should be something more than a well-delivered first affirmative debate speech” (p. 85).

The forensics community would take great strides towards facilitating change through adopting the advice of developmental theorists. At every opportunity we should encourage experienced students to test the limits of contest persuasion by pushing the boundaries beyond where they now rest. Such a move involves risk—certainly on the part of the student, but also on our part as coaches. It may mean subjecting ourselves to yet another drunk driving speech or confronting our own attitudes, beliefs, and values with a really controversial subject. It may mean “humanizing” the contestant by allowing him or her to disclose his/her personal involvement with the topic. It may mean giving up the comfort of the problem/solution organizational format for an inspirational or attitudinal speech.

One of my more pleasurable, and simultaneously unsettling, coaching experiences happened a few years ago when a student approached me with the topic urging a revamping of our adversarial legal system. I quickly dismissed the topic as competitively “suicidal,” given the number of legal students and lawyers who often serve as forensics judges. Yet the student, who had spent the summer clerking in his father’s law office, was persistent. The
solutions in his initial drafts were almost entirely attitudinal and a portion of his support material was derived from his own personal experience. Ironically, nearly every criticism he received on his ballots centered on these two issues. The student—with my blessings—opted for a safer, more traditional approach to the topic for the national tournament. By the time nationals rolled around, the focus of the speech had been narrowed to problems with discovery and expert witnesses, and all but a slight hint of the speaker’s direct involvement with the topic had been eliminated. Although the national tournaments proved the student had a “winning piece,” one comment from a fellow competitor, who had seen the speech early in the year, tarnished the glory. “Well, you certainly have a forensics winner—but you’ve cut the heart out of it. I really miss what you had before.” The big risk the student had taken with the legal topic suddenly went flat, and I wondered how many similar conversations had occurred between coaches and students throughout the year. Coaches will need to warn students who test the limits that they might not “win,” but they just might persuade—and they will actually learn.

Conclusion

Reports from business leaders and educators continually call for students to enter the workforce with a mastery of oral communication skills. We in forensics are in key positions to help students achieve this mastery by exposing them to the breadth of our vast discipline and by encouraging them to test its limits, even within the confines of the forensics “laboratory”. For generations contest oratory has been a practice area for the acquisition, development, testing, and expanding of public speaking skills. We are currently in a climate of stagnation where replication, not persuasion is rewarded. If our professed educational goals are to come to fruition, we must expand our notions of what contest persuasion is supposed to be.
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There is rage in these essays!

Well, not exactly "rage." Read them carefully, though, and one finds a quality that makes one wonder whether the authors are simply mildly irritated or they have carefully controlled a deeper rage—"sublimated" Freud would say. These actively involved forensics instructors see something in their activity that they wish to strike out at. Interestingly, theirs is not the lamenting of disappointed judges who did not hear what they would have wished to hear in a round. Rather, their lament is for moments when they have found themselves carefully draining the creativity from their students—we used to call it "managing" the student's creativity when my earlier generation did it—and wondered if this was the task which instructors were meant to perform. "Freedom" is too strong a word for their wish, but these authors feel the power of the restrictions on their teaching more acutely than they feel their power to facilitate the learning of their students. Theirs is a carefully measured plea to reexamine the activity they love—public speaking competition—to consider the direction that it has moved. They believe if you do so, you will work for changes too.

The problem with my story is that it interprets these essays as a kind of "Dr. Spock meets coaching" message—what our young need from us is freedom to make mistakes, not the heavy hand of discipline. I do not mean to suggest this interpretation. I am more interested in a paradox I find in the essays. My search for an approach to comment upon them brings me face to face with an irony: close reading reveals the presence of the same "PROBLEM-solution" approach that several of them complain restricts their students' view of the world. I want to contribute to their project and perhaps the way I can do so is to move beyond this paradox by stepping back from their immediate characterization of the problem and providing two prospects—a bit longer historical view and a transcending vision of public speaking that may contain the values fueling their lament.

A Wider History, or What We Did Wrong at the Last Revolution

The most typical strategy in the reformist genre in which they, and I, participate is to describe the golden age of public speaking events and seek to restore that time of yester-year. I will forsake that strategy for a different one—mea culpa! I was there at the fall.

The time when I competed in, and then coached, public speaking events—the 1960s and 1970s—was characterized by an increasing intensity in our work. We believed in the value of forensics, and with the spirit of the era—
social engineers with bright dreams seeking means of control—we sought to bring that intensity to our students. In retrospect, our increased intensity had some unintended and probably undesirable consequences.

First, our intensiveness led to a closing of the competitive forensic system. One of our innovations was the national tournament—the creation of the National Debate Tournament from the remnants of West Point in 1966 and the NFA and NIET shortly thereafter. There had been national tournaments before, but these new tournaments incorporated a kind of feeder system that subordinated other tournaments as “qualifying” preliminaries to the national tournaments. Along with the motivating strength these tournaments brought to the activity came the power to channel the diversity of tournaments into a national model. The definitions of events intended to permit manageable tournament administration became the national definitions. We accomplished standardization to a rather extraordinary degree. There were holdouts, but perhaps the degree of control is seen in the proliferation of “experimental” as the term to describe alternative definitions to those authorized by the national bodies. Kevin Dean describes the “calcification” of the persuasive speaking event and Sheryl Friedley documents the “narrowing” of the definitions governing public speaking that followed. Our search for standardization is what these essays describe.

Our intensiveness also emerged in our worry about the quality of judging at our tournaments. In the face of worry that the student’s intensive work was not being correlated highly enough with reward, we sought a way of standardizing judging. One of the solutions we tried was to broaden standardization of event rules into even more criteria—Chris Reynolds calls this a focus on product rather than process. Even if rule sprawl did not assure that judges would abide by the long list of do’s and don’t’s, at least it allowed us to point to the rules and the judges and “document the problem.” We proscribed some practices—Kevin Dean mentions visual aids in persuasion—and prescribed others—the full documenting of sources—to provide judge’s strict guidelines for their work.

These two trends served to purify the activity, but the underlying force was more important—they provided greater control. Control allowed predictability, and in the brave new age, my generation was able to teach tighter circles of predictable response, of behavior and reward. Once the pattern of greater control was established, we were even able to use our power as judges of events to impose control beyond the rules. A message to students referred to in these papers—“judges won’t accept doing it that way, so do it this way instead”—became a powerful tool for instruction. Although we could use this message to teach useful lessons, Kevin Dean reports accurately that the message was soon furthering our control into choices that had little to do with quality, and stifling constructive creativity among students. Our higher “purpose” too easily became to bring into focus a map of behaviors and predictable responses that we could use to mold students into effective contestants. To the extent we achieved this purpose we became better teachers of a sort, but our intense pursuit of that goal created a relatively closed system of competition in forensics.

The concept of a “closed system” implies that little information was crossing the boundary into our system. Although the extent that this was occurring
is arguable, I do believe that the reach "beyond the system" concentrated in two points and both had their undesirable consequences.

One of these points—illustrating the wise choices with unintended consequences—was our commitment to integrate forensics with our mainline curriculum—our term was "co-curricular." Although this move probably saved forensics economically as budgets tightened, the direction of public speaking instruction reinforced our notions of the controlled environment of speaking. The discipline generally took the term "public speaking" to break down this way: "speaking" is the activity and "public" is where it occurs. Consistent with the dominant "scientism" we adopted the metaphor of the "laboratory" as a rationale for forensics—a move that Kevin Dean takes note of in his essay. The idea of the laboratory was a purified atmosphere in which we could reconstitute the "public" arena with the "extraneous" variables controlled for the purpose of teaching speaking. Once our laboratory work was complete, our students could then take their knowledge from the laboratory into the world beyond. This metaphor of the laboratory fit our search for control very nicely, justified our closing the tournament experience as methodologically sound, and left us with a notion of the "reconstituted public" which encouraged our thinking of the "public" in "public speaking" as a place where the activity occurred.

The other major encouragement we gave our students to reach beyond our closed system was in research. We encouraged them to see their work in terms of the great problem solving work of the scientists and social scientists in the governmental and quasi-governmental social policy network. Sheryl Friedley identifies this link with the quasi-debate direction of the event. She may be right, but of course debate was taking a turn at the same time in the same direction and the relationship may be correlation rather than causation. This connection was quite fruitful to our students who moved quite naturally from our activity into the policy network since we trained them well in the logic which dominated it. But to achieve that objective other voices were being closed out. When Sheryl Friedley worries briefly in her conclusion that she cut off her feminist friends by dedicating herself to the "male dominated paradigm," I believe that her focus is misdirected; when Kevin Dean laments the proscription of "personal references" in contest speaking, he is closer to locating the connection. We sent our students to the objective logics of social scientific policy analysis as their research task. They began to think of the substance of speeches as quantifiable public problems solved by "change agents" through "action-changes." They viewed the public as "target consumers" of their discourse, equally analyzable through social scientific methods. We sought to reconstitute the public in the forensics laboratory in a way that would connect with this view of policy.

My purpose now is no more to condemn social science or policy analysis than my purpose earlier was to invoke Dr. Spock. My point is that choices made for good reasons in that era have had the fate of all choices: unintended consequences should now make us think about choice as somewhat tragic and stimulate our rethinking where we are.

In fact, I believe that we are suffering in this generation for the sins of my generation of the forensics establishment. Around us in the society's failure of leadership we see evidence of our choices then. I would point to two.
First, we taught this generation to be analysts rather than leaders. Of course, in those heady days we equated these two. It is now clear we were wrong. Leadership—particularly public leadership—entails more than just analytic skill. Public leaders must create a sense of community. They must inspire the cooperative dedication to human accomplishment. Indeed, they must articulate concerns and aspirations in a process that develops a vision of “accomplishment.” Ironically, I remember my chuckles as I read pamphlets from the 4-H or other organizations which extolled the virtues of their “leadership” programs which invariably had a public speaking component that I was about to judge. Perhaps, we systematically purified public speaking away from its natural qualities which are most needed today.

Second, we robbed this generation of a praxis of the public. Jürgen Habermas has recently critiqued our contemporary definitions of “the public.” Perhaps the alienation of the electorate from our electoral politics with its analyzed and segmented notion of “public” is the clearest evidence that something is amiss. Certainly we should expect that the kinds of associations produced by the term “targeting” would achieve something besides the connection of speaker with audience that Kevin Dean calls for. We left this generation, I believe, even without a vocabulary to describe the relationship between a “leader” and the public to which s/he is attached or from which s/he emerges.

These essays explore the contemporary residue of many of these issues. Sheryl Friedley provides a history of public speaking events that documents well a series of trends that I believe arise in this framework. Indeed, my criticism of her history is that it probably tells the story in too narrow a vocabulary by locating Genesis too late in the evolutionary chain. I have not moved the beginning point much earlier, but will be satisfied if I have placed her history within my history. Chris Reynolds’ characterization of current contests as focused on product permits her to unravel many of the characteristics of modern persuasion that lose sight of its fundamental connection of speaker, message, and audience. Kevin Dean’s careful study of techniques for connecting with an audience is a formula for guiding our students beyond mere analysis toward richer communication. His connecting today’s narrower conception of persuasion with the excessive focus on winning the contest is a plea to abate the tragic effects of the intensity of the earlier era. Tim Sellnow’s incisive indictment of the problem-solution pattern of organization sets him up to describe a technique for instructors to use to take students into deeper consideration of their connection with their public purpose. I believe that the laments, warnings, and techniques of these essays form a well considered commentary on the ironic residue of an earlier era that now requires some rethinking of forensics’ approach to public speaking events.

A Wider Vision, or Putting the Public Back in Public Speaking

I promised to contribute a transcending vision to the work of these papers. I will do so with a slogan that I make available to all: Put the Public Back in Public Speaking!

Kevin Dean recently used the phrase in the title of his essay for Argumentation and Advocacy. I believe my vision of the phrase’s implications is
even more dramatic than his. It begins with thinking of public speaking less as a skill to be taught than as an avenue in which our students construct their public selves. In a famous essay, C. Wright Mills distinguished between "the public" and "the mass." His somewhat romantic notion described the public as developed from engaged moral discourse which merged personal and collective experience. We might think of public speaking as the sometimes difficult task of socializing personal concerns into concepts of community experience and purpose. In a real sense, this notion suggests that the "public" is not something "out there" to be appealed to in a speech, but is something created by the speech. A good speech activates a public, and a good persuasive speech activates a public to accept the speaker's concern as something more than a personal concern.

Perhaps our concept of "audience" is too rigid to permit this kind of thinking—tied as it is to Mills' notion of the "mass" analyzable as target and open to the right appeals. Or perhaps we can save the concept with a notion like Maurice Charland's in his excellent essay which treats "audience" as a tentative community created through speech. Regardless, a different set of questions would confront our students: What audience do you wish to create with this speech? How would your speech serve as the basis for a public? What does your speech envision its contribution to this public being?

This notion would be a very small start on a larger revision of our way of thinking about our relationship to our students and forensics. We would urge them to think about the basis of community, for example; to teach them about discourse's role in developing the values which activate a community; to teach them that as powerful as objective analysis can be, one of the fundamental tasks of speaking is to prevent abstraction and depersonalization from sterilizing common (read shared) concerns; to teach them that "giving voice to" and "elevating the discourse of" a community is something different than mere listening and speaking.

There are a couple ways of approaching the practical implications of this vision. One is to think about the ways in which it would alter the preparation of our students. We would teach them to create publics in their speeches rather than analyze audiences. We would have them read more widely than policy analysis to ponder the relationship of their ideas to discourse that is more moral in emphasis such as great literature, narrative history, what we have come to call "social criticism," and discussions of societal purpose. We would expose them to notions of narrative or rhetorical logic to supplement their analytic skills. We would teach them that such concepts as "clarity" and "persuasiveness" should be seen not just as qualities of their speeches but as the basis for ongoing discourse in which many in the public can join.

Or we can think of the practical in terms of these essays on persuasive speaking. With Friedley, we can join to hope that "the persuasive speaking event will evolve to include more controversial topic areas that are more qualitatively significant than quantitatively significant, value the use of qualitative supporting evidence, and encourage the speaker to explore their more unique personal involvement with the topic." With Reynolds we can demand that our students feel the power and responsibility of persuasion. She would have them "speak about subjects to which they feel connected," see this connection as part of the fabric of their communication, and there-
fore “abide by their responsibility to actively engage.” With Dean, we can renew emphasis on sincerity and involvement as important to connecting with an audience so that we never have to approach a student and say, “Well, you certainly have a forensics winner—but you’ve cut the heart out of it. I really miss what you had before.” With Sellnow, we can help students to better explore their goals “to integrate their [forensics] work into broader learning frameworks,” and urge them to “view an experience in untraditional ways” to broaden the possibilities for persuasion. All of these authors suggest that those who teach forensics contemplate a central thesis: Our teaching has become too constrained by the rules and practices of our activity.

I believe that through either route the public speaking events in forensics will be more energetic, relevant, and central to a well-rounded quality education when the rich power and responsibility of speaking to transform our private ideas and concerns into public life becomes a focus of our teaching.

Wider Lessons, or What to Take Away from the Essays

Many lessons are available from these educators squeezed between rage and gentle resourcefulness. I hope that readers take some of the most important away from their reading and into their teaching. Take away from Sheryl Friedley’s essay her challenge to consider your own relationship to the changes in the event, and consider her plea to help our students develop their “full range of persuasive skills.” Take away Chris Reynolds’ struggle to reconcile student creativity with contest rules, a struggle she summarizes as her charge to “wrestle persuasive speaking back from mechanical conventions.” Take away Kevin Dean’s sound advice to widen your models of successful persuasion (a project he has contributed to in his essay for Argumentation and Advocacy’s recent special issue) and his charge to forsake the laboratory for a more realistic attitude of persuasion in the forensics round. And take away Tim Sellnow’s insights on how to frame your student’s work on a persuasive speech so the end result is education as well as training. This is much sound advice that should bring us closer to putting the public back in public speaking.
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Editor's Corner:

COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES ON REFORMING POLICY DEBATE

Star A. Muir
George Mason University
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At the meeting of the Policy Caucus at SCA last November, concern was expressed about several issues confronting the debate community: the length of the season, the possibility of using a topic in conjunction with CEDA debate, and the need for reevaluating the current district structure. To begin assessing community perceptions and sentiments on these issues, a survey was constructed by the Policy Caucus and mailed to 450 schools on the NOT master mailing list. This report provides the results of that survey, and offers some comments on both numerical and narrative elements of the survey.

In general, there is concern about the season length but nobody wants to change it, move up the date of the NDT, or significantly alter the date of the topic release. There is some support for releasing the topic later in July. There is consensus against the use of the CEDA topic, even as an experiment. Dissatisfaction with the district structure exists, although by a consensus and not a majority. There are, however, 4-5 times as many people who strongly oppose the district system as there are who strongly support it. A Percentage Based System (PBS) seems preferred while there is a great deal of opposition to an open NDT.

Survey Procedure

Demographics

There were 123 responses: 40 directors, 19 coaches, 60 debaters, and 4 "other." Of those who listed program information, only 1 survey listed novice as the division of competition, 1 listed junior varsity, and 6 said they did only novice or junior varsity. The remainder either said they did all divisions or varsity, and 25 listed varsity as the primary division they competed in. Of the respondents who filled out the debater portion of the survey, all but 7 said they competed in senior division (5 junior varsity and 2 novice). In sum, most of the people who filled out the survey competed in senior NDT.

For the purposes of analysis the other demographic items for programs were grouped in the following manner: Those successful at the national level (1 and 2 from the survey) and those successful at the regional level (3 through 6). School size was chunked as schools with 3 or fewer teams, 4 to 7, and eight or more. "Activity" measured schools that went to 1 through 10 tournaments, 11 to 17, and 18 and more.
For debaters, the majority (31 of 58) competed in senior division and listed "9" as their level of experience. Since those items didn't distinguish the students much, the other items were used to separate them. They were grouped into students with 5 years or less vs. 6 years or more participation in debate, 15 hours or less a week spent on debate vs. 16 hours or more, 9 or fewer tournaments vs. 10 or more, and 3 or fewer tournaments cleared at vs. 4 or more. In general, these splits were used to put a roughly equal number of students in each group. Other divisions that might make more sense would strain analysis with this number of responses.

Analysis
The above division created 8 independent variables and 44 dependent ones (each item was a potential dependent variable). The result was 352 comparisons. If the .05 significance level was used, we would be wrong 22 times. The correct way to control for this is with the MANOVA statistic. Given the large number of comparisons, however, that approach exceeded the memory of the computer. We thus used the statistic three different times: once to compare three different positions (director, coach, and student), once to compare different school types, and once to compare different debater types. There is a chance that this still might be too liberal for accurate interpretations. The crude way to correct for that is to raise the significance level. As a result, the differences reported below are all significant at the .01 level. If significant differences weren't found, they were not reported here.

Appendix 1 contains a compilation of all responses before any breakdown. Included is the raw number of respondents checking each item and the percentage of respondents checking each item, rounded off to the nearest hundredth. The significance level on Appendix 1 refers to a test of equal distribution—that the respondents are spread evenly across the 5 possible responses. Significance means that they aren't evenly distributed and that some preference is being expressed. This should be interpreted with care, however, since the responses could be bunched around response #3, indicating that most people are neutral. Please note: the conclusions we offer reflect general tendencies and by and large don't reflect the strength with which the respondents answered the questions.

Topic Date
Most people, 56%, think the season length is acceptable. 30% of the respondents want it shortened, but only 13% feel strongly about that. There is sharp disagreement between students and directors, however. Directors prefer a shorter season more than either coaches or students, and coaches prefer a shorter season more than students. The table below lists the means for the first 2 items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Length O.K.</th>
<th>Should be Longer</th>
<th>Should be Shorter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, schools with a large program seemed to be most happy with the topic date (mean=2.9) while schools with a moderate number of teams were most unhappy (mean=3.7), small schools fell in between those two groups (mean=3.3).

**Affect of Season Length on Students**

There was a lack of consensus about how the season length affected academics—the answers were scattered evenly across the board. There is some agreement that the season length works to increase stress and hinder career advancement. Around 40–50% of the respondents think that those things are hurt by the season length, and about 20% are neutral. An infrequency of travel corresponds to negative feelings about the effect of season length on stress and career advancement. In other words, programs that felt the long season hurt students travelled less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Means Based on Travel Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, large and small squads both felt that season length negatively affected stress and career advancement more than squads of moderate size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Means Based on Squad Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squad Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the same consensus existed in regard to feelings about how the shorter season influenced programs with small budgets: most felt it would help (48%) and more respondents were neutral (28%) than opposed (23%). Directors (mean = 3.7) felt this more strongly than coaches or students (mean = 3.1).

**How a Shorter Season Would Influence Debate**

A majority of respondents (58%–15% neutral) believed that a shorter season would compact the same amount of debating in less time, although debaters (mean = 3.8) and coaches (mean = 3.5) felt this more than directors (mean = 3.1). Paradoxically, many (44%, 31% neutral) felt that the shorter season would alter expectations for the number of tournaments teams would
compete at. Many (48%, 31% neutral) also felt that larger squads would be favored by a shorter season, and this feeling was most pronounced among smaller (mean = 3.9) and medium sized squads (mean = 3.5; large squad mean = 2.8). A similar number (46%, 20% neutral) felt a shorter season would compromise the quality of the experience, with medium-sized squads expressing the greatest concern (mean = 3.7; 3.3 for small and 2.7 for large squads). Most respondents (65%, 15% neutral) felt that there is not enough time to prepare for the NDT.

Date of the NDT

A consensus seemed to favor leaving the date of the NDT where it is (48%, 17% neutral), and opposition to moving the dates seemed to grow if changing the dates would release first-rounds immediately before districts (49% disagree, 32% neutral), eliminate the Northwestern tournament (51%, 24% neutral), squeeze second semester travel (51%, 21% neutral), or conflict with exams (62%, 19% neutral). There were no demographic differences.

Date of Topic Release

Most respondents disagreed with the notion of releasing the topic later (65%, 10% neutral), although directors liked the idea more (mean = 3.0) than coaches or debaters (mean = 2.0). Directors preferred the topic be released around July 15-30, debaters wanted in the July 8-22 range, and coaches seemed to prefer a date around July 1. On the 10 week scale starting 6-23, directors’ mean = 4.3, debaters’ mean = 3.7, and coaches’ mean = 2.2. Smaller squads were least opposed to a later release (mean = 2.8) than large squads (mean = 2.3), although medium-sized squads disliked the idea most (mean = 2.1).

Use of the CEDA Topic

Most respondents opposed use of the CEDA topic (75%, 10% neutral), and 35% were strongly opposed. Directors, while generally opposed, were more receptive to the idea (mean = 2.6) than debaters and coaches (mean = 1.5) and had more variance in their opinions (S.D. = 1.4, about .87 for debaters and coaches). Most respondents thought the CEDA topic would not expand travel opportunity (51%, 20% neutral) and would kill summer institutes (47%, 34% neutral). It was not believed that use of the CEDA topic would generate a meaningful dialogue between debate communities (40%, 31% neutral), and 29% felt that strongly, while most who thought adoption of the topic would create a dialogue did not feel so strongly (21% = agree, 6% = strongly agree). Students who had been involved in debate longer saw less promise for dialogue (mean = 3.2 vs. 2.5) as did students with greater success (mean = 2.3 vs 2.4) and students who were more active (mean = 2.2 vs 2.9). Further, most respondents opposed a 1-year experiment (60%, 13% neutral, 37% strongly opposed), although directors were more willing to try it (mean = 3.0) than coaches (mean = 2.1) or debaters (mean = 1.8). Again, coaches showed more variance in their responses (S.D. = 1.5 vs. about .95 for coaches and debaters). Among the debaters the experiment was most strongly opposed by highly active debaters (mean = 1.5 vs 2.1) and debaters
who had been involved in the activity for a longer time (mean = 1.6 vs 1.9). Although the data do not speak to this issue this might be the case because students in the latter two categories are nearing the end of their careers and don’t want to mess around with experiments.

Most agreed that the disadvantages to using the CEDA topic outweighed the advantages (53%, 19% neutral), though coaches (mean = 4.1) and debaters (mean = 3.7) were more vehement than directors (mean = 3.0). More successful programs were more strong in their beliefs (mean = 3.8) than less successful programs (mean = 3.1).

The District System

There seems to be significant dissatisfaction with the current district system (44%, 31% neutral), with only 5% of the respondents strongly in favor of the current structure. Debaters are the least discontent (mean = 2.9), followed by directors (mean = 2.4), and coaches, who are the least happy with districts (mean = 1.9). A guarded consensus (44%) felt that the district system did not fairly select teams for the NDT, although 25% of the respondents were neutral and 30% felt the system was fair. 22% strongly felt the system unfair, and only 5% strongly believed in the fairness of the system. Debaters (mean = 2.9) and directors (mean = 2.7) once again were more accepting of the fairness of districts than were coaches (mean = 2.0). Furthermore, less successful programs find the district system more fair (mean = 2.7) than more successful programs (mean = 2.5).

A majority believed that the NDT committee should seriously consider reforming districts (51%, 30% neutral) while only 4% strongly opposed reform. Coaches felt the most strongly (mean = 4.3), followed by directors (mean = 3.7) and debaters (mean = 3.2).

A majority was neutral (55%) about using the district structure for selecting representatives for the NDT committee, although more favored retention (24%) than opposed (18%). A similar neutrality was present in regard to redrawing district lines and retaining the system (51%), but fewer supported the idea (21%) than opposed it (25%). Most (49%, 24% neutral) did feel that the district structures provide a worthwhile sense of community, however.

The Bid Selections

There was a vast majority (73%, 14% neutral) who supported retaining the first-round process. Coaches (mean = 4.5) and debaters (mean = 4.3) favored retention more than directors (mean = 3.3). More successful programs favored retention of first-rounds (mean = 4.3) more than less successful programs (mean = 3.5). There was also a great deal of support for retaining second-round bids (69%, 14% neutral).

Most seemed to support a third team for 6 schools (55%, 19% neutral), with 37% strongly in favor and 11% strongly opposed. Not surprisingly, the idea was supported by successful programs (mean = 4.2) and opposed by less successful programs (mean = 2.8). In a similar vein, the idea was supported by successful debaters (mean = 3.3) and opposed by less successful debaters (mean = 2.8).
The PBS system received limited support, with 39% of the respondents supporting (20% strongly), 31% opposing (11% strongly), and 29% neutral. Debaters who had been involved in debate for a longer time supported the PBS (mean = 3.4) while those who had debated for a shorter time opposed it (mean = 2.7). 46% believed that the PBS would stimulate regional debate (34% neutral), and 42% felt it would be a more fair way to select teams for the NDT (26% neutral, 11% strongly opposed). 48% believed that it should be studied as a serious alternative to districts (25% neutral). Coaches (mean = 3.7) and directors (mean = 3.3) supported study more than debaters (mean = 3.1).

Open NDT

The open NDT was opposed by 69% of the respondents (13% neutral, 7% strongly in favor). Debaters (mean = 1.8) and coaches (mean = 2.0) were more opposed than directors (mean = 2.7). 62% opposed a plan that would put a limit only on the number of teams per school (13% neutral), with debaters (mean = 2.0) and coaches (mean = 2.3) again more opposed than directors (mean = 3.0). Most (53%) felt the open format would make preparations too difficult (21% neutral) and would destroy the feeling and meaning of qualifying for the national championship (68%, 13% neutral). A consensus (44%) opposed the idea that the open NDT would solve inequities of the district system (42%, 30% neutral). Finally, most did not even support study of the open format (53%, 20% neutral, 16% strongly opposed). Directors favored study of the format (mean = 3.3) while coaches (mean = 2.5) and debaters (mean = 2.1) opposed it.

Comments

Two things strike us about these data. First, they provide clear evidence that the debate community is ready for a change. Many of the comments are outspoken on the issue of district reform, terming the process "inequitable," "ludicrous," and "absurd." Only 5% of the respondents strongly agreed that the current district system was fair and should not be changed. 44% were unhappy with the current system, and of the available options, 25% favored revising the district system, and 39% favored some form of a Percentage Based System. 51% of the respondents felt that the Committee should seriously consider some reform, and only 17% opposed reform. There is also concern expressed in the comments that the NDT Committee has responded (and will continue to respond) slowly to the issue of district reform. Several respondents objected to the delay of the "study counter-plan," and there is skepticism about the current discussions of reform. There is hope, however, about moving forward on necessary changes, and about restoring a sense of progress in policy debate. The district structure should be changed, 44% said (with 31% neutral), and yet there was some sense that districts provide a worthwhile sense of community. This sentiment might lead us to explore a hybrid system that maintains selection power in the districts but also employs some form of a percentage requirement. Several of these were suggested on the survey. One thing seems very clear to us:
people are by and large interested in moving forward in revising the current selection system.

Second, it is apparent from this data that many program directors are burnt out and, at least to some degree, willing to shorten the season and play around with alternatives. This may be a more pressing long-term concern than re-districting. Interesting in this regard is that the sharpest differences in opinion are between the debaters and the directors, not between programs of varying size and success. There were 18 statistically significant different differences between debaters and directors, and by contrast only 13 significant differences between differing programs. This despite there being 3 different program dimensions and only 1 director/student dimension. In other words, the gap between student and director perception was more than four times larger than the gap between the perceptions of directors at various programs. This suggests to us that what might be the biggest concern is doing something to make the debate circuit more amenable to the career director. Many of the Program Director comments expressed frustration and bitterness about the nature of their work. Our discussion might change a bit if we placed at the center of our discussion the concern for directors, and for maintaining expectations and duties that don't drive people out of debate. More good directors will make for good programs, and for healthier debate.

Editor's Note: Since these survey results were compiled, the NDT Committee has adopted a reform measure reallocating the number of district bids in accordance with the ratio of teams submitting from each district/teams submitting bids nationwide. That reform, along with a 50% preliminary round win-loss floor on second-round bid applications, is scheduled to go into effect for the 1993–1994 season.
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Appendix 1
Total Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of season</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Length acceptable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Should be longer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Should be shorter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affects stress/health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academics suffer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career suffers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Short season help small programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Short season squeeze travel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short season change travel expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Not enough research time for NDT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Short season favor larger squads</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Short season reduce experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. NDT hosted earlier</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NDT earlier if districts follow</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. NDT earlier if northwestern not on bids</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NDT earlier if 2nd sem. travel squeezed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. NDT earlier if conflict with exams</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEDA topic and topic release</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. NDT topic released later</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. NDT use CEDA topic</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. CEDA topic expands travel</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. CEDA topic destroys summer workshops</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. CEDA topic opens dialogue</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Benefits worth 1-year experiment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Benefits not &gt; disadvantages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The district system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Current system acceptable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Current system fairly selects teams</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. NDT seriously consider reform</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. District rep. to committee retained</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Districts redrawn but retained</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Districts provide sense of community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The bid process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 1st round process retained</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 2nd round process retained</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 6 schools qualify 3rd teams retained</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A percentage-based system (PBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. PBS should replace districts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. PBS stimulate regional debate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. PBS a fair selection method</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. PBS seriously studied as alternative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An open NDT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Should be open NDT</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. NDT open except for team/school limit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Open NDT makes host preparation difficult</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Open NDT destroys meaning of NDT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Open NDT solves district inequities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. NDT committee seriously study open NDT</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1

#### Extended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Sig. (P &lt;)</th>
<th>Mean (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of the season</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEDA topic and topic release</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The district system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The bid process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A percentage-based system (PBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An open NDT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them to: "The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha."

The membership fee is $15.00. The official key (size shown in cut on this page) is $15.00, or the official key-pin is $17.00.

Prices include Federal Tax. The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the Fall issue of Speaker and Gavel. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive Speaker and Gavel for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive Speaker and Gavel may subscribe at the standard rate of $5.00 per year.